


University Integrations




Pennsylvania's
STATE SYSTEM
of Higher Education

WHY Integration? (1 of 3)



An “every tub on its own bottom” model works for public universities when enrollment-driven, state, and other revenues are sufficient to meet operating costs



Confronted with the combined downward pressure of declining enrollments, erosion of price advantage, and lagging state support, the model unravels, threatening a university’s financial viability—most seriously at institutions with relatively low enrollments and/or high debt loads

WHY Integration? (2 of 3)

Because integrated institutions can do more together than on their own

REINVENT

higher education from a student-facing perspective

DEEPEN

vibrant campus relationships with the community and region

GROW

enrollments, serve new populations, and meet employer needs

EXPAND

experiential learning opportunities, strengthening career readiness

HARNESS

the collective strengths of the institutions and leverage them to best meet student needs


SUPPORT

financially sustainable operations to ensure our mission continues

SUSTAINABLY operate **COMPREHENSIVE** universities that provide **ACCESS** in all regions across PA

WHY Integration? (3 of 3)

Academic program breadth at integrating universities



Overview of Public Comments (1 of 4)

Made via mail, website form, Board-hosted public hearings, APSCUF-hosted reviews

Responses by stakeholder group

Group	Count	%
Alumni	231	21%
Community member	61	6%
Faculty	482	43%
Parent	37	3%
Staff	104	9%
Student	58	5%
Other*	136	12%
Grand Total	1109	100

*Legislators, and those identified using “PA resident”, “Taxpayer” or other non-descriptive label, or not supplied

Responses by stated university affiliation, all groups

University	Count	% of those stating affiliation
Bloomsburg	38	9%
California	49	11%
Clarion	49	11%
Edinboro	37	8%
ESU	1	0%
Indiana	6	1%
Kutztown	6	1%
Lock Haven	100	23%
Mansfield	5	1%
Millersville	2	0%
Shippensburg	3	1%
Slippery Rock	2	0%
West Chester	142	32%
Grand Total	440	100

Including submissions from on behalf of: AFL-CIO, California University Council of Trustees, PAACC, LHU's Student Minority Retention Committee, Members of the Democratic House Caucus, PA Commission of Community Colleges, PASSHE Faculty Council, PASSHE Women's Consortium, West Chester University Faculty

Overview of Public Comments (2 of 4)

Commenter suggestion(s) made to the Board:

	Count	%
Delay the vote	169	15%
No position stated	391	35%
Oppose plan	475	43%
Support plan	74	7%
Grand Total	1109	100

Overview of Public Comments (3 of 4)

Commenter suggestion(s) made to the Board by stakeholder group:

	Delay the vote		No position stated		Oppose plan		Support		Total
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count
Alumni	9	4%	110	48%	86	37%	26	11%	231
Community	12	20%	28	46%	19	31%	2	3%	61
Faculty	82	17%	111	23%	278	58%	11	2%	482
Parent	2	5%	20	54%	13	35%	2	5%	37
Staff	12	12%	55	53%	20	19%	17	16%	104
Student	3	5%	24	41%	27	47%	4	7%	58
Other	49	36%	43	32%	32	24%	12	9%	136
Grand Total	169	100	391	100	475	100	74	100	1109

Overview of Public Comments (4 of 4)

Recommendation to Board by stated university affiliation

University	Delay		No position stated		Oppose		Support		Grand Total
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count
Bloomsburg	2	6%	8	7%	27	10%	1	5%	38
California	8	23%	25	21%	14	5%	2	10%	49
Clarion	9	26%	18	15%	15	6%	7	35%	49
Edinboro	6	17%	17	14%	10	4%	4	20%	37
ESU	0	0%		0%	1	0%	0	0%	1
Indiana	0	0%	1	1%	4	2%	1	5%	6
Kutztown	2	6%	1	1%	3	1%	0	0%	6
Lock Haven	5	14%	41	34%	50	19%	4	20%	100
Mansfield	1	3%	2	2%	1	0%	1	5%	5
Millersville	0	0%	1	1%	1	0%	0	0%	2
Shippensburg	0	0%		0%	3	1%	0	0%	3
Slippery Rock	0	0%		0%	2	1%	0	0%	2
West Chester	2	6%	7	6%	133	50%	0	0%	142
Grand Total	35	100	121	100	264	100	20	100	440

Review of Public Comments (1 of 5)

Asked for specific information (about a specific program or the process); advocated for a particular program

Expressed concerns about issues the plans already address:

- Maintaining university identity
- Maintaining university athletics teams
- Maintaining independence of affiliate organizations
- Continuing university-based fundraising
- Leaving existing donor funds untouched
- Not closing universities
- Improving student recruitment, retention, and outcomes

Review of Public Comments (2 of 5)

>200 made specific recommendations about:

- Presentation
- Process
- Implementation
- Finance
- Improving student success, faculty and staff supports, DEI outcomes
- Enrollment management (including marketing and student recruitment)

Review of Public Comments (3 of 5)

At least 300 offered alternatives:

Detail	Number
Deeper structural changes <ul style="list-style-type: none">- school closure, system dissolution, system centralization, deal with challenged schools individually- leadership accountability, waste elimination, shared services, program sharing and/or differentiation	>150
Increase state and federal funding to maintain 14 independently accredited schools	Between 1/5 and 1/4 of responses

Review of Public Comments (4 of 5)

Primary issues raised in public comments	How we addressed them
Extend implementation timeline	Extended timeline for curriculum integration
Concerns about community economic impact	Conducted third-party study showing integration with net positive community impact
Concerns about reliance on online learning	Clarified limited reliance on online and did market research into student/parent willingness/expectation
Concerns to protect partner universities that are already sustainable	Built in transitional financial protections
Concerns with projection assumptions	Updated financial projections; conducted third-party review verifying their alignment industry standards
Concerns about staff/faculty job losses	Working with collective bargaining units to minimize impacts of further pre- and post-integration job losses

Review of Public Comments (5 of 5)

150+ comments urged delay.

What would a delay mean?

- No further work on plans or clarity from accreditors/regulators
- Cost System \$40-\$50 million per year
- Prolong uncertainty for students, faculty with negative enrollment and talent management impacts
- Increases reputational risks
- Threatens emerging partnership with, funding from, the General Assembly

Next steps

A vote to approve:

- **Begins (doesn't end) multi-year process**

Long, deliberative, implementation engaging stakeholders

Continued evaluation against leading indicators with opportunities to course correct

High degree of transparency and accountability

- **Is an historic opportunity to re-imagine public higher education for the 21st century**

Ongoing review process

- Quarterly updates to the Board
- Quarterly hearings with General Assembly (Act 50)
- Regular review/reporting on

18 factors outlined in Act 50, Board-approved metrics

Normal Board approved metrics

other items as requested by the General Assembly and Board

18 Reporting Factors Required by Act 50

- (1) An overview of the financial position of the respective universities at the time of plan approval and at the time of the report.
- (2) The operating budget and total budget for each university at the time of plan approval and at the time of the report.
- (3) The estimated amount of expenditures needed to support plan implementation at the time of plan approval and the cumulative amount of expenditures made to support plan implementation at the time of the report.
- (4) The applicable organizational charts at the time of plan approval and at the time of the report.
- (5) Full-time enrollments at the time of plan approval and at the time of the report.
- (6) Graduation outcomes at the time of plan approval and at the time of the report.
- (7) The cost of tuition, room and board and fees at the time of plan approval and at the time of the report.
- (8) The average cost of attendance at the time of plan approval and at the time of the report.
- (9) The number of faculty and nonfaculty employees at the time of plan approval and at the time of the report.
- (10) The number of faculty and nonfaculty employees by location at the time of plan approval and at the time of the report.
- (11) Each impact to faculty and nonfaculty employee staffing, including, but not limited to, separations, reductions in force, reclassifications of job responsibilities or roles or reassignments to other universities within the system. The notification under this paragraph shall include an estimated financial impact for the current and subsequent two fiscal years.
- (12) The faculty-to-student ratio and the faculty and nonfaculty employee-to-student ratio at the time of plan approval and at the time of the report.
- (13) A list of academic programs that have been terminated or consolidated and an explanation of the reasons for termination or consolidation.
- (14) A list of new academic programs that have been approved and an explanation of the need for the programs.
- (15) The number of academic programs by location at the time of plan approval and at the time of the report.
- (16) A list of property that is for sale or has been sold and the value of the proceeds from the sale.
- (17) A list of administrative service consolidations and the value of savings resulting from the consolidations.
- (18) A list outlining concerns related to the implementation of the plan on the community and affiliated organizations.