



Office of the President
University of Cincinnati
P.O. Box 210063
Cincinnati, OH 45221-0063
Phone: (513) 556 – 2201
Email: President@uc.edu

July 27, 2016

Chancellor John Carey
Ohio Department of Higher Education
25 South Front Street
Columbus, OH 43215

Dear Chancellor Carey,

In accordance with House Bill 64 (Section 369.550), which required each institution to complete an efficiency review and submit their implementation plans to you by August 1, 2016, please find the University of Cincinnati's report enclosed.

Because the University of Cincinnati Board of Trustees did not have a meeting in July 2016, the Board will be taking the appropriate action at its upcoming August 23, 2016 meeting.

We wish to thank you for your leadership on the issue of student affordability and operational efficiencies and are pleased to share you with the exciting programs and progress we have made here at the University of Cincinnati.

If you or your staff have any questions about this report, please do not hesitate to reach out to myself or Bob Ambach, Senior Vice President for Administration and Finance for assistance.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads 'Beverly J. Davenport'.

Beverly J. Davenport
Interim President





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.

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, the University of Cincinnati Board of Trustees approved a modification to its purchasing rule adding this requirement at their June 2016 meeting. Use of university contracts was previously implied in the Board Rule and compliance appears to be good. However, the strength of the Board modification is expected to improve adherence to contract with an estimated annual value of \$210,000 per year: \$70M was spent off contract in FY16. While this spend is generally reviewed for contract availability, a two percent improvement in compliance, purchased at fifteen percent lower cost will yield \$210,000 per year.

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

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

Contract Type	Is the institution participating in joint contracts? [yes, no, plan to]	Include additional explanation here if needed. If the institution chooses not to participate, please explain why.
Copier/printer services	Yes, plan to	Contract negotiations are underway by the IUC-PG. UC plans to adopt at its next contract transition opportunity, July 2017
Computer hardware	Yes, plan to	The IUC-PG is working with the IUC-CIO group on this recommendation. UC is active on both committees and will collaborate on the contract.

Travel services	Yes, plan to	The universities without a primary travel agency are to adopt one by September 2016. The University of Cincinnati is in compliance with this. UC is also implementing a travel management department and has acquired a travel and expense management system toward improving efficiencies, enabling duty of care and achieving savings on travel expenses.
Outbound shipping	Yes, plan to	UC meets the Task Force recommendations by way of group purchasing contracts provided by the State of Ohio and the Educational & Institutional Cooperative. The IUC-PG is exploring options to manage inbound freight and will have a strategy developed by August 2016
Scientific supplies & equipment	Yes, plan to	UC is participating with Ohio State and others to create a scientific supplies and equipment contract effective January 2017
Office supplies & equipment	Yes	UC meets the Task Force recommendations in this area. The IUC-PG has finalized a collaborative office supply agreement that UC uses.

Assets and Operations

Recommendation 4 | Assets and Operations

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

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

The University of Cincinnati has/is evaluating assets for potential monetization. Analysis and discussion is ongoing with respect to parking operations, housing and campus recreation. No decisions have been made with respect to these endeavors and the university is in the process of releasing an RFP for external partners to further assist in evaluating these opportunities, incremental assets for consideration, as well as assistance with the evaluation of possible deal structures. In addition, we have evaluated our real estate holdings and have placed these on-hold, as currently the market value of these properties is less than our book value.

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:

In early 2016, the University of Cincinnati engaged Huron to complete an efficiency review of operations, with the goal of benchmarking our organization with other institutions to identify areas for enhancement. This review concluded in May

2016 and our Executive team and Board of Trustees is evaluating the findings and proposed areas for implementation.

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.

Co-op was invented at the University of Cincinnati in 1906. The oldest in the world, UC's co-op program is consistently listed among the nation's best in "US News & World Report" rankings. In 2015-16 coop placements exceeded 5,700 with estimated student earnings of approximately \$65 million. The program provides a blend of educational excellence and real-world experience that partners employers and faculty in the preparation of students for successful and rewarding careers.

The Live Well Collaborative (LWC) is a non-profit (501 c-6) co-founded in 2007 by UC and Procter & Gamble (P&G). Its purpose is to specialize in research and development of products and services for living well across the life span with an expertise in the 50+ marketplace. It is a unique academic-industry driven innovation center where interdisciplinary teams of UC faculty and students use a design thinking approach to translate consumer research into products and services. The Live Well is a College of DAAP studio project based research center. Each semester long interdisciplinary studio project is co-lead by a faculty team and expert advisors that work with selected graduate and undergraduate teams to address an opportunity an organization presents. The Live Well is dedicated to helping organizations better understand the needs of their consumers/patients to improve health and wellbeing regardless of age or ability.

Over the past 9 years the LWC have completed over 60 studio projects exposing over 500 students and 40 faculty to design thinking methodologies for solution development. LWC has worked with over 14 corporate and institutional projects. Current work is being done with Boeing, Pfizer, Cincinnati Children's Hospital and P&G. The most recent work with Cincinnati Children's Hospital has produced solutions that have been implemented and are undergoing validation studies. The work with P&G and Boeing has translated into several patents.

The University of Cincinnati entered into a partnership with Under Armour in 2015 that included annual cash compensation as well as apparel and equipment allowances. In addition to the financial terms improving the financial position of the Athletic department, a key component of this partnership is the opportunity for both organizations to help each other with promotion of the respective brands and a commitment to improve the performance of our athletes.

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
Live Well Collaborative	University of Cincinnati and P & G co-founded collaborative, nearly 10 years old
1500 Co-op employers	Generate ~\$62M in earnings for UC students – Money and experience make a difference in building future career opportunities and advancement.
Marathon Corporation for E3	Marathon Corporation partnership with College of Engineering and Applied Science (CEAS) have created the Emerging Ethnic Engineers (E3) Program Marathon and CEAS have partnered around scholarship support and co-op (and eventually full career placement) opportunities for underrepresented students in engineering disciplines key to Marathon’s business. Marathon provides support/programming to both the summer bridge program and also academic year scholarships up to \$100,000. UC provides Marathon with an early initial contact with appropriate students for co-op and eventually career placement.

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.

In early 2016, the University of Cincinnati engaged Huron to complete an efficiency review of operations, with the goal of benchmarking our organization with other institutions to identify areas for enhancement. This review concluded in May 2016 and our Executive team and Board of Trustees is evaluating the findings and proposed areas for implementation.

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.

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 recent Huron efficiency review of operations will be the supporting source document for the plan and actions that will be aimed at improving efficiency and effectiveness - which would have positive correlations on the productivity measures. That being said, the University of Cincinnati has been engaging in many activities aimed at improving our productivity scores. Our focus on attracting quality students and retaining them via their positive educational and social experiences lead to improved outcomes in course completion and degree attainment. In addition, we are continually looking to benchmark our performance against other peer institutions, both on the academic and administrative areas (National Study of Instructional Costs and Productivity, EAB, etc.), for areas where we can improve. Lastly, we look to pause before filling open positions to ensure that a need truly exists and we do not miss an opportunity to capitalize on additional efficiencies.

The University of Cincinnati has contacted with EAB in the APS program with results to be reported and reviewed in the fall of 2016.

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

We are considering the formation of a Project Management Office (PMO) to aid our leaders in the advancement of efficiency efforts. Six Sigma knowledge and concepts would be an important component of this office and a great resource for leaders to draw upon to help provide research or facilitation of activities of process redesign.

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.

In early 2016, the University of Cincinnati engaged Huron to complete an efficiency review of operations, with the goal of benchmarking our organization with other institutions to identify areas for enhancement. This review concluded in May 2016 and our Executive team and Board of Trustees is evaluating the findings and proposed areas for implementation. Structure is included in this review and set of recommendations, including the concept of shared service centers.

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

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

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

The university’s HR staff works closely with other IUC schools on healthcare and other benefit plan offerings. At this time, the IUC has group purchasing arrangements for Life and Disability Insurance, Employee Assistance Plan services, Dental plan, Vision plan services as well as Affordable Care Act (ACA) tax management reporting services. The IUC is not exploring consolidation of health plan providers at this time as available carriers have strengths in different markets and areas of the state. An attempted group purchasing effort for pharmacy benefit services was attempted several years ago, but universities were able to obtain better pricing outside a group purchasing initiative. The IUC schools are also working collaboratively on a retirement plan consulting arrangement with AON which will ultimately result in improved retirement plan options and services for all university employees.

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

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

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

The University of Cincinnati began implementing the State of Ohio Shared Services recommendations for the SOCC more than two years ago. The UC Board of Trustees approved in August 2014 a shared IT services agreement with the State of Ohio Computer Center (SOCC) for secure hosting and reliable backups for massive amounts of data at unsurpassed business continuity speed. [Currently 11 full cabinets/racks of UC data are replicated at the SOCC.]

When the connection went live in the summer of 2015, UC became the first higher education institution in Ohio to partner with the SOCC for co-location.

The SOCC co-location project came at a modest price compared to a phase I expense of brick-and-mortar disaster recovery site construction or contracting with a cloud storage vendor (approximately \$1.5 million initial construction cost avoidance).

The UC-SOCC partnership leverages connections to OARnet's 100 Gbps high-speed network backbone and the Cincinnati Education and Research Fiber Loop.

Future phases of the UC-SOCC partnership are intended to scale the IT services continuity architecture to a complete enterprise disaster recovery capacity. The full buildout of the data center co-location plan and a regional southwest Ohio disaster recovery data center site are two of the key milestones for realizing additional savings and cost avoidance.

UC is working closely with the SOCC, OARnet, and the Ohio Department of Higher Education to leverage and increase the utilization of shared services and aggregated purchasing.

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.

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.

Planning + Design + Construction conducted a Space Utilization Analysis with Comprehensive Facilities Planning (CFP) to examine the Uptown Campus West utilization of instruction space at UC for the Fall 2014 and Spring 2015 semesters.

The goal for classrooms at UC is to supply the best possible facilities for the instructional needs and use these valuable and finite assets in their most productive manor. The 207 total classrooms on the West campus were utilized 63% of the time. This is at the lower end of the recommended guideline of 60-70%. However, the 152 general use classrooms were scheduled at 67%, which is at the recommended guideline and is approaching the absolute capacity of 70%.

Conclusions

1. The current total classroom supply for West campus is adequate for the current enrollment.
2. The combination of Teachers College renovation classrooms and the modular classrooms at the Clifton Court Pavilions will bring the general use classroom supply in line with the recommended number of classrooms in Fall 2016.
3. The evening program could be consolidated into fewer building to address energy, student traffic, and securities concerns such as proximity to parking.
4. For future planning and enrollment growth expectations, the most beneficial classrooms to add to the general use classrooms are in the 30-39 seat range.

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.

Energy

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

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

Project	Collaborative Partnership(s)	Explanation
Dispatch Generation Based on PJM Prices	Dynergy, Beachfront Energy, PJM	We dispatch our generation based on economic conditions. We evaluate every hour whether we should produce or buy electricity. Our regulated rate for FY16 was a credit of \$1,000,000 and our purchased PJM costs averaged 2.259 cents per kWh for a total overall net electric cost of 1.95 cents per kWh.
REC Sales		We used our waste heat recovery generation certification to produce and sell \$300,000

		of RECS is FY16
Issue Natural Gas RFP		We issued a RFP that resulted in a price of NYMEX plus \$0.115/MMBTU which is almost half of our previous transportation cost. This contract will save about \$275,000 per year.
Special Contract for LDC	Vorys	We have a special contract for our natural gas local distribution costs which reduced our costs by \$800,000 in FY16.
Installing PEMS		Up to 50% less cost to install and maintain than CEMS and reduces the hardware and consumables (pumps, analyzers and calibration gases) needed for operation.
Chilled Water Filter System (in progress)		Filter the Chilled Water system on campus to clean heat transfer surfaces for energy savings, reduce corrosion rates to maintain longer equipment and prevent harmful clogging and bacterial growth for a healthier environment.
New Lights CRC		Replaced all HID lights in gym with LED lighting
New Lights Garages		Replaced over 1,000 HID fixtures with long life T5 high output lamps.
Duke Energy Rebates		We received a total of over \$160,000 of rebates for various projects in FY16. UC is Duke's largest recipient of rebate funds and UC has done more projects than any of Duke's other customers.
Vontz		Lab air flow controls upgrade to allow reduced outdoor air into the building for conditioning during unoccupied hours
ECUP air compressors Replacement	Ike Ratliff, Keith Bundy, Maury DuPont	Replacing inefficient Gardner Denver Air Compressors with a single variable speed unit. This will be the main compressor and will reduce energy consumption.
Old Chem lighting retrofit		Replace MH lighting with LED throughout building. 461 bulbs
Utility tunnel lighting		Installed occupancy sensors on utility tunnel lighting that had been on 24/7
VPC Boiler		Replaced burners on two boilers with high efficiency burners.

Outside lighting		Replaced incandescent outside lighting fixtures with LED in various locations (Langsam plaza, Fishwick)
Control valves replacement		Replaced all the HW/ CHW control valves at Procter hall. They were all leaking through.
Demand limiting		Wrote programming at the air handler level to reduce energy consumption when needed for peak shaving
Scioto - Dorm	Messer, GBBN, CMTA	Replace shell, HVAC, and lighting
Radiation Safety – laboratory		Building demolished, functions consolidated into existing buildings, removes the campuses most energy intensive building.
Teachers Dyer – classroom & office	Champlin, Motz	HVAC and lighting
Boiler Replacement at Fishwick		Replaced boiler with a high efficiency boiler
GMT- Fiswick – new building		Consolidated multiple buildings into one contemporary energy efficient building
PCP and McMicken Roofs		Increased insulation

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.

UC's Division for Administration and Finance now negotiates directly with publishers on behalf of our 44,000 students, saving each student an average of \$153.00. Of particular interest, the includedED® model saves students 40% on average. This strategy is ideal for courses requiring students to use an electronic workbook, or other electronic consumable material. Students are charged a course fee for these materials. We leverage the large class sizes to make certain demands of publishers.

These demands include:

- 1) a significant discount from the individual purchase price
- 2) the length of access to learning materials, typically to extend access through a student's career at UC
- 3) having optional printed copies available to students. Subsequently, our IT@UC department arranges for each student's access to learning materials through BlackBoard for the entire class.

Key outcomes include

- Discounts on the order of 40% per course have already saved students nearly \$700,000 during the 2015/16 academic year. A total of 4,567 unique students benefited from these discounts by enrolling in 1 or more class participating in the model.
- Students have access to required learning materials immediately at the beginning of the course. Once the BlackBoard course is activated, then they are already ready to log in.
- Students' financial aid can immediately apply to the cost of learning materials. Since the fee is part of their tuition and fees, students will not need to wait for financial aid to disburse in order to purchase learning materials.

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.

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.

UC standardizes electronic textbooks for all courses participating in the includedED® model described above. Participating courses include General Chemistry, Biology, Calculus, Introduction to Psychology (at our regional UC Blue Ash campus), and others. In addition, UC Great Gateway initiative provides a forum for faculty in Gateway courses to discuss the option of choose a common text.

In addition, UC has just standardized its e-Reader with the vendor Vital Source. This choice was made to support pedagogy

and to address student feedback that they often don't leverage all of the features of an e-texts because they are presented in multiple readers. We will teach students to use Vital Source through our first-year programs. Thus standardization has not only reduced costs but improved the learning environment.

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 Center for Excellence in eLearning is launching its first eTextbook Project. A group of 12 faculty are working to develop their own interactive textbooks using iBooks Author, avoiding the high cost of going through a publisher. These will either supplement the textbooks already used in courses or replace them altogether. Our Center for Excellence in Teaching will begin accepting applications for cohort 2 during the mid-fall semester and begin work during the 2017 spring term.

See: <http://us3.campaign-archive2.com/?u=875cc910a3ac765107d2cfcdb&id=5fb75b29b9>

In addition, UC Libraries maintains access to a growing array of articles, books, audio tracks, and other learning materials available online for free. By visiting UC Libraries Digital Collections, our faculty and students can find online resources such as ACLS Humanities, CRCnetBASE, Ebrary, Gutenberg-e Database, Naxos Music Library, Safari Books Online, SpringerLink, and the Wiley Online Library.

See: <https://digital.libraries.uc.edu/>

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

Recommendation 7 | Time to Degree

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

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

Yes, the University of Cincinnati (UC) has deployed fully updated Degree Audits for all of its undergraduate degree programs. Most of these are in a structured format displaying courses in 15 – 18 credit hour groupings per semester. Students are advised during Orientation that completing 30 credit hours a year is a necessary component to graduate on time. UC has also implemented at “15 to Finish” Campaign as part of our Financial Literacy Programming.

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.

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

No. UC has not implemented this recommendation. We review our awarding practices annually and will keep this strategy in mind. We believe strategies to close unmet need gaps to be more effective in helping students earn their degrees.

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

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

Yes, as a part of Semester Conversion all academic programs were reviewed against these credit hour measures. Unless there is an accreditation reason for requiring more, all Baccalaureate programs are required to be at 120 semester credit hours and Associate degree programs at 60 semester credit hours. As new programs are developed they are also held to this standard. Since adopting these standards time to degree has dropped from 4.8 years down to 4.5 years. In examining this figure, it is important to note 25% of UC students are in 5-year co-op inclusive programs.

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.

UC has implemented an Early Alert Tool (Starfish) – to better inform advisors (and students) of actions or inactions students are taking to deter or enhance success in the classroom. All first-year students and probationary students are required to participate in an advising session prior to registering for the next semester and we are seeking ways to extend this into the second year. UC will deploy Blackboard’s *Analytics for Learn* in the next year to enhance our ability to identify students who are at risk.

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.

UC enjoys an active summer enrollment in excess of 18,000 students, a level that is over 40% of our Fall/Spring enrollment. Summer 2016 enrollment is 4% greater than summer 2015, which exceeded the previous year by 3.5%. All gateway and critical path lower division courses are offered in the summer term, usually in multiple length format options. Many academic programs include summer as a standard term. Students on UC’s two regional campuses are incentivized to enroll in summer through an “Enroll in six credit hours, pay for five credit hours” scholarship plan.

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)?

Yes. UC has formal pathway agreements with 10 Ohio Institutions and numerous others outside of Ohio. They may be found at http://admissions.uc.edu/transfer/transfer_articulation.html

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

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

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

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

UC is actively developing its Information Technology (IT) degrees in a competency-based methodology and is considering this option for our RN-to-BSN program. The IT programs will serve approximately 500 students once fully deployed, and the RN to BSN program would serve approximately 300 students.

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 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.

Inter-institutional Synchronous Language Instruction

UC is building nascent relationships with Miami University, Ohio University (and potentially Ohio State University) to share language instruction. Utilizing synchronous courses accessed by students via conferencing technology, institutions might reduce low-enrollment courses and simultaneously increase offerings. Initially we plan on partnering with Miami University, which is interested in sending students to UC for Hebrew courses. UC would in turn virtually send students to Miami for Russian courses. Each institution would be sending students toward a curricular area of strength at the other institution, with the additional benefit of students taking courses with tenure-track faculty instead of adjuncts. This type reciprocity arrangement, already underway for Greek language instruction between Miami and Ohio Universities, requires reliable technology and relationships of trust between the faculties. Cisco conferencing technology, now on campus for

demonstrations, would be our planned web-based conferencing tool. Our next step is to bring together the relevant faculty – via video conferencing – to discuss the details of course sharing. A&S deans will be in Athens later this summer to discuss a variety of cooperative efforts, including language instruction.

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

Course/Program	Partnering Institution	Explanation
Synchronous Language Instruction	Miami University of Ohio	Course sharing of Hebrew and Russian Courses

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.

UC developed a Financial Literacy Coalition three years ago. Membership includes the OneStop Center, Financial Aid, Bursar, and the Wellness Center. Together, the Coalition jointly plans campus programming. Orientation, First-Year Experience classes, Residence Education, Greek life and other student groups are target offices. The Coalition has also supported programming for graduate students and International Students. The OneStop Center maintains a web tool called UCan Manage It found here: <http://onestop.uc.edu/manageit.html>. This database is a repository of resources and tools to support students and their families. In the last three years, UC’s default rate has dropped from 10.5% to 7.6%. Indebtedness upon graduation has dropped from \$28,152 to \$27,677 (-1.9%) for the two most recent graduation classes.

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

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

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)
Efficiency Practices			
3A: Campus Contracts	\$21,021,706		
3B: Collaborative contracts	\$5,859,460		
4A: Asset Review	In progress		
4B: Operations Review	In progress		
4C: Affinity partnerships and sponsorships	Not Available		
5A: Cost diagnostic	In progress		
5B: Productivity measure	In progress		
5C: Organizational Structure	In progress		
5D: Health-care costs	Not Available		

5E: Data Centers	\$1.5M in cost avoidance	no	Yes, by indirectly freeing resources for the development of online courses and tools.
5F: Space utilization	In progress		
Energy projects	\$2.2m in cost avoidance		
Academic Practices and Policies			
6A: Negotiate cost on textbook affordability	\$700,000 in cost avoidance	no	Yes, by indirectly freeing resources for other educational costs borne by our students.
6B: Standardize materials	unavailable		
6C: Develop digital capabilities	unavailable		Yes, online learning increases educational access to our students.
7A: Education Campaign	unavailable		
7B: Graduation Incentive	N/A		
7C: Standardize credits for degrees	unavailable		Yes, decreases time-to-degree
7D: Data-driven advising	unavailable	Benefits directly to students by improving progress to degree	Yes, increases rate of progress of students to degree
7E: Summer programs	The pay for 5 earn 6 credits on the regional campuses saved students \$222 to \$251 per credit hour depending on campus of enrollment.		Yes, access to all key courses during the summer allows for continued degree progress.
7F: Pathway agreements	unavailable	Benefits to students directly in terms of access and affordability	Yes, pathways agreements benefit students directly by providing access at a reduced cost per credit hour
7G: Competency-based education	In progress		
8: Duplicative courses and programs	unavailable		
Low-enrollment programs	N/A		

10: Financial advising	Savings in \$500 per student in indebtedness upon graduation	Benefits to students by providing good-decision making support about loans and financial options.	Yes, by indirectly freeing student resources.
Total Expected Annual Cost Savings:	Not quantifiable given that different students are impacted in different ways.		

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

Category	Amount Invested	Explanation
Reductions to the total cost of attendance (tuition, fees, room and board, books and materials, or related costs — such as technology)	Total not available	With no increases to in-state tuition and mandatory fees since 2012-13, the University of Cincinnati applied this across the board, and included the no increase to out-of-state and graduate student tuition as well. This has facilitated the graduation of thousands of students to graduate without an increase during their academic career. These efforts have been supported by our comprehensive textbook affordability project.
Student financial aid	\$1, 500,000 in additional aid from fund raised and general funds	Targeted fundraising for need-based aid netted approximately \$500,000 for UC students. Additionally, UC allocated \$1,000,000 in aid to close need gaps over the last 2 years. An additional \$500,000 investment is slated for 2016-17.
Student success services, particularly with regard to completion and time to degree	\$800,000.00	Ten advisors were hired to further support our students, lowering their time-to-degree (4.8 to 4.5 years) while simultaneously increasing their retention and graduation rates. We also purchased the StarFish retention software (and an administrator of the system was funded) with the intent of scaling our proactive student retention efforts via technology enhancements. A significant portion of the advising investment is devoted to a Pathways Advising Center, devoted to assisting transfer and transition students navigate clear pathways to completion. "Undecided remains our largest entry major." UC's Center for Exploratory Studies is a nationally recognized best practice Center that assists such students navigate to completion in a major of their choice.
Investments in tools related to affordability and efficiency	No new investment	Our textbook affordability project saves approximately \$153 per student, significantly reducing their educational expenses.

		<p>Through the leadership and support from the Office of the provost, our Center for the Enhancement of Teaching & Learning coordinated programming with faculty members in the Mathematical Sciences department. They introduced flipped teaching to the classroom, the adoption of early intervention strategies, and other pedagogical enhancements. In fall 2013, before the initiative, UC's uptown campus experienced a DFW (lack of success) rate of 36.7% in our Calculus I courses (including applied calculus, and courses with supplemental pre-calculus preparation). After the initiative's changes were established by fall 2015, this rate had fallen to 28.5%. If not for the improvement to our success rate, we estimate that approximately 156 students would not have completed Calculus in their first attempt this year, saving students money, while keeping them on-track for timely completion of their degree.</p>
<p>Improvements to high-demand/high-value student programs</p>	<p>\$0 (realignment of resources)</p>	<p>As the oldest co-op institution in the world, the University of Cincinnati is continually re-inventing experienced-based learning. We've recently begun a merger of our Career Development Center with our Co-op organization, ProPEI in order to provide seamless, single-point-of-entry, longitudinal support for our students and employers. Students earned approximately \$62M last year from co-op experiences, significantly contributing towards the cost of their education while gaining invaluable experience-based learning.</p>
<p><i>Add other categories as needed</i></p>		

MASTER RECOMMENDATION 2: FIVE-YEAR GOAL FOR INSTITUTIONAL EFFICIENCY SAVINGS AND NEW RESOURCE GENERATION

UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI

Category	Recommendation	Component	Description	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	Subtotal	Budget Narrative/Explanation of Efficiency Savings \$\$ (attach additional sheets if necessary)
<i>Efficiency Savings</i>	3A	Campus contracts	Require employees to use existing contracts for purchasing goods and services.	\$ 105,000	\$ 210,000	\$ 105,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 420,000	Off contract spending in 2016 was \$70 million. While these purchases are reviewed for contract applicability, UC's new Board Rule on compliance is expected to increase use of existing contracts. If a 2% improvement in contract use is achieved and the contracts offer a 15% price improvement this will yield a \$210,000 annual savings.
	3A	Campus contracts	Blue Ash Campus outsourced cleaning	\$ 325,000					\$ 325,000	New contract this year. This is the actual savings estimate.
	3A	Campus contracts	MRO Service Contract Consolidation		\$300,000				\$ 300,000	
	3A	Campus contracts	Travel expense reductions in airfare and lodging		\$150,000				\$ 150,000	
	3A	Campus contracts	eProcurement platform				\$350,000		\$ 350,000	An estimate of catalog targets with spending of \$7 million in 2016 could yield savings estimated at \$350,000 when acquired through eprocurement tools
	3B	Collaborative contracts	Pursue new and/or strengthened joint purchasing agreements.		\$ 200,000				\$ 200,000	Scientific products consolidation and collaboration, IUC-PG bidding
	3B	Collaborative contracts	Collaborative contracts		\$ 100,000	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$200,000	\$ 600,000	Contracts for inbound shipping, desktop printing and copy machine fleet management are underway with IUC-PG
	3B	Collaborative contracts	Collaborative contracts	\$ 4,692,179	\$ 4,692,179	\$ 4,692,179	\$ 4,692,179	\$ 4,692,179	\$ 23,460,895	Continued savings through use of existing IUC contracts using FY16 as a base
	3B	Collaborative contracts	Collaborative contracts	\$ 1,167,281	\$ 1,167,281	\$ 1,167,281	\$ 1,167,281	\$ 1,167,281	\$ 1,167,281	Continued savings through use of existing State of Ohio contracts using FY16 as a base
Subtotal Efficiency Savings				\$ 6,289,460	\$ 6,819,460	\$ 6,114,460	\$ 6,359,460	\$ 6,059,460	\$ 26,973,176	
Category	Recommendation	Component	Description	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020	FY 2021	Subtotal	Budget Narrative/Explanation of New Resource Generation \$\$ (attach additional sheets if necessary)
<i>New Resource Generation</i>										
	Subtotal New Resource Generation				\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
TOTAL OF COMBINED INSTITUTIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR ENHANCED STUDENT AFFORDABILITY				\$ 6,289,460	\$ 6,819,460	\$ 6,114,460	\$ 6,359,460	\$ 6,059,460	\$ 26,973,176	

SPECIFIC RE-DEPLOYMENT OF SAVINGS TO STUDENTS: Please use the area below to describe, in detail, how you plan to re-deploy the institutional resources that are saved and/or generated through the task force components outlined above to reduce costs for students.