

---

# Responsibility Centered Management (RCM) and Online Social Work Education: Navigating a Changing Financial Landscape

---

**Patrick Shannon**

University of New Hampshire

[Patrick.Shannon@unh.edu](mailto:Patrick.Shannon@unh.edu)

## Abstract

Online programs are often viewed as a cost-efficient strategy for increasing revenue for shrinking university budgets but this may not be an accurate assessment. Responsibility Centered Management (RCM) is a budgeting model that is purported to increase efficient delivery of academic programs. As RCM budgeting models have been embraced, many universities have launched online education programs. The Department of Social Work has experienced both successes and challenges with implementing an online MSW program under an RCM model. The Online MSW program has been deemed a success by faculty, students, and the University at large. The purpose of this paper is to share the strategies used in the development, implementation, and management of an online MSW program and provide some general guiding principles for new and existing programs.

## Introduction

Traditionally, budget and planning models at most universities utilized centralized budgeting systems that were directed and controlled by university administrators. Centralized budgetary and planning models have given way to decentralized models that emphasize efficiency and the generation of revenue as federal and state funding for higher education has decreased (Stocum & Rooney, 1997). While this is not new, the trend has intensified over the past 30 years of federal fiscal retrenchment and even more so since the 2008 economic crisis.

Responsibility Centered Management (RCM) is a budgeting model that is purported to increase efficient delivery of academic programs. As RCM budgeting models have been embraced, many universities have launched online education programs. Online programs are often viewed as a cost-efficient strategy for increasing revenue to cope with budget cuts, but this may not be an accurate assessment (Carlson, 2018; Casement, 2013; Goral, 2013; & Meyer, 2006).

According to Meyer (2006), advocates of online learning have suggested that online learning can help control rising higher education costs by increasing revenues, reducing costs, improving access, and increasing enrollments. The challenge that public universities face is understanding the true costs of online education and the unique needs that online education presents for students, faculty, and university infrastructure. A specific challenge is examining the budgeting system a university uses and the implications for cost effectiveness and quality for online education programs.

In the Department of Social Work at a land grant university, the collision between budget cuts, RCM, and an online Master of Social Work (MSW) program has created unique opportunities and challenges. According to Zacharakis, Tolar, and Collins (2014) many educators look upon online education as a “necessary twenty-first century educational strategy to ensure the sustainability of their faculty and department” (p. 441). Additionally, faculty members sometime believe that higher education is now a business, and that educators need to improve their business skills to survive. Faculty in the Department of Social Work did not, as Zacharakis, et al. stated, “venture into the online education world as capitalists’ intent on becoming successful entrepreneurs and achieving dominance in the social work higher education market (p. 442).” Rather, the faculty focused on the quality of the professional education (product) and the belief that the addition of online education strengthens all program options. The purpose of this paper is to explore 1) the financial management model of Responsibility Centered Management (RCM), 2) the cost of online education and its impact on administration of an MSW program, and 3) provide recommendations for development and implementation of online master’s degree programs. We begin with a description of the online program.

## The Online Master’s Degree Program

The first online MSW cohort started in January 2014. Faculty in the department chose to develop an online program organically, rather than develop a revenue-sharing contract with an Online Program Management (OPM) vendor (Kim, 2018). Faculty preferred to have complete creative control over the development of the curriculum and work with the University to build the supportive structure internally. The University is a traditional land-grant institution with a stated mission to “foster an educated citizenry in the state”, is comprised of seven colleges and schools, and classified by the Carnegie Foundation as a “research university” conducting “high” research activities. The University is built on a foundation of traditional, face-to-face education occurring within a traditional academic calendar. Introducing an online program challenged every student, faculty, and academic support system at the University to adapt to the unique needs of online students and the faculty instructing them. As Twigg (2010) warned, attaching online programs onto existing physical facilities, faculty, and traditional concepts of teaching can create overwhelming and unanticipated costs.

The Department offers a Bachelor of Science in Social Work (BSSW) and an MSW with three program options. The program is offered in 1) a traditional face-to-face option, 2) a weekend-based executive model option at the University’s satellite campus, and 3) a fully online option. The online program admits three cohorts of 15-20 students per year, for a total of 7 cohorts running concurrently at all times. For full-time students, the program takes 28 months to complete. The curriculum is offered across five, eight-week long *e-terms*—two e-terms in fall, two in spring, and one in summer. Full-time students take 2 courses per *e-term*. Core courses must be taken in online only courses but students can take electives in any program option. The first field experience begins at the start of each cohort’s fourth e-term (October, January, and March). Three new positions were created specifically for the online option, including a Program Coordinator, Online Field Coordinator, and full-time Program Support Specialist. Core faculty teach across all three program options to maintain a 1:12 faculty-to-student ratio in all three program options. A key challenge has been understanding the cost of the program in terms of the RCM financial budgeting system.

## Responsibility Centered Management (RCM)

Concepts that define the principles of Responsibility Centered Management (RCM) emerged in the 1970’s and began to gain favor in institutions of higher education in the mid to late 1990’s (The Hanover Research Council, 2008). Other names used to describe RCM include Revenue Center Management, Value Center Management, Responsibility Centered Budgeting, and Incentive-Based Management (Dubeck, 1997). The distinguishing feature of an RCM model is the transfer of responsibility for revenue generation and management of expenses to institutionally identified fiscal units (The Hanover Research Council). Fiscal units are typically designated at the college or school level, but may also be defined at the department or even faculty level (Stocum, & Rooney, 1997). Fiscal units are further designated by university functions supporting administration, academic technology (AT), instructional technology (IT), continuing education, student support services, faculty support services, and more.

Since the 2008 financial crisis, state governments have decreased funding for public research Universities by 26% (The Lincoln Project, 2016). Many universities responded by consolidating academic programs, cutting budgets, and raising tuition. Responsibility Centered Management (RCM) emerged prior to the crisis, but has been utilized more frequently after the crisis as a strategy for increasing efficiency through decentralizing budgetary authority and shifting

financial responsibility to colleges and departments (The Hanover Research Council, 2008). Proponents of RCM claim that it improves efficiency by providing performance-based incentives to increase revenue and use resources efficiently. RCM detractors suggest that it relies on administrators and faculty at the department-level that have little interest or skill in financial management (Smith, & Mityr, 2008). Additionally, Stocum and Rooney (1997) expressed concern that RCM can detract from the shared mission and vision of a university by creating internal competition for students and resources.

A 2015 campus-wide review of the University's strategic Initiative revealed the following concerns (University of New Hampshire, 2015). First, faculty expressed concern that RCM does not support strategic funding, which makes new initiatives challenging to fund and implement. Second, faculty were concerned that RCM can create internal competition and discourage collaboration. Stocum and Rooney (1997) raised this concern a decade earlier and added the fear that RCM can promote a decision-making process that is driven more by money than by quality. Next, there was a perceived lack of fiscal accountability of central service administration while revenue-generating academic units felt "nickel and dimed" by fees for every aspect of operations. Again, Stocum and Rooney expressed a similar concern that central administration does not have the same incentive for efficiency because funding comes from state appropriations and a share of general revenues. Finally, faculty expressed frustration that RCM has resulted in frequent changes to credit hour revenue weightings designed to take revenue from revenue-rich units to fund units that generate less revenue.

The University adopted RCM on July 1, 2000 (RCM Steering Committee, 2006). The RCM model is managed at the University by the Central Budget Committee (CBC) in consultation with the Vice President for Academic Affairs (VPAA), and Vice President for Finance and Administration (VPFA). Each of the 18 budget centers, including the College of Health and Human Services (CHHS), develops and manages its own budget within the guidelines of the RCM model (University of New Hampshire, 2016). In CHHS, Department Chairs develop and present budget proposals that are reviewed by the Dean's Office. Once a budget is approved, Department Chairs have the authority to manage and administer the budget within the procedural and policy guidelines of the College and University. Initial college budgets are based on student credit hour tuition revenue projections. Department-level budgets are based on projected operating costs and a share of overall college revenue projections. Additional resources occur throughout the year from activities involving contracts, grants, and training.

Determining the cost of online education is challenging, especially in RCM modeled universities because education costs are spread across many cost centers and programs, often underestimating the costs of developing online courses and programs (Iokamidis, 2007). Consequently, programs may be developing online education programs with limited understanding of the costs of online education and the financial implications for their institutions.

### **Costs of Online Education**

According to Twigg (2010), a dilemma faced by all institutions is that improving access and quality for online programs typically means higher costs and lower costs typically means lower quality and reduced access. For example, completing a routine refresh (update or revision) of content in all courses in a curriculum is expensive, but essential to maintain quality (Lieberman, 2018c). What little research there is suggests that online instruction costs more than face-to-face instruction (Lorenzetti, 2015; Stotzer, Fujikawa, Sur, & Arnsberger, 2013). Interestingly, Wang (2015) reported that universities charge online students approximately one-third less per course than face-to-face students. Many of the models used for determining the cost of online education are based on historical models that assume that courses are developed by faculty for teaching in face-to-face classrooms (Crawford, Gould, King, & Parker, 2010). Estimating the costs of education is critical for the long-term viability of online programs and public universities have lagged far behind for-profit institutions in estimating costs. According to Lei and Gupta (2010) however, online programs can reduce institutional costs through web-based registration, billing and payment, electronic communication, and other student support services. After the initial development costs of aligning institutional systems to support online programs have been absorbed, Goral suggested that online programs could save institutions 30-40% in delivery costs over traditional face-to-face programs (2013).

Stotzer, Fujikawa, Sur, and Arnsberger (2013) conducted a case study comparing the cost of the University of Hawaii at Manoa, School of Social Work's distance education (online) and face-to-face MSW programs. The researchers were only able to compare direct costs associated with expenditures incurred by the School and excluded other costs associated with units outside the school not reflected in the School of Social Work's budget. Results indicated that direct costs are, on average, 3.2 times higher per student credit hour for distance education students than for face-to-face students. Additionally, over 90% of the direct costs were associated with an increase in personnel costs. Online programs require more administrative support, student support, faculty support, and adjunct/instructor support and supervision. According to Carlson (2018), not understanding the true costs of online education is why many institutions focus more on increasing revenue and less on reducing the cost of education by examining strategies for efficiency.

Costs associated with online instruction start with fixed university costs such as a Learning Management System (LMS) (e.g., Blackboard, Canvas, or Moodle), supplemental/associated software platforms such as Kaltura or Tegrity for lecture capture, video conferencing equipment, network and increased bandwidth requirements, and other technology (Santovec, 2005). Twigg (2010) described these technological costs as a financial "black hole" (p.24). A need exists for personnel responsible for supporting online instruction such as Instructional Designers (ID) to support course development and delivery, Instructional Technology (IT) to support students and faculty with technology issues, administrative support staff, and administration to manage the process. Another significant development cost is professional development training for faculty to prepare for the online instructional environment as well as for students (Lei, and Gupta, 2010; Magda, 2019; Santovec, 2005). Initial and ongoing marketing can be an unanticipated cost if the university does not provide direct marketing support to the unit launching a program.

In a 2006 review of the literature on the costs of online education, Meyer reported the following conclusions. First, development of online programs is more expensive than delivery. However, development is where cost-efficiencies are made possible through innovation. For example, investing in technologies that improve efficiency. In addition to Meyer's list, the Department of SW has focused on the integration of these efficiencies across all forms of instruction (e.g., undergraduate/graduate, traditional face-to-face, and an executive model) that is blending all program options.

Third on Meyer's (2016) list is course delivery. After the costs of development have been absorbed, efficiencies are built-in to delivery such as lower labor costs such as support staff to take the burden off of faculty for time-consuming tasks such course set-up and student onboarding support. Fourth, administration costs can be streamlined through investment in online administrative systems such as registration, business services, library, student support services, and faculty support services. Fifth, students create economies of scale, but this does not have to impact quality if numbers are increased across multiple, smaller class sizes. Sixth, new staff positions can limit the need for faculty to complete routine tasks. Examples include instructional designers, online advisors, recruitment and retention specialists, social media personnel, marketing, and writing support specialists. Finally, infrastructure is a barrier, but is essential. This is especially a concern for institutions not well prepared for online education or coping with the high cost of development. For example, Berklee College of Music in Boston reported that the online venture took several years to become profitable, but they believed that the \$8 million investment in infrastructure resulted in high quality education and benefitted students in the residential program as well (Lieberman, 2018a).

An increase in costs related to administrative support, technology, personnel, student recruitment, and training means that the cost of online education is initially higher than face-to-face. Cost savings (e.g., no need for physical space) may be negated by increased technology costs. Therefore, profitability is linked to the number of students. Faculty that manage online programs may experience frequent pressure from administration to increase enrollment and class sizes and to spread the higher administrative, personnel, and technology costs over a larger pool of students. The conundrum is that increasing faculty to student ratios, increasing class sizes, and advising loads may decrease education quality (Delgaty, 2013; Twigg, 2010; Tynan, Ryan, & Lamont-Mills, 2015). The Department of Social Work described above is facing all of the above challenges related to its program.

### **The Department's Experience**

The Department has experienced both successes and challenges with implementing an online MSW program under an RCM model. The online program has been successful in terms of enrollment, academic success of students, and post-graduation outcomes such as professional licensure and employment. The program has maintained full enrollment, to date five cohorts have graduated (n=62), and the pass rate for graduates (includes all program options) taking the Association for Social Work Boards (ASWB) licensing exam exceeds 90%. Department revenues have increased threefold from 2013 to 2016 while operating costs have only increased by 30%. The increase in revenues was not solely attributed to the implementation of the Online MSW program, because there was a parallel increase of 40% in the undergraduate (face-to-face) program. The increase in the Department's undergraduate program is similar to the experience of the Berklee College of Music, which reported an increase in applications and enrollments in their residential program, which highlights potential unintended benefits of developing an online presence (Lieberman, 2018a).

The Department of Social Work has experienced many challenges with online education using an RCM model. A significant contributor to rising Department personnel costs has been the increase in the number of adjunct instructors, administrative support staff, and new core faculty positions needed to maintain 1:12 faculty-to-student ratio required by Council on Social Work Education (CSWE) accreditation standards (Commission on Accreditation, 2015). The Department chose to maintain the two existing face-to-face options while adding the online option and integrate the online option into the existing department structure. The intent and result was to ensure quality and equivalency in all program options. The consequence has been increased costs associated with maintaining three separate programs. While students can take electives in any program, core courses can only be taken in the program to which a student was admitted. A consequence has been the need for more adjunct instructors because of the increase in the number of sections per course and a need for increased administrative support.

A challenge in determining the financial viability of the online program has been estimating both the revenues attached to student credit hours and operating costs because the Department has a single budget that does not separate costs and revenues by undergraduate and MSW program options. This was intentional because faculty determined that an important strategy for maintaining high quality in the online program was to spread faculty teaching loads and resources across all program options. Additionally, developing an online delivery capacity provided an opportunity to strengthen all program options through integration of the benefits online infrastructure and resources produce.

The foundational principle that RCM promotes financial efficiency through incentive-based rewards may not have been realized for several reasons. First, the cost-center is the College of Health and Human Services (CHHS), not the Department. The college-based model creates what Stocum and Rooney (1997) referred to as the "begging model" where departments beg and plead for operational resources. This model can prevent innovation and expansion because projected budgets are based on past revenues and reasonably guaranteed projected enrollments. Cost of development is more expensive than delivery, which presents challenges with an RCM model. The RCM approach does not account for start-up funds for new programs.

Second, the Department organizational structure that was developed looks very different from other departments in the college and therefore an appearance of unfair resource allocation emerged (e.g., new coordinator, administrative supports, technology resources, marketing funds). Third, the college-based RCM model creates a disconnect between how resources are allocated across the college and how academic programs are managed. Resources are allocated according to college-wide revenue projections, but programs are administered and managed by individual departments. A challenge that universities face is how to reward good performance of individual units, while meeting the overall mission given varying academic units' financial performance. Department budgets are determined by projected costs rather than projected revenue. Therefore, if department "A" has projected revenues of 2 million dollars and operating costs of 2 million dollars and department B has projected revenues of 6 million dollars and operating costs of 2 million dollars, both departments would have the same budget (e.g., 2 million dollars). Further, innovation such as adding an online program increases operating costs for department B, resulting in the appearance of inequitable resource allocation or even a budget deficit, even though revenues are three times greater than department A.

It is important for Department Chairs and Directors to become knowledgeable about the fiscal relationship between the college and department. Specifically, departments need to be concerned about the fiscal health of the college and university and not micro-focused on the department budget. Department Chairs are responsible for simultaneously promoting academic quality and scholarship activities while being conscious of not overspending (Stocum, & Rooney, 1997). The academic plan should drive decision making, rather than pure entrepreneurship. A shared vision for excellence should be encouraged and supported from the President's Office down to faculty in each department. University administrators must live by the same fiscal code of efficiency that colleges and departments do so that allocations for non-revenue generating units do not create the perception of "unfair taxation."

### **Recommendations for the development of online Master's degree programs**

The Department has learned many lessons about the process of developing an online MSW program. The department's strategy was and still is to blend online modalities and resources with face-to-face program options with the goal of improving access and quality for all program offerings. The lessons learned are valuable for new and existing programs and should be shared. The guiding strategy employed emphasized four important components including 1) the integration or blending of all program options, 2) diversification of program offerings, 3) collaboration and division of roles, and 4) scale with quality.

### **Integration and blending of all program options**

Online education is here to stay and social work and other professional degree programs should be exploring ways to leverage the benefits of online education to improve all programs. The Department has been doing this in the following ways. First, routine aspects of student advising and support and faculty training and support have been shifted to Online orgs. Orgs have been created for students enrolled in all MSW program options to support 1) onboarding information and training of all new students, 2) ongoing advising support for all students, 3) information and training for all full-time faculty, and 4) information and training for adjunct instructors. Online orgs reduce faculty advising time for routine/technical issues (e.g., parking, student handbook, financial aid, LMS related issues, curriculum sequencing, etc.) and for individualized mentorship for adjunct instructors for similar routine/technical issues. Orgs also include informational videos on topics such as introduction to APA, mission and vision of the Department, and an overview of the curriculum. Information on the orgs allow faculty to focus more on advising for social work professional growth and ensuring adjuncts have a complete understanding of the courses they teach in the larger context of the curriculum and professional social work education. Finally, much of the time spent in face-to-face orientations has been shifted online and orientation is now held at the University's outdoor education facility to engage in interactive team building activities. It is simply more productive and fun.

Other changes that are blending the program options together include live streaming of the MSW Hooding ceremony; online open-houses and information sessions; online training for field supervisors in remote areas; online modules developed for classes that can be shared between sections of all classes; online lectures used in f2f classrooms to use a "flipped classroom" model; strong social media presence that connects students, faculty, alumni, supervisors, and employers; using LMS (Canvas) for all courses to include essential supports such as social work professional links, program information, APA support, and link to a library support page constructed for social work students and faculty. Everyone in the department is now adept at using ZOOM for distance classroom engagement and meetings. All faculty meetings now occur in a ZOOM technology-enhanced room and adjunct faculty meetings now occur via ZOOM. ZOOM is being used for advising, field site visits, faculty meetings, adjunct faculty meetings, and meetings with other constituents. It is important to note that f2f contact is preferred, especially for advising and site visits, ZOOM simply increases access.

### **Diversification of program offerings**

As the US population ages, the number of traditional university-aged students (17-22 years old) is shrinking. Universities are beginning to look at non-

traditional students, particularly in professional degree programs such as social work, to replace the shrinking undergraduate population. For example, Campbellsville University developed a successful online undergraduate model that created different length programs with one, two and four-year models where, students that complete a one-year program are encouraged to complete the two-year associates degree and then encouraged to complete the bachelor's degree (Lieberman, 2018c). The Department of Social Work at UNH has taken a similar approach by providing a wider range of program offerings to meet the needs of non-traditional students and to be more responsive to workforce development needs. The Department has developed a wide range of innovative elective courses such as Social Work with First Responders, Arts-Based Therapy, Adventure Therapy, Military Social Work, and more. Next, new certificate programs have been launched in Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities, Child Welfare, Substance Use Disorders to provide more opportunities for specialization. Finally, dual degree programs in Adventure Therapy and a JD/MSW are currently offered while dual degrees with MPH and MBA programs are being explored. The next area that is being developed is workforce development through contracts with state agencies to support professional development of their staff and, more generally, through online trainings to support the continuing education of professionals. The Department and the College of Health and Human Services are working in concert to strengthen relationships with community partners to support the workforce and the University's land grant mission.

### **Collaboration and division of roles**

As described above, the costs of online education are spread across an institution. The existence of online classrooms and instructors is only one piece of the cost of online education. The entire institution needs to be aligned to deliver high quality education in a cost-effective manner. Therefore, roles and responsibilities need to be clearly articulated between institutional units, including the sharing of both operating costs and revenues between units. We are still far away from these clearly defined agreements, but are successfully moving in this direction. Currently, we are advocating for a college and Graduate School infrastructure to support all departments to eliminate duplication. Important positions supporting recruitment and retention, advising, technology support, and training for instructors are examples of roles that can be shared across the college and Graduate School. A larger challenge is redefining and creating new roles in the department itself.

As Meyer (2016) observed, cost efficiency requires a reconceptualization of the staffing structures of academic programs. Programs across the country are confronting this issue and responding in many different ways. Traditionally, advising and instruction has been carried out by full-time tenure track and non-tenure track faculty, and adjunct/part-time instructors. There are new classes of faculty and staff positions emerging to support online programs. We now depend on adjuncts to teach up to 4 courses, we hire field liaisons to conduct field site visits, staff positions to support the field department, and we are exploring new positions to conduct student advising, support training and mentorship of adjunct faculty, and student success coaches to improve retention. These are all roles that were filled by faculty just 5 years ago. The challenge is convincing administration in a traditional university that such positions are a cost-efficient response that will support the long-term viability of online programs.

### **Scale with quality**

Scale drives costs down, but also can negatively impact the quality of the educational experience. The pressure to increase cohort size and class enrollments is becoming more pronounced. We have chosen to pursue modified scale by only considering growth in the number of cohorts and classes when additional resources (faculty and staff) are included prior to launch. As noted above, obtaining resources for program development in an RCM modeled university is a challenge. Additionally, as discussed above, integrating MSW program options rather than attempting to maintain three separate infrastructures is a key to efficiency.

### **Discussion**

Ultimately, the value of RCM will be measured in its ability to simultaneously support financial independence and interdependence of academic units. Public universities are measured by their ability to provide high quality education, research, and services to the people of their respective states. The Department of Social Work chose to pursue online MSW education to improve access to MSW education to more residents in a rural state, non-traditional students with complex lives, and residents with disabilities that experience physical and other access challenges. The likelihood that online education may cost more to deliver was not the primary criteria for choosing to develop an online program. Social work and other professional master's degree programs need to work closely with their university's administration to strategize the best methods for limiting costs while maintaining high quality programs that produce competent professional social workers. Additionally, it is important to discuss the benefits that online programs add to traditional education. Examples include attracting students and future social workers from underserved rural areas, opportunities for enhanced workforce development to public and non-profit service providers with online training, and expansion of course offerings/electives for students across all programs.

For new programs, patience is the key to financial viability. Once initial investments are made, technologies are tested and functioning as intended, costs will begin to decline. More importantly, programs need to consider the implications for their role as social work educators. Therefore, the following guiding principles should be followed. First, to maintain the quality of all methods of instructions, social work programs must pay close attention to how to prepare social work professionals to meet the competencies defined in the Council on Social Work Education's 2015 EPAS standards. Second, the reason for venturing into online is to meet unmet needs such as workforce shortages, and improving access (Commission on Accreditation, 2015). Third, programs need to develop a deeper understanding about how much education costs at their institutions. Finally, the new program should be consistent with the mission of the program's institution. A final thought by Meyer suggests that we are on the right path:

Online learning can be cost-efficient. But it takes resources, new staff, administrative services, and infrastructure. It requires that the goal of cost-efficiency be set up front rather than applied as an afterthought. It depends on thoughtful and careful design and a willingness to cost and budget carefully, test and assess and modify based on early results (p. ix).

---

### **References**

- Carlson, S. (2018, August 15). Enough 'do more with less.' It's time for colleges to find actual efficiencies. *Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from [https://www.chronicle.com/article/Enough-Do-More-With/244279?cid=at&utm\\_source=at&utm\\_medium=en&elqTrackId=b7fc9fce6974fd0a51c11eecc4bcb56&elq=a42a091433f3471b8127f6b546411656&elqaid=20140&elqat=1&elqat=1](https://www.chronicle.com/article/Enough-Do-More-With/244279?cid=at&utm_source=at&utm_medium=en&elqTrackId=b7fc9fce6974fd0a51c11eecc4bcb56&elq=a42a091433f3471b8127f6b546411656&elqaid=20140&elqat=1&elqat=1)
- Casement, W. (2013). Will online education lower the price of college? *Journal of College Admission, Summer* 15-18.
- Commission on Accreditation. (2015). *Educational Policy and Accreditation Standards for Baccalaureate and Master's Social Work Programs*. Washington, D.C.: Council on Social Work Education. Retrieved from <https://www.cswe.org/Accreditation/Standards-and-Policies/2015-EPAS>
- Crawford, C.B., Gould, L.V., King, D., & Parker, C. (2010, Spring). *Online Journal of Distance Learning Administration*, 8(1). Retrieved from <https://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdl/spring131/crawford131.html>
- Delgaty, L. (2013). A critical examination of the time and workload involved in the design and delivery of an e-module in postgraduate clinical education. *Medical Teacher*, 35, e1173-e1180.
- Dubeck, L.W. (1997, Spring). Beware higher ed's newest budget twist. *Thought & Action*, 13, 81-91.

- Goral, T. (2013, May). Education innovators: A conversation with Alan Walker. *UB Tech*. Retrieved from <http://www.universitybusiness.com>
- Ioakimidis, M. (2007). Online or on campus: A student tertiary education cost model comparing the two, with a quality proviso. *Higher Education in Europe*, 32, 249-260.
- Kim, J. (2018, August 1). OPM specialization. *Inside Higher Ed*. Retrieved from <https://www.insidehighered.com/digital-learning/blogs/technology-and-learning/opm-specialization>
- Lei, S.A., & Gupta, R.K. (2010). College distance education courses: Evaluating benefits and costs from institutional, faculty, and students' perspectives. *Education*, 130, 616-630.
- Lieberman, M. (2018a, July 11). A College prices its online programs 60% less. *Inside Higher ED*. Retrieved from <https://www.insidehighered.com/digital-learning/article/2018/07/11/berklee-college-music-defies-conventional-wisdom-low-price>
- Lieberman, M. (2018c, August 22). Spotlight on Innovation: Campbellsville grows online at a fast clip. *Inside Higher ED*. Retrieved from [https://www.insidehighered.com/digital-learning/article/2018/08/22/campbellsville-university-sees-online-enrollment-growth-product?utm\\_source=Inside+Higher+Ed&utm\\_campaign=f9a5f546cb-InsideDigitalLearning\\_COPY\\_01&utm\\_medium=email&utm\\_term=0\\_1fcbc04421-f9a5f546cb-234727921&mc\\_cid=f9a5f546cb&mc\\_eid=87cc665903](https://www.insidehighered.com/digital-learning/article/2018/08/22/campbellsville-university-sees-online-enrollment-growth-product?utm_source=Inside+Higher+Ed&utm_campaign=f9a5f546cb-InsideDigitalLearning_COPY_01&utm_medium=email&utm_term=0_1fcbc04421-f9a5f546cb-234727921&mc_cid=f9a5f546cb&mc_eid=87cc665903)
- Lorenzetti, J. P. (2015). How are you pricing your online courses? *Distance education report*, 19(24), 1-4.
- Magda, A.J. (2019). *Online learning at public universities: Recruiting, orienting, and supporting online faculty*. Louisville, KY: The Learning House, Inc.
- Meyer, K.A. (2006). The road map to cost-efficiencies of online learning. *ASHE Higher Education Report*, 32, 1-15 Retrieved online from Wiley Interscience at <http://www.interscience.wiley.com> DOI:10.1002/ache.3201.
- Responsibility Centered Management Steering Committee (July, 2006). 2006-RCM five year review. University of XXX, XXX, XX. Retrieved from <https://www.unh.edu/vpfa/responsibility-center-management>.
- Santovec, M.L. (2005, April). Counting the costs of distance education. *Distance Education Report*, April, 3-6. Retrieved from [https://www.magnapubs.com/newsletter/distance-education-report/45/distance\\_education\\_report\\_2005\\_index-9376-1.html](https://www.magnapubs.com/newsletter/distance-education-report/45/distance_education_report_2005_index-9376-1.html)
- Smith, D.E., & Mitry, D.J. (2008). Investigation of higher education: The real costs and quality of online programs. *Journal of Education for Business*, January/February.
- Stocum, D.L. & Rooney, P.M. (1997) Responding to resource constraints: A departmentally based system of responsibility center management. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 29:5, 50-57, DOI: 10.1080/00091389709602337
- Stotzer, R.L., Fujikawa, K., Sur, J., & Arnsberger, P. (2013). Cost analysis of a distance education MSW program. *Journal of Teaching in Social Work*, 33:357-368.
- The Hanover Research Council (2018). *Trends in Higher Education*. The Hanover Research Council, Arlington, VA. <https://www.hanoverresearch.com/reports-and-briefs/trends-in-higher-education-2018/>
- The Hanover Research Council (2008, April). *Responsibility Centered Management (RCM) at major public universities*. Report prepared for the University of California, Berkeley. New York, NY.
- The Lincoln Project: Excellence and Access in Public Higher Education (2016). *Public research universities Recommitting to Lincoln's vision: An educational compact for the 21st century*. Retrieved from [https://www.amacad.org/multimedia/pdfs/publications/researchpapersmonographs/PublicResearchUniv\\_Recommendations.pdf](https://www.amacad.org/multimedia/pdfs/publications/researchpapersmonographs/PublicResearchUniv_Recommendations.pdf)
- Twigg, C.A. (2010). Improving quality and reducing cost: Designs for effective learning. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 35 (4), 22-29. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00091380309604107>
- Tynan, T., Ryan, Y., Lamont-Mills, A. (2015). Examining workload models in online and blended learning. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 46, 5-15. Doi: 10.1111/bjet.12111.
- University of New Hampshire (2015). *Strategic Plan Refresh: Responsibility Centered Management Review Findings and Recommendations: Final*. Retrieved from <https://www.unh.edu/vpfa/responsibility-center-management>
- University of New Hampshire (2016, October). *Responsibility Centered Management Operating Manual*. Retrieved from <https://www.unh.edu/vpfa/responsibility-center-management>
- Wang, S. (2015, Spring). Online vs. on-campus: An analysis of course prices of U.S. Educational institutions. *Online Journal of Distance Education*, 28(2), Downloaded December 14, 2017 from <https://www.westga.edu/~distance/ojdl/summer182/wang182.html>
- Zacharakis, J., Tolar, M., Collins, R.A. (2014). The political economy of growing a rural university in the USA using online education: An examination of incentives for educational imperialism and academic capitalism. *International Journal of Lifelong Learning*, 33(4), 440-454, DOI: 10.1080/02601370.2013.857732.