

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.

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