

**AGENDA****Members:**

Co-Chair: LeAnn Maupin, *Dean, College of Health, Arts and Sciences*

Co-Chair: Vacant, *Dean, College of Engineering, Technology, and Management*

Dr. Gary Kuleck, *Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs*

Laura McKinney, *Vice President for Wilsonville*

Sharon Beaudry, *Vice President, Faculty Senate*

Sean St. Clair, *Department Chair, Civil Engineering*

Dan Peterson, *Department Chair, Communication*

Todd Breedlove, *Department Chair, Computer Systems Engineering Technology*

Dawn Taylor, *Department Chair, Medical Laboratory Science*

Paula Russell, *Department Chair, Dental Hygiene*

Claudia Torres-Garibay, *Department Chair, Electrical Engineering and Renewable Energy*

Jamie Kennel, *Department Chair, Emergency Medical Services*

Jack Walker, *Department Chair, Geomatics*

Mark Neupert, *Department Chair, Humanities and Social Sciences*

Jeff Hayen, *Department Chair, Manufacturing and Mechanical Engineering and Technology*

Tiernan Fogarty, *Department Chair, Mathematics*

Debbie McCollam, *Department Chair, Medical Imaging Technology*

Ken Usher, *Department Chair, Natural Sciences*

Jeff Pardy, *Department Chair, Respiratory Care and Sleep Health*

Hallie Neupert, *Department Chair, Management*

Erika Veth, *Dean, Online Learning*

**Guests:**

Seth Anthony, *Interim Director of Academic Excellence*

Aja Bettencourt-McCarthy, *Librarian*

Marla Edge, *Director of Academic Agreements*

Erin Foley, *Vice President for Student Affairs & Dean of Students*

Brian Fox, *Vice President for Finance & Administration*

Wendy Ivie, *Registrar*

Jim Jones, *Associate Vice President-Chief Information Officer*

Dr. Nagi Naganathan, *President*

Steve Neiheisel, *Vice President for Strategic Enrollment Management*

Farooq Sultan, *Director of Institutional Research*

---

**AGENDA****Sunday, September 17, 2017****RUNNING Y****5500 Running Y Road, Klamath Falls, OR 97601  
Lodge Conference Room**

- 5:00 – 5:30 PM Mingle & Hor d’oeuvres
- 5:30 – 6:00 PM Strategic Vision | Dr. Nagi Naganathan, President
- 6:00 – 6:15 PM Provost Message | Dr. Gary Kuleck
- 6:15 – 7:00 PM View from Leadership Team | Vice Presidents & Deans
- 7:00 – 7:45 PM Getting to know our Students & their Employers | Laura McKinney & Erika Veth
- 7:45 – 8:00 PM Closing Remarks | Dr. Gary Kuleck

**Monday, September 18, 2017****OREGON TECH****Klamath Falls Campus****College Union, 2nd Floor, Sunset**

- 7:30 – 8:00 AM Continental Breakfast
- 8:00 – 8:15 AM Plan for the Day | Dr. Gary Kuleck
- 8:15 – 9:15 AM Department Chair Case Study | Brian Fox & Farooq Sultan
- 9:15 – 9:30 AM Break
- 9:30 – 11:00 AM Start – Stop – Continue to achieve Strategic Vision | Jim Jones
- 11:00 – 11:30 AM Leadership Team Discussion on Academic Strategic Planning | Vice Presidents & Deans
- 11:30 – NOON Wrap-up with Academic Council Academic Year Plan | Dr. Gary Kuleck
- 12:00 – 1:00 PM** **Enjoy lunch with the Oregon Tech Excellence in Teaching Conference**  
**The Check-in Table will have your meal ticket.**  
**College Union, Cascades**  
*You are also invited to attend the afternoon sessions scheduled for 1:00 – 4:00 PM*

Oregon Institute of Technology

ACADEMIC COUNCIL

October 6, 2017

**MINUTES**

Provost Gary Kuleck called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. Academic Council members present were: Sharon Beaudry, Todd Breedlove, Tiernan Fogarty, Brian Fox, Jeff Hayen, Jim Jones, Gary Kuleck, LeAnn Maupin, Debbie McCollam, Hallie Neupert, Mark Neupert, Jeff Pardy, Paula Russell, Matt Schnackenberg for Dan Peterson, Farooq Sultan, David Thaemert for Sean St.Clair, Ken Usher, Erika Veth, and Jack Walker. Jamie Kennel, Laura McKinney Dawn Taylor, and Claudia Torres-Garibay joined the meeting remotely. Seth Anthony, Dan Peterson and Sean St.Clair were absent.

**PLAN FOR THE YEAR & GOALS**

Provost Gary Kuleck stated that there are great opportunities for moving the University forward in positive ways. This year, the goal of the Academic Council will be to explore issues and policies that impact both faculty and students. Some issues will include:

- *Challenge of the Deficit and Drop in Enrollment* – Operational efficiency is essential at the unit level if we are to thrive.
- *Workload and Course Planning* – Work with the tools that will be unveiled this Fall.
- *Effective Planning* – Free up faculty time to allow more time with students, time to pursue initiatives to advance careers and to benefit the university. and time to seek out revenue opportunities.
- *Strategic Planning* – Empower faculty to become engaged in strategic planning.
- *Effective Spending* – Ensure money is being spent effectively.

**WORLD CAFÉ OVERVIEW**

Provost Gary Kuleck asked Jim Jones to give an overview of the World Café exercise conducted at the retreat. Jones stated that the exercise was broken into three rounds. Participants went to a new table each round and were asked a question. The question was the same each time except for a slight different ending – *In context of the strategic direction, challenges facing higher education, and the department workload philosophy, what should the departments start doing, stop doing, or continue doing?*

Discussions yielded flipchart notes full of concepts and ideas. Jones organized the ideas into categories, ranking them by priority levels assigned by participants. Jones presented the findings in a PowerPoint presentation, outlining the following top priorities and core themes: Top Priorities to Start, Top Priorities to Stop, and Top Priorities to Continue.

Jones stated that in the World Café series, the next step would be to see if these priorities are the right ones to align with the strategic direction and mission. Full discussion results are available should anyone wish to see them. Kuleck will be working to create an Academic Council share-point and asked that documents to be shared with the Council be sent to Valjean Newsome.

## WORKLOAD/COURSE PLANNING

### Background and Overview

Provost Gary Kuleck asked for input regarding utilizing the tool that was introduced at the retreat. Brian Fox provided a bit of background. Much the same as the World Café exercise, the reason for development was an effort to increase productivity and to reduce operational inefficiencies. Key reasons included reducing busy work and double data entry, to provide tools to make chairs' jobs easier, and to reduce efforts in completing workload. Fox stated that another large development component is to help with course planning. This will allow students to view courses offered for the entire year and will help faculty to view course offerings, enabling them to make decision for combining or cancelling sections.

Farooq Sultan stated that three chairs participated in a test pilot over the past month. Sultan presented a slideshow of the tool featuring a standardized template for all departments and went over several basic features.

### Capstone Courses

*Kuleck asked how capstone courses, which typically have lower enrollment, are handled and how it currently appears on the workload report.*

Breedlove responded that capstone courses are very labor intensive to teach and will likely always show in the red. Department responses on how faculty and students are assigned to capstone courses varied greatly. Some responses were as follows:

- CIV – David Thaemert stated that 2-3 faculty are assigned to a single section of the class. Although the model varies annually, the number of faculty are determined by number of students enrolled. Projects vary widely but the department tries to have one faculty assigned to each course acting as a mentor to each team. It gets difficult when there are 4-5 teams per class.
- COM – Matt Schnackenberg said that individual faculty are assigned and they show up as several sections with one student enrolled per section.
- CSET – Todd Breedlove responded that individual faculty are assigned to teach one-on-one with students. Junior year is a three-term, team-based project currently with five teams of 4-5 students per team.
- NSC – Ken Usher stated that the department has tried several approaches – having all projects funneled through one faculty member and having a few students enrolled in each section (although sometimes it's not enough to receive workload). The inability to do it well and for faculty to be recognized has limited how willing they are to do it.

### Effective Planning

Todd Breedlove suggested a procedural change of using week one enrollment numbers rather than week four. Breedlove added that chairs need to make decisions regarding adding/canceling class sections by the first week. Sultan responded that week four are official numbers that the University must go by but realizes that many decisions need to be made much earlier. Fox added that having the five-year enrollment history trends should help to make some of those decisions, enabling course changes to be made a few weeks in advance. Kuleck agreed that the multi-year planning approach can be very useful in long-term planning. LeAnn Maupin added that while some departments have been doing this on their own, this tool will offer a single touch-point model for all to do it uniformly.

*Kuleck asked, capstone courses aside, as traditionally they need more attention and have lower enrollment, would planning enable departments to consolidate course offerings that don't have specific time requirements? Might sequences in curriculum maps be able to be restructured or modified?*

Breedlove replied that the prerequisite structure dictates when courses are offered, and with a limited number of technical electives in the CSET curriculum, there isn't much flexibility. Mark Neupert stated it's fairly complex. Some general education courses are specified by programs, so the offerings are dependent upon the major and where the courses lie in the curriculum.

Sharon Beaudry shared that recently in trying to determine whether or not to run a class for the Management Department majors, the solution was very labor-intensive and required looking up each individual student to determine if they needed the class. Beaudry asked if there is an easier way to show need or to receive reports that can predict needs based on course maps. Beaudry also asked how the CPC process might be streamlined. CPC curriculum forms will be a direct result of curriculum map changes and Beaudry would like to look at ways to reduce the level of work required.

*Kuleck asked, in looking at what Farooq has laid out, how can this tool help you effectively plan out the year and, at some point, help with multi-year planning?*

Tiernan Fogarty replied that although the Math Department already plans a year in advance it may help to speed things up. Fogarty asked for clarity on the cutoff of 10 students or less being counted as low enrollment. Kuleck stated that economically it doesn't make sense to teach courses with less than 10 students enrolled. Fox added that in looking at every lecture and seminar course taught last year, the average enrollment was 13 students. With a break-even point of about 18 students, this is very problematic. Fox noted that while some departments may have much higher enrollment averages, the balance over the entire institution is important. When 30-40 percent of courses have 10 students or less, it's not economically feasible. Fox continued that while some low enrollment classes, such as capstone courses, may be necessary, finding a balance is important. This tool can help departments identify which courses are important to run and those that aren't.

Jamie Kennel stated that since he has fixed-cost faculty, the decision not to offer courses due to low enrollment actually costs money rather than saving money because he still needs to pay the faculty member. This creates a challenge of how to make that decision. Fox responded that this starts to show that we have capacity and suggested marketing those course to increase enrollment rather than adding faculty. Fox added that the purpose of this isn't financial but rather a management tool and that cost savings will ultimately be realized by reducing overload. Kennel agreed that this tool will be useful in identifying which courses to cancel.

Kennel stated that as departments look to cancel low enrollment sections, possibly due to overload, he doesn't have good visibility of what that might do to student persistence or to graduation rates, which could ultimately impact funding even more. Kennel added that he would like to have that information prior to making a decision. Breedlove stated that CSET uses retention as low enrollment justification as missing the course would put students an entire year out. Fox replied that departments will be able to view the prior year's enrollment to see if primarily freshmen, seniors, etc. are taking the class. This will offer at least a glance and, although not perfect, it might start laying the groundwork as a first step to addressing Beaudry's concern of how to systematically identify which courses to offer and when.

Farooq shared that departments might also use the tool to identify inefficiencies. For example, if a course is offered each term with low enrollment, the department may consider offering it fewer times per year or combining sections.

*Kuleck asked if programs have an idea of their retention rates from year to year?*

Breedlove said not currently but that he would love to have that information by class if possible to see D, F, and W rates.

#### Workload

Sultan commented that another helpful tool element is workload preparation. Previously, due to typos, etc., some information couldn't be tied back to Banner, some courses were missing, and enrollment numbers were often incorrect. Having a single data set and a uniform template will allow data to be upload easily and uniform data will be provided across departments.

Jeff Hayen asked if once this tool matures it will replace the current workload process. Hayen also asked if the data in the tool is resident in the file. Sultan responded yes to both questions. Sultan added that currently instructional workload is built into the tool and that he will be working to add non-instructional workload as well. In regards to workload units, Sultan commented that some courses, such as labs, have different ratios and that the tool will accept any value within reason.

Sultan added that once the blue sections of the spreadsheet are filled in, the data will automatically be uploaded into Banner. Fox stated that since enrollments can fluctuate due to course additions/cancellations, etc., periodically verifying information accuracy is recommended (maybe at the end of each term). Fox also recommended taking a final look at the end of the year. This will allow workload to be a work in progress with a forecast, rather than a large project at the end of the year.

Farooq will send the spreadsheet to chairs soon. The form consists of four terms; Summer 2017, Fall 2017, Winter 2018, and Spring 2018. Farooq asked that if you see courses in the history that are under-enrolled and not required (specifically for Winter 2018), you may want to cancel or combine them.

#### Identifying Valuable Tool Usage

From the discussion, Kuleck stated that some valuable outcomes for using this tool are identifying:

- Low-enrolled courses
- Courses required for graduation
- Key trailer courses
- Capstone projects necessary for student experiences
- Large courses that require several small lab sections  
Some due to capacity – some student/faculty ratios mandated by accreditation

#### Course Add/Drop Process

*Kuleck asked how much time chairs spend on students adding and dropping courses.*

Beaudry commented that it's not just chairs, but faculty, advisors, and especially students who have to run around collecting signatures. Beaudry view the process as a huge time waster. Beaudry commented that she has seen extremely efficient models at other institutions where all signatures were done electronically. Beaudry added that moving to a similar system would save all involved a tremendous amount of time. Breedlove commented that he recently spoke to Jim Jones about adopting software such as DocuSign to address the issue. Apparently Jones used similar software at Gonzaga and is considering implementing it at Oregon Tech.

### Portland-Metro Low-Enrollment Courses

Fogarty wanted to address low enrollment courses taught at Portland-Metro by full-time faculty. Fogarty recalls that when the Portland-Metro campus was new, low enrollment was attributed to start-up but that is no longer the case. Fogarty noted that typically, Portland-Metro offers much smaller courses that would likely be cancelled in Klamath Falls. Mark Neupert sees value in offering new classes taught by adjuncts. Enrollment will likely be low but the adjunct salary is less as well, allowing some experimentation with classes that may grow over time. Fox agreed that this tool will drive those kinds of conversations and allow the deans to approach these issues systematically.

### **OPEN FLOOR**

#### New Position Requests

There were questions about the status of position requests. Beaudry shared that as a former HR director she knows that the hiring timing cycle is critical. To get the cream of the crop, positions should be approved in the spring and advertisements should go out in the summer. Beaudry believe not adhering to this timeline to be a top reason for failed searches. The Council agreed that each spring decisions should be made for the following academic year. Kuleck, Maupin, and Hallie Neupert will meet after to outline the process.

The next meeting will be held October 30, 2:00-4:00 p.m.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Valjean Newsome

Oregon Institute of Technology

ACADEMIC COUNCIL

October 30, 2017

**MINUTES**

Provost Gary Kuleck called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. Academic Council members present were: Seth Anthony, Todd Breedlove, David Culler for Jeff Hayen, Tiernan Fogarty, Gary Kuleck, LeAnn Maupin, Hallie Neupert, Don McDonnell for Debbie McCollam, Mark Neupert, Jeff Parady, Paula Russell, Dan Peterson, Farooq Sultan, Sean St.Clair, Terri Torres for Sharon Beaudry, Ken Usher, and Erika Veth. Brian Fox, Jamie Kennel, Dawn Taylor, and Claudia Torres-Garibay joined the meeting remotely. Laura McKinney and Jack Walker were absent.

**BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING UPDATE**

Provost Gary Kuleck stated that during the recent Board of Trustees meeting, President Naganathan shared his vision for the University regarding strategies to achieve growth as the leading polytechnic institute in the pacific northwest. Naganathan would like to nourish Oregon Tech's reputation as "industry's university" and focused on a one-year, short-term action plan to include:

- Increasing reputational capitol
- Increasing enrollment and diversity
- Providing spaces and incentives for faculty innovation and pedagogy
- Focusing on investing in professional opportunities for faculty and staff
- Improving efficacy of business operations – operational efficiency
- Expanding relations with alumni and donors – leveraging partnerships and developing new ones

The Board was very receptive and asked Naganathan to, within the next few months, work to develop a five-year strategic plan that reflects growth beyond the first year.

**WORLD CAFÉ UPDATE**

At the last meeting, Jim Jones gave an overview of the World Café exercise conducted at the retreat. Jones stated that the exercise was broken into three rounds. Participants went to a new table each round and were asked a question. The question was the same each time except for a slight different ending – *In context of the strategic direction, challenges facing higher education, and the department workload philosophy, what should the departments start doing, stop doing, or continue doing?*

Discussions yielded flipchart notes full of participant concepts and ideas that Jones organized into categories, ranking them by priority levels 1-4. Jones presented the findings in a PowerPoint presentation. Jones stated that in the World Café series, the next step would be to see if these priorities are the right ones to align with the strategic direction and mission. To refine the data, Maupin pulled the top 2 top priorities/concerns of the departments. Maupin found it interesting that the guiding principles below developed on their own:

## #1 Workload

- No overload – possibly reinventing a workload model to accommodate that
- Balance of online and in-load
- Reduction of committee work
- Capturing forward-facing work
- Retaining small class sizes and hands-on components
- Reducing busy work
- Maintaining a high level of educational quality
- Reduction of data input requests for department chairs

## #2 Academic Strategic Planning

Maupin stated that the second overarching goal was the academic strategic planning which included:

- interdisciplinary focus
- faculty hires
- number of faculty
- coordinated efforts
- reduction of silos
- innovative ideas
- broadening of thinking
- visibility

Maupin was encouraged that workload modeling is being addressed via the tool currently being developed is workload modeling is being addressed via tools that are being developed and stated that she may address the other priorities at a later date.

## **STRATEGIC PLANNING AND VISION**

Provost Gary Kuleck stated that the University's strategic plan and vision cannot be realized without input and development of strategic goals and planning from the academic departments and programs. As strategic planning is used as the basis for all decision-making (hiring, equipment, budget, operations), elements such as sound business practices, program offerings that match industry needs, and external partner relationships need to be considered.

Prior to the meeting, Kuleck sent the group two documents for discussion during the meeting:

- Strategic Planning Rubric
- Faculty Request Form 2018-19 Prioritization

### Rubric

LeAnn Maupin noted that the rubric was developed by Council members at the summer retreat as they contemplated how to align the strategic plan with department resource requests and that components therein are those identified as valuable by department chairs.

### Faculty Request Form

Maupin stated that the form is the same used in 2015-16 with a few minor changes:

- Many fields are now automatically populated
- A few changes to the data factsheet at the end (to be populated by administration)
- The addition of the creative works piece.

Maupin welcomed suggestions for improvement and stated that the goal is for departments to use the information to begin planning strategically.

Kuleck shared that the first section is an assessment of the strategic narrative and a focused attempt to address where departments are heading in 3-5 years. Kuleck reminded all to include justification for market demand and to focus on needs, challenges, resources, and clarity of presentation. Kuleck views strategic plans as equivalent to academic business plans and stated that they should be data-driven and evidence-based. In an effort to help departments develop effective strategic plans, Kuleck would like to meet with each chair in the next few weeks as well as to continue developing tools and strategies throughout the year.

Ken Usher asked for clarity about linking the strategic plan to new hires, especially in regards to general education or service departments. If departments have new or growing programs that require a new faculty member, how might chairs know that in advance? Kuleck replied that each department is unique and fulfills different parts of the University's mission which can factor into resource justification. Although the model is still being reshaped, justification for hires will need to revolve around fulfilling the mission.

Todd Breedlove stated that the form seems forward-thinking and geared more to new positions. Breedlove doesn't believe it fits departments such as his which aren't trying to grow or increase offerings but rather to simply survive and staff current offerings. Kuleck replied that part of the rationale could be that until a replacement is hired, the department can't continue to support a growing program. Kuleck added that the idea isn't to starve programs but to provide maintenance and to improve efficiency.

#### Creative Works Element for New Hires

Kuleck stated that new tenure-track hires will need to include a creative works element and believes there are faculty that will welcome both teaching and the student-focused creative aspect. While teaching is paramount, the extra little piece brought creatively will also be important and can be a great opportunity for departments when creatively linked together. Kuleck believes this will be attractive to talented, potential hires.

Breedlove asked where the creative piece would fit within the annual performance evaluation for tenure-track faculty, as individuals will all have different strengths. Kuleck responded that creative works would fall under Institutional and Professionally-Related Public Service and that departments will define and shape the requirements.

Breedlove voiced concern that when hiring, until he found the 'teacher' he wouldn't know what other creative elements a new hire might have to offer. Kuleck suggested this while this might be addressed in the job advertisement, offering incentives is critical. Incentives such as start-up money to fund or develop a project is important to attracting faculty. Claudia Torres-Garibay noted that the EERE Department's Smart Grid laboratory is not currently being utilized. Kuleck replied that developing that facility would be a perfect opportunity for a new faculty member. Terri Torres asked if start-up funds would be available to current faculty as well. Kuleck noted that funds available to current faculty would be characterized as small grants.

Ken Usher believes there may be a generational challenge when looking for individuals to do some form of creating work. Although he has seen an increased emphasis on creative work over the past 5-10 years, many faculty members nearing retirement were hired and have been promoted due to excellent teaching and other institutional service. Kuleck noted that he doesn't believe in punishing individuals who were brought in under a different model and that those who are mid to late-career won't be affected. Kuleck added that as we look to increase our brand and recognition, it will be important to encourage faculty to go beyond what has been done in the past. This can be accomplished by reducing the service component, allowing faculty more time. Kuleck stated that the goal isn't to disrupt or to destroy what is already being

done well but to acknowledged that there is an opportunity to promote the outward-facing piece in new faculty hires.

Jamie Kennel commented that he appreciates the creative work flexibility but wanted clarification on how this process will be standardized across the departments as each department will vary in their requirements and how they fit into the University's tenure and promotion requirements. Kuleck agreed that standardizing is challenging and would like the Council to have future discussions about equivalency expectations across departments. Kennel believes discussions and approval needs to happen prior to faculty being hired rather than when they are going up for promotion or review. Kuleck agreed that defining what that would look like in each department will be a charge of the Council in the very near future.

Torres asked for clarification of tenure-track and non-tenure-track – if administration has nailed down how to make those decisions and if they are made at the departmental level. Kuleck replied decisions will be made through discussions with the chairs about things such as where the department is going and what the economics look like. Breedlove requested that non-tenure track faculty position descriptions be nailed down and that questions such as advising and teaching load be addressed. Breedlove would like to have a clear path of moving faculty from non-tenure to a tenure-track should the department choose to do so.

Kuleck stated that he previously worked in systems with mechanisms to hire tenure track faculty (with economical and strategic justification) or fixed-term faculty with renewable contracts. There were two paths for the non-tenure track – fixed-term without the option of upward mobility and non-tenure track with promotion capacity. Kuleck would like to explore both opportunities and stated that tenure-track provides opportunities to hire fabulous faculty to do great things but can also lock departments into having a position. Non-tenure track provides a different kind of flexibility and in many ways can be beneficial to the department – one of which addresses workload issues as they can have a large teaching loads. Kuleck added that with a declined enrollment, each department needs to think about their economic stability and growth and decide if they want to hire tenure-track or non-tenure track positions.

Tiernan Fogarty voiced concern about the timeline. Fogarty inquired as to when decisions will be made and departments will be notified. Kuleck stated that the goal is to meet with chairs in next 2-3 weeks, before the Thanksgiving break and is hopeful that this process will happen much sooner next year.

Fogarty stated that he would like to include position specifics in the advertisements. Dan Peterson agreed that being able to lay out specific terms such as track was critical and that discussions need to happen now in order to make hiring decisions. Kuleck agreed that the timeline needs to be being moved up. Kuleck added that he views timing, job ad description, and negotiation as the top three hiring components.

Breedlove stated that he submitted an addendum his strategic plan to address updates. Kuleck invited all to do the same if they wish.

Kuleck asked that Gary be prepared to discuss strategic planning and hires. Farooq will send out five-year trend enrollment data to chairs by the end of the week to help determine whether or not hires are feasible.

The next meeting will be held November 21, 2:00-4:00 p.m. Kuleck reminded all to send agenda items to Dierdre Williams.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Valjean Newsome

ACADEMIC COUNCIL

November 21, 2017

**MINUTES**

Provost Gary Kuleck called the meeting to order at 9:04 a.m. Academic Council members present were: Seth Anthony, Sharon Beaudry, Kevin Brown for Dan Peterson, Todd Breedlove, Tiernan Fogarty, Brian Fox, Jeff Hayen, Gary Kuleck, LeAnn Maupin, Debbie McCollam, Hallie Neupert, Mark Neupert, Jeff Pardy, Paula Russell, Sean St.Clair, Farooq Sultan, Mason Terry for Claudia Torres Garibay, Ken Usher, Erika Veth, and Jack Walker. Laura McKinney and Dawn Taylor joined the meeting remotely. Jamie Kennel was absent.

**HIRING REQUEST REVIEW**

The Proposed Hiring Form was sent to department chairs to prioritize hiring requests. The Provost's Leadership Team reviewed the requests submitted. Provost Gary Kuleck explained the rationale used in reviewing the documentation. He thanked department chairs for their efforts in planning and envisioning for their respective departments.

*What does "Replacements" on the approved/ non-approved faculty position list mean?* The term "replacements" entails new, replacements, retirements, tenure denials, withdrawals, etc.

*Will departments receive feedback on non-approved positions?* Dr. Kuleck stated he would meet with department chairs over the next two weeks regarding non-approved positions.

**NON-TENURE TRACK**

Ken Usher asked about how to best approach non-tenure track (NTT) faculty currently teaching 12 workload units per term, if the new expectation were to become 15 workload units. Provost Kuleck gave an example of how a department could explain the situation to the faculty member. Dr. Usher stated that there are no guidelines in existence regarding assigning workload as described above. Dr. Kuleck stated that these are points of discussion for departments as well as the ETM and HAS colleges. This discussion can be had with individual NTT faculty as more are hired.

Todd Breedlove asked if the current Annual Performance Evaluation (APE) form appropriately addresses NTT faculty. There was discussion surrounding the review process, which would be the same as that of a regular faculty member. The Faculty Objective Plan defines the expectations, and the APE is the evaluation of the achievement of those things or equivalent items. It was stated that fixed term status is essentially the same as NTT status. Sharon Beaudry stated that one of the Faculty Senate committees is charged with looking at APE's. She was unsure of the committee's progress on this charge.

Dr. Kuleck stated that the 15 workload unit expectation will take place with all new hires, and includes returning NTT faculty. Dr. Kuleck advised Chairs to work with the Deans on NTT hires.

Discussion regarding a potential 3 unit workload release for new hires in order to stay afloat so each has time to prepare curriculum, develop courses, etc.

### **DEPARTMENTAL REVIEW OF FACULTY PERFORMANCE**

There are currently four departments providing third year reviews to faculty members. Dr. Kuleck asked for feedback on how the review process is received by faculty. Mark Neupert stated that his faculty like the format. From the perspective of department chair, the reviews are a useful tool in mentoring junior faculty. Kevin Brown stated that the Communication department provides a narrative as well as a review to assist the newer faculty in assessing how well they are doing; the department also provides senior faculty the opportunity to contribute to the conversation. Dr. Kuleck asked if there is a peer review of teaching. Dr. Brown stated no, but his department is discussing the possibility. Seth Anthony stated that the Commission on College Teaching is also looking at the potential benefit of peer review. Faculty trained at the OTET workshop learned about a set of common principle values that could be utilized in peer review.

### **STRATEGIC PLANNING**

Dr. Kuleck encouraged feedback from the department chairs in the form of discussion and strategic planning to figure things out. Dr. Kuleck is considering having departments make presentations at future Academic Council meetings.

Dr. Kuleck will be revising the equipment form and distributing to department chairs soon. Dr. Kuleck would like Chairs to submit a one page summary highlighting the immediate equipment needs and the justification for the equipment. LeAnn Maupin stated, and Brian Fox agreed, that Chairs should submit three year equipment plans in lieu of one year plans.

Discussion regarding new hires, and working on a model in which NTT positions could potentially become permanent.

Advertisements for new hires should be more descriptive in order to attract applicants to Oregon Tech. Dr. Kuleck would encourage Chairs to think creatively and broadly to more effectively market each department. Suzette Yaezenko created a university template to assist in composing a compelling advertisement.

Dr. Kuleck highly recommended more diversity in the creation of search committees. Interdisciplinary faculty should be considered for inclusion.

### **NEXT STEPS**

The next Academic Council meeting will be held December 11<sup>th</sup>. Equipment requests will be discussed at that meeting. Suzette Yaezenko has also been invited to train Chairs on the new HEROES system.

Meeting adjourned at 10:45 a.m.

Oregon Institute of Technology

ACADEMIC COUNCIL

December 11, 2017

**MINUTES**

Provost Kuleck called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. Academic Council members present were: Seth Anthony, Sharon Beaudry, Todd Breedlove, Tiernan Fogarty, Jeff Hayen, Gary Kuleck, LeAnn Maupin, Hallie Neupert, Mark Neupert, Jeff Pardy, Dan Peterson, Paula Russell, Farooq Sultan, Sean St.Clair, Ken Usher, Laura McKinney and Jack Walker. Brian Fox was absent. Jamie Kennel, Debbie McCollam, Dawn Taylor, Claudia Torres-Garibay, and Erika Veth joined the meeting remotely. Randall Paul and Suzette Yaezenko were also in attendance.

**NEW FACULTY HIRES**

Prior to the meeting, Provost Kuleck sent two documents to the Council:

- Creative works *Listing basic features as it applies to professional development*
- Brief summary\_hiring *Outlining PLT+ academic hiring recommendation rationale*

Kuleck stated that creative works expectations will vary per department and emphasized that they will provide a framework for tracking career progression and provide guidance to chairs in FOP and APE preparation. Kuleck added that although non-tenure track faculty are being hired and guidelines aren't fully in place, a policy should be finalized within six months. Kuleck believes that part of the attractiveness of working for Oregon Tech is having a position with some permanence and stated that non-tenure track faculty will be eligible for contract renewal of up to three years.

**EQUIPMENT PROPOSALS**

Prior to the meeting, Provost Kuleck sent the following document to the Council:

- 2017-18 equipment proposals

Dr. Kuleck asked LeAnn Maupin to highlight form elements. Much discussion followed. Maupin briefly went over the form, noting that the Proposals-General section is the same as 2014-15 and encouraged departments to continue with a five-year academic planning concept. Maupin stated that while equipment needs are built in to department strategic plans, the table on page 4 should be used more as an "at-a-glance." Maupin suggested changing the table 1-5 rankings to represent years which will better allow the PLT to plan several years out in terms of needs and cost. Maupin added that funds should be spent by the end of the fiscal year in which they are awarded.

Laura McKinney stated that it is critical for departments to be able to count on a long-term trajectory for equipment funding. Laying out a five-year strategy will allow the PLT to have requests on the strategic horizon and be able to secure funding. It will also give the University a better idea of costs needed to keep programs current.

Dr. Kuleck stated that providing information to the Deans will allow them to develop a plan for the College, empower them to fundraise via alumni and industry partners, and strengthen the sponsored projects office via grant submissions. Kuleck added that the Deans will assist chairs in submitting proposals and would like for departments to think strategically with a five-year look at what objectives might be accomplished with equipment purchased.

Jeff Hayen stated that for the past few years he has utilized the tab system in the strategic planning Excel spreadsheet and likes the way it is laid out. Hayen would like to continue using the same form. McKinney believes that since an approach has already been adopted, automating a form that can pull from existing sheets would save department chairs a lot of time. Debbie McCollam agreed that this would be very efficient.

Tiernan Fogarty stated that the Math Department planned and saved for several consecutive years but at the end of each year remaining funds have been swept. Fogarty wanted assurance that administration was aware of upcoming expenses and that swept monies would be made available.

McKinney stated that departments saving individual usually results in departments either saving more than is necessary or not being as flexible as they could be. McKinney went on to say that using the Equipment Proposal Form as the endorsed direction for equipment requests would allow departments to purchase needed equipment and allow the University to realize larger cost savings. Dr. Kuleck added that common needs can more easily be identified and purchased with greater discounts.

Dr. Kuleck believes purchasing computers in bulk may yield a large discount and asked how many lab computers each department annually purchases. Dr. Kuleck stated that although we are already doing this to some degree, there may be room for greater bargaining power. Maupin stated that faculty computers have historically been paid for with departmental S&S funds and believes there may be a better way to manage that. Maupin would like to see IT serve as a general clearinghouse and manage the computer portion of requests, keeping an inventory of all computers on campus, and helping to determine replacement due dates. Dr. Kuleck noted that he is in favor of a five-year replacement cycle.

Claudia Torres-Garibay commented that departments may have unforeseen needs that arise and asked how those needs might be handled. Dr. Kuleck replied that although a five-year plan will help the Deans strategize, he realizes that circumstances may change and stated that requests will be reviewed annually. Garibay asked if there are limits to departmental requests. Dr. Kuleck replied that while the dollar limit per proposal is \$100K, there is no limit on the number of request that can be made. Maupin added that the total annual equipment budget is \$600K. Dr. Kuleck would like to amend the document to state that any item over \$5K needs to be in a separate proposal. Miscellaneous items under that amount can be lumped together.

Jamie Kennell commented that with limited resources available, certainly all requests will not be funded. For the sake of transparency, Kennell requested that the PLT make funding decisions and justification available to all. As departments attempt to increase the persuasiveness of future requests, Kennell believes knowing which request tend to be funded and those that don't would help departments to plan better and to be more realistic. Dr. Kuleck stated that all proposals and a brief description of funding decisions could be shared on the T:/drive. Dr. Kuleck added that for proposals that aren't funded, other funding opportunities may be available.

Mark Neupert asked how expenses for reconfiguring office space would be handled. Maupin stated that in the past, requests were made by departments to the Provost and were included in department strategic plans but that there currently isn't a formal process. Dr. Kuleck proposed that small upgrades, those under \$10K, be included with equipment requests. Mark Neupert and Dan Peterson submitted a joint proposal last year. Dr. Kuleck asked if other departments are looking at joint proposals for shared space and if the current form is sufficient for interdisciplinary proposals. Jack Walker believes there are a number of initiatives with other programs, departments, and faculty where combining uses and applications would make sense. Walker believes the current form could work by adding space for signatures of lead faculty members from each department to the signature page. Walker added that each department could also have their own priority ranking. Dr. Kuleck encouraged interdisciplinary projects and the Council agreed that both departments could work on the narrative together and add signatures to

the existing form as needed. McCollam stated that she is currently working on a joint initiative and would like to see the form have a section relating to space requests.

Mark Neupert added that planning in advance for space requests is important. Small space renovations can usually be handled by Facilities during the summer months and providing ample lead time usually reduces the cost. Maupin believes office space renovations requests would be fine but cautioned about larger renovation requests as the Academic Technology Advisory Council (ATAC) in conjunction with the Commission on College Teaching (CCT) are working on general instruction classroom usage. Dr. Kuleck added that all renovation proposals would be shared with ATAC and CCT for input.

McKinney stated that we don't often tend to think of these things as a strategic plan, where all components of a plan are review and priorities are set relating to what is to be accomplished. McKinney believes these types of conversations need to come under strategic review and would like to start having them. McKinney added that the University needs to decide which initiatives are important and to look at all aspects of support. Dr. Kuleck asked if the master academic strategic plan takes into account strategies at a higher level. Maupin stated that the current master academic plan needs to be reviewed and rebuilt. McKinney added that currently there isn't a process to report on the past year; what changes occurred, what new needs arose, what goals were met, etc., but sees value in that.

Paula Russell stated that the Dental Hygiene Department has been working with several departments on interdisciplinary activities in a dental setting which would require additional space to expand their dental clinic. Including dental equipment, the remodel would cost at least \$100K. Russell asked if this is the correct avenue to make that type of request. Dr. Kuleck stated that changes that large should go through the ATAC. Maupin noted that the rooms to be remodeled as upscale classrooms have already been decided on and dollars allocated and that the room being requested may not be available.

Todd Breedlove asked for clarification on proposals currently being compiled, specifically if they are intended for purchases this academic year. Dr. Kuleck stated that yes, funds are available for this year. Breedlove suggested that moving forward, the process be completed spring term of the previous academic year to allow departments to prepare during summer term. Dan Peterson asked that firm deadline dates be set and added to the academic calendar. Dr. Kuleck asked what ideal dates would be. Ken Usher replied that the dates chosen for this year, which are the same as last year, work well.

Dr. Kuleck reiterated that from the conversation, the following are suggested document changes:

- Laura McKinney – pulling data requests from the 5-year strategic plan
- Departments will create separate proposals with rankings
- Separate proposals will be submitted for items over \$5K
- Small Facilities request are acceptable proposals, particularly office space renovations

Dr. Kuleck asked that additional feedback regarding document language be sent to him right away.

Dr. Kuleck will revise and send to chairs in the next few days. Dr. Kuleck extended the proposal deadline from January 19 to January 26 and reminded all that award announcements will be made by February 2.

## **WORKLOAD REPORT UPDATE**

Prior to the meeting, Provost Kuleck sent the following document to the Council:

- 2017-18 Course Planning V4.3

Farooq Sultan went over the latest version of the form and functions of the three tabbed documents within. Sultan stated that 2017-18 Current Courses is a reporting document that looks at the courses taught over the current academic year. Columns to be completed by the department chair are shown in

blue and include Load Type, Workload Units, Action and Comments. Sultan reminded all that this will replace the end-of-year workload reports that have been completed in the past. Sultan added that chairs will update the form throughout the year rather than waiting until the end of the year to complete the entire report.

Sultan welcomed comments and will update and resend the Summer 2017 and Fall 2017 to chairs in the next few days. Dr. Kuleck would like to revisit and discuss Winter 2018 and Spring 2018 at a later date.

### **REQUESTS FOR CARRY-OVER FUNDS**

Prior to the meeting, Provost Kuleck sent the following documents to the Council:

- Request for Carry Over Funds College of ETM fillable
- Request for Carry Over Funds College of HAS fillable

LeAnn Maupin reminded all who wish to request 2016-17 carry-over funds fill out the appropriate form and submit it to their Dean.

Provost Kuleck cancelled the December 29 Academic Council meeting and stated that the next meeting is scheduled for January 19.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Valjean Newsome

Oregon Institute of Technology

ACADEMIC COUNCIL

January 19, 2018

**MINUTES**

Provost Kuleck called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. Academic Council members present were: Todd Breedlove, Jan Cope for Paula Russell, Tiernan Fogarty, Jeff Hayen, Claude Kansaku for Todd Breedlove for a portion of the meeting, Gary Kuleck, LeAnn Maupin, Debbie McCollam, Hallie Neupert, Mark Neupert, Jeff Pardy, Dan Peterson, Farooq Sultan, Sean St.Clair, Ken Usher and Erika Veth. Seth Anthony, Sharon Beaudry, Brian Fox, Laura McKinney and Jack Walker were absent. Jamie Kennel, Dawn Taylor, and Claudia Torres-Garibay joined the meeting remotely. Jim Jones, Stephanie Pope, and Dawn Lowe-Wincentsen were also in attendance.

**OPEN EDUCATION RESOURCES UPDATE**

Prior to the meeting, Dawn Lowe-Wincentsen, Wilsonville Librarian, emailed the following document to Council members who would be attending remotely. Lowe-Wincentsen distributed hard copies to those in Klamath Falls and plans to send electronically to all faculty next week.

- Low cost, No cost, and Open Educations Resources, Call for Proposals

Lowe-Wincentsen stated that the Library would like to offer individuals money to create, adapt, and adopt low-cost, no-cost, and open education resources. Lowe-Wincentsen stated that although the program at Oregon Tech is primarily for upper-division classes, we also have a statewide committee which deals mostly with lower-division classes.

*Copied from the Oregon State Legislature webpage on House Bill 2871:*

**WHAT THE MEASURE DOES:**

Establishes Open Educational Resources Grant Program within Higher Education Coordinating Commission (HECC). Directs HECC to employ Open Educational Resource Specialist. Appropriates moneys to HECC to fund grant program and Specialist. Requires public universities and community colleges to designate in catalogs and online, those courses exclusively using no-cost or low-cost course materials. Requires resources created or revised with grant funds to be openly licensed. Declares emergency, effective on passage.

LeAnn Maupin stated that the Bill was legislated last year but that Oregon Tech hasn't been in full compliance. To fulfill requirements, Lowe-Wincentsen is working with Tech Nest to obtain required documentation and sent out a survey fall term during Open Access Week. Lowe-Wincentsen has also learned how others are documenting Open Access resources and getting information out to students.

Gary Kuleck asked Chairs how faculty in their departments view OERs in general. Dan Peterson commented that COM has had conversations in terms of tenure and promotion there is concern regarding time investment and how much value will be given to creating their own OERs.

Regarding creative works, Dr. Kuleck asked if departments would find it valuable for faculty members to focus on developing material and publishing it in a way that can demonstrate that it is being downloaded and used.

Peterson views this as very valuable but voiced concern that on a promotion level it may not be viewed the same way across the campus. Ken Usher stated that this is done for many laboratory courses in NSC; however, faculty are not widely disseminating the material. Usher agreed, this may not be at the top of faculty priority lists and is unclear how it will be valued for promotion and other processes.

Lowe-Wincentsen commented that there are programs such as OER Commons and OpenStack that require a peer review process for textbooks published to those sources and have an option for information to be widely shared. Dr. Kuleck added that publishing a textbook externally obviously validates a substantial amount of work and asked how faculty might similarly validate scholarly effort put into OER creation.

Todd Breedlove stated that CSET currently has some open source books, especially for computer engineering and embedded systems where textbooks are typically very expensive. Breedlove stated he and Randy Albert co-authored a book several years ago and added that with current technology, updating material to current is very easy. Debbie McCollam stated that many of the textbooks used in the MIT Department have a large number of images, which could be extremely labor intensive. Dr. Kuleck recognized that many students still prefer a physical book. Breedlove recently conducted a poll of 20 students and only one student preferred an electronic copy. McCollam stated that MIT students definitely prefer hard copies.

## **BUDGET OFFICE UPDATE**

Stephanie Pope, Budget and Resource Planning Director, gave an overview of Budget Office functions. The Budget Office is no longer part of the Business Affairs Office and now operates independently. The Budget Office is working to determine how to best help the campus operate effectively and be mindful of future directions. Budget Office functions include budget forecasting, long-term planning, fiscal reporting, and coordinating all budgets on campus.

Short-term, the Budget Office is working with on-campus stakeholders to:

- develop a new, more transparent budget model
- push tools out to departments for needed data access
- be more active in the budget process, and
- continue providing FAST training.

Long-term, the Budget Office plans to work with departments to develop:

- long-range strategic planning tools
- budget and forecasting models
- more in-depth financial training to understand and track budgets
- a dashboard.

Mark Neupert stated that Pope has been an extremely helpful resource and support system and recently provided assistance and expertise in figuring out enrollment targets and economics of running HSS programs. Pope produced beautiful spreadsheet models, allowing Neupert to plan and forecast. As a service provider to campus, Pope asked all to let the Budget Office know how they can be of assistance in moving departments and the campus forward.

Gary Kuleck added that Deans should have a sense of upcoming expenses and needs and be able to provide support to departments – identifying efficiencies through bundling, encouraging interdisciplinary opportunities and collaboration, and through outreach to industry for financial support.

## **ITS UPDATE**

Jim Jones, Chief Information Officer, Information Technology Services, stated that currently there is no consistent process for replacing aging computer equipment across campus. Jones introduced the idea of moving to a leasing option for all networked equipment and distributed copies of the following document:

- Centralized PC Purchasing

Jones would like to form a short-term task force to create a policy around computer renewal and replacement, to establish guidelines and exceptions, and to negotiate standards. Jones stated that adopting a centralized PC leasing model would allow departments to receive new equipment every three to five years. Computers would be replaced on a 1 to 1 basis and departments would pay the initial cost difference for upgrades. Jones stated that departments would set specification standards for department and laboratory computers and that computers purchased via grant money would be part of the exception process as determined by the task force. For individuals operating with both a laptop and desktop, Jones recommended switching over to one device.

Jones spoke about many positive aspects of leasing, stating that at the beginning and end of each fiscal year, there is a huge spike in new computer purchases. Old computers are then offered to individuals with even older computers, creating a cascading effect and placing a heavy time burden on IT staff via installs. As equipment ages, Jones stated that it is unable to receive security patches and thus poses a security risk. With a lease, computers would be on a regular replacement schedule, allowing IT to know which computers were to be replaced annually and to schedule and manage installs over the course of the year. Knowing the annual replacement number would also result in maximum bulk order discounts.

Jones stated that asset management would also improve. Over the summer, IT conducted a physical inventory of computer equipment on the Wilsonville and Klamath Falls campuses and included all devices that checked into the network over the last 18 months. Jones priced computers from low to high-end to find median replacement costs. Jones calculated that a \$424,000 initial investment would be needed to begin the replacement cycle, replacing 20% of laptops and 25% of desktops campus-wide. Farooq Sultan inquired where the money would come from and asked if S&S budgets would be reduced. Stephanie Pope replied that a model is under discussion and needs vetting but that a construction of a plan will be out soon. Jones would like to see a policy in place by FY 2019.

Pope stated that, computers aside, the campus should conduct an annual inventory on all capital equipment but currently that isn't happening. The current process comes from the Business Affairs Office (BAO) and only BAO staff have access to the information. Pope added that the Budget Office needs capital inventory information and will be working to update the information and grant access to those who need it for long-range planning, etc.

Chairs interested in serving or wanting to recommend a department member to serve on the task force should contact Jones.

## **WORKLOAD REPORT UPDATE**

Provost Kuleck announced that Anna Clark, Research Analyst, has joined the Institutional Research office. Farooq Sultan thanked all for supplying needed data and stated that the next step will be to compile it and determine which courses remain. Sultan will then send a short list to departments. For changes such as adding an instructor, Sultan will send requests to the Registrar's Office to update Banner. When complete, Sultan will send reports to departments for final review and approval. Departments will be able to make changes through spring should needs arise.

Sultan stated that the tool needs a few modifications such as adding a supplemental piece to capture the DH clinics and labs not currently tied to a course, entering pre-calculated workload, adding summer courses, and adding a drop-down menu to select and categorize non-instructional work. Sultan welcomed additional feedback. Ken Usher stated that after initial data entry, when adding a course or changing the instructor, it would be helpful to be able to add rows. Debbie McCollam believes the spreadsheet will ultimately be a big time saver and asked if it was possible to hide or freeze columns for ease of entering and comparing data. Sultan noted both requests and will make the changes.

Mark Neupert stated that some HSS courses are taught at Boeing where he has no supervision of the course offering. In the comment section, Neupert is making note of this. Sultan stated that he can pull all Boeing courses and send to Seattle for review. Neupert suggested developing a model and formula for externship courses. Sultan stated that, per workload guidelines, he can make externship courses auto populate and allow data to be overridden if needed.

Jamie Kennel commented that determining in-load and out-of-load at the beginning of the year is difficult due to factors such as whether or not a new course will be offered. Kennel also commented that since externship is distributed across multiple faculty, assigning workload appropriately is difficult with one faculty member assigned to the course. Sultan stated that the faculty member listed in Banner is the primary instructor but additional faculty can be added and assigned a percentage of responsibility. LeAnn Maupin noted that some departments with externships are managing this by listing multiple sections of the same course – each with a unique CRN and the appropriate faculty name.

## **EQUIPMENT PROPOSALS**

Provost Kuleck thanked those who worked on form development and asked that any straggling proposals be submitted by the end of the day. Dr. Kuleck asked for feedback to improve the process going forward. Debbie McCollam stated that she struggled with how much content to include and whether to focus on immediate needs or all five years. Dr. Kuleck replied that the most important thing is to focus on needs for this year. All information included will be useful for strategic planning but those who didn't include a lot of information for the entire five-year look won't be penalized.

Maupin stated that there is still confusion around timeframes – placing requests for immediate needs and requests for things needed next year. Dr. Kuleck commented that the goal this year is to determine immediate needs. Dr. Kuleck added that and in an effort to get ahead of the curve, PLT will meet in April-May to review hiring and equipment needs for FY 2019.

## **RETREAT**

Dr. Kuleck would like all to start thinking about dates for a half-day retreat to be held late-winter, early-spring and would like to include Chair training as an agenda item. Dr. Kuleck believes that as Chairs take on high level administrative visioning and strategic thinking for their departments, ample training is critical.

## **NEXT MEETING**

Gary Kuleck stated that the next meeting will be held February 9 and noted that President Naganathan will be in attendance. Agenda items will include Equipment Requests and Workload updates.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Valjean Newsome

Oregon Institute of Technology

ACADEMIC COUNCIL

February 9, 2018

**MINUTES**

Provost Gary Kuleck called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. Academic Council members present were: Seth Anthony, Sharon Beaudry, Todd Breedlove, Paula Russell, Tiernan Fogarty, Jeff Hayen, Claude Kansaku for Todd Breedlove for a portion of the meeting, LeAnn Maupin, Debbie McCollam, Hallie Neupert, Mark Neupert, Jeff Pardy, Dan Peterson, Farooq Sultan, Roger Lindgren for Sean St.Clair, Ken Usher, Erika Veth and Jack Walker. Brian Fox was absent. Jamie Kennel, Dawn Taylor, Claudia Torres-Garibay, and Laura McKinney joined the meeting remotely. Jim Jones was also in attendance.

**PRESIDENT'S REPORT**

President Nagi Naganathan attended the beginning of the meeting and reported on several legislative initiatives and highlights pertaining to Oregon Tech and updates on other institutions.

Oregon State University (OSU)

Dr. Naganathan reported that OSU is aggressively pursuing a very expanded cascades campus, causing concern to many other universities. OSU plans to launch their engineering program in Bend and has requested \$300M in capital funding over the next 10 biennia. OSU is currently in line for \$39M for new building construction, including a large student services center. Dr. Naganathan stated that OSU has also acquired space in downtown Portland to expand operations. Although being presented as consolidating foundation operations, it will be the hub for launching many educational and research programs in the Portland Metro area.

University of Oregon (U of O)

The U of O plans to roll out an applied sciences program in the Portland area, which Dr. Naganathan believes will be the first step to launching an engineering program.

Eastern Oregon University (EOU)

Dr. Naganathan stated that Eastern Oregon University is trying to claim the status of Oregon's rural university with a bill to support that.

Southern Oregon Alliance

Dr. Naganathan stated that he is working with presidents from Southern Oregon University (Dr. Linda Schott), Rogue Community College (Dr. Cathy Kemper-Pelle), and Klamath Community College (Dr. Roberto Gutierrez) to form a southern Oregon alliance in hopes of creating a stronger presence and to bring activities together.

Oregon Health Sciences University (OHSU)

Dr. Naganathan stated that OHSU will soon have a new president and believes this to be the time to begin conversations and is hopeful that it will foster a desire to engage the other universities in a more inclusive way.

Tuition Bill

Dr. Naganathan spoke of a possible tuition bill that is of great concern. If passed, it would create many restrictions including a cap of 3% tuition increase across all campus. Anything higher would require lobbying in front of HECC. Dr. Naganathan stated that we are currently lobbying hard to ensure this will

not be a constraint and commended our students for the fabulous job they did speaking in front of HECC and relaying how engaged they are in the tuition setting process.

#### Emissions Legislation

Dr. Naganathan stated that there is an emissions legislation and that, by virtue of our renewable energy and science portfolio, Oregon Tech has an opportunity to be the top destination to graduate energy engineers and scientists.

#### Doctor of Physical Therapy (DPT)

Dr. Naganathan stated that we are making a concerted effort to move forward with a DPT degree and has spoken with the Provost of OHSU, Alena Andresen, who has promised support. Andresen will visit the Klamath Falls campus next Friday, and key topics will include offering physician assistant and DPT programs.

#### University Day

Dr. Naganathan stated that University Day, a large lobbying day, is next week and invited all who are able to come and offer support.

#### Legislative Breakfast

As part of a recent trip, Dr. Naganathan was able to host a legislative breakfast in Portland, with the Higher Education Committee Chair in attendance. The legislators, the Tuition Committee, and our students did a great job of explaining how things work at Oregon Tech and how pleased they are to be included in the process.

#### Budget and Enrollment

Dr. Naganathan thanked all in academic leadership roles, noting how challenging it can be. Dr. Naganathan stated that soon more resources, accountability, and responsibility will be kept at the Dean and Chair level. Dr. Naganathan stated that the Board was kind enough to approve a \$3M deficit budget last year and that budget will be a challenge. On average, 1% enrollment is equal to \$300,000 – a 10% enrollment increase would be needed to meet the deficit. Dr. Naganathan continued that unfortunately, fall enrollment numbers were not where they needed to be. Portland had a 20% applicant increase, yet fewer students than last year enrolled. Dr. Naganathan stated that not admitting and matriculating student that applied in a timely fashion was a real mistake. Last year Dr. Naganathan found that there were pending applicants who had gone 180 days with no contact from Oregon Tech. Dr. Naganathan added that almost 50% of applicants come between now and when the term starts, which is simply too late, and that we should be at the 75-80% by this time.

When the State approved the budget last year there was a note stipulating that tuition cannot be increased by more than 5% in the second year. Dr. Naganathan added that aside from tuition increases, it is critical that revenue growth occur in other areas. Dr. Naganathan asked for input from the Council to improve recruiting efforts and to be creative in devising additional processes.

As a proactive measure, Dr. Naganathan relayed that he has asked VPs to conduct a budget adjustment exercise with 3% and 5% reduction and 5% investment scenarios and added that departments may be asked to do the same in the near future.

#### Faculty Compensation

Dr. Naganathan stated that he is willing to look at a new model for setting faculty compensation – considering the market and individual value to departments rather than letting CIP codes be a restraint. Dr. Naganathan stated that a task force will soon be formed with the intent of making decisions within a few months' time and that data that we already have will be utilized, namely from the recent work of the Compensation Committee.

## Open Floor

Dr. Naganathan invited conversation from the Committee.

Mark Neupert asked, *“How are you working to align external activities with the Provost and his leadership of the Academic Council? How did you coordinate activities and strategies to advance the shared academic vision and what should the role of the VP of Finance be in this process?”*

Dr. Naganathan stated that he recently met with the Faculty Senate Executive Committee who was concerned about the President, Provost, and VP of Finance all traveling at the same time. Dr. Naganathan stated that he would like to get to a point where he and the Provost are not gone at the same time but noted difficulties in a multi-campus setting. Dr. Naganathan added that a concerted effort is being made to avoid simultaneous travel and believes that a few key hires such as the Dean of ETM, and Vice Provost for Innovation and Academic Affairs will help.

With respect to Finance, Dr. Naganathan stated that through his vast experience working with Provosts and Finance VPs (10 different of each), it is important to note that they work collaboratively together, all working together to bring resources and to fortify our finances. Dr. Naganathan stated that Brian Fox brings not only his finance expertise but key connections in the State and added that Oregon Tech cannot exist on state subsidy and tuition dollars alone. Dr. Naganathan stated that he and Provost Kuleck are utilizing their academic experience and are working with individuals and coaching them on their roles.

Dr. Naganathan announced that Governor Kate Brown will be our keynote commencement speaker and is anxious to have her visit campus. Dr. Naganathan hopes to fit in a tour of Corbett to show how her investment is making a difference.

Dr. Naganathan relayed the need to cultivate additional lobbying opportunities to be sure our voices are heard in securing additional resources for Oregon Tech and stated that a person of influence should be selected for all future commencements. The keynote speaker in Wilsonville will be Mark Johnson, former Senator, and newly named CEO of Oregon Business and Industry.

Dan Peterson asked, *“In terms of an academic plan for the Institution, how do you see yourselves working together on that plan and how can we as faculty members, chairs, and deans participate to develop that plan?”*

Dr. Naganathan stated that Provost Kuleck is the chief academic officer but has the responsibility to ensure that our mission is served. Rather than starting from scratch, Dr. Kuleck is working on a strategic planning recalibration. In preparation, Dr. Naganathan stated that Dr. Carol Cartwright has agreed to give additional guidance in the planning process and will host focus groups. In identifying opportunities, Dr. Naganathan stated that he is counting on participation from all and recommendations on what should be developed and what we should walk away from.

## **EQUIPMENT PROPOSALS**

Provost Gary Kuleck stated that the biggest challenge in making equipment decision was the fact that there were \$1.9M in requests and \$480,000 in available funds (some of which is reserved for IT computer requests). Dr. Kuleck added that great efforts were made to fund the highest priority items and that several factors including immediate need, number of students impacted, and level of student support were considered. Dr. Kuleck would like to meet with each Chair over the next few weeks to discuss details.

Dr. Kuleck reminded all that departments have been asked to look for external funding sources and to provide some level of match. Some requests articulated how industry may help while others were missing

this element and Dr. Kuleck encouraged an entrepreneurial spirit of funding and in making connections and added that many departments have extensive industry connections that may yield tremendous opportunities.

At the last meeting, Jim Jones presented a plan to centralize computer and printer purchases and maintenance to ensure a functional replacement cycle. Dr. Kuleck stated that a new engineering building and the Cornett renovation have presented a variety of needs, including high level printing needs. For computer requests not funded, Dr. Kuleck has asked that Jones meet with Chairs to strategize on meeting department needs. In determining laboratory needs, first knowing which software will be used will help Jones determine computer needs.

Dr. Kuleck has asked Brian Moravec to meet with Chairs to strategize on furniture needs. A faculty visioning group will also start meeting in a few weeks to visualize for the new building. Dr. Kuleck stated that while the University does not have a deferred maintenance budget to replace items as needed, two furniture requests have been approved – one funded from the Provost's Office and the other is for Cornett Hall which will serve many departments. Moravec and Thom Darrah are discussing funding for furniture in the newly renovated spaces. Dr. Kuleck has asked that purchases be strategically planned and encouraged departments to use an interdisciplinary approach for opportunities and funding.

### **WORKLOAD REPORT UPDATE**

LeAnn Maupin reiterated that a main reason for moving to a new workload process was to provide tools to simplify time consuming duties that Chairs have been tasked with. The workload tool was built to enable course planning, workload allocation, and to provide more automated reporting.

Farooq Sultan combined all spreadsheets into one master and had the following findings: workload was missed for 580 courses, 68 courses were duplicated with multiple departments claiming the same instructor and workload, 380-400 courses were missing the workload type or unit. All total, close to a 1,000 courses still need action before individual reports can be run.

Sultan stated that for the scheduling piece where add, modify, cancel, comments were entered, the course wasn't flagged to modify or cancel. Any time a course needs to be added, the Registrar's Office is asking that departments contact them directly and will verify with the Chair prior to making changes. Sultan also tried to determine if some of the courses marked as cross-listed courses actually were as many listed different times and campuses.

Claudia Torres stated that she tried to correct some mistakes but was having problems with the file and couldn't see most of the faculty in the department. Sultan stated that if filters are turned on, the list becomes shorter and will need to be removed before all information can be viewed.

LeAnn Maupin noted several comments such as "I don't have any control over this course because it's in Boeing" and stated that ultimately the courses belonged to the department and that Chair needs to reach out to those individuals. Maupin added that coordinating with Boeing has been an issue for quite some time. Chairs don't always have the opportunity to vet the adjuncts hired and aren't quite sure how to enter workload. Erika Veth viewed this as an opportunity to have a conversation and to have some oversight of the courses offered stating that the goal is to work toward a broader understanding of what is happening by department and to make better decisions as it affects strategic planning.

Dr. Kuleck gave an example of how it may impact departments. For instance, if the Board of Trustees sees a lot of low enrolled courses, they might say no more hiring and suggest getting more efficient in hiring and scheduling. Dr. Kuleck added that this could greatly impact workload.

Tiernan Fogarty asked if Boeing could submit a workload report to justify offerings. Jeff Hayen stated that Boeing operates completely differently. Courses are offered on an on-demand basis to keep Boeing satisfied. Sometimes course enrollments are high and sometimes they are low but classes are never cancelled. It is routine to see course with 2-6 students enrolled. Hayen added that most courses are taught by adjuncts which means we make a lot of money on them.

Beaudry commented that when it comes to hiring, since Boeing operates very differently, might they be filtered out when talking about numbers. Veth stated agreed this is an option if chairs are armed with this knowledge and are familiar with the data. Sultan suggested having one Boeing employee review all Boeing courses. Veth commented that it is easy to understand how things operate within your own departments but for someone from the outside looking in, it may not make a lot of sense. Veth stated that this information is helping her to form a larger conversation for the University moving forward strategically and thoughtfully regarding enrollment management.

Ken Usher stated that many of his faculty are in an overload status and asked for clarification in determining which courses would put them in an overload status. Maupin stated that the intent is to look at the course utilization piece. If a faculty member is in an overload situation with several under enrolled classes, it may give the Chair an opportunity to combine sections or to more efficiently deliver courses. Sultan stated that at EOU, each course is marked as in or out-of-load. Courses with higher enrollments are typically kept as in-load to show regular workload for base salaries. When making adjustments and reducing courses, typically overloads are looked at first. Fogarty commented that in his department it would be difficult to select which courses would be overload as all courses are full. Veth replied that in that case, the course chosen wouldn't matter but suggested being thoughtful about selection when some courses are full and others are not.

Sultan will send a short list to Chairs early next week. Dr. Kuleck asked that corrections be made two weeks from receiving reports.

### **SABBATICAL REQUESTS**

Dr. Kuleck stated that decisions for sabbaticals would be made soon. Dr. Kuleck added that there are 12 pending applications and that he is unsure that all can be awarded. For departments with multiple applicants, Dr. Kuleck will have a discussion with the Chair regarding possible impacts to the department. Dr. Kuleck will speak with the Deans and is hopeful that decisions will be made by early next.

### **RETREAT**

Dr. Kuleck would like all to continue thinking about dates for a half-day retreat to be held late-winter, early-spring.

### **BUDGET REDUCTION EXERCISE**

At a future meeting, Dr. Kuleck would like to discuss how to achieve the budget reduction exercise spoken of by Dr. Naganathan and the role of the Deans in this process.

### **NEXT MEETING**

Gary Kuleck stated that the next meeting will be held Friday, March 2.  
The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Valjean Newsome

Oregon Institute of Technology

ACADEMIC COUNCIL

March 2, 2018

**MINUTES**

Provost Gary Kuleck called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. Academic Council members present were: Sharon Beaudry, Todd Breedlove, Paula Russell, Terri Torres for Tiernan Fogarty, Jeff Hayen, Doug Lynn for Todd Breedlove for a portion of the meeting, LeAnn Maupin, Debbie McCollam, Hallie Neupert, Mark Neupert, Jeff Pardy, Dan Peterson, Farooq Sultan, Sean St.Clair, Ken Usher, Erika Veth, and Jack Walker. Seth Anthony, Brian Fox and Laura McKinney were absent. Jamie Kennel, Dawn Taylor, and Claudia Torres-Garibay joined the meeting remotely. Brian Moravec, Heather Smith, and Suzette Yaezenko were also in attendance.

**WORKLOAD REPORT UPDATE**

Provost Gary Kuleck stated that the goal for revising the workload process is to make it much more seamless. Dr. Kuleck invited Heather Smith from the Registrar's Office to discuss potential solutions. Todd Breedlove noted challenges and stated that although the current spreadsheet will serve as a stop-gap for this year, he would like to see a better, less time-consuming design. Farooq Sultan agreed that merging spreadsheets and making changes is cumbersome. Sultan stated that currently course information is gathered after the fact and added that it would be best for information to be populated as soon as courses are offered. Smith commented that since course information does not roll forward, it needs to be entered each term for each class. Breedlove replied that most course information remains the same from term to term and if input in advance, final adjustments such as assigning workload or overload would be minimal.

Sultan stated that he will begin looking at a better model for next year, with the Registrar's Office doing much of the course data collection and input and IR focusing on data analysis and reporting. Sultan reminded all to submit changes by March 12 and to send change requests directly to the Registrar's Office.

**DEPARTMENT CHAIR DUTIES**

Prior to the meeting, Provost Gary Kuleck sent the following document to the Council electronically and distributed hard copies at the meeting. Dr. Kuleck asked LeAnn Maupin to highlight the main duties.

- *Departmental Chair Roles and Responsibilities v4*

Leadership

Maupin stated that although the Department Chair Position Description hasn't been revisited since 2002, expectations are much different. Maupin added that the goal is to empower departments in their efforts to work with their Deans and across colleges in multidisciplinary efforts. Maupin stated that to accomplish this, having clear-cut roles and responsibilities and providing adequate training is important. Maupin referred to Dr. Naganathan's concept of part-time departmental leaders and acknowledged that being a part-time leader with all of the responsibilities is difficult and wanted to define how that might work.

Budget

Maupin stated that information for new budget model will include clear guidelines on how the University will build the budget and that these components will be tied together.

### Communication

Maupin commented that as we transition to new Chair and Dean roles, having an effective communication plan, including with whom to communicate for various initiatives, will be beneficial.

### Faculty and Student Development

Maupin stated that Dr. Kuleck has spoken a lot about developmental aspects such as creative works, working with students, and multi-disciplinary work and added that it will be important to define those duties and how they affect Chair roles and responsibilities.

### Recruitment

Maupin commented that Dr. Naganathan has stated several times that recruitment and fundraising at the department level is very important and that enrollment should be a concern for all. Maupin noted that straight forward recruitment roles need to be developed.

### External Engagement

Maupin noted that the Chair role may change in this respect. Having clear-cut responsibilities and training is important as well as identifying what is currently being done and what can be improved upon. Maupin added that Chairs will be empowered as departments work together with their Deans and across colleges to identify multidisciplinary opportunities.

Maupin stated that components are not set in stone and welcomed input. Jamie Kennel stated that this is an impressive expansion of Chair duties and asked if there would be an expansion of release time to accommodate the additional responsibilities and if there is a document to compare the old and new department chair roles and responsibilities. Todd Breedlove noted that duties would require much more than 20 hours/week and that .5 release time would not be adequate. Breedlove asked if there was a push to move to half-time or full-time chairs.

Dr. Kuleck reminded all that Dr. Naganathan has mentioned implementing professional chairs with their primary role being strategic planning, visioning and securing resources. Dr. Kuleck believes this makes sense in several instances, especially for larger departments struggling to stay afloat just dealing with operational matters. Dr. Kuleck expressed a need to distribute support for those types of inequities and to revise compensation models.

Dr. Kuleck added that Chairs are not necessarily responsible for doing everything on the list. Primary fundraising will be the Dean responsibility and Chairs will work with them. Dr. Kuleck noted that some items may not be relevant to some departments and that some may be assigned to others within the department. The following suggestions were noted:

- Jeff Hayen – Roles and responsibilities relating to instruction are missing.
- Mark Neupert – External engagement, sponsored projects, grant funding and oversight, adjunct hiring and reviews, and HR duties are missing.
- Dan Peterson – All signatures may not need to fall under Chair duties.

Hallie Neupert stated that although duties and responsibilities are different, Chairs are currently evaluated with the same APE form used for teaching faculty and asked if a separate evaluation form will be developed. Mark Neupert stated that the review process for Chairs is incredibly weak. Mark Neupert recently underwent post-tenure review and was Chair during the entire review period. In the PTR policy, department chair is listed along with scheduling coordinator and program director. Neupert added that although the role of Chair requires a huge amount of time, energy, effort and inspiration, it is evaluated the same as other department faculty. Neupert also noted that departmental development falls under Chair duties, however there is no way to include that on the APE.

Dr. Kuleck agreed that a Chair evaluation process needs to be developed and asked the Council if evaluations should involve teaching, administration or both. Jamie Kennel replied that currently there isn't anything in place where comments make it back to the Chair, identifying strengths and weaknesses. Dr. Kuleck also asked what Deans want to see when evaluating Chairs. LeAnn Maupin stated that evaluating is difficult without a list of expected duties to refer back to.

Dr. Kuleck emphasized the importance of training to aid in Chair success. Dan Peterson agreed that proper, more meaningful training, directed specifically to Chairs is important. Dr. Kuleck reminded all that this is a draft document and asked all to send suggestions and comments to him via email and to copy Dede and Valjean. Dr. Kuleck added that a department chair policy is currently under review at Faculty Senate and that he will share it once available.

Dr. Kuleck stated that his role as Provost is to support faculty and added that a few ways he is doing this is through summer productivity grants, an improved sabbatical leave policy, and incentive startup packages for tenure-track faculty, and added that one of Dr. Naganathan's goals is to develop meaningful mentorship programs.

## **WORKLOAD GUIDELINES**

Dr. Kuleck stated that he would like 9-month faculty to stick to the 36 instructional unit guideline and asked for feedback on how falling under 36 has been addressed in the past and how to address it moving forward.

Ken Usher stated that NSC he has 3 new faculty members this year (2 are in an overload status and one is 2 units short) and that meeting 36 instructional units can be challenging. Mark Neupert added that he can be creative and make additional assignments but wanted clearer guidelines for what is permissible. Neupert asked if it is allowable to give banked release time a faculty member who is short.

Dr. Kuleck replied that although it should not be chronic, being flexible and assigning equivalent projects is important. Dr. Kuleck added that Chairs usually have several projects that need to be done and can be assigned out – making it fair and balanced to other faculty while accomplishing something useful for the department. Hallie Neupert stated that since MGT faculty teach so many online courses, there is flexibility to place an online class in-load if they are short, but noted that this is not in the workload guidelines.

Paula Russell stated that she appreciates the ability to be flexible but also asked for clarification on what is allowable. Russell noted that within DH, there is a great workload inequity for labs – lead instructors have a large amount of responsibility managing all coordination, scheduling, and student experiences, yet they receive the same workload as adjuncts assigned to the lab. Russell asked if an additional workload unit could be assigned to lab managers. Russell also noted that DH labs are 4 hours long rather than 3.

Jamie Kennel stated that as policy is discussed, 12-month faculty need to be better incorporated. LeAnn Maupin replied that the workload guideline is just that, a guideline, not a policy. Maupin noted that the guidelines are outdated and need to be adjusted to fit what is happening now and to ensure equity. Debbie McCollam stated that MIT has a tenured position (36 instructional units) that was replaced with a non-tenured position (45 instructional units) and that trying to find courses to fill workload is problematic. Dr. Kuleck said that he would be happy to meet with McCollam and Maupin to discuss options.

Terri Torres commented that overloads are not paid until summer term. Torres added that at one time, overload didn't kick in until the faculty member reached 39 instructional units, then Brad Burda changed it to 37 instructional units, but that it did not get changed in the workload guidelines. Dr. Kuleck stated that he will look into that.

## INVESTITURE CEREMONY

Dr. Kuleck read the official meaning of ‘investiture’ and stated that relating to universities, investiture ceremonies date back to the middle ages. Dr. Kuleck added that an investiture is symbolic of a new era and the commitment of the university and the new president to work together to achieve a strategic vision. Dr. Kuleck noted that the Board of Trustees will be heavily involved as well as community members and asked for feedback for ideas to encourage student participation, possibly by offering a class substitution or cancelling classes. Hallie Neupert and LeAnn Maupin are helping to coordinate some of the investiture events. Below are events currently listed on the OIT website:

<h3>Schedule of Events</h3>	
<i>Celebrating Student Success</i> Thursday, May 17, 2018	<a href="#">Board of Trustees Meeting</a> College Union 8:00am – 4:00pm <a href="#">Catalyze Klamath Falls Challenge</a> Student Entrepreneurship Event 4:00pm – 7:00pm
Friday, May 18, 2018	<a href="#">Iron Owl Challenge</a> Military Honor Event, Opening Ceremony Snell Hall Lawn 12:00pm – 1:00pm <a href="#">Student Symposium and Open House</a> 2:00pm – 5:00pm
<i>Investiture</i> Friday, May 18, 2018	<a href="#">Platform Party Breakfast</a> Mt. Mazama Room, College Union 9:00am – 10:00am <a href="#">Investiture Ceremony</a> Gymnasium 11:00am – 12:30pm <a href="#">Investiture Reception</a> Crater Lake Complex, College Union 12:30pm – 2:00pm

For the Student Symposium/Open House, Beaudry would like to showcase every program and is currently talking to all departments on how to highlight them via demonstrations and tours. In terms of community engagement, Beaudry stated that Ashley VanEssen is working on PR and that high school students will be bussed to campus. Beaudry added that they will also work with Career Services to help employers attend the Student Symposium and Catalyze Klamath events and that Tracy Ricketts will help connect with alumni and with tours of Cornett Hall. Additional activities happening that week include:

- May 14-18 Spring Fling, sponsored by the Residence Hall Association
- May 15 Faculty/Staff Retirement and Service Recognition dinner
- May 19 Foundation Board Meeting
- May 19 16<sup>th</sup> Annual Taste of Klamath

Kuleck stated that this will be an amazing marketing opportunity with great potential gain. For event updates, go to the OIT homepage click on Investiture. Jamie Kennel stated that this has not been talked about much in Wilsonville. Dr. Kuleck will look into correcting that.

## **DEPARTMENT CHAIR TRAINING**

Department Chair Training is scheduled for March 23, 2018. Dr. Kuleck stated that he and Suzette Yaezenko have been working to schedule the day. Yaezenko is looking to schedule a meaningful event for Chairs and asked all to contact her regarding what types of support and training would be helpful. A draft agenda will be sent early next week. LeAnn Maupin suggested inviting chairs that will start on July 1. Dr. Kuleck invited all Portland-Metro employees to attend in Klamath Falls offered to pay for travel expenses. Dr. Kuleck added that ETM Dean Search interviews will be held the same day and recognized that some individuals may need to come and go as needed to attend both. Dr. Kuleck added that more structured Chair training will happen during convocation.

## **NEXT MEETING**

The Academic Council Retreat/Department Chair Training is scheduled for Friday, March 23, 8:00 am - 5:00 pm. The next regularly scheduled meeting be held Friday, April 13.

The meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Valjean Newsome

# AC Retreat – Chair Training

March 23, 2018

## Attendees:

Debbie McCollam	Hope Corsair	Paula Russell	Grace Rusth
Dawn Lowe-Wincentsen	Tiernan Fogarty	Mark Neupert	Seth Anthony
Barbara Neal/Jesse Sundit	Sean StClair	Dan Peterson	Ken Usher
Troy Scevers/Todd Breedlove	Jack Walker	Jamie Kennel	Adam Wagner
Farooq Sultan	LeAnn Maupin	Claudia Torres Garibay	Gary Kuleck

## **Dr. Kuleck:**

Welcome! Recognition given to how much chairs have to balance, and gave an overview of what would be covered throughout a day.

## **Leading the Academic Department...**

**Suzette:** introduced Dr. Jon Lange (Prof. Emeritus, SOU & Dept. Chair, Comm Dept.)

## **Dr. Jon Lange:**

DC (Dept. Chair) rolls have changed significantly with hard issues being people & personnel, leading & motivating.

Activity: broke into pairs of one speaker and one listener where listener was to show no emotions at all; speaker felt negative emotions; point of exercise to show how critical listening is.

“Leaving anxiety with its proper owners” is one of his favorite phrases, it is important not to take on other people’s problems while still listening and sharing empathy.

He suggests that every moment someone has with you counts, that how you appear and act counts, and that how you are perceived matters...this all helps establish leadership.

“Nothing as practical as a good theory”-Four organizational behavioral theories: Classical, Human Relations, Participative and Culture.

“Expectations” is the source of all conflicts! So, continually be clear and clarify.

Praise: as a DC he suggests to praise often and to pass praise from others along.

Exercise: broke into groups of 3 for 1 person at a time to describe their toughest Dc moment. By sharing experiences, it reassures others and shares useful advice.

Distributed article “The 10 Things I Wish I Had Known When I Became Department Chair” by Higher Ed.

Distributed resources with links to helpful websites for DC role.

### **Exploring & Pursuing Interdisciplinary Opportunities...**

#### **Don McDonnell, Medical Imaging Technology:**

Collaboration leads to more collaboration and better student experiences.

Invited all to attend a simulation on April 13<sup>th</sup> from 1:30-4:00pm—nationwide program of families living in poverty accessing healthcare. Simulations have developed more global viewpoints, teamwork, interaction of students, faculty developing relationships and a higher level of respect for other departments.

When objectives are defined upfront you get better outcome.

Remember the Sweat vs Benefit ratio.

Future ideas:

Stress reduction, including allowing dogs onto campus.

Cultivate a culture of teamwork that may carry over to the workforce.

Small short interactions can be beneficial.

### **Promoting Effective Teaching...**

#### **Dr. Charles “CJ” Riley, Civil Engineering:**

There is a plethora of opportunities to improve teaching!

CCT Annual events

Quarterly Grants

Annual Awards

Excellence in Teaching

Etc.

Lowman’s two dimensional model: Intellectual model and Personal Rapport

There are two approaches to effective teaching: 1. Focus on student learning 2. Focus on teacher performance

Activity: everyone took a look at the literature on student learning to identify w/a partner which items seem to be important, such as: a lot of active learning and engagement feedback; higher levels of cognitive learning; high expectations of learning objectives; trying to meet student preferences of learning styles; and meeting meaningful applications.

## **Managing Departmental Resources...**

### **Stephanie Pope, Budget Office:**

Discussed deciding on structure and which rolls her office and the BAO should do. They are both here to help you manage and plan your budgets by assisting in new program planning and providing FAST training and help.

The Budget Office will eventually build out departmental dashboards for easy financial reference including general funds. They also recently did a workshop about the University budget model.

They sent out Budget Templates for next year to the Dept. Deans that are due back April 6<sup>th</sup>. Hopefully the board will approve budgets at the May mtg.

Suzette asked for feedback on what DC would like additional training on? Gary added that Skills based training will be available in Sept., possibly the creation of models that would allow anytime access.

### **Barbara Neal, Sponsored Projects & Grants:**

Her objective is to make it easy for Depts. To submit proposals for funding.

Federal side: Will guide you through this process to ensure compliance to regulations

State Funds: Regulations are a bit more relaxed

Foundation Funding: Looks to see how the University mission meets the individual Department mission.

SPGA needs a day advanced notification prior to the due date and will need the PI to provide:

- a complete PAF
- a draft proposal
- a budget & justification

SPGA will review and help to insure document accuracy, completeness and compliance.

As DC, reviewing the PAF is important to consider time and cost commitments.

### **Cathy Dyck, Business Affairs Office:**

Collects on student tuition and fees; and deals with disbursements.

She has a large volume of travel and personal reimbursement that she needs DC help with approvals.

Policies & Procedures: Many have not been updated since part of OUS. Trying to streamline, but still have to adhere to regulations. She would be happy to work individually with people.

How to get budget authority set up:

- contact BAO to be set up in Banner
- you will receive a signer letter to be signed.
- once approved you will receive an email listing all the Indexes
- you can electronically approve invoices via web
- year-end is very important, docs sitting in ques are problematic, so please let BAO know if you will be gone.

### **Developing Funds and Friends:**

#### **Krista Darrah and Josh Wetzler, Oregon Tech Foundation:**

April 2<sup>nd</sup> is the extended deadline for Rising Scholar Award and Faculty Achievement Awards

Sole mission is to support the mission of Oregon Tech.

Board of directors oversees

501-C3 entity that can accept donations, non-profit organization.

Funds can sometimes be spent which may be restricted by the university

Funds are protected by being swept by the state

UD is charged with providing financial support of Oregon Tech's mission by connecting individually and organizing with philanthropic opportunities at Oregon Tech

Went over how UD:

- supports OT

- what constitutes a charitable gift

- why every gift makes a difference-would like to foster giving

- how the process works

- ways donors can give

- gift types

- how UD can partner with your Dept.

- way to engage

- Dept funds-donor gifts for your Dept.'s use, how to use them, receiving fund balance reports

### **Essential Studies:**

#### **Seth Anthony:**

Essential Studies Implementation

Discussed the 6 Hats approach

Discussed how to improve Gen Ed reform

Went around the room one-by-one wearing Yellow Hat

Went around the room one-by-one wearing Black Hat

Went around the room one-by-one wearing White Hat

Seth expanded on the Impact analysis report, have we captured the questions and concerns? He will reach out over Spring Term again.

### **Student Engagement:**

#### **Erika Veth, Strategic Enrollment Management**

Video presentation on SEM:

Discussed admissions, retention, the Rock and financial Aide

She is always available to help if anyone needs to reach out to her.

#### **Erin Foley, Student Affairs:**

She did not have a presentation rather she opened it up the attendees to ask questions and give her input on their thoughts and needs. How can Student Affairs help you do your job more successfully?

Most everyone spoke up and pitched to her their thoughts, ideas, concerns of such things like student involvement, parental involvement, students feeling like they have a voice on campus, etc.

She took a lot of notes and reminded everyone that if they think of more to feel free to call her at any time.

### **Optimizing Faculty Time:**

#### **Karen Stone, Southern Oregon University, VP for academic Resource Manager:**

Power Point presentation:

Course budget Planner (projection): Excel spreadsheet of each class with projected number of students and how many classes each faculty is teaching

Release Times: -Chair time

-Grad/Under Grad supervisory

-student advising

-administrative releases

-cancel low-enrolled classes with maybe offering that class every other year or combining Jr's and Sr's

Year Long Scheduling (fluid): Chart is an excellent tool for students understanding it is a fluid chart

Faculty Loading Report (took them 2yrs!): Excel spreadsheet listing Program name / faculty type / course or work load / term: fall, winter, etc. / activity (chair release, etc.) / figure release amount / student to faculty ratio

Their Budget Authority is the Director instead of the Dean

Faculty Accountability: to give activity insight

-faculty submit annually a professional activity self-report

- they do additional reporting for CBA-related provisions
- they have access to the Dept. expectations via the Provost page

### **Managing Faculty and Staff:**

#### **Suzette Yaezenko, Office of Human Resources**

Suzette introduced David Groff, University General Counsel Office.

Briefly went through a few slides on Protected Leave, FMLA, Sexual Harassment, Retaliation Policy, Discrimination, Gifts and O.W.L.

Answered a few questions from the attendees regarding the above items.

### **Start-Stop-Continue Follow-up:**

#### **Jim Jones, Information Technology Services**

Core themes from the “World café” style exercise that happened at AC meeting last fall are:

- Inter-Dept. integration
- Tools and Solutions
- Work Overload
- Tolerance for Risk
- Funding and Resources
- Support Dept.

This exercise created an action item, then assigned an owner, and empowered the owner to make a change.

Today’s exercise: to see how much progress we have made by having everyone put red, green and yellow dot stickers on the displayed lists of the action items from a last Fall’s AC “World Café” exercise to see where everyone believes each action to be standing according to how many and what color of dots are the majority on each item. Discussion regarding those items and why the dot color may have or not have changed.

Meeting adjourned.

Oregon Institute of Technology

ACADEMIC COUNCIL

April 13, 2018

**MINUTES**

Provost Gary Kuleck called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. Academic Council members present were: Seth Anthony, Sharon Beaudry, Lucas Cordova for Todd Breedlove, Tiernan Fogarty, Brian Fox, Jeff Hayen, LeAnn Maupin, Hallie Neupert, Mark Neupert, Jeff Pardy, Christopher Syrnyk for Dan Peterson, Paula Russell, Farooq Sultan, Ken Usher, and Jack Walker. Jamie Kennel, Dawn Lowe-Wincentsen, Dawn Taylor, and Claudia Torres-Garibay joined the meeting remotely. Wendy Ivie, Brian Moravec, and Stephanie Pope were also in attendance and Grace Rusth attended for Marla Edge. Todd Breedlove, Debbie McCollam, Dan Peterson, Sean St.Clair, and Erika Veth were absent.

**BUDGET MODEL REPORT**

Provost Gary Kuleck opened with a reminder that budget templates were sent to Chairs last Friday. While the timeframe has been affected by the creation of a new budget model, Dr. Kuleck stated that he is encouraged that the Chairs are able to participate in the budget setting process.

Stephanie Pope, Budget & Resource Planning Director, gave an overview of the new budget model and began with a bit of background information. Although the model is for the entire campus, Pope stated that she would be focusing on the academic piece. Pope stated that in Fall 2017, the Fiscal Operations Advisory Council (FOAC) was charged with developing a new, more inclusive, transparent budget model. FOAC discussed various budget types, then formed a budget taskforce. Before developing a model, the taskforce developed principles, goals, and a vision, being mindful to align them with those of the Institutional Strategic Plan.

Pope stated that the Budget Office is beginning to roll out the new model and to meet with various constituents. Brian Fox added that as Chairs have been given additional responsibilities, including budgetary pieces, obtaining feedback from the Council is important.

Prior to the meeting, Pope sent the following documents electronically to the Council and distributed hard copies at the meeting:

- *Budget Model Report* (slides for presentation)
- *Budget Model Interim Report* (initial draft)

**Structure**

The taskforce identified the following structured elements, considering the goal and responsibility of each:

- Academic Resources
- Departmental Management
- Equipment
- Strategic Investments
- Other Resources

## **Responsibility**

Pope noted that the model outlines responsibility levels from lowest to greatest and stated that faculty and staff should have an understanding of how the Institution works in general and how their department and various activities affect the budget.

Jamie Kennel voiced concern about responsibility and authority on budgetary matters. Specifically, having responsibility yet not having full authority. Kennel added that the words “control over” are confusing and do not imply that Chairs have authority to spend all of their budgets without consultation with their Dean and Provost. Pope replied that, in terms of budget development, a good model fosters good communication and that Chairs should consult with the Deans. Fox stated that there is a greater push to give much more budgetary authority to Chairs – both direct responsibility and accountability for department funds. Fox agreed that consulting with Deans to determine approval thresholds is good practice, and stated that while budget size is determined in consultation with the Dean and Provost, it is the responsibility of the Chairs to stay within that budget.

## **Adjunct and Overload Management**

Pope stated that the goal is to drive course delivery management and adjunct/overload to the Chair level. Adjunct/overload money has been allocated, with initial amounts figured at 85% of a 3-year average.

## **Gain Sharing/Incentives**

Fox stated that tools are being created to reward departments for cost savings and to departments to build up reserves for larger purchases. Fox added that there is also growth incentive. Tuition revenue produced will be reinvested into departments for faculty development, release time, overload, and travel and will eventually replace the current stipend/release model. Fox stated that the key is to create much simpler reward linkages at the department level, while considering overall institutional needs. LeAnn Maupin stated that service departments delivering required courses should also receive a revenue percentage.

Kennel voiced concern about technical programs that represent loss leaders, stating that the language talks about revenue, incentives and margins, then profitability evaluation rather than a total input evaluation. Fox stated that rather than defining whether a department made or lost money, departments will be rewarded for student credit hour production. Mark Neupert added that some programs are more expensive than others to deliver and the idea is to develop a model to incentivize all programs to improve revenue and efficiencies regarding cost for delivery.

Kennel believes there may be large, branded programs that the University should be willing to accept a loss on with an incentive to thrive, experiment and develop as they benefit all. Fox concurred that there should be rewards and incentives throughout all departments. Knowing the loss leader programs and determining, after all general education courses are considered, if they arrive at a break even. Fox continued that it doesn't mean dropping departments that don't support themselves, but it may offer ways to operate more efficiently and allow the Institution to make decisions. Pope added that more time may need to be spent on this.

Dr. Kuleck stated that the Board is focused on three pieces – increasing net revenue, financial stability, and raising brand awareness. A program that raises brand awareness that is a loss leader may have intangible benefits that are not visible and those programs should be encouraged to continue. Dr. Kuleck added that departments should also explore additional programming opportunities.

## **Library Resources**

Pope stated that departments need to think about specialty resource requests not typically funded by the library. Fox stated that necessary subscriptions should be aligned with the cost of the program. Fox added that this can create a feedback loop and provide an opportunity to identify departments with the same needs, possibly creating cost-sharing incentives. Christopher Syrnyk noted the potential to align with changes in expectations for outward-facing work. Syrnyk added that this is the only University at which he has worked that did not have a subscription to JSTOR. Syrnyk added that JSTOR is his primary research database and what he wants his students to use.

Dawn Lowe-Wincentsen stated that the majority of resources come through Orbis Cascade Alliance and that members receive deep discounts on most aggregates. Lowe-Wincentsen reminded all that library resources, especially electronic, need to be paid for annually or resources go away. Lowe-Wincentsen noted that any time a change is made, affected departments are notified. Sharon Beaudry stated that the librarians are doing an excellent job and provide the Management Department with year-end reports that show how resources, especially databases, are being utilized. Fox noted that some items will be department-level and some college-level but the key will be for Chairs to identify and come together around a suite of needs.

## **Faculty and Staff Development**

Pope stated that professional development resources are currently allocated only to academic departments based on full-time, 1.0 FTE faculty members. The idea is to recalculate this for both the academic and administrative sides based on actual total FTE. Pope added that this will likely result in more money for departments than in the past. Fox commented that part of the goal is to enhance student learning and to recognize creative works. Tying this to the academic side for professional development, determining the goal and using dollars in a linked way.

## **Annual Department Rollover**

Pope stated that the goal is for departments to benefit from a rollover plan that can be counted on every year. Unused salary and OPE would roll back into the general fund and be used for future faculty replacements. Positive S&S rollovers would be split Dean 25%, Department 25%, Provost Opportunity Fund 10%, and Central Reserve Account 40%. Negative rollovers would be netted against Dean carryover funds, incentivizing Deans to ensure that departments are not overspending. Kennel asked how rollover percentages were determined. Pope responded that this is still up for discussion and is not absolute at this point. Mark Neupert stated that the big revenue numbers to watch for will come from tuition sharing.

Pope added that departmental savings accounts (sinking funds) will also be developed to help create an equipment budget reserve. For each department setting up a fund, this becomes a place where dollars can be put for future equipment and other needs. Fox stated that the purpose is to create predictability and for departments that are equipment intensive to save for equipment purchases rather than relying solely on the Provost's Office for funding. Pope stated that a full inventory of current equipment needs to be developed, including the estimated lifecycle of each item. Fox added that the BAO recently asked Chairs to fill out departmental equipment inventory forms and asked that these be taken seriously as this is the starting place for building the equipment budgets.

## **Provost and Dean Strategic Funds**

Pope stated that the goal is to develop funds that allow the Deans and Provost to make quick, tactical decisions on items needing immediate attention without having to go through an approval cycle.

## **FY 19 Budget Buildup**

Pope stated that there are already a few pieces included in the FY 19 budget build at the department level:

- Adjunct and Overload Budgets
- Professional Development Dollars
- Equipment Reserve Funds

Pope believes the new budget model will be implemented in pieces and will likely take 2-3 years to be implemented fully. Pope welcomed all to submit feedback via email.

Maupin stated that by going through the budget exercise the first time, much information will be gleaned regarding cost of departments and what percentages of tuition revues can be put back into departments. Dr. Kuleck added that the budget model is a participatory process and that nothing is static yet. Dr. Kuleck thanked all for their willingness to provide feedback with such a short timeframe.

## **THOUGHTEXCHANGE**

Provost Gary Kuleck announced that a new software program, Thoughtexchange, will be rolled out in the next two weeks. Dr. Kuleck stated that Thoughtexchange allows entire communities to engage in two-way, meaningful, interactive discussions and to make decisions based on that feedback. The initial purpose of the software will be to allow feedback and discussion regarding Gen Ed Reform and the Essential Studies Model. In an effort to obtain broad feedback, Dr. Kuleck is asking Chairs to encourage full faculty participation. Dr. Kuleck invited all to visit the Thoughtexchange website at [www.thoughtexchange.com](http://www.thoughtexchange.com).

## **GOAL #4 – EXTEND ACADEMIC PLANNING**

President Naganathan sent an email to the campus community on 1/3/18, Goals and Short-term Action Plan for 2017 and 2018 Academic Years, which outlined 11 specific goals and named champions/administrative leaders for each. Dr. Kuleck referred specifically to Goal #4:

#4: Extend Academic Planning Part I

Plan for the implementation of our modernized general educational component—Essential Studies—in support of our Essential Student Learning Outcomes (ESLOs) across our diverse programming and student demographics. Also, pilot an Essential Studies Synthesis Experience (ESSE) to expand interdisciplinary opportunities for faculty and students.

Dr. Kuleck stated that since so much work has been done, an ad-hoc taskforce is being formed. Faculty invitations to serve on the taskforce have already gone out and more will go out today or Monday. Dr. Kuleck stated that details on moving forward are outlined in his newsletter. Seth Anthony stated that the goal is not to re-task Gen Ed but to take the concrete product of the Essential Studies model, and to make changes if necessary. Anthony added that he would like to have a refined version of that model, with clear justification behind it, by convocation in the fall and to be able to ensure that it is implementable under current restraints.

## **HOUSE BILL 2998**

Seth Anthony stated that House Bill 2998 passed in the 2017 Regular Legislative Session. The Bill was designed to smooth the transfer of credits to post-secondary institutions statewide without loss of credits. Anthony added that by Fall of 2018, Oregon's 7 universities and 17 community colleges are mandated

to have foundational curricula in place and must contain a minimum of 30 college-level academic credits. Anthony stated that a statewide working group, convened by the HECC, has taken the spirit of the mandate and has crafted a foundational curriculum, building on the past work of the Associate of Arts Oregon Transfer (AAOT) the Oregon Transfer Module (OTM), and the Gen Ed outcomes work done at the state level ten years ago. Anthony referred the following document distributed electronically prior to the meeting:

- *HB2998DraftFoundationalCurriculum-OITCrosswalk - Mar2018*

Anthony stated that on the community college side, when students complete necessary courses, the foundational curriculum will be transcribed. On the university side, our responsibility is to determine how to apply that to degrees.

Mark Neupert asked if this was similar to AAOT where if a student came Oregon Tech for two years and followed the AAOT curriculum, they could transfer fairly seamlessly to another four-year institution. Neupert added that, depending on the major declared, a student may or may not be getting credits in their first year, and asked if it would be required for students to take the courses in their first year. Neupert also asked if the idea is for a student who spends a year at an Oregon college to be able to move a block of classes, adding that for certain programs at Oregon Tech, students won't be accumulating a block of transferrable classes. Tiernan Fogarty asked, if a student leaves, will Oregon Tech be held accountable for the student not completing the entire block.

Wendy Ivie replied that it will not be Oregon Tech's job to transcribe foundational curriculum. Oregon Tech will be receiving not sending. Anthony stated that Oregon Tech is not mandated to provide curriculum that speeds student time, rather we will be required to find places within the entire set of degree requirements to apply them. Anthony added that program blocks may be differently shaped but will be the same size. For example, with an inverted curriculum, Gen Ed is not packed into the first year, but there are still the same number of blocks. Anthony noted that this may also be the foundation for articulation agreements. Anthony added that the second item mandated in the legislation is the Unified Statewide Transfer Agreements, which essentially are statewide articulation agreements from all of the community colleges to all of the universities.

Anthony closed by stating that the purpose of sharing this information is to solicit feedback and encouraged all to contact him with questions.

## **WORKLOAD REPORT UPDATE**

Tiernan Fogarty stated that many courses changed during spring break and asked for an updated workload report to work from. Farooq Sultan responded that because changes are still occurring, he had planned to send updates near the end of spring term and planned to provide individualized reports for each department showing only their department information. However, Sultan agreed to send updates by next week if all were in agreement that no further courses with workload will be added.

Maupin stated that it would be easiest for Sultan to do one data push for course utilization and course enrollment, but that official numbers can't be provided until after Week 4. Sultan stated that he can provide final reports by Week 5 and added that because they will be used to calculate overload payments, Chairs will be asked to sign off to confirm accuracy. Fogarty stated that once received, he would like a few weeks to confer with his department to ensure accuracy.

Mark Neupert stated that over the course of the year, faculty in his department taught several externship courses and asked for the preferred way of listing them. Sultan replied that workload should be listed once with a note referencing the others.

Jeff Hayen commented that it is often difficult to make a determination on which courses to assign overload to and asked if there is a way to roll up a single figure for all classes, subtract 36, and pay overload based on that. Sultan replied that overload needs to be assigned to specific courses for the cost/revenue model. Sultan added that to aid in reaching 36 instructional units, courses can be split. For example, if a faculty member was at 35, a 3-credit course could be split with 1 credit in-load and 2 as overload. Sultan added that the spreadsheet does not yet allow for this but on the final version, it can be added in the comments and adjustments can be made.

For ease of input, Sultan will work to minimize columns viewed. Sultan noted that this was a learning year and discovered that Excel is not the easiest way to handle workload. Next year it will go through Banner via the Registrar's Office.

## **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

### Department Chair Duties

Dr. Kuleck stated that he has received comments and that documents will be updated and shared soon.

### Remaining AC Meetings

Dr. Kuleck stated that after the May 4 meeting, there will be two additional Council meetings to finish out the year that will likely need to be rescheduled due to conflicting campus events. Valjean Newsome will send out a poll with new date options. Dr. Kuleck asked all to respond with their preference quickly.

### Hiring Requests

Dr. Kuleck stated that the time to submit Hiring Requests for Fall 2019 is upon us. Based on Council feedback, the Hiring Request Form will be tweaked and sent out to the group. Dr. Kuleck asked all to be prepared to submit in early May.

## **NEXT MEETING**

The next regularly scheduled meeting will be held Friday, May 4.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Valjean Newsome

Oregon Institute of Technology

ACADEMIC COUNCIL

May 4, 2018

**MINUTES**

Provost Gary Kuleck called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. Academic Council members present were: Nellie Stewart for Seth Anthony, Sharon Beaudry, Tiernan Fogarty, Jeff Hayen, LeAnn Maupin, Hallie Neupert, Mark Neupert, Jeff Pardy, Dan Peterson, Paula Russell, Farooq Sultan, Ken Usher, and Jack Walker. Todd Breedlove, Jamie Kennel, Dawn Lowe-Wincentsen, Dawn Taylor, and Erika Veth joined the meeting remotely. Marla Edge and special guest, Dr. Skip Myers were also in attendance. Seth Anthony, Brian Fox, Debbie McCollam, and Claudia Torres-Garibay were absent.

Dr. Kuleck welcomed all in attendance and introduced special guest, Dr. Skip Myers.

**CAMPUS COMMITTEES**

Dr. Kuleck recognized the importance of many of the on-campus committees. In an effort to reduce workload for faculty and staff, Dr. Kuleck believes it may be possible to reduce the number of committees (combining where possible). Dr. Kuleck will get more information to the Council and asked for all to provide feedback on which committees are viewed as absolutely essential, keeping in mind their impact on faculty development and effective teaching.

**NON-TENURE TRACK (NTT) POLICY REVIEW**

Prior to the meeting, Dr. Kuleck sent the following documents to the Council for review:

- *20-04x Promotion for NT Instructional Faculty.docx*  
(OIT-20-04x, Academic Appointment, Rank and Promotion for Non-Tenure Track Instructional Faculty)
- *ntt proposal draft\_gk edits.docx*  
(Dr. Kuleck's proposed edits to OIT-20-04x)

Dr. Kuleck stated Faculty Senate voted on a NTT policy last year. Over the past few months Dr. Kuleck has had discussions with Faculty Senate. Dr. Kuleck reminded the Council of the importance of timely feedback from impacted constituents and encouraged all to review the document and provide feedback by Friday, May 18 at 5:00 pm, via email to Valjean Newsome. Recommendations will go to President's Council for deliberation and final approval. Dr. Kuleck will serve as Chair of the President's Council.

Ken Usher stated that he did not attend the last Faculty Senate meeting and asked about comments regarding the proposed draft. Dr. Kuleck replied that there was no discussion of modifications. Dr. Kuleck added that Matthew Sleep mentioned that the Rank, Promotion, and Tenure (RPT) Committee was working on a modified version from Senate that will go to President's Council but that it was not yet ready for sharing. Usher stated that he is on RPT and believes their specific intent is to not put forth their version until the first version has been considered by President's Council. Dr. Kuleck replied that per policy, the sponsoring group (Faculty Senate in this case) submits to President's Council, who sends it out to constituents for review, then sends it back to President's Council for deliberation. Jeff Hayen stated that his understanding was that the draft was going to be shared with Senate at their next meeting for an initial look, prior to it going to President's Council. Dr. Kuleck stated that a recommendation will be made to the President this academic year and that Senate will have an opportunity to review the document for final input. Dr. Kuleck added that although President's Council has not met for two and a half years, they will meet in May, then again before the end of the academic year. Dr. Kuleck stated that both the NTT policy and the Department Chair policy will be considered at that time and will include input from all constituents.

*Academic Council Meeting Minutes*

*May 4, 2018*

*Page 1 of 4*

## SHARED GOVERNANCE – DR. SKIP MYERS

Dr. Kuleck welcomed Dr. Myers, who is consulting with various members of the community to discuss shared governance, and asked that he speak briefly on his background and his on-campus meetings.

Dr. Myers stated that he is a recovering college university president with previous positions at a liberal arts institute, two world-wide institutes, a technical engineering institute, and a culinary institute, and that for the past seven years he has been consulting for Casagrande Consulting. Dr. Myers added that as he moved from one institution to another he looked for something radically different and challenging and focused on helping institutions to improve their effectiveness. Dr. Myers commented that he also works with university boards and presidents to help them better align with one another.

During his on-campus visits with individuals and groups, Dr. Myers stated that he found conversations to be very forthcoming and interesting and commented that Oregon Tech is definitely in a place of flux.

Dr. Kuleck has done much reading on the topic of shared governance and stated that one interesting thing he read is that in order for an institution to survive it is necessary for the board, the president, administration, and faculty to work together to effect necessary change. Dr. Kuleck asked Dr. Myers to share his past experience working with institutions who have experienced a lot of change and how he helped to bring that all together.

Dr. Myers stated that if shared governance didn't exist, it would have to be invented. Shared governance is not just a nice thing to have but is an absolute necessity – the bedrock of effective decision-making and absolutely critical in times of change. Dr. Myers added that this is true in stable environments, but even more so in challenging ones. In the country's higher-education ecosystem there are things that can be anticipated and planned for, but there are also the unexpected. Dr. Myers continued that there will be changes impacting the Institution that will require a concerted, collaborative effort of all participants and a shared governance structure that brings the best minds to the table to work collaboratively and appropriately with one another to resolve challenges.

Dr. Myers stated that there are almost 4,000 colleges and universities in the nation and probably 2,000 ways to practice shared governance. Dr. Myers commented that there is no prescriptive formula as to the best practice. Shared governance is situational and needs to align with several things at the institution – culture and traditions, strategic priorities, and the strategic plan. Dr. Myers added that evidence seems to suggest that thresholds for effective shared governance embrace the following seven cultural markers:

- Trust
- Collaboration
- Communication
- Transparency
- Inclusiveness
- Honesty
- Integrity

Dr. Myers concluded that the question often raised is where to start and added that the basic foundational element of these markers is effective, two-way, symmetric communication.

Dr. Kuleck excused himself and Dr. Myers and asked that LeAnn Maupin and Farooq Sultan lead the remaining discussion.

## **WORKLOAD REPORT UPDATE**

Farooq Sultan stated that 4<sup>th</sup> week numbers are ready. Sultan will send each Chair their own department information rather than the entire report, and asked that remaining changes be submitted by May 15. Once finalized, Chairs will be asked to sign off on workload reports. Sultan reminded all that ACP courses will not show up on the report and asked to be notified of any being paid in-load.

Ken Usher inquired how to handle workload for faculty leaving mid-term on medical leave. LeAnn Maupin replied that the faculty member would be paid via the medical leave policy and that the instructor teaching the balance of the courses would receive workload as well.

Jamie Kennel stated that some EMS faculty members teach non-EMS courses and asked whose workload they would show up on. Sultan replied that if marginal workload was submitted by the Chair throughout the year, the faculty member would show up on the department report. Sultan added that he will create a drop-down menu with a “not mine” option to handle exceptions to ensure that courses are not missed.

Sultan commented that the reason for the new workload model is due to problems last year such as CRNs and courses not matching and courses on workload reports that were never taught. Maupin stated that the idea moving forward is to automate – for faculty to be assigned when courses are scheduled and for workload to be automatically generated at the end of the year. Maupin added that this will be helpful at the beginning of the year as well in scheduling an entire year at a time. Sultan stated that this will also benefit students, allowing them to better plan their schedules.

## **ACADEMIC STRATEGIC PLANNING UPDATE**

LeAnn Maupin stated that the last two Academic Council meetings are scheduled for June 1 and June 8 and will include staffing and position requests. Maupin added that prior to then, strategic plans submitted last year will be reviewed. Farooq Sultan will pull actual enrollment to serve as a guide for staffing requests. Maupin added that a hiring template will be sent out by June 1 and that Chairs will have one week to prepare staffing plans which will be discussed on June 8. Maupin continued that the intent is for positions to be approved and for searches to be launched when faculty return in the fall.

Sharon Beaudry stated that ideally, ads would be posted over the summer before faculty return, allowing search committees to dig right in when they return. Beaudry suggested approving positions earlier to allow this to happen and added that the big job push for higher education is in July. Beaudry stated that the applicant pool is greatly reduced by waiting and that the rule of thumb is to be sooner than later in order to get the cream of the crop. Beaudry suggested that all parties involved work to develop and follow a timeline. Beaudry added that from experience, if faculty can be hired prior to leaving for Christmas break, it will be much more successful.

Tiernan Fogarty shared his most recent experience stating that he and the search committee quickly entered all required information into HEROES (within 24 hours). After waiting for 9 weeks, Fogarty inquired as to where the PD was in the process. Fogarty voiced frustration that even if it can be tracked in HEOROES, there is no way to move it along and added that for 9 weeks absolutely nothing had happened. Fogarty questioned whether or not it was realistic that PDs could be approved by June 15.

Maupin stated that Dr. Kuleck’s intent is to have approvals completed prior to summer or shortly thereafter. Once positions are in the system they go to HR, to the Dean, back to HR if edits are made, then to the Provost. Fogarty asked why the Dean approving the ad does not spark immediate advertisement and how the Council can make this suggestion. Mark Neupert asked why the Budget Office would need to weigh in again on the posting if advertising expenses comes from Dean approved budgets,

Maupin replied that the Provost's Office approves the postings and that Dr. Kuleck would like to view each to ensure that they are written in a way to encourage individuals to apply. Maupin stated that after the Provost approves the ad, it goes to Budget, then to Finance again (even on positions that have already been vetted and approved). Maupin believes this may be the hold up. The Council questioned the HEROES routing efficiency. Jamie Kennel stated that departments suffer when other offices delay, requiring fixes such as hiring adjuncts, cancelling courses, and requiring others to work overloads.

Todd Breedlove asked if departments would have to reauthorize for failed searches. Maupin replied that her gut feeling is yes, due to the budget deficits predicted for the next year. Maupin agreed that that HEROES workflow and software glitches need to be reworked and stated that due to a glitch in the system her authorization was temporarily denied. Hallie Neupert had a similar experience where email notifications for PD approvals were not coming through.

Mark Neupert commented that the latest report from FOAC is that there will be a neutral budget realized by salary savings. Neupert continued that he would like to see more accurate forecasting in order to make better planning decision required to innovate and grow and added that Chairs need to feel that there is some freedom to invest in things.

Ken Usher stated that a good number of hires are not preplanned and come up mid-year. Usher asked about developing a process to address this and asked how others are doing this. Mark Neupert stated that he had an instance this spring. Neupert stated that he entered the PD, which is still sitting there, and it is now too late to complete the search this year. Neupert added that the first wait is getting the position approved. The second should only be for advertising, but it becomes an opportunity to again decide whether or not the position is approved, thus progress comes to a grinding halt. Maupin agreed that there should be a written process.

## **NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting will be held Friday, June 1.

The meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Valjean Newsome

Oregon Institute of Technology

ACADEMIC COUNCIL

June 1, 2018

**MINUTES**

Provost Gary Kuleck called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. Academic Council members present were: Sharon Beaudry, Tiernan Fogarty, Jeff Hayen, Debbie McCollam, Dawn Lowe-Wincentsen, Hallie Neupert, Mark Neupert, Jeff Pardy, Dan Peterson, Sean St.Clair, Nellie Stewart for Seth Anthony, Farooq Sultan, Ken Usher, Erika Veth, and Jack Walker. The following individuals attended the meeting remotely: Todd Breedlove, Tina Clark for Paula Russell, Jamie Kennel, Dawn Taylor, and Claudia Torres-Garibay. Lloyd Parratt, was also in attendance. Seth Anthony, Brian Fox, and Brian Moravec were absent.

Due to technical difficulties in Mt. McLaughlin, faculty joining the meeting via Skype were able hear the conversation in Klamath Falls but Klamath Falls was unable to hear them. As a workaround, faculty attending remotely who wished to comment were asked to send a chat message to Dawn Lowe-Wincentsen, who relayed messages to the group.

**HIRING REQUESTS**

Prior to the meeting, Provost Gary Kuleck sent the following document to the Council via email:

- *Faculty Hiring Request Form\_final2\_Acad\_council\_distribution*

Dr. Kuleck stated that since the beginning of the year the goal has been to move the hiring process to its appropriate location; spring term of the preceding year. Dr. Kuleck noted that some departments have ongoing searches and stated that unsuccessful searches will not need to be reauthorized. Dr. Kuleck added that he has been involved in hiring for ETM and LeAnn Maupin for HAS and that the Chairs have been involved in negotiations.

Dr. Kuleck asked Chairs to fill out the *Faculty Request Form 2019-20 Prioritization* and encouraged all to refer to their academic strategic plans to provide economic and strategic justification. Dr. Kuleck added that Farooq Sultan will provide necessary enrollment data by Monday and that forms will be given to PLT for review at the June 8 meeting. Hiring decisions will be announced by June 15. Dan Peterson noted that the form does not provide a place to distinguish between tenure-track and non-tenure-track and asked how to provide justification. Dr. Kuleck asked all to make a note on the form, adding that it will be updated for next year.

Dr. Kuleck stated that providing economic and strategic rationale is critical – if enrollment is dropping but program courses need to be taught, non-tenure-track positions would be offered. Dr. Kuleck added that in an effort to align with tenure-track positions for promotion, non-tenure-track positions were changed to 3-year renewable positions this year and will move to 4-year renewable positions beginning next year.

Ken Usher inquired about abrupt faculty departures and having a process in place to fill such positions on short timeframes. Dr. Kuleck stated that he has seen many unplanned departures since he arrived and that the approval process to fill those positions has been and will continue to be abbreviated. Dr. Kuleck encouraged all to use the same form for these instances and stated that PLT will expedite those requests.

## WORKLOAD REPORT UPDATE

Farooq Sultan reminded all that overload will be calculated from workload reports submitted by the Chairs and stated that his office will not be checking numbers for accuracy. Sultan has assigned workload to all but 14 courses (ACAD and ALH prefixes) which will be sent to the Deans for review. Sultan added that there were a lot of changes at the end of the term – changes that should have been made at the beginning of the term such as adding and removing instructors. Sultan thanked all for their work in compiling the information.

Several suggestions were made for an improved process next year. Mark Neupert would like clearer instructions for externships. Neupert stated that Christopher Syrynk is teaching Honors Program courses that are listed under HSS but are overseen by the Provost. Neupert asked that overload pay not come from HSS. Ken Usher suggested an in-load or out-of-load option for non-instructional workload. Sultan agreed, adding that a drop-down menu would be ideal.

## FACULTY WORKLOAD GUIDELINES

Prior to the meeting, Dr. Kuleck sent the following documents to the Council via email:

- *18-19 Workload Guidelines\_Final2*
- *Proposed Online Workload Guidelines\_draft3\_ev*

### General Guidelines

Dr. Kuleck went over proposed workload guideline changes and asked all to provide feedback by next Friday:

- Non-tenure Track Appointment (Professional Track) – added.
- Instructional Load – updated thresholds.
- Course Prefixes – updated.
- Graduate Course Workload - increased workload distribution. Sean St.Clair stated that the language (*3 term, 3 credit sequence with one student = 4.5 WLU*) is confusing and may be interpreted as one credit each term making up a three-credit sequence over three terms rather than the intended three credits per term over a three-term sequence. Dr. Kuleck agreed and charged St.Clair with providing clearer language.
- Minimum Class Size Standards
  - Chairs to work in consultation with the Dean to determine workload assessment for courses with less than 10 students enrolled.
  - Removed the word *waiver*.
  - Removed the words *and/or independent study*.
  - For clarification, changed  $\frac{3}{4}$  and  $\frac{1}{2}$  pay to read  $\frac{3}{4}$  and  $\frac{1}{2}$  class workload.
- Overloads – updated nine-month contract language.

### Online Guidelines

Erika Veth announced that she has recently worked to draft the first ever online workload guidelines. Veth added that the guidelines have been vetted through the Faculty Welfare Committee, the Faculty Compensation Committee, and the Budget Office. Veth added that the Online Learning Advisory Council (OLAC) is also working on a set of quality standard guidelines as a policy proposal that will be submitted to Faculty Senate in the fall. Veth stated that the goal of the guidelines is to promote financial equity and to facilitate a positive impact on faculty welfare and student access and is hopeful that it will provide an opportunity to hire more people to teach online. Veth stated that while working on the guidelines she tried

to think of all possible scenarios at Oregon Tech. Veth briefly went through the document and asked for Council feedback.

Sean St.Clair noted that 1. Online-only, 1.0 FTE states what happens when teaching additional workload but that the same is not noted in 2. On-campus 1.0 faculty, teaching online courses in-load. St.Clair suggested adding the same verbiage to #2 if they are to be separate processes. St.Clair stated that for faculty members teaching totally online that choose to teach an on-campus course, the language should be clarified to reflect that the in-person course will be paid at the adjunct rate.

There was discussion of out-of-load work being considered a separate contract and the moonlighting policy having a cap of 20 percent. St.Clair asked how 20% of 12 WLU per term (36 WLU per year) is equal to 6 and asked for clearer language. Veth stated that the goal is to be able to teach one class out-of-load per term. It was suggested to clearly state the number of courses rather than credits and to have an either/or statement since class credits can vary greatly. It was decided to move away from workload unit and toward student credit hours or course and to define that further. This would allow faculty to teach multiple courses with only 1 or 2 students enrolled. Veth agreed to work on the changes.

Veth stated that although these are currently guidelines and not policy, it is a starting place for providing some structure. Veth added that the guidelines will be phased in and is hopeful that they will go before Faculty Senate to become policy. Veth stated that when students graduate it is expected that the online courses have the same rigor as the on-campus counterpart. However, there is no mechanism currently in place to promote better course quality or to remove a faculty member who is not doing a good job. Veth stated that teaching a large number of online out-of-load classes is not only about class quality but is also about faculty bandwidth. Veth stated that doing too much may affect ability to push department strategic goals.

There was discussion of who should review course rigor. Mark Neupert stated that Chairs should be paid extra if they are required to review outside jobs. Veth commented that OLAC discussed the possibility of paying a stipend to a faculty member within the department who has received online review course training. Neupert suggested having a full-time online faculty member review the courses as part of their departmental service.

Dan Peterson commented that summer should be a time to flourish yet many of the 100 and 200-level courses are not full. Peterson added that it seems really unfair and bad for the University to not have on-campus, face-to-face classes and fears that as more faculty teach online, fewer on-campus courses will be offered. Veth agreed and stated that having all courses online also forces students to pay online prices. Peterson would like to find a way to encourage on-campus classes and to see summer faculty compensated fairly. Fogarty stated that compensation for faculty in his department has been poor, adding that classes with less than 11 students receive less than adjunct pay.

Tiernan Fogarty stated that for the past 15 years the Mathematics Department has taught 10-12 on-campus math classes. This year they offered 0. Fogarty added that as soon as online offerings were available, on-campus enrollment was cut in half. Veth replied that there have been a lot of student and parent complaints about not having on-campus options this summer. Veth stated that many courses could be filled with adjuncts if there is demand but departmental faculty do not want to teach. Veth added that this is an opportunity for Dr. Kuleck to support hiring more online faculty and to build up an adjunct pool.

Dr. Kuleck asked for Council input on how to create a vibrant, sustainable, on-campus summer presence to include courses, food options, and various events. Farooq Sultan suggested cross-listing courses to allow faculty to receive online pay.

## **NEXT MEETING**

The last meeting for this academic year will be held Friday, June 8. Light refreshments will be provided at both locations.

The meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Valjean Newsome

Oregon Institute of Technology

ACADEMIC COUNCIL

June 8, 2018

**MINUTES**

Provost Gary Kuleck called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. Academic Council members present were: Tiernan Fogarty, Jeff Hayen, Aja Bettencourt-McCarthy for Dawn Lowe-Wincentsen, Debbie McCollam, Brian Moravec, Hallie Neupert, Mark Neupert, Lloyd Parratt, Dan Peterson, Paula Russell, Farooq Sultan, Ken Usher, Erika Veth, and Jack Walker. The following individuals attended the meeting remotely: Todd Breedlove, Hope Corsair, Jamie Kennel, Dawn Taylor, and Claudia Torres-Garibay. Eric Johnson, Director of Admissions, attended a portion of the meeting. Seth Anthony, Sharon Beaudry, Brian Fox, LeAnn Maupin, Jeff Pardy, and Sean St.Clair were absent.

Eric Johnson, Director of Admissions, introduced himself and gave a brief overview about his background and his admissions vision. Johnson stated that he would like to break away from standard admissions criteria. Johnson believes it important to adopt an admissions process that aligns with our polytechnic mission and is STEM focused, and stressed bringing in students that are a good fit and likely to graduate. Johnson then introduced his three strategic principles and stressed the following:

1. *Over-Communicate*

Messaging the right population at the right time and using market segment analysis to drill down to high school clusters and educational neighborhoods.

2. *First-in-Box*

Making the first impression. As a state, Oregon is slow to enrollment management. Our flagship institutions are slow to the admission game and are not cranking out decisions quickly. Being the first to email and voice inboxes will allow us to make a positive impression. With the technical capacity and staffing, current manual processes could be automated.

3. *Plus-One Service Approach*

Finding the plus-one approach where we can make a difference. Winning on the visit every single time and taking personalization to the next level. In a competitive marketplace, we need to wow the students. Recruiting to retain, identifying in and out-of-state STEM high schools, and doing our absolute best with every student interaction.

Johnson spoke of looking at quantitative market data, identifying which students we want, and aligning search strategies to funnel students into appropriate programs. Johnson stated that we have lost market share. In 2001 Oregon Tech brought in over 700 freshmen – in Fall of 2017 there were only 312. Johnson added that we must market ourselves better to the right offices, streamline processes, and take bold steps in new directions. The Admissions Office is currently working on data clean-ups in an effort to function more effectively and efficiently. Johnson added that he has made several trips to Wilsonville and plans to align efforts at Portland-Metro with Klamath Falls.

**HIRING REQUESTS**

Provost Gary Kuleck thanked those who have submitted requests for next year and urged all who are not finished to get them in as soon as possible. PLT will review them next week and would like to complete the process by the end of the academic year. Dr. Kuleck added that the goal will be to have ads out as early as

possible next fall to hit the heavy faculty recruiting season. Dr. Kuleck noted that there are several ongoing faculty searches and that there will be a number of international faculty joining us next year. Dr. Kuleck stated that incentives such as start-up and travel money have been negotiated for the first time and thanked the Chairs who have diligently participated in the hiring process.

## **FACULTY WORKLOAD GUIDELINES**

At the last meeting, Dr. Kuleck outlined updates to the Faculty Workload Guidelines and invited all to send additional comments and suggestions via email. Topics addressed are as follows:

- Graduate Course Workload – Modified language for clarity.
- Instructional Load – Clarified time in which overload kicks in for 9-month faculty.
- Non-tenure Track Appointment (Professional Track) – Clarified the professional track role.

A number of Chairs pointed out that there are a relatively small number of non-tenure track positions open and that teaching loads are lighter than the professional track. Dr. Kuleck stated that there will be no change to guidelines next year. However, in the future, non-tenure track faculty will be transitioning into the new professional track. Dr. Kuleck added that the multi-year renewable aspect of the professional track for new faculty will provide a path to promotion that is not currently present with fixed-term.

Dr. Kuleck added that there were questions regarding overload and out-of-load distributions – 9-month faculty occurring at the end of the year and 12-month faculty being paid quarterly. Dr. Kuleck stated that he would like to address this in the future but will keep it the same for this year. Dr. Kuleck recognized that the guidelines do not spell out every possible scenario and is willing to work with Chairs on special circumstances.

## **RELEASE-TIME/STIPEND ALLOCATIONS & WORKLOAD**

Provost Kuleck announced that that Stipend Release and Workload Overload calculations are almost complete. Dr. Kuleck thanked the Chairs for their workload efforts this year and gave special thanks to Farooq Sultan for the tremendous amount of work that he did.

## **PROPOSED ONLINE WORKLOAD GUIDELINES**

From discussion at the last meeting, Erika Veth stated that she updated the Proposed Online Workload Guidelines to incorporate Council suggestions and added examples of acceptable out-of-load online courses per term. Veth then presented the document to Faculty Senate and incorporated those suggestions as well. Prior to the meeting, Veth shared the most current document with the Council:

*Proposed Online Workload Guidelines\_draft4\_ev.docx*

Veth stated that this document is rather historic and includes opportunities to teach online in-load and provides guidelines to do so. Jamie Kennel commented that clarification to the examples may be needed to ensure that 20% includes *all* moonlighting endeavors. Mark Neupert stated that retired faculty members teaching online courses are limited to teaching fewer than 100 students per year to stay in PERS compliance and suggested that state moonlighting guidelines be used as a benchmark.

Veth stated that the Online Learning Advising Committee (OLAC) drafted a set of standards to address course quality topics such as peer review, communication, proctoring, and oversight of blended courses. Veth would like to see the standards go through Faculty Senate and become policy. Veth commented that workload guidelines, in conjunction with standards, would provide stability for online growth and help to make arguments for new hires.

Jamie Kennel cautioned about online and face-to-face classes having two separate sets of quality evaluation standards and asked why online courses are not currently evaluated as face-to-face courses are. Veth replied that faculty are evaluated on contracted work and that online courses are not part of normal contracts. Kennel commented that the guidelines are volume driven with the assumption that if the quantity is too high then the quality must be slipping. Fogarty stated that quantity seems to be a side issue and added that if the quality is there it would be best to focus on that and not limit the number of courses. Veth stated that this is a guideline and that specific circumstances can be considered by the Chair.

Dr. Kuleck agreed that next year this should be addressed via Faculty Senate and that quality should be the driving factor. Dr. Kuleck added that if online delivery is good, students get a great educational experience. Veth thanked all for their input and will considerate it for further revisions.

### **CURRENT STUDENTS – NO ADVISOR LISTED**

Dr. Kuleck stated that Barb Conner recently sent an email to Chairs and faculty advisors listing about 900 students who have not yet registered for fall term. Dr. Kuleck urged Chairs to work with their departments to be sure all students are registered. Ken Usher requested that advising coordinators also be included in those emails. Deb McCollam commented that MIT requires students to apply before they are admitted – they are in the system but are listed as transfer students. McCollam added that a good majority of pre-MIT students are waiting to see if they are selected. Erika Veth would like to see a transfer advisor position added to reach out to students in those circumstances and to explain options.

### **SURVEY**

Dr. Kuleck stated that he hopes to have a survey out to the Council by the end of next week regarding the past year – things that have worked well and those that might be improved upon. One change that Dr. Kuleck would like to make for next year is to embed skills-based training throughout the year.

### **PLANNING FOR NEXT YEAR**

Dr. Kuleck briefly touched on the following:

#### Processes & Procedures

Dr. Kuleck would like to look at how to handle a myriad of tasks – looking for ways to automate and make things easier, and creating dashboards for Chairs.

#### Policies

Dr. Kuleck wants Chairs to weigh in – some policies addressed this year were the Department Chair & NTT.

#### Programs

Dr. Kuleck would like to streamline the Approval to Proceed process. Dr. Kuleck asked how Academic Council might play a role in exploring new programs presented to Graduate Council and CPC and if the Council is comfortable looking at programs proposed by other departments and providing feedback. Dr. Kuleck stated that some of the best opportunities lie at interdisciplinary interfaces and added that the Council could provide great insight. Ken Usher suggested that if the Council does get more involved in making recommendations, that it happen in parallel with something else.

Dr. Kuleck would like to see a basic fundamental description of a program under consideration presented to both administrative and academic sides for review. This would provide a good solid outline of what a program might look like without investing large amounts of time in data collection.

Dan Peterson stated that from a Board perspective, financial aspects are important but the largest issue has been timing. Peterson commented that proposals need to get into the hands of the Board in an appropriate way and that timing needs to be effective enough so that the department can move forward. Peterson added that decisions need to be fast enough to be able to strike while the iron is hot – if the process takes too long, the opportunity may be gone.

Dr. Kuleck stated that he would like to have a clear-cut process in place with a market analysis and financial analysis that can be presented to the Board for input before it is sent to Graduate Council or CPC. Dr. Kuleck added that in order to put it on the Graduate Council or CPC dockets, it really needs to happen early fall term.

Provost Kuleck thanked all for their hard work this academic year.

The meeting adjourned at 3:38 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Valjean Newsome