

Oregon Institute of Technology

ACADEMIC COUNCIL RETREAT

January 11, 2019

MINUTES

Provost Gary Kuleck called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m. Academic Council members present were:

Seth Anthony, Phil Howard for Todd Breedlove, Tiernan Fogarty, Wendy Ivie, Tom Keyser, Chris Caster for Debbie McCollam Jeff Pardy, Lloyd Parratt, Dan Peterson, Paula Russell, Matthew Sleep, and Ken Usher, Erika Veth, Jack Walker. Sharon Beaudry, Randall Paul, Sean St.Clair, and Terri Torres attended a portion of the meeting. Todd Breedlove, Hope Corsair, Veronica Koehn, MariaLynn Kessler, Dawn Lowe-Wincentsen, Maureen Sevigny, Dawn Taylor, and Adam Wagner attended remotely. Roger Lindgren, Hallie Neupert, and Mark Neupert are on sabbatical and will join remotely when able. Steve Addison, Abdy Afjeh, LeAnn Maupin, Brian Moravec, and Farooq Sultan were absent.

FALL 2019 ADMISSIONS PROJECTIONS

Erika Veth stated that new enrollment tactics have been implemented and that Fall 2019 numbers look positive. Veth showed a slideshow, *SEM Fall 2019 Update*, and stated that applications are up by 40% and that admitted students are up by 30% for a total increase of 328 students. Veth added that the largest application increases came from CA, HI, WA, and OR and that numbers were up for males and for all ethnicities. Veth broke numbers out by campus and student type.

Applications by Campus	% Change	Applications by Student Type	% Change	Freshmen in PM and KF	% Change
Klamath	30%	Freshmen	40%	Klamath	40%
Online Learning	0%	Masters	30%	Online Learning	250%
Portland-Metro	50%	Post Bacs	30%	Portland-Metro	90%
		Transfers	-10%		

Veth asked all to begin thinking about Gen Ed and how to accommodate the enrollment increase. Tiernan Fogarty responded that on the first day of winter term technology did not work for the first three hours work in any of the math classes held in Owens or Purvine. Fogarty continued that he has reported the issue to IT for the last seven consecutive terms and that each term he has spoken with Jim Jones directly. Fogarty added that the entire math department met with Jones on one occasion to resolve the issue. Each term Jones states that a plan is in place to resolve the issues yet the same problem occurs the next term. Fogarty stated that this is both a retention and enrollment issue as unreliable technology has become the norm and passes via word of mouth. Sean St.Clair stated that Cornett has similar issues and that IT response time takes weeks.

Jack Walker commented that the issues have been the same for decades despite various IT directors – the mindset is not student-focused and of being a service organization. Walker added that each spring he requests software installations during the summer in preparation for fall term, with time for faculty to test the software. Walker continued that time passes and IT typically responds that the entire lab needs to be reimaged and that it will not happen until the first week in September. More time passes and IT routinely does not install the software until the third or fourth week of the term. Walker added that this term he cancelled labs three weeks in a row due to no software. Walker stated that in order for software to be available on the first day of classes, IT’s schedule needs to be backed up, with software installed in July and faculty testing in July/August to allow time to work out bugs.

Jeff Pardy stated that IT purchased software for his department and afterward told him that it would not work due to OIT's firewall. Pardy continued that the software company was nice enough to reissue licenses to install on faculty personal computers and that they have operated like this for a few years. Pardy added that the purchase was a complete waste of infrastructure and time. Ken Usher reported that DOW issues are not as severe.

Provost Gary Kuleck stated that Toney Richey relayed that much of the classroom technologies are incompatible and that outdated equipment does not interface with new software and computers. Dr. Kuleck stated that IT recently revamped a few classroom, working on one room at a time, and believes this is the wrong approach. Dr. Kuleck added that there are Council members serving on the Academic Technology Advisory Council (ATAC) and asked if classroom upgrades have been discussed. Veth stated that surveys were sent out and a plan developed to identify and upgrade 10 classrooms at a time. Terri Torres added that these plans can included everything from painting to replacing chairs and computers. Fogarty responded that that Jones told him all classrooms would be upgraded to a minimum technology threshold – some would be more modern than others but that there would be similarities amongst them and that equipment would be reliable. Fogarty added that the problem is, issues are discussed and plans made but that nothing is ever implemented.

Fogarty stated that reimaging frequently happens the weekend prior to classes starting with no testing done. Fogarty has spoken to Jones and other IT personnel multiple times and all agreed that this is a bad idea, yet it happens the next term. Dr. Kuleck stated that timing definitely needs to be reworked and asked for input for spring term as it is rapidly approaching. Fogarty stated that Friday of finals week or earlier should be routine. Dr. Kuleck asked if ATAC is the appropriate body to take issues to for resolution. Veth stated that yes, provided IT follows up and implements. Fogarty responded that recommendations are useless if implementation does not occur. Dr. Kuleck stated that he will be on top of the situation and would like to meet with faculty the week before finals to formulate a plan.

Veth stated that she is chairing the search for the new IT CIO and that she has heard of many similar issues. Veth added that she will keep all comments in mind during the search and that search aside, she will be a squeaky wheel with regards to retention. Sharon Beaudry commented that this is a reputation issue. Pardy added that it also impact faculty evaluations. While students realize the issues are not the fault of the faculty, they still reflect negatively on the class overall.

Tom Keyser asked if Portland-Metro has a similar structure. Dawn Lowe-Wincentsen stated that it is different and that Jones has allowed Jeff Hower to experiment. Lowe-Wincentsen continued that Hower has one full-time person and a handful of students and that faculty and that staff receive faster service. Veth noted that Portland-Metro equipment is much newer and that all was purchased in 2012. Maureen Sevigny stated that Portland-Metro requires students to have their own laptops and that some labs were configured to accommodate this over the summer.

Maria Lynn Kessler asked, given the potential bump in freshmen at Portland Metro, what resources will be available to accommodate faculty, planning extra sections of courses, faculty schedules and workload. Veth stated that this is the reason for discussion and is an early warning to notify all of what the data indicates. Veth stated that this is brand new and is why Admissions is calling students who have applied to Portland-Metro. Veth is hopeful that this will help form a better picture of student expectations. Veth added that on the Admissions web page there is now a confirmation page requiring applicants to state if they are coming or not. Veth stated that Dana Onorato is the SEM contact for Portland-Metro and is staying on top of planning there. Lowe-Wincentsen commented that service departments, including the library, might be able to work with SEM and believes that neither library is able to support undergrads at the freshmen level very well.

Veth stated that much is being done to be strategic and focused with partnerships and outreach opportunities. Veth commented that promotional items with the new logo are readily available and stressed the importance of only taking up-to-date items to recruiting events. Veth added that James McPherson is available to support marketing and recruitment events. Veth stated that most departments have worked with McPherson to develop a one-page fact sheet and asked that departments that have not, please do so. Veth would like all departments to have matching fact sheet brochures soon.

ESSENTIAL STUDIES PROGRAM MAPPING PREVIEW

Dr. Kuleck stated that both he and Seth Anthony recently sent emails to all faculty outlining progression of the essential studies model with recommendations from the Gen Ed Reform *Ad Hoc* Committee (GERAC). Along with GERACs recommendations, Dr. Kuleck stated that Anthony's data-driven, evidence-based program analyses are now posted online and that all have been sent to Dr. Naganathan for review.

Anthony shared a slideshow presentation, *Looking Forward to Essential Studies Curriculum Mapping*. Anthony stated that discussion is contingent on the assumption that there is agreement from the President, Provost, and GERAC to move forward. Anthony invited two GERAC members (Phil Howard and Randall Paul) to participate in discussions and to relay Council concerns.

Anthony reminded all that last summer GERAC, chaired by Dan Peterson and Wendy Ivie, recommended a plan forward to proceed with foundational Gen Ed courses and alignment of those course requirements with ESLOs. The committee recommended not proceeding with course requirements with multiple levels (foundation and essential practice levels) and proceeding with Essential Studies Synthesis Experience (ESSE) exploration and supporting pilots. Anthony stated that his report attempted to analyze paths forward consistent with those recommendations. Anthony added that assuming the President, Provost, and GERAC agree on a path forward, it will be important to move quickly on program mapping discussions and that this would be the conversation focus.

Anthony stated that it was necessary to construct departmental curriculum maps for his report, stressing that those maps are imperfect and only "proof of concept." Anthony commented that he was interested in things such as counting how many credits may need to be adjusted and how many transfer credits apply. Anthony continued that that he did not worry about the order in which classes were listed and that he made reasonable assumptions. Anthony added that there may be mistakes and encouraged program feedback and review as departments will sign off on final maps. Phil Howard reiterated that the maps are only "proof of concept" to see if all course puzzle pieces will fit and once approval is received from President Naganathan, they can be adjusted to create the best fit.

MariaLynn Kessler asked for clarification on what Chairs are being asked to do – from the slides it appears that Chairs are being asked to map their programs to this direct model, then submit forms to CPC and write catalog descriptions to be available next year. Anthony responded that curriculum map development will be a process and that the first pass through will not result in the CPC final maps. Anthony anticipates a phase-in, working toward each department being comfortable with solutions. Kessler stated that it sounds like a decision has been made to adopt the proposed recommendations and asked if this is now the new Gen Ed model.

Anthony replied that he will look to the President, Provost, and GERAC for direction on a path forward. Anthony commented that GERAC is the faculty body charged with thinking about Gen Ed and that constraints have not been imposed on how they proceed. Anthony continued that President Naganathan will not make or announce a decision until GERAC has had a chance to weigh in and that the earliest possible implementation date is Fall 2020. Dr. Kuleck stated that he suggested that President Naganathan adopt the recommendations. Dr. Kuleck also recommended that this be a phased opportunity to allow for future changes, emphasizing that it is critical to getting Gen Ed reform started.

Kessler stated that she is hearing that the model proposed by Anthony will be the new Gen Ed (unless GERAC would like to make additional changes). Kessler continued that when she served on GERT Force there was extensive university-wide involvement of students, student services, faculty, etc. Kessler added that a proposed model was then sent to Faculty Senate but stalled to due to vacancies in administration. Kessler continued that a new model is now being presented without university-wide involvement or Senate approval and is relying only on the work of a smaller committee, Anthony's work, and GERACs recommendations.

Dr. Kuleck responded that it is much broader than that. A financial analysis was conducted as well as a thorough analysis of the impact on transfer students by the Registrar's Office. Dr. Kuleck continued that the University is

in a different environment than two years ago with respect to pressure from Legislators who feel higher education is not responsive to the needs of students and therefore perpetuate restrictive legislation. Dr. Kuleck stated that there was deliberate selection of GERAC members from a wide variety of constituents, which is a good representative body, with at least a third from Finance, Admissions, and the Registrar's Office. Dr. Kuleck added that their input is important given the diversity of programs and the challenges of implementation. Dr. Kuleck pointed out the importance of having a foundation in place then tweaking and analyzing and that much information was derived from the GERT Force model. Dr. Kuleck stated that the University is at a critical point of deciding whether or not to move forward. Randall Paul added that an enormous amount of people have contributed to this process.

Matthew Sleep asked at what point reforming Gen Ed become not reforming Gen Ed. Sleep then asked if in the "met" column for maps, only 3 of 12 or 13 categories are changed, what we are accomplishing by changing nothing. Anthony responded that both GERAC and GERT Force pointed out that the real strength of the model would be when all pieces were working together. Anthony continued that the foundational changes are meaningful and beneficial on their own but are exponentially strengthened by the other pieces. Anthony added that his expectation is, once the foundational piece is complete, moving on to the next.

Randall Paul stated this is an ongoing process with phased implementation. Paul continued that GERAC discussed the minimal worthwhile reform at great length and that the answer was ESLO alignment and having Gen Ed required courses line up. Paul believes that although difficult, this has been accomplished. Paul continued that after much discussion, GERAC agreed that while ESSEs have strengths they also have some big things to tackle. Randall added that the approach was to set up pilot ESSEs to determine what works and what does not and that there will be a better understanding after a few years. Paul added that as part of an ongoing process, GERAC is currently working on ESLO alignment, and will then focus on ESSEs. Dr. Kuleck stated that he sees the ESSE as the next big challenge as at least 50 percent of our students are transfer students. Torres stated that the ESSE was designed to be at the Junior level to have a course that transfer students would take at Oregon Tech.

Dr. Kuleck stated that last year there was support for pilot ESSEs with one or two takers. Anthony stated that with the Catalyze ESSE some lessons were learned about supporting pilot ESSEs and needed structure. Paul stated that there needs to be a broader rule regarding how ESSEs count toward requirements – if students take an ESSE having the credits count as some way. Not taking ESSEs just for the fun of it, rather students should be progressing through their Gen Ed requirements. Anthony stated that Dr. Kuleck and he have discussed ways to provide support for development such as CCT providing some pedagogical backing. Dr. Kuleck added that there was also a suggestion to redo some of the technical communication courses and that he would support potential summer creativity grants to formulate what that would look like and for other pilot ESSEs.

Ken Usher asked that if this is an option to please announce it well in advance in time for fall registration which takes place in May. Howard stated that once the go ahead for implementation is received, GERAC's intent is to have a slot where ESSEs can count toward Gen Ed, giving students motivation to take them as they will be fulfilling graduation requirements.

Anthony reassured all that programs and departments will have ultimate control over curriculum maps and final CPC submission. Paul added that GERAC will continue to meet as necessary and that he would like to have some draft catalog language as a starting point. Dr. Kuleck applauded the hard work done by all to move the process forward.

NEXT MEETING

The next Academic Council meeting is scheduled for Friday, February 1, 2019.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted, Valjean Newsome