

April 30, 2008

Report

Of the Task Force on the Future of Regional Campuses

Subcommittee Reports

**Administrative and Reporting
Structures**
**Academic Program
Development**
**Faculty Relationship with
Departments in Athens**
Finance
Auxiliary and Student Services

Presented to

Dr. Kathy Krendl
Executive Vice President and Provost

April 30, 2008

Table of Contents

Subcommittee Reports

Administrative and Reporting Structures	2
Academic Program Development	5
Faculty Relationship with Departments in Athens	11
Finance	18
Auxiliary and Student Services	22

Appendices

APPENDIX A Survey Comments / Details	28
APPENDIX B Survey Instrument	38
APPENDIX C Auxiliary and Student Services	40
APPENDIX D Charge by the EVP and Provost	47
APPENDIX E Task Force Membership	50

**Task Force on the Future of Regional Campuses
Subcommittee Report
Administrative and Reporting Structures**

Subcommittee Members

John Furlow (Co-chair), Dennis Irwin (Co-chair), Patty Griffith, Greg Nadon, Donald Moore, James Fonseca (Regional Campus Resource Dean)

Subcommittee Charge

We understand that the central mission for the regional campuses is to meet the higher educational needs of our respective communities and to provide programming at the certificate, associate degree, and baccalaureate degree levels as well as minors and non-credit coursework. The regional campuses provide courses to meet the transfer mission not only to Athens, but ALSO to other colleges and universities. The regional campuses also provide workforce education, including business and industry training. The regional campuses also serve as centers for cultural activities and for information (library) and technology support for their communities. The campuses are partners with secondary and elementary schools in their communities and assist them in fulfilling their educational mission.

Recommendations

1. We recommend that the current Regional Higher Education structure remain as it is. The Deans should report to the Executive Vice President and Provost of the University. There should be an Executive Dean or Associate Vice Provost for the Regional Campus System and a financial position to serve the accounting and data needs of the regional campuses. The Executive Dean or Vice Provost position should advocate for the regional campuses' role within the University and act to keep the campuses performing smoothly as a system, not as five separate independent colleges. With over 8,000 students, the Regional Higher Education system should have access to the Provost and be represented on the Leadership Council of the University.
2. We recognize that each campus must develop its own programming to meet the needs of its region and community. However, this must be balanced against the need to represent and support the Athens campus and to work for the overall growth and development of Ohio University.
3. We recommend that every office and unit in Athens whose services are used jointly by the regional campuses should have a person designated as the contact person for regional campus issues. We recommend that these units appoint this contact person from existing staff in support of the One University concept and in recognition of existing transfers of funds made from the branches to the main

campus and that the units not see this as an opportunity to assess new fees for these services.

4. Since programming and course offerings are key to the campus mission, we advocate strong representation by the regional campuses on the University Curriculum Committee. A mediation committee should be established by the Provost when issues arise over program, faculty departmental and curricular matters between the Athens campus faculty and the regional campuses. We recommend that the current Regional Higher Education Curriculum Committee remain and not only recommend certificates, minors, and associate degrees to meet the campuses' needs but also be able to recommend baccalaureate degrees that may not be offered by Athens. These would be created to meet market needs on one or more of the campuses. We need to develop incentives for the departments to put baccalaureate degrees on the campuses. We like the idea of feedback from the departments that we can address. For example: Additional faculty will be needed on the campuses to offer this degree. We believe that the regional campuses were established in south and south-central Ohio as centers to reach out and provide University programming. We recognize that the University must perform outreach throughout Ohio. However, the Outreach office at Athens should not compete with Athens or regional campuses by offering alternative programming in the regions the campuses serve, particularly in undergraduate programming.
5. We recommend the continuing development of technological communications and programming formats to allow the campuses to be better integrated into the University and to permit the offering of programming to benefit the variety of needs of our regions.
6. We recommend that the current administrative structure common on the regional campuses be maintained. There should be a Dean as the Chief Administrative leader of the campus, responsible for budget management, facilities, development, and maintenance. There should be an Associate Dean who is Chief Academic Officer who reports to the Dean and who can act in the absence of the Dean. There should be a Student Services office, a Computer Services department, a Physical Plant department, a Business office, and a Public Relations and Marketing office. The Dean may develop other offices such as Development and/or Continuing Education as the Dean sees will best serve the needs of the community where the campus is located. The Dean is responsible for developing the most efficient and effective organizational reporting structure as that person feels best suits the campus and maximizes its strengths.
7. We recommend that all efforts be made to recognize the contributions of the regional campuses to the overall vision of Ohio University. Special recognition should be given by the Provost's Office for special campus efforts that contribute to the overall well-being, growth, and development of Ohio University. That recognition could be for regional campus faculty research or leadership activities,

April 30, 2008

or for finding ways to promote better integration and coordination between the regional campuses and Athens.

**Task Force on the Future of Regional Campuses
Subcommittee Report
Academic Program Development**

Subcommittee Members

Matthew Adeyanju, Qiuping Cao, David Castle (Co-Chair), Sherrie Gradin, Claudia Hale (Co-Chair), Richard Greenlee (Regional Campus Resource Dean)

Executive Summary

This sub-committee of the Task Force on the Future of Regional Higher Education was charged with examining issues related to academic programming and curriculum. In conducting its examination, the sub-committee reviewed current practices in terms of the cooperation and coordination between Athens and the regional campuses to deliver academic programming to regional students, including utilization of resources. The sub-committee also explored ideas that might improve current practices, with the goals of (1) enhancing the academic opportunities available to regional students, including a wider selection of degree possibilities; and (2) better utilizing limited resources by avoiding duplication and inefficiencies in scheduling and course offerings.

This report identifies strengths in current practice and a large number of areas of concern, followed by a list of desired goals in improving of the system. The report concludes with recommendations on ideas that need further exploration. Given the short time frame of this investigation and report, the sub-committee emphasizes that its recommendations are intended as questions for further exploration, not definitive answers.

Current Practice: Areas of Strength

It is the sense of the sub-committee that communication, cooperation, and coordination between Athens and the regional campuses (and faculty) in terms of academic programs varies greatly between academic departments. While in many cases, there is a serious lack of interaction; communications between Athens and regional campuses have improved in some colleges, departments, and programs recently. The sub-committee hopes these communication efforts will positively impact decisions regarding course approval process and academic program development in the long run. Below are some examples of working models of cooperation:

- **Education** – there has been increasing communication between RCs and Athens in the last year or so. At the Dean’s level, important information has been sent out from the COE Dean to regional campus faculty regularly informing them of events and developments, and seeking input regarding state issues, inviting participation in the college outreach dean search. In the early childhood education program, joint faculty meetings (involving faculty from CHHS, COE, and regional campuses) are scheduled biweekly over the compressed video and many

decisions are made jointly at these meetings. Faculty minutes are sent to every ECE faculty member at all campuses. All faculty are involved in decisions regarding some changes in the program.

- **History** – the History department has cooperated with regional campus faculty to offer the History major on the regional campuses. This effort has involved regional faculty meetings among themselves and with Athens faculty to coordinate course offerings and assure regional students a wide selection of courses and instructors, including the incorporation of compressed video and online coursework.
- **Communication** – the Bachelors of Science in Communication has been offered on the Regional Campus for approximately ten years. The success of this program is due in large part to the cooperation between the Athens department and the regional faculty. Approximately eight years ago, a regional coordinator position was established for the Communication Studies program. Responsibilities of the coordinator include processing the applications of regional students, organization of interactive television courses, arranging quarterly meetings between regional Communication Studies faculty, and serving as a liaison with the Athens department. The Athens department has shown continued support for this position and the program through participation in regional meetings, invitations to attend faculty meetings in Athens, and approving courses to be offered in alternative formats, a necessity for regional education.
- **Social Work** – regional campus faculty have a very good working relationship with the Department of Social Work. This can be demonstrated by the fact that the Eastern Campus was the first to offer and graduate MSW students in June 2008. Cooperation is underway to develop course offerings so that the BASW will be offered on regional campuses with the goal of the first students graduating in the spring of 2011. This cooperation has been achieved because regional campus faculty are invited and actively participate in monthly faculty meetings. Regional faculty serve on department committees, including search committees. In addition, regional faculty teach classes over interactive television that are available to Athens students. Social Work has a regional campus faculty member who coordinates what courses are taught on the regional campuses. This is a critical point for the Social Work department since the department is accredited by the Council on Social Work Education and this body requires that all courses taught in the program are comparable.
- **Health Sciences** – the School of Health Sciences has cooperated and coordinated with regional campus faculty to offer the Bachelors of Health degree in Health Services Administration and Community Health at the Eastern Campus and recently at Lancaster and Zanesville. There are no serious obstacles to this cooperation except the concept of a one-person program which we are addressing by harnessing faculty resources on all the campuses, including Athens and the use of course rotation mechanism among the campuses.

Another area of strength has been the university's commitment to distance learning and outreach. Ohio University, especially the regional campuses, effectively uses the

OULN/compressed video system to broaden and expand curricular opportunities to Ohio students. The growth of online course offerings has created additional possibilities in bringing a wider variety of academic programming to students who are place-bound and/or need the time flexibility offered by an online course.

Furthermore, the sub-committee believes that Ohio University's mission to provide a high quality university education is well-served by the strength of its faculty and staff, both in Athens and on the regional campuses.

Current Practice: Areas of Concern

The sub-committee discovered a number of areas of concern in examining academic programming and current practice, including the following:

- Communication between the regional campuses and the Athens campus differs from program to program. In many instances, very little communication occurs. The end results of this situation include:
 - decision making on the Athens campus that fails to take into account the mission and challenges faced on the regional campuses,
 - implicit treatment of colleagues on the regional campuses as receivers of decisions rather than participators in decision making, and
 - potentially missed opportunities due to the failure of Athens campus programs to appreciate the needs and interests of regional campus students.
- Coordination of course offerings among the regional campuses and between the regional campuses and the Athens campus is often less evident than might be ideal. With current practice, at least nine different course schedules (Athens, OULN, Online, Chillicothe, Eastern, Lancaster, Southern, and Zanesville) are produced each academic quarter, often in complete independence from each other. The end result is a loss in program efficiency.
- In some situations, students on the regional campuses are put into the unfortunate circumstance of taking too many classes with a single instructor, especially if those students are to make appropriate progress in completing the degree. While we will not try to quantify what is meant by "too many" and do not believe that there is a workable policy to address this situation, better coordination of resources among the various campuses might result in a significant reduction of the risk that this situation will exist for a program.
- With few exceptions, degree programs and course development emerges from the Athens campus. As a result, opportunities that take advantage of the clientele served by and the situations faced by the regional campuses are neglected.
- There is a need for coordination and control, but the mechanisms for coordination and control are either ill-defined or totally seated within the Athens campus, making the regional campuses secondary agents, at best. The question arising from this situation is how best to achieve the coordination and control that is

needed while respecting the different missions, needs, and circumstances of the various campuses.

- For most Athens campus programs, there are few incentives that encourage/support coordinating with or participating in regional campus programming.
- In some instances, there are financial policies/practices in place that discourage coordination among regional campuses and/or between the Athens campus and one or more regional campuses. This is an issue, at least in part, of how courses/programs are funded and how we might best use the combined resources of our various campuses.
- The sub-committee raises the questions as to whether the compressed video system is being employed in as efficient a manner as possible and whether the compressed video system is working to help programs meet student needs in as effective a manner as possible. There is also concern that the system's capacity is insufficient to meet the potential demand, particularly as the sub-committee believes the compressed video system is critical to the efficient use of resources and as a mechanism to creatively problem solve (program delivery) across campuses.
- Increasingly, the University is moving to an online environment. Efforts are underway to clarify systems for approving courses for online delivery. The approval system that is adopted needs to not only insure course quality but be consistent across campuses (in order to minimize confusion) and ensure an approval process that is sensitive to the needs and circumstances of the different campuses.
- The University needs a clearly established process for handling articulation agreements with other academic institutions.
- There appears to be a perception in some quarters that all students who begin their program on a regional campus will need to move to Athens for completion of their program. This view fails to account for students whose work/family situations require them to complete all degree work on a regional campus if they are to have an opportunity for a degree from Ohio University. This view also is not in line with the vision articulated by the Chancellor concerning the role of Regional Higher Education in Ohio. To address this vision, regional campus students need to have access to more of the 250 majors available at Ohio University than is currently the case.
- There appears to be a difference in the definition of "on-load" versus "over-load" on the regional campuses versus the Athens campus. Differences in this area are exacerbated by whether a program is over-subscribed or under-subscribed by students. Unfortunately, the situation offers the potential for resentment among faculty members. A single, uniform policy might not be appropriate, but the situation needs to be monitored.
- The BSS degree is available on all campuses, but we believe there is a need for a more flexible degree (perhaps the "Bachelor of Arts in University Studies") that

gives students generic skills to think, write, and analyze problems to perform in the work place.

- There seems to be a presumption that, with very few exceptions, the programs on the regional campuses are mirrors of what exist on the Athens campus. Is that appropriate? What opportunities are missed in this approach? What problems are created in this approach?
- While the Athens campus student population is selective, residential-based and largely traditional, the student population on the regional campuses is non-selective, often place-bound, trends toward non-traditional, and includes a higher percentage of community college and technical college transfer students. The sub-committee raises the question as to whether this divergence in student population creates the need for divergent strategies in fulfilling the mission of Ohio University.

Desired Goals and Outcomes

Given the above list of bullet points, there are a large number of critical issues that should be addressed to improve the Regional Higher Education system. The sub-committee was more successful in identifying problems than designing solutions. Nevertheless, there are some obvious goals that emerged from our discussion of these issues. The sub-committee believes the following goals are desirable and these strategies to achieve them should be explored:

- Increased cooperation, communication, and coordination between Athens departments and regional campus faculty.
- While maintaining reasonable departmental autonomy, seek to eliminate inconsistencies in procedure and process related to Athens and regional campus interactions.
- Increased coordination in course scheduling, particularly between the five regional campuses; with emphasis on maximum efficiency and student needs.
- Expansion of the degree programs offered on the regional campuses, making a wider selection of Ohio University's 250+ majors available and accessible to regional students.
- Enhanced flexibility for Regional Higher Education to develop degree programs needed at the regional level and consistent with local community education and economic development needs.
- Dramatic expansion of the distance learning system (compressed video); with an emphasis on linking the five regional campuses together so as to better utilize the system-wide breadth of faculty specializations – potentially a key factor in solving multiple problems. This expansion coupled with resolution of coordination issues raised above.

- Increased coordination system-wide of key issues, such as online course development and approval, articulation agreements, and the needs of all student constituencies.

Recommendations (Issues to Explore)

In the course of its deliberations, the sub-committee discussed a number of specific ideas related to solving the problems identified under “current practices” and achieving the desirable goals. Some of these ideas also fall under the province of other sub-committees of the Task Force, and may be addressed in their reports as well. The sub-committee is not suggesting that these ideas are necessarily solutions to the problems identified; only that they may warrant exploration and, if proved to be practical and sound, deserve consideration:

- Stronger regional faculty representation on critical Athens-based committees (such as University Curriculum Committee).
- A unified regional campus course schedule.
- Expansion of the degree programs offered on regional campuses.
- Significant investment in the expansion of the compressed video system.
- Regional faculty tenure to the regional system (rather than individual campuses).
- Elimination of financial disincentives that limit cooperation between components of the University.
- Development of a flexible degree (such as “Bachelor of Arts in University Studies”) that will provide students on the regional campuses with generic and adaptable skills to think, write, and analyze problems to perform in the 21st century work place.
- Creation of a College of Regional Education; e.g. unite the five regional campuses (perhaps with Outreach) into a unified “college” within the Ohio University system, thereby creating greater efficiencies of scale, addressing many coordination issues, providing broader degree program flexibility, and establishing an enhanced role for regional education within the existing Athens governance system.

**Task Force on the Future of Regional Campuses
Subcommittee Report
Faculty Relationship with Departments in Athens**

Committee Members

Renée A. Middleton (Co-chair), Jan Schmittauer (Co-chair), Robert Galbreath, Pramod Kanwar, J. Nicole Pennington, Susan Tice-Alicke, Mary Ann Janosik (Regional Campus Resource Dean)

Summary of Major Issues Discussed by the Committee

The primary charge given to this group was to identify and make suggestions concerning the working relationship between the five regional campuses and the main campus. Areas of focus were to be policies for course approval, authority for textbook selection, approval and use of non-Group 1 instructors, and general lines and methods of communication. A secondary charge was to look at the promotion and tenure process for regional campus faculty. Finally, the committee was charged to look at what mechanism could be used to encourage the Regional Campuses to respond to critical needs in the community with degree and certificate programs to meet those documented needs.

During the committee meetings, understandably, it was discovered that communication between the regional and main campuses varied considerably. The School of Nursing, for instance, appears to have excellent lines of communication, while other departments appear to communicate moderately, minimally, or not at all. In an effort to accurately assess the communication across all departments, the committee developed a survey. This survey included questions that were part of the original charge of the committee as well as questions that came up through conversations during the committee meetings and from review of documents provided obtained from other universities that have regional campuses. This survey was made available to all faculty and administrators and the results have been made available within this report. The work of the committee coupled with the results of the survey culminated in a number of suggestions as follows:

Search Committees

Currently, there is a general requirement that faculty hired on Regional campuses must be approved by Athens-based faculty. This cooperative arrangement should be maintained; however, we recommend that in program areas offered on Regional campuses, regional campuses are also invested in who teaches courses on their campuses. To this end, we recommend that at least one regional campus faculty member and/or academic administrator be invited to serve on Athens-based search committees. Likewise, searches taking place on the regional campus should include at least one faculty or academic administrator on its search and selection committee. A joint approval process should occur. The Athens-based Deans and Executive Dean of Regional campuses should be a part of a joint recommending agent for all faculty appointments.

Curriculum Changes

OU-Athens has a history of making curriculum changes without consulting, informing or involving Regional campus faculty in the decision-making process. This does not bode well for collegiality, program continuity, and does not achieve the necessary assurances of program quality and accountability. We recommend that the regional campus deans or their designees be included in signatory sign-offs of all curriculum program changes to ensure communication and notification in shared disciplines. Further, development of new courses may be generated or initiated from both campuses, but will require joint approval.

Textbooks

Faculty should retain the inherent right to adopt textbooks of their choosing. However, if departments or programs on either campus have a textbook selection committee, regional campus faculty should be represented and included as voting members.

Promotion and Tenure

We are one university, so the expectation of quality is the same for all campuses. In the case of tenure and promotion, it should be the joint responsibility of the Regional campus unit head and the regional campus faculty member to see that the tenure and promotion process begins at the appropriate time. Candidates and regional campus unit heads should supply information necessary for approval and review by OU-Athens/Regional faculty and appropriate OU-Academic Dean and Executive Dean of Regional campuses.

Requirements for tenure and promotion should not differ for OU-Athens and OU-Regional campus faculty. However, the precise terms and conditions of every appointment should be in writing and taken into consideration where decisions regarding tenure are concerned. Promotion is based on merit. A candidate for promotion should have acceptable achievements in the areas of: 1) teaching, 2) research/scholarship or creative works. He or she is further expected to have contributed useful service to the University/Regional campus.

Communications and Collaboration

One important aspect of our charge in examining faculty relationships with the main campus was to examine strategies for improving communication. As a result of several discussions, the following recommendations will be made. While many of these recommendations appear to be basic, general, or obvious communication suggestions, we think it necessary to address them because there is too much variability in the degree of communication between the regional campus faculty and the main campus departments. Communication is essential among faculty who view each other as colleagues where shared learning experiences are provided. Coherence within the curriculum by course sequences and by courses and degrees that provide connections among shared disciplines is essential. We propose that there should be a minimum standard of communication

required by departments. Some of the following recommendations may be a part of that standard.

Recommendations

- Each department chair, assistant undergraduate chair, or designated departmental faculty member on the main campus will serve as a contact person for the regional campus faculty. The contact person will be responsible for filing an annual summary of activities, retreats, and other outreach efforts between the main campus department and the regional campus faculty.
- Associate Deans on Regional campuses be responsible for providing OU Deans or their designees with updated e-mail list of all regional campus faculties to ensure effective communications via e-mail between OU-Athens and OU-Regional Campuses.
- Faculty on OU-Athens and OU-Regional Campuses meet on a regular basis consistent with current departmental program area meetings. These meetings may be face-to-face and/or via use of distance technology. At least annually, OU-Athens based faculty should hold regularly faculty meetings or program planning meetings on OU-Regional campus.
- Regional campus faculty should include and invite academic unit heads and/or faculty from OU-Athens to the Annual Retreats held by Regional Campuses.
- The RHE faculty will be invited to the main campus at least annually for a meeting with the department chair and assistant undergraduate chair, and/or contact person.
- It is important to provide incentives to the department to provide assistance in encouraging the communication. There should be some financial resources set aside to the department to compensate the contact person for their efforts and for the department to host an annual meeting. In addition, the RHE faculty should be compensated for their mileage to travel to the main campus.
- Each main campus department will provide departmental minutes to the regional campus faculty via email.
- Regional campus faculty will be notified regarding changes in curriculum, program requirements, etc. in a prompt manner. Furthermore, regional campus faculty will be informed of departmental activities/events that may be considered useful to students on the regional campuses.
- It is important to emphasize that the line of communication is two-way. It is necessary for the RHE faculty to inform the department contact person regarding program/course concerns, curriculum needs, instructor needs, and achievements.
- A member of the department regional campus faculty should be appointed to serve on the main campus department curriculum committee.
- The regional campus faculty should be invited to engage in open discussions concerning program and/or curriculum changes.

Nursing: A Strong Model of Effective Communication

The School of Nursing has a unique relationship between the regional campuses and the main campus. The School functions under one Director of Nursing, who is over the MSN, BSN, and ADN programs. Each campus has an Associate Director of Nursing whose role is administrating the program on the regional campuses. A major strength of the program is the collaboration between each campus and the main campus. The Associate Directors meet monthly with the Director of Nursing to review program activity and to discuss program planning. All faculty from the regional campuses meet monthly to work in committees addressing specific program content such as enrollment/recruiting, evaluation, by-laws, curriculum, etc. These committees work together to make continuing improvements in all program areas.

To maintain strong relationships and communication when in person meetings are not possible, the use of compressed video and phone conferencing is utilized to continue addressing issues as needed. In addition to these communication strategies, the use of e-mail provides another means of sharing information between faculty members on all campuses. The minutes of meetings are shared with all faculty members on a monthly basis to keep everyone abreast of all committee activities and their progress. This is particularly helpful as everyone cannot be on every committee. All of these methods combined provide everyone the opportunity to provide input into other committees when they desire to do so.

These methods of communication and faculty collaboration could easily be replicated by other Ohio University departments and programs to strengthen and improve relationships. The benefits of similar program communication could result in unnecessary duplication of the same work if faculty shared creative teaching strategies, presentations, syllabi, etc. This could be especially helpful to new faculty at Ohio University, where a mentoring situation could be established. There is also potential to increase faculty retention as well if the end result of increased communication and collaboration culminated in increased faculty satisfaction.

By duplicating some of the strategies that the School of Nursing has implemented could have an end result of increased productivity, retention of faculty, and improved program outcomes. This is what we are striving for in the School of Nursing-one cohesive unit working together to create great nurses!

Survey Report

Amidst concern that there is a lack of consistency among the main campus departments and faculty at regional campuses, the subcommittee was given the charge to make recommendations to strengthen the relationships among these constituents. To better understand the issues, the subcommittee surveyed the faculty both at the regional campuses and at the main campus. The focus of the survey was relationship and communication; course clearance process; hiring; and promotion and tenure (a copy of the survey is included in Appendix B). The subcommittee received a total of 386 responses (Athens 262, Chillicothe 23, Eastern 13, Lancaster 35, Southern 17, and Zanesville 36).

Summary

The survey responses confirm that there is a need to strengthen communication among the regional faculty and their counterparts on the main campus. It appears from the comments that the faculty at regional campuses feels that they are not treated at par with their counterparts on the main campus. The comments from the faculty on the main campus, on the other hand, showed lack of trust in the capabilities of their counterparts at regional campuses. Increased communication and participation of the faculties from the main campus and regional campuses in the activities of the other group will help strengthen the relationship between departments on main campus and regional faculty; will help them know each other better; and also instill a feeling of one university.

Regarding the faculty hiring on the regional campuses and at the main campus, faculty in general agree that these decision should me made jointly. The survey responses from both the constituents are also in favor continuing with the current practice of joint clearance of courses, including online courses. The faculties both at regional and the main campus shared some logistic concerns regarding the online courses (please see comments below). The response in favor of offering more bachelor's degree programs on the regional campuses was also overwhelming among the regional faculty. The faculty at the main campus was, however, a little cautious due to limited resources available to run a program.

Regarding the promotion and tenure process faculty at both regional and main campuses is a little cautious. Although some faculty favors having promotion and tenure process with the parent department on the main campus, others have concerns due to heavy teaching load expectation on the regional campuses and limited available resources.

Detailed Report on the Four Areas

1. Relationship and Communication

A sizeable majority (65%) of responses from the main campus indicated that either there is an indifferent or a poor relationship between the main campus faculty and their counterparts on the regional campuses. More than 55% of the faculty on the main campus did not communicate with their counterparts on the regional campus. Almost 70% of the faculty on the main campus indicated that they do not get any information about any workshops or research colloquia on the regional campuses and more than 85% of the faculty indicated they never participate in such activities on the regional campuses. Less than 50% of the faculty at regional campuses indicated a good or excellent relationship with their counterparts on the main campus and less than 35% of the faculty indicated that they get information about the workshops or research colloquia on the main campus. More than 60% of the faculty at regional campuses indicated that they never participate in such activities on the main campus. 44% of the faculty from the main campus indicated that they receive important information from their parent department weekly, less than 10% of the faculty on the regional campuses shared a similar view. Almost 40% of the faculty on the regional campuses indicated that they never receive important information from their parent department. See Appendix A for some of the comments and concerns shared by the respondents in the area of communication (Questions 5 – 12).

2. Hiring

Almost 70% of the responses from faculty at the main campus and more than 60% of the responses from the regional campuses favored joint decisions regarding faculty hires on regional and main campuses. Some faculty also felt that the faculty for the associate degree programs should be the sole responsibility of the regional campuses. In general, the faculty at regional faculty felt that involving the faculty from the main campus in the hiring process is beneficial to the campus. See Appendix A for some of the comments and concerns shared by the respondents in the area of hiring (Questions 13 and 15).

3. Course Clearance and related issues

More than 70% of the respondents from the main campus indicated that course clearance process should be a joint venture and more than 60% of the regional campuses expressed similar views. More than 90% of the respondents from the regional campuses were in favor of more bachelor's degree programs at regional campuses. The respondents from the main campus were however a little cautious. Less than 10% of the faculty at the main campus and less than 10% of the faculty on the regional campuses felt the need for a separate clearance procedure for online courses. Faculties both at the regional as well as at the main campus did share some concerns regarding the quality of these courses. See Appendix A for some of the comments and concerns shared by the respondents in the area (Questions 17, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23).

4. Promotion and Tenure

The faculties at both regional as well as at the main campus have mixed feelings about this issue. Although some faculty favors having promotion and tenure process with the parent department, others have concerns due to heavy teaching load expectation on the regional campuses and limited available resources. Faculty, however, favors a system in which tenure is with the university and not tied to a campus or a department. This is a model that is followed by some other schools. See Appendix A for some of the comments and concerns shared by the respondents in the area (Questions 20 and 24).

Mechanisms to Encourage the Regional Campus to Respond to Critical Community Needs

The committee consulted the regional campus deans to solicit their input regarding the significant needs of their communities. Many valuable suggestions were made and are also included in Appendix A.

Conclusion

This committee modeled the professionalism, collegiality, cooperation, and collaboration that can and should characterize the relationships between the departments on the Athens campus and the regional campuses. Each member took his/her responsibilities seriously and attended every one of our numerous meetings except in emergency situations. Each member contributed a section of this report. Some members volunteered for additional responsibilities such as co-chairing the committee and, in Pramod's case, assuming a significant work load in sending out the survey, tabulating the results, and writing the extensive narrative for the report. The spirit of goodwill, camaraderie, and respect that characterized our work together is a small example of the potential Ohio University has to rise to the challenge of truly being "one university" in the coming days of great challenges and great opportunity.

**Task Force on the Future of Regional Campuses
Subcommittee Report
Finance**

Subcommittee Members

John Day (Co-Chair), Michael McTeague (Co-chair), Rose Rossiter, Susan Sarnoff, Audrey Whitright, Richard Bebee (Regional Campus Resource Dean)

Sub Committee Charge

As part of the Task Force on the Future of Regional Campuses, the Finance Subcommittee was charged with reviewing the financial model under which the Regional Campuses operate and the financial interactions between the Regional Campuses and the Athens campus. Regional Campuses have always been financially self-supporting and this discipline has led to important efficiencies. In terms of the creation and delivery of programs, however, Regional Campus activity is inter-related with Athens Campus activity which is led to a long history of financial interactions which are now complicated and in need of review.

The Sub Committee received a series of questions to frame its discussion. Given the short time frame and high level of complexity involved in each of the issues to be explored, it was felt that this report would have to remain at a conceptual level. We were not in a position or have the information needed to make detailed and specific recommendations about suggested budgets, overhead rates, tuition levels, etc. Instead, we focused on general structural relationships, incentive systems and metrics.

The remainder of this report will outline the discussion and preliminary conclusions of the sub-committee organized around the questions/issues given to us. Each question/issue will appear in italics and recommendations from the subcommittee are underlined.

Financial Connections Between Athens and Regional Campuses

What should be the financial arrangement between regional campuses and Athens academic units for upper division and graduate programs offerings on Regional Campuses?

This financial arrangement involves two different funding arrangements. An overhead payment from Regional Campuses to Athens related to undergraduate activity and the Resource Distribution Plan governing distribution of revenues from Athens to the Regional Campuses for regional graduate programs.

The Overhead Relationship

The current arrangement is an overhead payment of 6.33% on tuition and subsidy revenue for undergraduate activity. This rate has rarely been adjusted and changes have been incremental. This has caused the rate to become disconnected with the basis for the rate. There is a need to rationalize this overhead rate if this mechanism remains. One suggestion is to do an overhead study similar to that used for determining the overhead rates we are allowed to charge the federal government on grants. This would allow us to estimate the impact RHE has on Athens operations and create an overhead rate that matches that impact. The subcommittee recommends that we do a comprehensive review and recalibration of the overhead rate between Athens and the Regional Campuses.

The Resource Distribution Plan

For outreach graduate programs, Regional Campuses receive 20% of Gross Tuition (before expenses via transfer from the Bursar) and 50% of the subsidy (via a year-end true-up between Athens and RHE). The choice here is whether to maintain the system as an equity position in which regional campuses share in a percentage of gross revenues or alternatively set up more of a fee for service arrangement where a fee for assistance with marketing or facilities is charged. If this would be done, the overhead rate should be adjusted to compensate for the loss of revenue to regional campuses.

The current method of capturing tuition flows for these programs creates an incentive for Athens programs to redirect on-campus resources towards these programs. For units with fully enrolled programs in Athens, this could lead to an incentive to expand those programs in favor of these regional programs to gain additional funding by assuming that Athens funding would not decrease when Athens programs are reduced. At the macro level, this creates a budget shortfall while increasing the funding within the Athens unit.

In addition, as the Athens campus moves towards a new budget model, revenues will begin to be attributed to all credit-generating activity and the distinction between an Athens and a Regional graduate program will disappear. Under that scenario, the RDP could eventually disappear.

The subcommittee recommends that this system be reviewed to determine the most effective incentive system to encourage both Athens and Regional campuses to increase participation in this type of program and that the implications of the new budget model be considered as that new model is implemented.

In addition to these two structural financial arrangements, there are numerous “side deals” between RHE and Athens where RHE might pay a unit directly (like the registrar or admissions) for services. The subcommittee recommends that these arrangements be minimized or preferably discontinued as part of the recalibration of the overhead arrangement.

Regional Campus Tuition Rates

What should the tuition on Regional Campuses be to compete with community and technical colleges especially in the new environment of the University System of Ohio? What is the impact of differential fees? The comprehensive fee? Should regional campuses charge additional fees to students beyond tuition and general fees? If so, how are fee charges and revenues from fees allocated between regional campuses and the main campus?

Tuition for regional campus programs – particularly lower division courses leading to associate degrees - competes with community college rates. There is still some debate as to whether we need to compete with that rate or whether we can charge a higher rate because of our reputation and ability to offer a four-year degree. Tuition for upper division courses leading to bachelor’s degrees is a higher rate.

The general fee on the regional campus was drastically reduced last year to \$22 to reflect the fact that many fewer services of this type are available on those campuses. There are some complications created by this when students in Athens take a course on a regional campus and vice versa.

Tuition on Eastern and Southern is currently different (lower) than Chillicothe, Lancaster and Zanesville because those campuses also have to compete with other states. They also have agreements to waive the non-resident fee.

A concept to change the lower and upper division tuition rates was discussed. Lower division rates are paid by students who have earned less than 96 hours and upper division by student with more than 96 hours. It does not matter what courses they are taking, the rates apply to the students. At this point the comprehensive fees for lower and upper division are:

	Eastern Southern	All Others
Lower	1443	1505
Upper	1562	1656

The proposed concept is to look at changing this to lower the cost for lower division hours and increase the cost for upper division hours and at the same time move away from the idea of a comprehensive fee to a flat hourly rate at the lower division. The current proposal is to drop the lower division rate to \$85 per hour at the co-located campuses – Eastern and Zanesville and \$99 at the other three. To balance revenues, the upper division rate to \$153 per credit with a comprehensive fee of \$2448 which is still lower than the Athens fee. A full document detailing this proposal is available.

If tuition rates between lower and upper division are changed, we might also look at differentiating the overhead rate at these two levels.

Given the uncertainty about the price elasticity in the regional market, the subcommittee was uncertain as to whether we really need to reduce our lower division tuition to compete with the community colleges. At this point we recommend perhaps piloting this idea on one campus, selected by the Executive Dean and the five Regional Deans, to see what effect it might have on enrollments since reducing price with a corresponding increase in enrollment most likely cause us to lose money.

Benchmarking

How do services and costs for services compare with regional campus systems at other Ohio Universities?

The subcommittee did not have sufficient time to address this issue directly. It was felt that we should do some benchmarking of the other regional campuses in Ohio. There are differences in the number associated with each university – Akron (1), BG (2), Kent (7), Miami (2), OSU (4), OU (5), Cincinnati (2) and Wright State (1) have them for a total of 23 in the state. We should also look at some systems in other states – Pennsylvania and South Carolina were suggestions. This analysis should consider both any overhead percentage paid as well as the services and expenses exchanged between the regional and main campuses.

Reserves

Is there a need for a deep reserve and, if so, how should the amount of reserve be determined? Is the reserve solely a rainy day fund or may it be used for investment? Who should control the reserve? Should it be dedicated to individual campuses or is it to be shared among campuses?

The subcommittee did not devote a significant amount of time to this issue. It was recommended that we take a look at the carry forward trends over the last ten years to get a better idea of how this reserve has evolved over time. Since Regional Campuses are not supported by the Athens budget, there is a need for adequate reserves to handle enrollment shifts and long-term projects.

Faculty Salaries

What should be the relationship between Athens and Regional Campuses faculty salaries?

Regional Campus tenure-track faculty tend to have a different load and salary structure than Athens. This may partly derive from the lower tuition rates constraining the amount of money flowing in from each class. At the same time regional campus faculty salaries need to be kept competitive as compared to other regional campuses in Ohio. It was recommended that the investment in faculty salaries be continued on the regional campuses to make them more competitive relative to our peers.

**Task for on the Future of Regional Campuses
Subcommittee Report
Auxiliary and Student Services**

Subcommittee Members

Jackie Forshey (Chair), Robert Pleasant, Kathleen Sullivan, Barry Tadlock, Candice Thomas-Maddox, William Willan (Regional Campus Resource Dean)

Subcommittee Charge

The subcommittee was presented with the charge of analyzing current services and providing recommendations to enhance and expand these offerings. Students at the Regional Campuses appreciate and expect a certain level of service and, for lack of a better term, “A Bobcat Experience.”

Appendix C contains a list of issues considered by the subcommittee. After initial discussion and analysis, the committee identified four primary areas to address in this report. These include:

- Strengthening the relationship between current Athens-based student service offerings and University Outreach and Regional Campuses (UROC) student services
- Expanding opportunities for regional campus student services
- Enhancing the student relocation experience to the Athens campus
- Identifying existing areas of excellence

Strengthening the relationship between Athens-based and UROC Student Services

A. Student Senate Liaison

After investigating the structure of student government on each of Ohio University’s campuses, it was noted that many of the regional campuses have their own Student Senate. The Athens campus currently hosts a Student Senate, as well.

RECOMMENDATION: Link regional campus student leaders to Athens student leaders via:

- 1) Identification of a Student Senate Liaison from each regional campus.
- 2) Regular participation by the regional Liaisons in Athens Student Senate meetings
- 3) Invitations for Athens Student Senators to visit regional campuses

B. Education Abroad Opportunities

The enrollment in Ohio University’s Education Abroad programs exceeds 900 students per year. However, that enrollment is limited to primarily Athens-based students due to the limited resources available to regional campus students. Information is not readily

available to RHE students, and they are responsible for contacting the Office of Education Abroad to solicit information. Further, faculty advisors at the regional campuses do not have information to provide students regarding these opportunities.

RECOMMENDATION: Increase the visibility of the Education Abroad Liaison for each regional campus. This liaison:

- 1) Attend quarterly meetings in Athens for information about Education Abroad opportunities
- 2) Serves as the local campus advisor for Education Abroad experiences and assists students in researching and registering for the experience, as well as providing essential financial information

s

C. Service Learning/Community Service

The Office of Community Service on the Athens campus serves as a valuable resource for instructors and students who wish to complete service learning or community service projects. A website is maintained that allows agencies and faculty to link together. Up to this point, these services have been limited to Athens-based agencies. Faculty and students at the regional campuses are required to conduct their own research and form relationships with agencies, a task that is often very time-consuming and repetitive when multiple faculty are seeking the same information.

RECOMMENDATION: Encourage the Community Service office in Athens to include information about service opportunities in the regional campus communities. Doing so would accomplish the following goals:

- 1) Make information more easily accessible to regional faculty
- 2) Encourage collaborative work between Athens and regional campus classes which incorporate service learning in their curriculum
- 3) Enhance the visibility of all of Ohio University's campuses as a resource for providing service to their surrounding communities

Expanding Opportunities for Regional Campus Student Services

A. Career Services

Only one regional campus (Southern) currently has a full-time position dedicated to providing career services for students. The regional campuses currently provide the funding for a graduate assistant in the Athens Campus Career Services office with the intent that this person will provide advising to regional campus students. Research with regional campuses discovered that the graduate assistant has not visited the campuses nor provided any type of services during the current academic year.

RECOMMENDATION: Fund a full-time career services position at each regional campus. Doing so will provide students with the valuable resources needed during the job search process. In addition, this would address the outreach mission of Ohio University by reaching out to local employers to provide additional education for employees, and to educate the local community to attract more economic growth. Doing so could accomplish the following objectives:

- 1) Build relationships with the local job market via the following tasks:
 - a) Coordinate a local job fair

- b) Communicate with the local Economic Development Boards in each regional community to identify career needs and career opportunities.
- c) Provide career counseling for students for jobs and internships
- d) Host career seminars for students and local communities on topics such as:
 - i) Resume writing
 - ii) Interviewing
 - iii) Planning for Graduate School
 - iv) Business and Professional Etiquette
 - Career Search Strategies
 - If financial resources preclude the hiring of a staff member for each campus, consider “sharing” a career services staff between campuses

B. School-Age Evening Tutoring Program

Many non-traditional students at the regional campus are parents of school-age children who are faced with the task of securing childcare during evening hours when they are attending classes at Ohio University.

RECOMMENDATION: Coordinate the College of Education to provide tutoring services during M-TH evenings while parents attend classes.

- 1) Pursue grant opportunities to create a tutoring program at each regional campus
- 2) Create a tutoring room with tables and computer terminals
- 3) Pay students to tutor and monitor school-age students while their parents attend evening classes – assist with homework, engage in computer learning, etc.
- 4) Service would be a recruitment/retention opportunity for non-traditional students

C. Day-Care Program

With the tradition of regional campuses being accessible to all students, the addition of an available Day Care center was found to be a high priority.

RECOMMENDATION: Study the current program at the Lancaster campus which currently has a program established to see if implementation on other campuses is reasonable.

The current program at OUL expanded their hours of operation in 2008 until 7:00 p.m. due to demand. The Center is state licensed, and thus they are only able to accept children from the ages of 18 months through kindergarten age. Cost for child care is \$2.50/hour. The average number of children enrolled in the Center varies from 20-30 per quarter.

D. Student Organizations

Currently, the Athens website lists 361 organizations available to students on the Athens campus, and 0 organizations available at each regional campus. Information obtained from the regional campus websites indicates that there are between 4 and 26 organizations on the various campuses. There is a need to provide up-to-date online information about the opportunities for student involvement at the regional campuses.

Doing so would also enable similar organizations across to all six of Ohio University's campuses to seek common interests and pursue co-sponsorship of activities and events.

RECOMMENDATION: Communicate with the Athens office of Student Organizations to provide updated information about Student Org. opportunities at regional campuses.

- 1) Regional campuses need to maintain up-to-date information on their websites to inform students of current opportunities (some organizations listed on the sites are non-functioning).
- 2) Identify liaisons in the Dean of Students or Campus Life offices at all Ohio University campuses to communicate on a regular basis regarding the scheduled activities and student organization opportunities. For example, four OU campuses have Lambda Pi Eta (Communication Honorary) chapters. Increasing awareness of similar groups across campuses may facilitate co-sponsorship of programming.

E. Student Athletics

Unlike Athens-based athletic teams, those on the regional campuses function much like "student organizations". Student-athletes are provided with an opportunity to meet students who have similar interests. No athletic scholarships are provided to regional campus students. The student athletics departments at some of the regional campuses have an operating budget of approximately \$20,000 which is used to fund more than 80 student-athletes per campus.

RECOMMENDATIONS: Enhance the awareness of athletic programs at the regional campuses and encourage attendance at athletic events on the Athens campus by means of the following recommendations:

- 1) Invite regional campus teams to play "preliminary games" before Athens games. Doing so would familiarize regional campus students with the Athens campus (and may encourage relocation) and increase awareness of the presence of regional campuses among the Athens campus community. In previous years, these games have been hosted but have been scheduled during breaks when Athens students are not on campus and attendance at Athens athletic events is low.
- 2) Reconsider the selection of dates for Regional Campus Day at football games. In recent years, Athens has hosted "Regional Campus Day" during the Thanksgiving break. Many regional campus students are already working holiday jobs during the break and are unable to attend. Many regional campus student-athletes have indicated a desire to attend this event, but are prohibited from doing so because it is scheduled in the midst of their own athletic season (basketball practice, games, etc.).
- 3) Consider expansion of Regional Campus Day events in other sporting events on the Athens campus such as volleyball, baseball, soccer, and softball.

F. Health Services

The Committee determined the need for services for health insurance to be available at a group rate as those available to Athens based students.

RECOMMENDATION: Investigate feasibility of offering these benefits to regional campus students.

G. Counseling Services

Counseling services is available and in place on the regional campuses; however, the staff of two counselors was found to be overwhelmed. Currently, Cindy Linn and Candice Pinella visit all five regional campuses on a regular schedule. Both counselors see numerous students as well as a number of faculty and staff.

RECOMMENDATION: Conduct an investigation to determine if the need for an additional counselor or counselors is feasible and available for additional assistance on regional campuses.

Enhancing Student Relocation Experience to Athens Campus

A. Recruitment and Retention

The Committee determined an area directly affected by recruitment and retention was relocation. Relocation not only affects students from regional campuses but also transferring students from other institutions. A large number of students either return to their original regional campus or do not return to the Ohio University system.

FINDINGS:

1. No accurate method at this time for tracking students relocating from regional campuses evident by the lack of response to surveys or events.
2. No follow-up with relocating students to identify any problems or concerns.
3. Lack of communication between Athens and regional campuses regarding relocation events.
4. No advising directly assigned to relocating students.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Establish a method utilizing the regional campuses and University College to track and correspondent with students that are relocating to Athens.
2. Assign an advisor(s) to relocating or transferring students that is available to those students even if they are currently assigned an advisor. This advisor would assist the student with general information such as DARS, RAC number, housing, student organizations, acquiring tutoring and other student assistance on campus.
3. Residence life follow-up for those students relocating or transferring to campus housing. Possible training for RAs to identify and assist these students.
4. Include regional campuses with relocation information and planning such as Relocation Day.

5. University College representatives to visit regional campuses on a possible quarterly basis to meet and be available to those students interested in relocating.
6. Have services that are available to relocating students open to transfer students. Both groups (relocating and transferring) can be identified as “transitioning students”.

Existing Areas of Excellence

After reviewing the initial list of potential areas for consideration (see Appendix A), the committee identified several areas in which Ohio University already demonstrates excellence. These include the following:

- 1) Registration
Provided through the Registrar, available online to regional campus students.
- 2) Library
Regional campus students use the OU library website, have their own libraries and can access materials through intercampus borrowing and OHIOLink.
- 3) Classroom technology
Classrooms on regional campuses are equipped with audio/visual equipment for use during teaching.
- 4) Probation/discipline
Provided through regional campus Learning Advancement Centers and assistance from Athens campus Legal Affairs if necessary.
- 5) Transfer credit
Information and services are provided through the Undergraduate Admissions and the Registrar or by visiting the Transfer.org website.

APPENDIX A

Faculty Relationships with Athens Subcommittee

Detailed Report on the Four Areas with Comments/Remarks

5. Relationship and Communication

A sizeable majority (65%) of responses from the main campus indicated that either there is an indifferent or a poor relationship between the main campus faculty and their counterparts on the regional campuses. More than 55% of the faculty on the main campus did not communicate with their counterparts on the regional campus. Almost 70% of the faculty on the main campus indicated that they do not get any information about any workshops or research colloquia on the regional campuses and more than 85% of the faculty indicated they never participate in such activities on the regional campuses. Less than 50% of the faculty at regional campuses indicated a good or excellent relationship with their counterparts on the main campus and less than 35% of the faculty indicated that they get information about the workshops or research colloquia on the main campus. More than 60% of the faculty at regional campuses indicated that they never participate in such activities on the main campus. 44% of the faculty from the main campus indicated that they receive important information from their parent department weekly, less than 10% of the faculty on the regional campuses shared a similar view. Almost 40% of the faculty on the regional campuses indicated that they never receive important information from their parent department. Some of the comments and concerns shared by the respondents in the area of communication are (Questions 5 – 12):

- “I have an enormous amount to say here. Too much for this survey. Basically, I have made it a project to reach out the branch campuses and have found many stumbling blocks. One major one is deans, vp's at regionals who have wanted to spar over turf. I have also found that each branch campus has its own culture which is very hard to "get" as an Athens faculty member. And while it is clear they are resentful of Athens, there is some sentiment that they'd like to be left alone, I think. On the other hand, the faculty I have had contact with, and one of the deans, have been very supportive of me trying to have a serious relationship with the branch programs. It is an extremely complicated issue.”
- “I only communicate with one faculty person at a regional campus. She is a full-time faculty member directly in our own field as on the Athens' campus. Many other regional campuses utilize people either to teach one class in our area, or utilize someone from another part of their program to step in to teach a class under our designation. We don't really communicate at all with those one-course folks, but about once a quarter, the full-time faculty member might give me a call.”
- “I think the assumption is that anything offered on the regionals is also offered at Athens, but I know they have had opportunities to take workshops on "Elluminate" and other on-line platforms. To my knowledge, those same workshops have not been offered to Athens campus faculty.”

- “By dumb luck I ended up at one of the regional conferences held for regional faculty last Memorial day weekend at Eastern. It was awesome. Would like to do stuff like that.”
- “I don't interact at that level - and am not privy to any reviews of teaching etc. that may go on.”
- “I received emails from the dean of the department sharing news and workshop offered by OU. However, I am not sure the workshops are on the regional campuses or only in Athens.”
- “I believe my department is very receptive to working with the regional campuses, although at the same time, I am not sure to what extent faculty members in the department really understand the mission of regional campuses, the students, or the faculty (e.g., our qualifications, work load).”
- “I was just nominated for a major position in one of my associations and one of the senior scholars in my department didn't even know who I was. It's sad when I have a major presence in the field and yet people within my home department don't know I exist.”
- “I have never met anyone from the ATHENS DEPARTMENT, EXCEPT FOR MY INTERVIEW (VIA MICROWAVE) AND AT A "WELCOMING" MEETING WITH NEW FACULTY. AT THE LATTER MEETING, I INTRODUCED MYSELF TO A NEW FACULTY MEMBER ON THE ATHENS CAMPUS. WHEN HE SAW I WAS FROM THE CHILLICOTHE BRANCH, HE TURNED HIS BACK ON ME AND REFUSED TO TALK WITH ME FURTHER. I FORGET HIS NAME, BUT HE STUDIES SET THEORY.”
- “I only have contact with them when I ask for it. No effort, that I am aware of, has been made recently to involve the regional campuses. No Athens department member has been on our campus for years.”
- “My overtures to the department were never acknowledged or reciprocated.”
- “I get occasional emails from the dept. chair that have times, days, and lists of names. Regarding #4, I have never attended one of these events because they are always in the middle of the week. I noticed that next quarter they are going to be held on Fridays, so I may actually be able to participate for a change.”
- “would like to get direct emails on this rather than have to always log onto main campus and hope I find what I am looking for; would add a personal touch.”
- “I do receive notices regarding meetings, although I do not think we receive minutes. We could probably communicate better regarding curriculum changes and textbook changes, although we do eventually straighten these issues out.”
- “I do occasionally receive an email referring to textbook changes, but never meeting minutes or notices of meetings.”
- “There should be an undergraduate committee in every discipline where there should be reasonable representation from regional campuses. This committee's role is to make sure that there is ample communication between all campuses about new courses developed, changes in prerequisites etc.”
- “I believe that increased communication and interaction between regional campus faculty and Athens campus faculty would be beneficial. At the same time, I'm not sure how to accomplish this goal. I know our Athens department is meeting with

all of our regional campus faculty in our area for the first time this spring in an effort to increase communication. We are having meetings in the morning and then having lunch together. I think funds for meetings like this one on at least a yearly basis would be one step in the right direction. Maybe we could have one meeting in Athens and then a second one on a regional campus that isn't too far from Athens, like the Lancaster campus. Another idea might be to e-mail department chairs suggesting the addition of regional campus faculty member e-mail addresses to their department e-mail list so that regional faculty members will receive most department e-mails by default.”

- “There needs to be an expectation that every department will have at least one annual get-together of all faculty in that discipline, at a time that is conducive to RC faculty participating. The RC faculty need to be portrayed to the main campus faculty as undergrad education experts, which we are. They can learn a lot from us. The unfortunate thing on our end are the small but vocal number of RC faculty who want a sort of benevolent neglect and to be left alone by the main campus department.”
- “I think that we should increase the interaction with the regional campuses and have common faculty that teaches at both places. A meeting at least once a quarter of all the faculty in every discipline would increase our interaction. We should plan common activities.”

6. Hiring

Almost 70% of the responses from faculty at the main campus and more than 60% of the responses from the regional campuses favored joint decisions regarding faculty hires on regional and main campuses. Some faculty also felt that the faculty for the associate degree programs should be the sole responsibility of the regional campuses. In general, the faculty at regional faculty felt that involving the faculty from the main campus in the hiring process is beneficial to the campus. Some of the written comments from the respondents are (Questions 13 and 15):

- “There are some very good, dedicated, and well educated faculty members at the Regional campuses. The "community college hires" that result in unqualified people teaching subjects in which they neither have a degree nor publish does no favors to anyone.”
- “I think this is important because those courses are also offered on the Athen's campus. Some of these courses are pre reqs for continuing courses on the Athen campus.”
- “Regional faculty should have primary responsibility and decision making, but it would be good to have Athens faculty involved -- it would improved mutual knowledge of both departments.”
- We have standards that are not well understood by non members of the profession; for example, regional deans often seek faculty who can teach "across the discipline:' we consider such faculty "jacks of all trades and masters of none"
- “Our national accreditation requirements include faculty teaching any of our core or major courses at the regional campuses. It is crucial that we have some say in hiring and teaching assignments.”

- “I have always been confused about this relationship -- I think we have some responsibility on the Athens' campus for the quality of the programs in our academic area at the regional campuses -- hence we are sometimes asked to approve a request to have someone teach a class that falls under our academic area...but then we have no further contact, so I don't think there is a very close relationship. What needs to be clarified is whether regional campuses are really independent or whether they are under the programmatic control of the Athens' campus. I am still unclear about this.”
- “I've just served on two searches over the past quarter. There needs to be communication between the regional and the main campus about the quality of applicants and the teaching needs of the candidates.”
- “I have found in this area that often the regional campus wants to hire a "friend" and not someone exceptionally qualified. My experience is also that the regional campus does not see the complete picture of how the program is conducted on the Athens Campus and therefore is unaware of the needs of the TOTAL program rather than the 1 or 2 courses they teach that fits the Total program.”
- “Given that course approvals are done by the Athens dept., it makes no sense that they should be left out of the hiring process. However, the notion of Athens departments making the decision on their own is absurd. The colleagues of the new hire will be the other RC faculty, not the Athens ones. Tenure and promotion decisions are made by the RC. The new hire has to mesh with the mission of the RC.”
- “However, I really think this depends on the purpose. If regional campus faculty really on function on the regional campuses, then I think the hiring decision should be made on the regional campus. If, however, regional campus faculty are considered faculty within their respective departments in Athens, then I think a joint hiring is important.”
- “These decisions should be made with input from academic department in Athens but the final decision should be left to the regional campus faculty.”
- “If we are one University then we should all have a voice. So when faculty are hired to main campus, regional campus faculty should be included in those decisions.”
- “As it is now. The regional campus should consult the Athens department to assure that the candidate will be cleared to teach a viable load of courses, but since the individual will be a citizen of the regional campus, the final decision should belong to the regional campus”

7. Course Clearance and related issues

More than 70% of the respondents from the main campus indicated that course clearance process should be a joint venture and more than 60% of the regional campuses expressed similar views. More than 90% of the respondents from the regional campuses were in favor of more bachelor's degree programs at regional campuses. The respondents from the main campus were however a little cautious. Less than 10% of the faculty at the main campus and less than 10% of the faculty on the regional campuses felt the need for a separate clearance procedure for online courses. Faculties both at the regional as well as at the main campus did share some concerns regarding the quality of these courses. Some

of the comments shared by the respondents in this area of concern are (Questions 17, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23):

- “My department has an accredited program. We could not allow chemical engineering courses to be taught outside of our control and maintain accreditation. Absent such an accreditation issue, I would say that decisions should be made jointly. It is absolutely essential that students taking courses on the regional campuses should be getting the same course, if not a better course.”
- “If the degree has the OU name on it only, i.e., not OU-Lancaster & etc., then the responsibility for the curriculum lies with the Department Chair. Any attempt to change that will be catastrophic for the University and I suspect will encounter serious resistance.”
- “I do believe that there should be a clear process for determining whether a course can be offered on our campus. If the answer is no, a course can not be offered, I believe departments should also outline what is necessary to get clearance to offer the course.”
- “With equal degree qualifications, faculty on the regional campus should have the very same process for clearance as Athens faculty have or either don't have--through the academic dean, associate dean, or department head.”
- “As one university, we should have ties with Athens and meet their criteria for clearances. However, if it is an associate degree course, regionals should be able to determine the clearance.”
- “This isn't happening and it is a problem, as some of the regional faculty would not even be hired as Group II instructors on the Athens Campus. Also, the cost of an online class should be the same.”
- “At this point, the terms for online courses are so poorly worked out, with unclear ownership and control provisions, that the department that owns the course needs to use great caution.”
- “This is a difficult issue. The problem resides in the funding for designing on-line courses, when regional faculty design online versions of courses Athens faculty teach. This seems as if they profit from our work, and furthermore design unfair competition for students.”
- “There **must** be coordination between the two, with the Athens campus overseeing the whole process. We cannot have a situation where enrollment in classes on the main campus drops below optimal levels because students in residence on the Athens campus are taking an on-line version of the same class from a regional campus.”
- “This is a VERY critical issue. Regional administration is looking for REVENUE and don't care how they get it. They want to offer online classes, but they don't realize that the process will cannibalize enrollment at other regional campuses and could effect Athens enrollment also. If Regional offers the classes online, then Athens will follow a similar philosophy which could make the regional programs less desirable for students.”
- “Any course still has the same outcome regardless of its delivery method. Those evaluating and approving new courses though, should have background and expertise in all three types of courses so they can make informed decisions. I am

- not sure that the course development/approval committees on the Athens' campus all have this expertise to evaluate all types.”
- “Regardless of the mode of delivery, the instructor needs to be qualified to teach the subject matter. If anything, I would request extra clearance for those teaching online or hybrid courses as these are honestly more challenging regarding the interaction!”
 - “Exploring ways to both encourage, and have a means of completing bachelor degrees at the regional campus would be the single most important contribution to our overall institutional retention. I would hope that we could explore ways to keep the 50%+ attrition rate on the regionals.”
 - “I think this is important because the purpose of the regional campuses is to provide educational opportunities for students who cannot attend the main campus. In most cases these are non- traditional students who are committed to continuing their education. I think the university should offer incentives for main campus faculty to offer some degree specific courses on these campuses where a need has been identified. This will only strengthen the university as a whole. Technology is available to give some options in this.”
 - “More degrees would allow a better education and a better offering for the whole university. However, I believe that Athens should offer more options than the other courses, because it would be easier for the students that otherwise would have to commute among campuses.”
 - “For many regional campus students, transferring to the main is very difficult due to either family responsibilities or financial issues. I strongly believe we need to offer more bachelor's degrees. I think many students on the regional campuses choose their major based on the few that we offer as opposed to their real preference for an academic focus. I do not think the hybrid degrees (e.g., B.S.S., B.T.A.S.) are a good solution to this problem as I believe they put students at a disadvantage on the job market upon completion of their degree. I also believe we need to communicate with Athens departments and determine exactly what the requirements would be for a particular major to be offered on the regional campuses. I would like to see this in writing for most majors so that we can assess where we are and where we need to go to offer a particular major.”
 - “The University's funding model has been changed in such a way that the RCs get insignificant income from graduate programs. At the same time, the University System of Ohio is almost certainly going to expand the rights of community colleges and tech schools to deliver the first two years. If the RCs don't have more Bachelor completion programs, we will have no purpose.”
 - “WITHOUT BACHELOR'S PROGRAMS, IT IS IMPOSSIBLE TO MAINTAIN DECENT PROGRAMS. FOR ONE THING, THERE ARE NO UPPER CLASSMEN TO WISEN UP THE FRESHMEN AND SOPHOMORES, SO THE ACADEMIC QUALITY SUFFERS. ALSO, THERE ARE NOT ENOUGH STUDENTS TAKING THE MATH SERVICE COURSES ABOVE ALGEBRA TO KEEP OFFERING THESE COURSES. WE ARE IN DANGER OF BECOMING A TECH SCHOOL RATHER THAN A BRANCH OF A UNIVERSITY.”

- “Absolutely. This would be the single most important change that OU could make to better meet our mission of serving all of southeast Ohio, not just the students who attend the Athens campus.”
- “Our regional campus is growing and we can continue to grow if Athens would allow us more bachelors degrees instead of insisting students drive there”
- “There are place-bound students who cannot attend in Athens. If we do not provide the bachelors degrees, then they will attend Marshall University.”
- “There are policies for running online courses for Ohio University as a whole. These processes should be followed. However, I have seen people put in for an online course and were turned down by the department because someone in the department decided to teach the online course instead. I do not agree with Athens' stealing of regional campus faculty's ideas.”
- “If courses are approved by the Curriculum Committee to be taught on-line, the process should be the same for faculty on any OU campus. We are One University, are we not?”
- “This would help decrease replication of the same courses. However, the department in Athens should not have the ability to deny a course unless there is one already created and offered to students with similar objectives and outcomes.”
- “I believe a joint discussion regarding the appropriateness for certain courses to be offered online vs. hybrid vs. tradition presentation is important. If you mean that someone cleared to teach a course in a traditional format needs to be cleared again for an online format, then I'm not sure I understand the rationale for the need and therefore it is hard for me to comment.”

8. Promotion and Tenure

The faculties at both regional as well as at the main campus have mixed feelings about this issue. Although some faculty favors having promotion and tenure process with the parent department, others have concerns due to heavy teaching load expectation on the regional campuses and limited available resources. Faculty, however, favors a system in which tenure is with the university and not tied to a campus or a department. This is a model that is followed by some other schools. Some of the respondents' comments (Questions 20 and 24) are as follows:

- “sharing expectations might help understand on which level the Athens' campus is in comparison with the other and can also help teachers understand where they are and work together for finding a solution”
- “to be tenured on the Athens' campus would mean they would have to meet all the same standards as we do -- and I think that the regional campuses need to be more focused on high quality teaching and oftentimes remedial education. The expectations for research and service should not be the same...but then this also means that tenure decisions on regional campuses and pay salary and work load, etc., should be different. I recall a time or two when I was an assistant professor with a Ph.D. in my area with all of the attendant expectations of an Athens' campus tenure-line professor, while I had students who were Associate professors, even in my field, who were working on regional campuses with a M.Ed. and hence, they were taking classes from me an Assistant Professor when

- they themselves were Assistant Professors. It always felt a bit strange and uncomfortable since the individuals would often talk about their status. So something should be different, but I am unsure what.”
- “This issue is complicated. Although I believe there are benefits to being tenured on the Athens campus, without graduate students and a significant teaching load reduction it would be extremely difficult to match the research expectations of the Athens campus. Even with graduate students and a course load reduction, there is little in the way of research lab space or participants for research projects.”
 - “IF we are truly "one university," let's make us one. However, I do believe the tenuring of regional campus faculty should come with the stipulation that they should be tenured within the department but on a specific campus. I think one of the big fears that some regional campus faculty have is that if they are tenured to Athens, they will be moved around from campus to campus like chess pieces.”
 - “I STRONGLY AGREE THAT WE SHOULD BE TENURED AT OHIO UNIVERSITY, PERIOD (NOT THE ATHENS CAMPUS---THE UNIVERSTY. THE TENURE REQUIREMENTS SHOULD VARY ACCORDING TO THE MISSION OF THE CAMPUS AND THE AREA IN WHICH THE FACULTY MEMBER WORKS. THIS IS A POOR QUESTION, BECAUSE IT LUMPS TWO COMPLETELY DIFFERENT ISSUES INTO ONE. I STRONGLY AGREE WITH THE FIRST AND STRONGLY DISSAGREE WITH THE SECOND. WE HAVE FACULTY TEACHING TECH COURSES WHO DO NOT HAVE A PH.D. ALSO, WE DO NOT HAVE TA'S LIKE THEY DO IN ATHENS AND HAVE A MUCH LARGER TEACHING LOAD.”
 - “A hundred different problems could be solved by having university-wide tenure. Even though it would be harder to obtain, it would be worth far more than campus-specific tenure.”
 - “Several regional campus faculty have similar qualifications (in scholarship) with Athens faculty”
 - “The last thing regional campus faculty need to be encouraged to do is more research and less teaching. The current mix of 36 quarter hours and modest research expectations is appropriate. I would even create a teaching track to tenure that would still require research but would allow a faculty member to demonstrate greater competence in teaching to get tenure. I would allow new faculty to choose between a teaching track and a research track to tenure.”

Mechanisms to Encourage the Regional Campus to respond to critical community needs:

The committee consulted the regional campus deans to solicit their input regarding the significant needs of their communities. Suggestions follow:

Chillicothe

- Conduct economic development impact studies on local levels. Tap into expertise of Voinovich Center as much as possible (ongoing) .

- Encourage increased online offerings to better serve the needs of non-traditional students.
- Use online and other distance learning capabilities to give students access to the academic offerings on the Athens and other regional campuses in the OU system
- Increased flexibility in offering certificate and degree programs that respond to area needs in terms of training and retraining the local workforce for emerging career fields in the region.

Zanesville

- I would argue that our students have a lot of the same interests and the same career potentials as do Athens students. Therefore, to serve our areas well, we should pretty much offer the majors that Athens does. To an extent Athens has "surveyed" our area students and discovered that below is the list of top majors in demand. (This list is a few years old but it could be easily repeated and updated). You will see immediately how few we offer on our campuses. I think in part and in some cases, this is because the degrees we have are ones that generated the least resistance to our offering it, rather than being based on what our students wanted or needed. We "kind of have" some of these majors: for example, the various business specialties are probably handled reasonably well under our generic business major. But I've highlighted a few in bold that might be of interest to us as we add programs in the future. (Again, this gives the general idea; this list needs to be updated.):

ND1201 UNDECIDED UNC 1603
COE&HHS EARLY CHILD EDU 743
BA4101 PSYCHOLOGY A&S 575
ND5153 GENERAL ART FAR 528
BB6127 MARKETING CBA 453
BB6125 FINANCE CBA 323
BS8122 EXERC PHYSIO HHS 286
BC5313T COM-VIDEO COM 274
BA4201 POLITIC. SCIA&S 266
BS8123 SPORT INDUST HHS 264
BS6380 RETAIL MERCH HHS 263
BJ6933 JOUR-MAGAZNECOM 261
BS5305 HEAR SP LANG HHS 259
BB6121 ACCOUNTING CBA 258
BC5342 INCO-ORG COM 251
BS7257 MECH. ENGNRG ENT 251
BA4253 SOC CRIMINOLA&S 244
BS6308 INTEGR SOCSTU EDU 228
BS1112 SPECIAL STDS UNC 207
BA5231 ENGLISH A&S 206
BS6306 INTEGLANGART EDU 191
ND0610 UNDEC CBA CBA 183

Eastern

- We need flexibility in degree offerings and more specific degrees that meet the needs of local businesses and the community such as the following:

General business, accounting degree, political science, psychology, special education, math and science degrees to be used for secondary education, masters in social work, masters in public administration, graduate degrees in counselor education and special education rural principalship.

- We also need to be able new degree offerings in a timely manner that meet the needs of the business community and help technical school graduates develop higher skill levels.
- We are in dire need of developing a curriculum review procedure and mechanism to do this thoroughly, but much more quickly than we can currently mount a new degree program.

Conclusion

This committee modeled the professionalism, collegiality, cooperation, and collaboration that can and should characterize the relationships between the departments on the Athens campus and the regional campuses. Each member took his/her responsibilities seriously and attended every one of our numerous meetings except in emergency situations. Each member contributed a section of this report. Some members volunteered for additional responsibilities such as co-chairing the committee and, in Pramod's case, assuming a significant work load in sending out the survey, tabulating the results, and writing the extensive narrative for the report. The spirit of goodwill, camaraderie, and respect that characterized our work together is a small example of the potential Ohio University has to rise to the challenge of truly being "one university" in the coming days of great challenges and great opportunity.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert Galbreath, Pramod Kanwar, Renée A. Middleton, Dean, J. Nicole Pennington, Jan Schmittauer, Susan Tice-Alicke

APPENDIX B

Faculty Relationships with Athens Departments Subcommittee Survey

I am a faculty member at Athens – Department _____

Regional Campus

Please use the space following each question for your comments.

1. I communicate (including physically, compressed video, phone conferences) with faculty from the Athens/regional campus often seldom never.

2. My department has a good indifferent poor relationship with the Athens/regional campus.

3. I receive information regarding teaching/learning workshops and research colloquia offered by the department on the Athens/regional campus often seldom never

4. I have participated in teaching/learning workshops and/or research colloquia offered by the department on the Athens/regional campus often seldom never

5. More bachelor degrees need to be offered on the regional campuses. agree neutral disagree

6. Regional/Athens campuses need to offer more online courses.
agree neutral disagree

7. Important information such as minutes of the department meetings, curriculum changes, textbook changes are communicated to me by my Athens department
often seldom never

8. Ohio University would benefit by having regional campus faculty tenured on the Athens campus with similar teaching/research/service expectations
agree neutral disagree

9. Athens departments should be very somewhat minimally involved in hiring on regional campuses.

10. Athens departments should be very somewhat minimally involved in course clearance on regional campuses.

What are your suggestions for improving faculty relations between the regional campuses and the Athens campus

APPENDIX C

Auxiliary and Student Services Subcommittee

Overview of Major Tasks of Students Services and Auxiliary Services on Ohio University Regional Campuses

Student Services

- Counseling
- Orientation
- Student organizations
- Advising
- Tutoring
- Childcare Services
- Registration
- Transfer credit
- Recruit/retention
- Financial aid Issues (scholarships etc.) → Equity for all campuses
- Probation/discipline
- Job placement?
- Internships?

Problems

- International transfer credit
- Remedial learning

Athletics

- Have or Have not → what level budget?
- Men's and/or women's
- Scholarships → Offer to keep kids local
- "Bobcat identity"

Library/Resources

- Books
- A.V.
- Elmo
- What level provided at each campus?

Technology

- Student
- Faculty
- System wide

- Blackboard
- SIS
- Oracle
- Lack of compressed video availability
 - Meetings
 - Education

Physical Plant

- Renovations
- Utilities pay

Auxiliary/ Student Services

- Examine Athens Student Services programs:
 - Which are or are not offered to or accessible to Regional Campus students?
 - Health Services?

Additional Questions for Consideration:

January 7, 2008

**Executive Vice President and Provost's Charge
to the Task Force on the Future of Regional Campuses**

On August 13-14, 2007 Regional Campus administrators and faculty leaders from all Ohio University regional campuses met to discuss the future of the regional campuses. Since then the task has taken on even more urgency with proposals associated with the Governor's and Chancellor's initiative of The University System of Ohio. At the Retreat, the Provost noted that we are committed to one Ohio University with a strong mission of both excellence and access. Regional Campuses have traditionally enabled Ohio University to provide access to higher education for the underserved student population of Appalachian Ohio. Families with limited income and mobility in Southeastern Ohio look to the Ohio University Regional Campuses to fulfill their educational needs and ambitions through high quality academic programs. At the same time, Regional Campuses engage in exemplary service to their surrounding communities.

The profile of the Ohio undergraduate is changing. The numbers of young adults juggling family and work with study are growing. This is the student who has historically been served by a Regional Campus. This is also the student who may not be willing to relocate to the Athens campus for degree completion, but will seek out local options instead.

As increasing numbers of Ohio citizens seek degree programs at every level close to where they live and work, the potential of the Regional Campuses to contribute to building Ohio's workforce demands consideration. What are the best directions for development among the Regional Campuses in line with the emerging University System of Ohio? What will be the future relationship of the Regional Campuses with Lifelong Learning? Regional Campuses already offer many on-line and blended learning courses and they are well suited to expand their offerings.

The Ohio University Regional Campus system differs from other regional campus systems in many ways. The Regional Campuses' population is larger than the typical branch campus, especially in Ohio. Each Regional Campus is unique in its profile of degree offerings and service to its region. Zanesville, for example, (as well as Chillicothe and Southern) is known for its large nursing program while Ohio University Southern has a much wider variety of technical programs, including a horse park, and is repositioning itself with its Proctorville Center. While Ohio University's Regional Campuses do not exhibit the same characteristics as other branch campuses, it is important to consider best practices derived from other systems as we plan for the future.

Five topic areas need further definition and study. What follows is a gathering of issues, questions, and ideas from the August retreat with some additions provided from the Regional Campus Faculty Conference held in November:

I. Administrative & Reporting Structures

The consideration of Regional Campuses' reporting structure should begin with an understanding of the central mission for the Regional Campuses. The key question is what administrative and leadership structures will best help us serve our students and our region? The reporting lines are important because they shape other processes such as faculty promotion and tenure. We should look at how other branch campus structures in Ohio and elsewhere are constructed to determine an optimal reporting configuration.

II. Academic Program Development

What role should Regional Campus faculty have in curriculum planning and decision-making around new courses and even new degree programs? This is a critical issue as demonstrated by an informal survey of regional campus faculty at the most recent annual faculty conference, where curriculum issues were voted the single most important item of concern.

III. Faculty Relationship with Departments on the Main Campus

In general, there is a lack of consistency among main campus departments in how they interact with the regional campuses and how they approach their roles in the hiring and course clearance process. How can the relationship between main campus departments and regional campus faculty be strengthened and supported? It has been suggested that regional campus faculty be regularly informed of changes within their departments and changes made to curriculum; that chairs and main campus faculty visit the regional campuses periodically; that main campus departments encourage and welcome visits from regional campus faculty and that regional campus faculty be invited to participate in campus meetings, newsletters and list-serves.

What mechanism could be used to encourage the Regional Campuses to respond to critical needs in the community with degree and certificate programs to meet those documented needs? What is an acceptable and efficient process to allow Regional Campuses to do what they do best--serve their students and communities?

IV. Finances

Regional Campuses have been financially self-supporting and this discipline has led to important efficiencies. In general, how can fees be restructured to provide financial incentives for the regional campuses to grow and expand within the context of Responsibility Centered Budgeting? That is, how can we develop an accounting/budgeting system which will encourage entrepreneurial activities for the campuses?

What should be the financial arrangement between regional campuses and Athens academic units for upper division and graduate programs offerings on Regional Campuses?

Additional questions to consider are: What should the tuition on Regional Campuses be to compete with community and technical colleges especially in the new environment of

the University System of Ohio? What is the impact of differential fees? The comprehensive fee? Should regional campuses charge additional fees to students beyond tuition and general fees? If so, how are fee charges and revenues from fees allocated between regional campuses and the main campus?

V. Auxiliary and Student Services

Students at the Regional Campuses appreciate and expect a certain level of service and, for lack of a better term, “A Bobcat Experience.” What is the optimum level of services that should be located at the Regional Campus? A “laundry list” of multiple services is provided in Appendix A as a starting point for further exploration.

The Future

As noted above the task of determining the best course for the regional campuses of Ohio University has taken on urgency with the Governor’s and Chancellor’s initiative known as The University System of Ohio. We remain committed to one Ohio University with a strong mission of both excellence and access. Regional Campuses must remain positioned to highlight Ohio University’s dedication to access for the underserved student population of Appalachian Ohio. For generations these students from families with limited income and limited flexibility of travel have looked to the Ohio University Regional Campuses for their dreams of higher learning. The Regional Campuses must remain dedicated to high quality academic programs and to service to their surrounding communities.

Procedure and Timeline

The Provost will appoint Task Force chaired by the Executive Dean for Regional Campuses to oversee and coordinate this charge. The Executive Dean for Regional Campuses will chair the committee to be made up of faculty, administrators, and classified staff from the Regional Campuses and the Athens Campus. Fifteen members (three from each Regional Campus consisting of two faculty and one administrator or one classified staff). Eleven members (at least two Deans and at least 7 faculty).

It is recommended that the Task Force divide into five sub-committees, one for each of the major areas identified in this Charge. A Regional Dean will serve in an ex-officio capacity and resource to each of the sub-committees. Subcommittees may also enlist the assistance of others to include broader participation and to ensure that tasks can be completed within the allotted time period. The Committee should be named by January 2008 and should develop a timeline for completion of the task and submit a report of its findings to the Provost by April 30, 2008.

APPENDIX A

OVERVIEW OF MAJOR TASKS OF STUDENTS SERVICES AND AUXILIARY SERVICES ON OHIO UNIVERSITY REGIONAL CAMPUSES

Student Services

- Counseling
- Orientation
- Student organizations
- Advising
- Tutoring
- Childcare Services
- Registration
- Transfer credit
- Recruit/retention
- Financial aid Issues (scholarships etc.) → Equity for all campuses
- Probation/discipline
- Job placement?
- Internships?

Problems

- International transfer credit
- Remedial learning

Athletics

- Have or Have not → what level budget?
- Men's and/or women's
- Scholarships → Offer to keep kids local
- "Bobcat identity"

Library/Resources

- Books
- A.V.
- Elmo
- What level provided at each campus?

Technology

- Student
- Faculty
- System wide
- Blackboard
- SIS
- Oracle

- Lack of compressed video availability
 - Meetings
 - Education

Physical Plant

- Renovations
- Utilities pay

Auxiliary/ Student Services

- Examine Athens Student Services programs:
 - Which are or are not offered to or accessible to Regional Campus students?
 - Health Services?

Appendix D

January 7, 2008

**Executive Vice President and Provost's Charge
to the Task Force on the Future of Regional Campuses**

On August 13-14, 2007 Regional Campus administrators and faculty leaders from all Ohio University regional campuses met to discuss the future of the regional campuses. Since then the task has taken on even more urgency with proposals associated with the Governor's and Chancellor's initiative of The University System of Ohio. At the Retreat, the Provost noted that we are committed to one Ohio University with a strong mission of both excellence and access. Regional Campuses have traditionally enabled Ohio University to provide access to higher education for the underserved student population of Appalachian Ohio. Families with limited income and mobility in Southeastern Ohio look to the Ohio University Regional Campuses to fulfill their educational needs and ambitions through high quality academic programs. At the same time, Regional Campuses engage in exemplary service to their surrounding communities.

The profile of the Ohio undergraduate is changing. The numbers of young adults juggling family and work with study are growing. This is the student who has historically been served by a Regional Campus. This is also the student who may not be willing to relocate to the Athens campus for degree completion, but will seek out local options instead.

As increasing numbers of Ohio citizens seek degree programs at every level close to where they live and work, the potential of the Regional Campuses to contribute to building Ohio's workforce demands consideration. What are the best directions for development among the Regional Campuses in line with the emerging University System of Ohio? What will be the future relationship of the Regional Campuses with Lifelong Learning? Regional Campuses already offer many on-line and blended learning courses and they are well suited to expand their offerings.

The Ohio University Regional Campus system differs from other regional campus systems in many ways. The Regional Campuses' population is larger than the typical branch campus, especially in Ohio. Each Regional Campus is unique in its profile of degree offerings and service to its region. Zanesville, for example, (as well as Chillicothe and Southern) is known for its large nursing program while Ohio University Southern has a much wider variety of technical programs, including a horse park, and is repositioning itself with its Proctorville Center. While Ohio University's Regional Campuses do not exhibit the same characteristics as other branch campuses, it is important to consider best practices derived from other systems as we plan for the future.

Five topic areas need further definition and study. What follows is a gathering of issues, questions, and ideas from the August retreat with some additions provided from the Regional Campus Faculty Conference held in November:

I. Administrative & Reporting Structures

The consideration of Regional Campuses' reporting structure should begin with an understanding of the central mission for the Regional Campuses. The key question is what administrative and leadership structures will best help us serve our students and our region? The reporting lines are important because they shape other processes such as faculty promotion and tenure. We should look at how other branch campus structures in Ohio and elsewhere are constructed to determine an optimal reporting configuration.

II. Academic Program Development

What role should Regional Campus faculty have in curriculum planning and decision-making around new courses and even new degree programs? This is a critical issue as demonstrated by an informal survey of regional campus faculty at the most recent annual faculty conference, where curriculum issues were voted the single most important item of concern.

V. Faculty Relationship with Departments on the Main Campus

In general, there is a lack of consistency among main campus departments in how they interact with the regional campuses and how they approach their roles in the hiring and course clearance process. How can the relationship between main campus departments and regional campus faculty be strengthened and supported? It has been suggested that regional campus faculty be regularly informed of changes within their departments and changes made to curriculum; that chairs and main campus faculty visit the regional campuses periodically; that main campus departments encourage and welcome visits from regional campus faculty and that regional campus faculty be invited to participate in campus meetings, newsletters and list-serves.

What mechanism could be used to encourage the Regional Campuses to respond to critical needs in the community with degree and certificate programs to meet those documented needs? What is an acceptable and efficient process to allow Regional Campuses to do what they do best--serve their students and communities?

VI. Finances

Regional Campuses have been financially self-supporting and this discipline has led to important efficiencies. In general, how can fees be restructured to provide financial incentives for the regional campuses to grow and expand within the context of Responsibility Centered Budgeting? That is, how can we develop an accounting/budgeting system which will encourage entrepreneurial activities for the campuses?

What should be the financial arrangement between regional campuses and Athens academic units for upper division and graduate programs offerings on Regional Campuses?

Additional questions to consider are: What should the tuition on Regional Campuses be to compete with community and technical colleges especially in the new environment of the University System of Ohio? What is the impact of differential fees? The comprehensive fee? Should regional campuses charge additional fees to students beyond tuition and general fees? If so, how are fee charges and revenues from fees allocated between regional campuses and the main campus?

V. Auxiliary and Student Services

Students at the Regional Campuses appreciate and expect a certain level of service and, for lack of a better term, “A Bobcat Experience.” What is the optimum level of services that should be located at the Regional Campus? A “laundry list” of multiple services is provided in Appendix A as a starting point for further exploration.

The Future

As noted above the task of determining the best course for the regional campuses of Ohio University has taken on urgency with the Governor’s and Chancellor’s initiative known as The University System of Ohio. We remain committed to one Ohio University with a strong mission of both excellence and access. Regional Campuses must remain positioned to highlight Ohio University’s dedication to access for the underserved student population of Appalachian Ohio. For generations these students from families with limited income and limited flexibility of travel have looked to the Ohio University Regional Campuses for their dreams of higher learning. The Regional Campuses must remain dedicated to high quality academic programs and to service to their surrounding communities.

Procedure and Timeline

The Provost will appoint Task Force chaired by the Executive Dean for Regional Campuses to oversee and coordinate this charge. The Executive Dean for Regional Campuses will chair the committee to be made up of faculty, administrators, and classified staff from the Regional Campuses and the Athens Campus. Fifteen members (three from each Regional Campus consisting of two faculty and one administrator or one classified staff). Eleven members (at least two Deans and at least 7 faculty).

It is recommended that the Task Force divide into five sub-committees, one for each of the major areas identified in this Charge. A Regional Dean will serve in an ex-officio capacity and resource to each of the sub-committees. Subcommittees may also enlist the assistance of others to include broader participation and to ensure that tasks can be completed within the allotted time period. The Committee should be named by January 2008 and should develop a timeline for completion of the task and submit a report of its findings to the Provost by April 30, 2008.

Appendix E

Membership List: Task Force on the Future of Regional Campuses

Administrative & Reporting Structures

Dr.	Furlow	John	Lancaster
Mrs.	Griffith	Patricia	Chillicothe
Dr.	Irwin	Dennis	Athens
Dr.	Moore	Donald	Southern
Dr.	Nadon	Greg	Athens
Dr.	Fonseca	James	Zanesville

Academic Program Development

Dr.	Adeyanju	Matthew	Athens
Dr.	Cao	Qiuping	Lancaster
Dr.	Castle	David	Eastern
Dr.	Gradin	Sherrie	Athens
Dr.	Hale	Claudia	Athens
Mr.	Lafreniere	Michael	Chillicothe
Dr.	Greenlee	Richard	Eastern

Faculty Relationships w/Athens

Departments

Dr.	Galbreath	Robert	Eastern
Dr.	Kanwar	Pramod	Zanesville
Dr.	Middleton	Renee	Athens
Ms.	Pennington	J. Nicole	Southern
Dr.	Schmittauer	Jan	Chillicothe
Dr.	Tice-Alicke	Susan	Athens
Dr.	Janosik	MaryAnn	Lancaster

Finance

Dr.	Day	John	Athens
Dr.	McTeague	Michael	Eastern
Dr.	Rossiter	Rose	Athens
Dr.	Sarnoff	Susan	Athens
Dr.	Whitright	Audrey	Zanesville
Dr.	Bebee	Richard	Chillicothe

Auxiliary & Student Services

Ms.	Forshey	Jackie	Zanesville
Dr.	Pleasant	Robert	Southern
Dr.	Sullivan	Kathleen	Athens
Dr.	Tadlock	Barry	Athens
Dr.	Thomas-Maddox	Candice	Lancaster
Dr.	Willan	William	Southern

Dr.	Evans	Dan	Southern
Dr.	Flaherty	Stephen	Athens
Dr.	Krendl	Kathy	Athens

April 30, 2008