Summary: Post-Secondary Online Expansion in Florida

November 16, 2012
There are differing views as to the primary objectives for online post-secondary education in Florida. The strategies presented here attempt to encompass this spectrum of objectives.

This is a long-term post-secondary online strategy; it is not meant to focus on any specific degree level or industry.

Any strategy adopted should exhibit outstanding offerings and best practices for post-secondary online learning, such as best-in-class course and program design, top faculty, highly efficient course scheduling, analytically advanced marketing efforts, and data-driven student supports.

Any adopted strategy must include comprehensive tracking of online outcomes. Online learning is an evolving method of delivery – constant evaluation is critical to drive further innovations and improvements; daily, weekly, and monthly monitoring of online students is critical.

The National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES) is the source of the expenditure data in this report. This data is submitted to IPEDS by all Title IV eligible institutions.

Online learning is not a “silver bullet”: Different learners are suited to different ways of learning. Online learning allows Florida to expand its portfolio of offerings to meet the needs of its diverse constituent base.

The strategies presented here have been described, modeled, and evaluated one at a time. A combination of the strategies could also be adopted.

The accompanying detailed fact-base provides both background and further detail behind the materials presented in this summary.
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Objectives for Online Learning

In Florida and across the nation, students are taking advantage of online learning opportunities.

Percent of Nationwide Students Taking at Least One Course Online, 2002-2003 to 2010-2011

Percent of Florida SUS and FCS Students Taking at Least One Course Online, 2010-2011

Note: Students taking at least one online class is defined as students taking at least one course where 80% or more of the content is delivered online.

Source: Babson Survey Research Group; SUS Board of Governors; FL DOE
### Objectives for Online Learning

The online offerings that students seek come in a number of forms, targeting different students with different requirements for success.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Online/Hybrid Courses for Campus-Based Students</th>
<th>Target Students</th>
<th>Requirements for Success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ~1/3 of students are already taking an online course | • Residential and commuter students  
• Can be campus-based or remote | • Coordination on degree program design and supplemental services to achieve best-in-class offerings, scale efficiencies and lower costs across the system |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fully Online Degree Programs</th>
<th>Target Students</th>
<th>Requirements for Success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>~50% of institutions are offering online degree programs</td>
<td>Undergraduate Certificate / Associate Degree Completion</td>
<td>• Adults looking to enhance their employment prospects or transition professions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| | Bachelor Degree Completion | • Working adults looking to complete bachelor’s degrees  
• Typically employed and/or with families |
| | Graduate Degree | • Employed working adults typically intending to remain in their current career field |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-Directed Courses (MOOC-Inspired)</th>
<th>Target Students</th>
<th>Requirements for Success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Nascent offering | • Wide age range of students (e.g., high school through adult) seeking to accelerate credit accumulation at a very low cost  
• Self-directed students, who require no instructor contact | • Quality evaluation frameworks and testing policies to allow for awarding of credits |

Source: Babson Survey Research Group; Parthenon Online Survey; Peterson’s Database
Objectives for Online Learning

Stakeholders across Florida have conveyed four primary objectives for post-secondary online learning:

**Expanding Access**
- Allows students who cannot take face-to-face courses to continue their education
- Allows high-performing students to accelerate their education
- Provides an attractive option for degree completers

**Reducing System and Student Costs**
- Requires less physical infrastructure
- Enables better management of class utilization
- Can reduce time- and cost-to-completion through alternative models of competency-based learning
- Increases the effective capacity of an institution
- Attracts out-of-state students with market-based tuition, to subsidize in-state students

**Strengthening the Link Between the Labor Market and Post-Secondary Education**
- Enables a broader scaling of labor force-demanded degree programs through dissemination beyond the local catchment area
- Aligns new programs with labor-market needs

**Enhancing the Student Experience**
- Allows digital delivery, in its many forms, to enhance the quality of existing core programs
- Allows students scheduling flexibility and ability to learn at their own pace
Objectives for Online Learning
Online degree programs are expanding access to adult and non-traditional learners

SUS and FCS Online-Only Students Enrollment by Age, 2010-2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUS Online-Only Students</th>
<th>FCS Online-Only Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 25</td>
<td>25 and Over</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.9K</td>
<td>67.1K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Florida Today

- Students are enrolling in online programs at all degree levels; the demographics of these students are similar across degree levels
- The SUS and FCS currently offer ~700 online programs; ICUF (~220) and for-profit institutions (~850) also offer many online programs
- Online courses within the SUS and FCS are primarily focused on providing multiple modality options for the same target student
- The Florida Virtual Campus (FLVC) allows students to more easily access courses from other institutions
- Florida’s common course numbering and articulation agreements promote easy transfer of course credit between Florida’s institutions
- UF has recently announced it will post non-credit MOOCs on Coursera

Opportunities for Further Innovation Within the SUS/FCS

- Develop robust onboarding/support services and data tracking capabilities across the SUS and FCS
- Develop MOOCs and proctored exams for high demand courses

Note: Additional breakdown by degree level can be found in the detailed fact base; SUS and FCS online-only defined as students who only took online courses in 2010-2011
Source: SUS Board of Governors; FL DOE; Interviews with SUS and FCS institutions
Objectives for Online Learning
Online-focused institutions are developing fundamentally different expenditure models

Benchmarked Online Institutional Expenditures per FTE, 2010-2011

- Online courses within the SUS and FCS are offered at the same tuition levels as comparable face-to-face courses
- The addition of the distance learning fee increases the total cost per credit hour for most distance learning students in SUS and FCS institutions
- Most SUS and FCS institutions believe online and onsite costs are comparable
- The costs of their online-only courses and degree programs cannot easily be separated from other institutional costs
- ICUF and for-profit online offerings are typically offered at lower tuition levels than onsite

Florida Today

- Develop lower-expenditure and lower-tuition models to expand the portfolio of offerings available to students, while maintaining commitment to performance
- Closely identify and track online course costs

Degree Program Model | Credit-Based | Competency-Based | Credit-Based | Competency-Based
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---
Instructional touch | High | Low | Low | Very Low
Student-faculty ratio | 18:1 | 30:1 | 39:1 | N/A

Note: Competency programs award credit based on mastery of material rather than on seat time. These programs minimize instructional costs by utilizing student mentors and allowing students to complete courses at their own pace; Expenditures include academic support expenditures, student service expenditures, institutional support expenditures, and instruction expenditures. Source: IPEDS; 85+ Institution and expert interviews were conducted by Parthenon for the Florida engagement as well as multiple proprietary projects, from July – November 2012.
Objectives for Online Learning
Nationally, online degree programs can meet post-secondary requirements for ~80% of job openings in target clusters

EFI Target Industry Job Openings (2020 Projected) that Can Be Satisfied with Current National Online Degree Program Offerings

Florida Today
- Institutions are offering online courses and degree programs with career-focused options at every degree level
- Of the EFI Target Industry Job Openings (2020 Projected), ~30% can be satisfied with SUS or FCS online programs

Opportunities for Further Innovation Within the SUS/FCS
- Increase the focus on online-only students through a broader portfolio of more flexible offerings, while maintaining high standards of academic quality
- Better alignment between industry and post-secondary education through state-level “Industry Councils” and Florida Department of Economic Opportunity, who would provide input on new degree programs and curriculum

Note: SOC codes are manually mapped to Florida’s 6 target clusters, identified by Enterprise Florida Inc; Job openings in positions with SOC codes are mapped to a program CIP code; it is then determined which program CIP codes map to DL courses offered nationally (green); Some occupations fell into more than one job cluster and are therefore duplicated within appropriate industry clusters
Source: BLS; Florida Department of Economic Opportunity’s 2012-2020 Projections Statewide (FL DEO); 2010-2015 Strategic Plan for Economic Development, from Enterprise Florida Inc. (EFI); Peterson’s Distance Learning Database; IPEDS; SUS Board of Governors; FL DOE
Objectives for Online Learning

Students are increasingly seeking online options

Percent of Students Taking at Least One Course Online, National 2002-2003 and 2010-2011, SUS and FCS 2010-11

- National 2002-2003: 10%
- National 2010-2011: 31%
- FCS and SUS 2010-2011: 40%

Percent of Students Taking Fully Online Degree Programs

- National 2010-2011: 12%-14%
- FCS and SUS 2010-2011: <10%*

Note: Students taking at least one course online refers to any student taking at least one course where 80% or more of the content is delivered online;
*There is no designation within SUS/FCS for online-only students; The number of students taking online-only courses in 2010-2011 is 93K; It appears that the actual number of online-only students is lower as only 19K of those same students were enrolled in online-only courses in 2011-12

Source: Babson Survey Research Group; Deutsche Bank Report; Eduventures Online Higher Education Update 2011; School websites; IPEDS; SUS Board of Governors; ~85+ Institution and expert interviews were conducted by Parthenon for the Florida engagement as well as multiple proprietary projects, from July – November 2012

Florida Today

- Online courses often fill first
- A small subset of students within the SUS and FCS take fully online degree programs*
- ICUF institutions have ~30K students enrolled in online-only programs
- Professors are adding online components to core onsite courses to enhance the student experience
- Program design, marketing, and support service capabilities differ across the 38 FCS and SUS institutions that offer online courses

Opportunities for Further Innovation Within the SUS/FCS

- Ensure all students have access to best-in-class online offerings and supports
- Robust ongoing analysis on a daily and weekly basis will be critical to improving online outcomes
Objectives for Online Learning

Institutions are developing best practices in online post-secondary education, with a focus on high quality program development, delivery and support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Design</th>
<th>Marketing and Inquiry</th>
<th>Onboarding/Student Support</th>
<th>Course Scheduling</th>
<th>Instruction</th>
<th>IT and Data Analytics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expanding Access</td>
<td>Students can access a portfolio of offerings</td>
<td>State, regional, and national marketing efforts to ensure coverage of all target students</td>
<td>Multi-modal support services (in-person, online, phone), responsive 24/7</td>
<td>Increased frequency of start dates offer greater flexibility to nontraditional students</td>
<td>Asynchronous and synchronous modalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducing System and Student Costs</td>
<td>Studio space, technology, and faculty serve multiple institutions</td>
<td>Large-scale data-driven marketing that drives economies of scale</td>
<td>Coordinated scheduling that allows for optimization of student-teacher ratios</td>
<td>Greater instructor utilization possible</td>
<td>Early-warning systems tied to intervention to reduce attrition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening the Link Between the Labor Market and Post-Secondary Education</td>
<td>Industry collaboration on program offerings</td>
<td>Private partners utilized to target offerings to student segments with in-demand program offerings</td>
<td>Career service and job placement teams</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancing the Student Experience</td>
<td>State of the art technology and best-in-class design teams serve multiple institutions</td>
<td>Private partners utilized to target offerings to student segments best matching student need</td>
<td>Data-driven at-risk identification and proactive intervention strategies</td>
<td>Virtual campuses allowing students to leverage course offerings across a system</td>
<td>Embedded value-added digital learning solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assigned success mentors and guidance counselors</td>
<td>Common course numbering</td>
<td>Leverage star faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dedicated analytics teams tracking real-time student performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Common LMS and student information system</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ~85+ Institution and expert interviews were conducted by Parthenon for the Florida engagement as well as multiple proprietary projects, from July – November 2012
Objectives for Online Learning
These activities are currently being developed independently across the 38 institutions that offer online courses

12 SUS Institutions
- FAMU
- Florida Atlantic University
- Florida Gulf Coast University
- FIU
- Florida State University
- New College
- University of Central Florida
- UF
- University of West Florida
- USF
- West Florida
- FL POLY

28 FCS Institutions
- Brevard
- Florida Keys
- Hillsborough
- Lake Sumter
- North Florida
- PCC
- Saint Leo
- Sarasota-Manatee
- St. Petersburg
- Santa Fe
- St. Johns River
- Polk State
- Seminole State
- Gulf Coast
- Daytona
- Estrella
- Florida
- University
- Tampa

Each institution within the SUS and FCS with an online program (✓) has an independent online strategy, with its own marketing, course design, instruction, support services, and IT capabilities.

Source: FLVC
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## Strategies for Consideration

Florida could consider four strategies to drive the development and expansion of high quality new program offerings:

### Institution by Institution
- **Description:**
  - Institutions develop online offerings on their own, driving innovation in a way that best fits each school’s mission

### Institutional Collaboration
- **Description:**
  - System-wide online degree program offerings are developed under the direction of a coordinating body (e.g., FLVC, BoG, FL DOE)

### Lead Institution(s)
- **Description:**
  - One (or a few) institution(s) is selected by RFP process to drive the development of new online offerings in target degree levels and disciplines

### New Online Institution
- **Description:**
  - An online institution is launched to drive portfolio expansion of lower cost models

### How it Works:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution by Institution</th>
<th>Institutional Collaboration</th>
<th>Lead Institution(s)</th>
<th>New Online Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutions continue to independently drive online innovation through new course and program development and/or adjustments to existing offerings</td>
<td>System-wide online degree program offerings are developed under the direction of a coordinating body (e.g., FLVC, BoG, FL DOE)</td>
<td>One (or a few) institution(s) is selected by RFP process to drive the development of new online offerings in target degree levels and disciplines</td>
<td>An online institution is launched to drive portfolio expansion of lower cost models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State defines broad parameters for innovation and achievement</td>
<td>Centralized marketing, onboarding/ support services, and data analytics are each either managed by the central body or one of the participating institutions</td>
<td>Lead institution(s):  - Designs the programs  - Drives marketing, onboarding/student support, course scheduling, and data analytics  - Delivers instruction</td>
<td>New online institution:  - Designs the programs  - Drives marketing, onboarding/ student support, course scheduling, and data analytics  - Delivers instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program-level RFPs are issued to institutions for program development</td>
<td>Lead institution(s), on its own or with partners, must be able to serve both the university-level and college-level target students</td>
<td>New institution, on its own or with partners, must be able to serve both the university-level and college-level target students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Program instruction and scheduling is coordinated by the institution that develops the program</td>
<td>All institutions continue with existing strategies</td>
<td>All institutions continue existing online programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All institutions continue with existing strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Across all 4 strategies, programs will:
1. Increase student access to a **portfolio of offerings**
2. Be delivered at a **lower cost to the student** and/or the state
3. Align to **statewide labor force needs**
4. Ensure a **high quality student experience** for all students
Strategies for Consideration

Considered strategies could be evaluated for **each** type of online offering - the new, fully online degree programs are developed in detail in this section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Students</th>
<th>Requirements for Success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Online/Hybrid Courses for Campus-Based Students** | • Residential and commuter students  
• Can be campus-based or remote | • Coordination on degree program design and supplemental services to achieve best-in-class offerings, scale efficiencies and lower costs across the system |
| **Fully Online Degree Programs** | | |
| Undergraduate Certificate/ Associate Degree Completion | • Adults looking to enhance their employment prospects or transition professions | • Incoming students have 20+ credits  
• Continuous starts, competency options  
• Highly aligned with labor market needs |
| Bachelor Degree Completion | • Working adults looking to complete bachelor’s degrees  
• Typically employed and/or with families | • Incoming students have 40+ credits  
• Continuous starts, competency options  
• Highly aligned with labor market needs |
| Graduate Degree | • Employed working adults typically intending to remain in their current career field | • Self-directed study often possible and preferred  
• Highly aligned with labor market needs |
| Self-Directed Courses (MOOC-Inspired) | • Wide age range of students (e.g., high school, college, adult) seeking to accelerate credit accumulation at a very low cost  
• Self-directed students, needing no instructor contact | • Quality evaluation frameworks and testing policies to allow for awarding of credits |

Source: Babson Survey Research Group; Parthenon Online Survey; Peterson’s Database
**Strategies for Consideration**

**Strategy 1: Institutions develop online programs of their own accord, driving innovation in a way that best fits each school’s mission**

**Benefits:**
- Allows institutions to drive their own online strategy in accordance with their missions
- Fosters local innovation

**Potential Drawbacks:**
- Economies of scale and best-in-class processes are harder to achieve consistently if they are developed by each institution
- Lack of centralized or coordinated program aligned to changing needs of state labor markets

---

**Role of FLVC**
- Institutions would list all online course offerings through the FLVC
- FLVC would continue to provide analytical support for students to track progress toward requirements/degree

**Legislative Considerations**
- Changes to statute would be required if regulations regarding FLVC course listing were to be adjusted
- Changes to statute would be required if tuition requirements for out-of-state students were to be relaxed

**Accreditation Considerations**
- Individual institutions demonstrate program equivalency according to SACS guidelines

**Admission Approach**
- Individual institutions maintain existing admissions selectivity and focus

---

Source: Interviews with FLVC, SUS Board of Governors, SACS staff
Strategies for Consideration

Strategy 2: Coordinating body (e.g., FLVC/BoG/FL DoE) coordinates development of complementary course and degree program offerings across the system

Benefits:
• Reduced duplication of efforts across institutions
• Ability for all students to benefit from the same high quality processes and offerings
• Inclusive but coordinated: many institutions can be selected to participate

Potential Drawbacks:
• No clear “owner” of the results
• Greater political will needed to sustain innovation
• Difficult to make adjustments to processes quickly with multiple stakeholders involved

Role of FLVC
• If used as the coordinating body, the FLVC would be given the authority and budget to manage new online model development across the system(s)

Legislative Considerations
• Detailed statutory language creating the FLVC already exists, which would be updated to reflect additional budget and authority
• FLVC already receives state appropriations, which would potentially need to be increased
• Changes to statute would be required if tuition requirements for out-of-state students were to be relaxed

Accreditation Considerations
• Individual institutions demonstrate program equivalency according to SACS requirements
• Central delivery of student supports may require SACS approval

Admission Approach
• Individual institutions maintain existing admissions selectivity and focus
• Coordinating body ensures that expanded access is provided across new programs
• To ensure program access for a diverse student base, partnerships would need to be developed with other institutions where needed

Source: Interviews with FLVC, SUS Board of Governors, SACS staff
### Benefits:
- Scale efficiencies can be developed
- There is a designated “owner” of the strategy in the lead institution
- Existing brand strengths can be leveraged

### Potential Drawbacks:
- Participation of non-selected institutions could be limited
- Innovation is potentially stifled through focus on one institution instead of many
- Initially contentious option politically

### Strategies for Consideration

#### Strategy 3: Lead institution(s) develops and offers new models across the system

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits:</th>
<th>Potential Drawbacks:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Scale efficiencies can be developed</td>
<td>• Participation of non-selected institutions could be limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There is a designated “owner” of the strategy in the lead institution</td>
<td>• Innovation is potentially stifled through focus on one institution instead of many</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Existing brand strengths can be leveraged</td>
<td>• Initially contentious option politically</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Role of FLVC
- Courses offered by the lead institution can be shared with other students and institutions through the FLVC

### Legislative Considerations
- Legislation would be required to create and fund a performance grant
- New state appropriation would be required
- Changes to statute would be required if tuition requirements for out-of-state students were to be relaxed

### Accreditation Considerations
- Few accreditation limitations, as lead institution would operate within the boundaries of existing accreditation
- Lead institution demonstrates program equivalency according to SACS guidelines

### Admission Approach
- To ensure program access for a diverse student base, partnerships could be developed with other institutions, if needed

---

Source: Interviews with FLVC, SUS Board of Governors, SACS staff
Strategies for Consideration

Strategy 4: New online institution is created to focus exclusively on the development of new models

Benefits:
- Fewer institutional barriers to developing new models and processes
- Ability to design and implement best practices from the start
- Systems and infrastructure designed specifically for the online student

Potential Drawbacks:
- Lacks the brand equity of an existing institution
- Complexity and cost of creating new institution
- Initially contentious option politically

Role of FLVC
- Courses offered by the new institution can be shared with other students and institutions through the FLVC

Legislative Considerations
- Extensive legislation will be required to create and delineate the mission and responsibilities of a new institution
- New state appropriation would be required
- Changes to statute would be required if tuition requirements for out-of-state students were to be relaxed

Accreditation Considerations
- New institutions will require a lengthy accreditation process
- SACS timeline anticipates 3-4 years from naming of a president to full accreditation

Admission Approach
- To ensure program access for a diverse student base, partnerships would need to be developed with other institutions where needed

Source: Interviews with FLVC, SUS Board of Governors, SACS staff
## Strategies for Consideration

Partners could be considered across all four strategic options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Private Providers</th>
<th>Description of Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Online Enablers</strong></td>
<td>• Provide expertise in areas where an institution or system may lack a core competency (e.g., marketing, support services, data tracking)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Can help defray start-up costs and ongoing capital required; flat fee or revenue share is the typical business model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Competency Program Providers</strong></td>
<td>• Provide a lower-tuition postsecondary alternative, typically to degree completers and working adults</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Partnership could speed learning curve of the internal development and execution of competency programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Program Providers</strong></td>
<td>• Provide labor-focused, flexible (e.g., more start dates, modularized) course offerings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Can defray development costs; revenue share model would likely need to be developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marketing Services Providers</strong></td>
<td>• Provide expertise in outsourced marketing services (e.g., SEO, web marketing, TV, etc.), which is typically not a core competency of public institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Flat fee or revenue share is the typical business model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Testing Providers</strong></td>
<td>• Provide proctored examination facilities; can also partner to develop tests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Can defray the cost of developing a more comprehensive exam proctoring operation; given testing providers’ scale, they could likely offer the exam at a lower cost to the student</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Strategies for Consideration

System expenditures are driven by three factors: start-up investment, recurring cost of educating students and number of students reached.

**Start-Up Expenditure + (Recurring Expenditure x System Volume) = System Expenditure On Educational Attainment**

- **Start-Up Expenditures**
  - Initial investment is needed to develop new educational offerings
  - Areas of investment include:
    - Physical Infrastructure
    - Technological Infrastructure
    - Brand Recognition
    - Program Design

- **Recurring Expenditures per FTE**
  - Recurring expenditures vary across different educational models and degree types
  - These expenditures can be broken into four primary categories:
    - Instructional Costs
    - Academic Support Services
    - Student Support Services
    - Institutional Support Services

- **System Volume (Enrollments, Persistence, Completions)**
  - Educational expenditure is highly variable on FTE enrollment
  - FTE enrollment is dependent on:
    - Newly Admitted Student Rates
    - Persistence
    - Time to Completion
    - Degree Mix

\[
\text{New Admits} \times \text{Persistence} \times \text{Time to Complete} = \text{Completions}
\]

**System Expenditure on Educational Attainment**
## Strategies for Consideration

Strategies will necessitate levels of initial investment ranging from ~$30-70M

### Start-Up Expenditures Associated with Each Approach to Online Expansion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution by Institution</th>
<th>Institutional Collaboration</th>
<th>Lead Institution(s)</th>
<th>New Online Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>New building ($18M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Expand SIS ($3M)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Building</td>
<td>Existing brand, reduced marketing effectiveness ($15M)</td>
<td>Existing brand, reduced marketing effectiveness ($15M)</td>
<td>New brand ($20M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Design*</td>
<td>100 degree programs created across multiple institutions ($30M)</td>
<td>50 degree programs created ($15M)</td>
<td>50 degree programs created ($15M)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Institutional Leadership</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Program design will take place over the 10 year time period

Note: Dotted lines represent range of total start-up expenditure; Facility needs benchmarked off of WGU infrastructure needs; Technology assumes: $5M for LMS (learning management system), $2M for ERP (enterprise resource planning), $1M for SIS (student information system), benchmarked off of multiple institution interviews; Brand building benchmarked off of SNHU’s $15M brand building initiative and WGU’s brand building spend when entering Texas, Indiana and Washington; Program design assumes $10K per course and an average of 30 unique courses per program; Institutional leadership becomes a recurring cost as FTEs begin to enroll

Source: ~85+ Institution and expert interviews were conducted by Parthenon for the Florida engagement as well as multiple proprietary projects, from July-November 2012
Strategies for Consideration
Recurring expenditures are benchmarked by degree level and program type against national best practices

Benchmarks for Recurring Expenditures per FTE for Online Instruction, by Degree and Program Type

- **Instruction Expenses**
  - Primarily driven by class size and teacher utilization
  - Professors are primarily non-research; Vast majority of their hours are spent teaching

- **Academic Support Expenses**
  - Driven by program and curriculum design as well as technology costs such as studio space, program design technology, scheduling technology, training and support for faculty and instructional design staff
  - Tend to increase as instructional contact decreases to balance the supports provided to students

- **Student Service Expenses**
  - Includes expenses related to admissions, registration and general help, such as onboarding counselors for students, long term counselors through to completion, student mentors, career services, job placement counselors and 24/7 technology help desks for students
  - Low cost models utilize centralized business processes at scale to reduce cost associated with these services

- **Institutional Support Expenses**
  - Primarily driven by marketing and admissions costs
  - Include general administrative expenses, such as partnerships with industry groups to better understand and adapt to labor market needs
  - Robust data systems and dedicated staff to track student performance metrics, feeding information in real-time to counselors and other support staff
  - Low-cost models utilize centralized business processes at scale to reduce cost associated with these services

Competency programs award credit based on mastery of material rather than seat time. These programs lower instructional costs by utilizing student tutors/mentors and allowing students to complete courses at their own pace.

Source: IPEDS; ~85+ Institution and expert interviews were conducted by Parthenon for the Florida engagement as well as multiple proprietary projects, from July – November 2012
Strategies for Consideration

Recurring expenditures per FTE vary across models due to structural efficiencies

Recurring Expenditures per FTE for Online Instruction, by Strategy, Program and Degree Type

Bachelor's and Graduate

$15K

$13K

$13.9K

$12K

$6.7K

$6.7K

$5K

$5.0K

$4K

$3.4K

Credit-Based

Competency-Based

$13.9K

Strategy 1

Strategy 2

Strategy 3, 4

$6.7K

Strategy 1

Strategy 2

Strategy 3, 4

$5.0K

Strategy 1

Strategy 2

Strategy 3, 4

$3.4K

Strategy 1

Strategy 2

Strategy 3, 4

$13K

Strategy 1

Strategy 2

Strategy 3, 4

Recurring Expenditure Drivers

1. Institution by Institution
   - Duplicative processes result in inefficiencies across support services provided to new fully-online students

2. Institutional Collaboration
   - Instructional models move towards best practices, but coordination difficulties across participating institutions prevent institutions from matching best practice cost structures

3. Lead Institution
   - Centralized processes allow the system to eliminate inefficiencies, achieve scale and match best-in-class support service cost structures

4. New Online Institution
   - Centralized processes allow the system to eliminate inefficiencies, achieve scale and match best-in-class support service cost structures

Source: IPEDS; ~85+ Institution and expert interviews were conducted by Parthenon for the Florida engagement as well as multiple proprietary projects, from July – November 2012
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Recurring online expenditures per FTE will be lower and will vary across degree levels

Recurring Online Expenditures per FTE as a Percent of Current SUS Expenditures per FTE: Bachelor’s and Graduate

- Institution: 74%
- Institutional Collaboration: 71%
- Lead Institution: 59%
- New Online Institution: 59%

Recurring Online Expenditures per FTE as a Percent of Current FCS Expenditures per FTE: Associate’s and Undergraduate Certificate

- Institution: 84%
- Institutional Collaboration: 79%
- Lead Institution: 73%
- New Online Institution: 73%

Note: Recurring online expenditures per FTE is based on the average of the recurring costs per FTE for credit-based and competency-based programs; Current expenditure per FTE is equal to $13.9K for SUS and $5.0K for FCS. Source: 10 Year Financial Model; IPEDS; FL DOE.
Strategies for Consideration

Newly admitted student growth varies with brand strength, marketing effectiveness and the speed of program design

Newly Admitted Online Students, by Potential Model

Across all strategies, degree mix is targeted based on projected Florida job openings:
• Undergraduate Certificate 10%
• Associate 30%
• Bachelors 50%
• Masters 10%

Newly Admitted Student Drivers

1. Institution by Institution
   • Newly admitted student growth is dependent on institutional adoption of programs
     – Assume 200 programs added gradually over 10 years
     – Assume 250 students enrolled in a mature program
     – Assume degree programs take 5 years to reach maturity

2. Institutional Collaboration
   • Program growth is slowed as institutions attempt to coordinate ownership

3. Lead Institution
   • Leverages existing brand to recruit new students
   • Efficient centralized processes drive newly admitted student growth in line with benchmarked fully online institutions

4. New Online Institution
   • New student growth is initially slowed as infrastructure is built and accreditation is gained
   • New brand needs to be built and heavily marketed, but eventually this marketing will be consolidated efficiently in a single entity

Source: IPEDS; Parthenon Persistence Study; BLS
Strategies for Consideration

Differences in persistence rates alter system volume and the cost of producing successful educational outcomes

Estimated One Year Persistence Rate for Fully Online Programs by Degree Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Level</th>
<th>Persistence Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master's Degree</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's Degree</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate's Degree</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Certificate</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Online models with outstanding support services can close the gap between online and onsite persistence rates

Persistence Benchmarks

Nationally, persistence rates vary by degree and modality, trending ~10% lower online than onsite

Master's Degree
- Persistence rates are highest in graduate programs due to the advanced nature of graduate students

Bachelor's Degree
- Across the SUS fully online undergraduate students persist at 75%

Associate's Degree
- On average FCS students persist at 60%. Fully online student persistence rates are assumed to be ~10% lower based on national trends

Undergraduate Certificate
- Persistence rates in undergraduate certificate programs are substantially higher than Associate persistence rates due to the short duration of the program

Note: SUS data used to estimate persistence rates for fully online Bachelor's degree programs; IPEDS retention rates and FCS graduation rate data used to estimate persistence rates for fully online Associate's degree programs; Parthenon's national persistence study used to estimate persistence rates for fully online master's degree and undergraduate certificate programs; Estimated Online Graduation Rate is for Year 1

Source: IPEDS; Parthenon Persistence Study; SUS Board of Governors; FL DOE
Strategies for Consideration

Models with outstanding support services can close the modality gap in persistence rates

- Differing support services structures across strategies drive different levels of persistence rate improvements
- Time to completion is held constant across models and takes into account transfer credits and percent of competency-based classes taken

### Persistence Drivers

1. **Institution by Institution**
   - Maintaining the current structure results in persistence outcomes in line with the current state

2. **Institutional Collaboration**
   - Sharing of best practices across institutions improves online persistence rates gradually

3. **Lead Institution**
   - Efficient centralized best-in-class processes drive online persistence rates in-line with onsite persistence rates

4. **New Online Institution**
   - Sole focus on online programs and efficient processes drive online persistence rates in-line with onsite persistence rates

### Time to Completion Drivers

#### Transfer Credits
- Fully online programs target degree completers. It is assumed average students begin with transfer credits:
  - Associate’s: 20 credits
  - Bachelor’s: 40 credits

#### Program Mix
- Competency-based programs allow students to complete credits at their own pace, potentially lowering the time needed to acquire a degree:
  - 50% Competency-Based
  - 50% Credit-Based

#### Time to Completion
- High levels of transfer credits and adoption of self-paced competency programs result in reduced time to completion:
  - Undergraduate Certificate: 1 Year
  - Associate’s: 2 Years
  - Bachelor’s: 3 Years
  - Master’s: 2 Years

Source: IPEDS; Parthenon Persistence Study; ~85+ Institution and expert interviews were conducted by Parthenon for the Florida engagement as well as multiple proprietary projects, from July – November 2012; College Board Completion Arch
Strategies for Consideration
Differing newly admitted student and persistence rates result in varied enrollment and completion volumes

FTE Enrollments by Potential Model

Key benchmarks include, Liberty, SNHU, Kentucky Community College System, WGU, and Colorado State University – Global Campus

Completions by Potential Model

Source: IPEDS; ~85+ Institution and expert interviews were conducted by Parthenon for the Florida engagement as well as multiple proprietary projects, from July – November 2012; 10 Year Financial Model
## Strategies for Consideration

Effectiveness of educational investment is measured by students served and cost of successful outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution by Institution</th>
<th>Institutional Collaboration</th>
<th>Lead Institution(s)</th>
<th>New Online Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Completions (Over 10 Years)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25K</td>
<td>48K</td>
<td>77K</td>
<td>41K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditure (Over 10 Years)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0.9B</td>
<td>$1.4B</td>
<td>$1.9B</td>
<td>$1.1B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Expenditure Per Completion = Expenditure per Credit x (Credits Needed / Graduation Rate)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expenditure per BA Credit (in Year 10)</th>
<th>$416</th>
<th>$395</th>
<th>$332</th>
<th>$335</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduation Rate (in Year 10)</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure per BA Completion (in Year 10)</td>
<td>$79K</td>
<td>$64K</td>
<td>$47K</td>
<td>$47K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Expenditure per credit is calculated by dividing expenditure per FTE by 30 credits; Expenditure per completion assumes students are enrolling with 40 credits and need 120 to completes; Expenditures include instruction, academic support, student support, and institutional support expenditures

Source: 10 Year Financial Model
# Strategies for Consideration

Across strategies under consideration, self-directed courses provide a unique opportunity for innovation for Florida.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Students</th>
<th>Requirements for Success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Online/Hybrid Courses for Campus-Based Students** | • Residential and commuter students  
• Can be campus-based or remote | • Coordination on degree program design and supplemental services to achieve best-in-class offerings, scale efficiencies and lower costs across the system |
| **Fully Online Degree Programs** | • Adults looking to enhance their employment prospects or transition professions | • Incoming students have 20+ credits  
• Continuous starts, competency options  
• Highly aligned with labor market needs |
| Undergraduate Certificate / Associate Degree Completion | • Working adults looking to complete bachelors degrees  
• Typically employed and/or with families | • Incoming students have 40+ credits  
• Continuous starts, competency options  
• Highly aligned with labor market needs |
| Bachelor Degree Completion | • Employed working adults typically intending to remain in their current career field | • Self-directed study often possible and preferred  
• Highly aligned with labor market needs |
| Graduate Degree | | |

**Self-Directed Courses (MOOC-Inspired)**

- Wide age range of students (e.g., high school through adult) seeking to accelerate credit accumulation at a very low cost
- Self-directed students, who require no instructor contact

- Quality evaluation frameworks and testing policies to allow for awarding of credits

Source: Babson Survey Research Group; Parthenon Online Survey; Peterson’s Database
Strategies for Consideration
MOOCs are the most common example of this kind of innovation in self-directed courses...

What is a MOOC (Massively Open Online Course)?
- Free course with open online access typically not offered for credit
- Institutions throughout the US are posting MOOCs through organizations such as Udacity, Coursera, and edX

How are MOOCs evolving?
- Colorado State University’s Global Campus recently announced that it would grant transfer credits to students who passed a proctored Udacity computer science exam
- The UT system is seeking to develop MOOCs and offer proctored exams for credit to provide lower-tuition alternatives for students and to overcome the hurdle of students being “locked out” of oversubscribed courses

What is the Florida opportunity?
- Florida’s statewide common course numbering system would allow MOOCs developed within the FCS/SUS to be used by students across the state
- Proctored exams would need to be established for these courses
- MOOCs could provide students with a lower-tuition offering; it may also attract students looking to accelerate their studies

How should expectations be tempered?
- Student demand for proctored MOOCs has not yet been established

Source: Inside Higher Ed; ~85+ Institution and expert interviews were conducted by Parthenon for the Florida engagement as well as multiple proprietary projects, from July-November 2012
Strategies for Consideration

...with potential for significant cost savings to the student and to the state

Note: The cost of developing a MOOC depends on factors such as course topic, type of test administration (continuous vs. fixed administration), test format (number of open responses that must be evaluated) and security measures (number of versions of the test and type of surveillance of the test); Associate’s course cost is estimated based on average tuition and fees across FCS institutions for in-state students pursuing an associate’s degree; Bachelor’s course cost is estimated based on average tuition and fees across SUS institutions for in-state undergraduate students

Source: ~85+ Institution and expert interviews were conducted by Parthenon for the Florida engagement as well as multiple proprietary projects, from July – November 2012; School websites; SUS Board of Governors

Approximate Expenditure to Create One Proctored MOOC
(For Course and Test Development)

Per Course Expenditure for Student:
MOOC and Traditional

MOOC Course Development
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Strategies for Consideration
A portfolio of offerings will allow different students to make choices that best meet their needs

Diane graduates high school with straight A’s and enrolls in a state university. She receives all of her credits onsite.

Sally graduates high school and enrolls in a local state college. After two years she decides to pursue a Bachelor’s degree and transfers to a state university where she takes the majority her credits onsite, but elects to take two MOOCs to limit the debt she is taking on.

John enters the workforce full time after receiving an A.S. degree from a state college. Two years into his professional life he realizes that he needs a B.S. degree to be eligible for promotion and enrolls part time in a fully online B.S. program. John takes a number of competency based courses allowing him to complete his degree faster and takes MOOCs to limit the cost.

Wendy enrolls in a state college after high school, but drops out after a year due to family circumstances. Without a degree she struggles to find a job and decides to complete her degree. Concerned about the high cost of college she enrolls in two MOOCs to see if she can balance academic and familial responsibilities. After successfully passing her MOOC exams, Wendy rededicates herself to school, enrolls in a fully online B.A. degree program and graduates cum laude.

Credit Accumulation by Program Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Type</th>
<th>Florida College System</th>
<th>State University System</th>
<th>Online A.S. Credit-Based</th>
<th>Online A.S. Competency-Based</th>
<th>Online B.A./B.S. Credit-Based</th>
<th>Online B.A./B.S. Competency-Based</th>
<th>MOOCs</th>
<th>Total System Expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total System Expenditure</td>
<td>$56K</td>
<td>$35K</td>
<td>$25K</td>
<td>$23K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: MOOC recurring cost is assumed to be $0; One MOOC is assumed to be 3 credits; These stories are all fictional and do not represent real people. Source: iStockphoto.com; 10 Year Financial Model
### Strategies for Consideration

Strategies have been evaluated against online objectives as well as a range of other practical considerations.

#### Objectives For Online Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expanding Access</td>
<td>All population groups will be able to utilize online courses and degree programs to meet their education goals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|Reducing System and Student Costs|• Start-up costs: initial investment will be recouped in shortest amount of time.  
• Recurring costs: cost per FTE to the system will be greatly reduced over time.|
|Strengthening the Link Between the Labor Market and Post-Secondary Education|• Online courses and degree programs will align to labor market needs and be informed by statewide labor councils and the Florida Department of Economic Opportunity.|
|Enhancing the Student Experience|• Students across the state will be able to receive best-in-class online offerings and will achieve similar or better performance results to onsite students.|

#### Other Practical Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Additional Accreditation Processes Required</td>
<td>• Impose the fewest accreditation hurdles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree of Implementation Difficulty</td>
<td>• Require the least amount of change from parties involved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brand Strength</td>
<td>• Leverage strong brand names.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Best-in-Class Business Processes</td>
<td>• Facilitate the achievement of effective business processes at low cost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start-Up Time Required</td>
<td>• Shortest time to enrollment of students in newly created programs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Most favorable strategies in each case will include the following:*
Strategies for Consideration

Prioritization of strategies may differ based on the prioritization of stakeholders and by type of online offering.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Considerations</th>
<th>1 Institution by Institution</th>
<th>2 Institutional Collaboration</th>
<th>3 Lead Institution</th>
<th>4 New Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expanding Access</strong></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="More favorable" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="More favorable" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="More favorable" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="More favorable" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reducing System and Student Costs</strong></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Less favorable" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Less favorable" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Less favorable" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Less favorable" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start-Up Costs</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="More favorable" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="More favorable" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="More favorable" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="More favorable" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recurring Costs</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Less favorable" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Less favorable" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Less favorable" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Less favorable" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strengthening the Link Between the Labor Market and Post-Secondary Education</strong></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="More favorable" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="More favorable" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="More favorable" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="More favorable" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enhancing the Student Experience</strong></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="More favorable" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="More favorable" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="More favorable" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="More favorable" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Additional Accreditation Processes Required</strong></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="More favorable" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="More favorable" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="More favorable" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="More favorable" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Degree of Implementation Difficulty</strong></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="More favorable" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="More favorable" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="More favorable" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="More favorable" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brand Strength</strong></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="More favorable" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="More favorable" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="More favorable" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="More favorable" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Developing Best-in-Class Business Processes</strong></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Less favorable" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Less favorable" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Less favorable" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Less favorable" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Start-Up Time Required</strong></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Less favorable" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Less favorable" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Less favorable" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Less favorable" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stakeholder priorities should determine the relative weighting of these considerations.
### Strategies for Consideration

**Worksheet: A matrix of approaches exist**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Online/Hybrid Courses for Campus-Based Students</th>
<th>Fully Online Degree Programs</th>
<th>Self-Directed Courses (MOOC-Inspired)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Certificate/Associate Degree Completion</td>
<td>Bachelor Degree Completion</td>
<td>Graduate Degree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A combination of strategies could be adopted to best meet student needs.