

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