

Oregon Institute of Technology

ACADEMIC COUNCIL RETREAT

November 16, 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, Tiernan Fogarty, Wendy Ivie, MariaLynn Kessler, Veronica Koehn, Debbie McCollam, Brian Moravec, Jeff Parady, Lloyd Parratt, Dan Peterson, Paula Russell, Farooq Sultan, Terri Torres for Matthew Sleep, Sean St.Clair, Ken Usher, and Jack Walker. Steve Addison, Abdy Afjeh, Hope Corsair, Dawn Lowe-Wincentsen, Maureen Sevigny, Dawn Taylor, Erika Veth, and Adam Wagner attended remotely. Stephanie Pope and Harmony Stobaugh also attended a portion of the meeting. Tom Keyser, LeAnn Maupin, and Matthew Sleep were absent. Roger Lindgren, Hallie Neupert, and Mark Neupert are on sabbatical and will join remotely when able.

Due to technical difficulties in Mt. McLoughlin, those connecting via Skype were able to hear and see but Klamath Falls was unable to hear them. As a workaround, comments were sent and relayed via Paul Titus.

BUDGET PLANNING UPDATE

Prior to the meeting, the following document was sent to the Council: *Academic Counsel 11.6.18*. Stephanie Pope went over key items for Chairs to consider for the FY20 budget build process. Pope stated that in January budget templates will be distributed via SharePoint and Deans and Chairs will help determine access privileges. Pope stated that templates will be due late February to allow the Budget and Planning Office (BPO) time to review and make adjustments. Pope continued that campus constituents will review budgets in April to prepare for Board review and approval in May. Pope added that the BPO plans to have budgets available by July 1.

Pope stated that all Chairs should have access to FAST and suggested those who do not request access right away in order to participate in training. Pope added that the following trainings will be available in December and January and that the BPO will visit Portland-Metro in early January to offer the same. The BAO plans to provide training to Seattle faculty via Skype.

Fast Finance Training

- Dec. 5 11:30-12:15
- Dec 12 1:00-1:45
- Dec. 17 2:30-3:30 Reserved for Department Assistants
- Dec. 19 3:00-3:45

Budget Basics

- Dec. 13 1:00-2:00
- Jan. 3 9:00-10:00

Budget Building

- Dec. 20 10:00-11:00
- Jan. 3 1:00-2:00

As the Board must approve all spending, Pope stressed the importance of including all items (including future needs) in the budget build. Usher asked if the current Stipend/Release Model will continue next year. Provost, Gary Kuleck stated that the model will likely be used again for FY20 and that Deans will work closely with Chairs. Pope stated that BPO would prefer that Stipend/Release be completed in Dec./Jan. and be built into the budget. Usher commented that the amount available to allocate in the program related portion relies on numbers that Chairs do not have. Dr. Kuleck replied that this will be discussed at the Dec. 7 meeting.

Dr. Kuleck stated that the equipment request form used last year will also be used again this year and will be discussed at the Dec. 7 meeting. Dr. Kuleck would like the awards process to be completed prior to the budget build. Pope stated that eventually an inventory of all major equipment will be done to help Chairs determine lifecycle and replacement costs. McCollam voiced concern that saved equipment funds would be swept. Pope acknowledged the historical distrust and stated that the budget build is a planning document rather than a promise and that President Naganathan and the Board have final control over budgets. Dr. Kuleck commented that he will do his very best to ensure that does not happen and that he and the Deans will proactively look for ways to help. Dr. Kuleck added that Jim Jones will attend the Dec. 7 meeting to discuss the orderly replacement of computers.

Seth Anthony inquired about Zero Base Budget Build. Pope replied that it is a review process to allow departments to make sure they are being properly budgeted and funded. Pope stated that because it is a lot of work, departments will be on a rotating cycle of every 4-5 years and added that two departments (EERE & MMET) will participate this year.

HEROES TRAINING

Harmony Stobaugh, HR Consultant, asked all to bring laptops to participate in some general training. Stobaugh stated that the position description is always the starting point for recruitment and that once in the system, a new posting can be created. Stobaugh walked all through the posting process via the test site and suggested saving the test link to use as a hands-on practice/learning tool. Stobaugh stated that all staff positions descriptions are now in HEROES and the goal is to eventually have all faculty positions as well.

Sharon Beaudry suggested using the position description process for position approvals in the spring. Tiernan Fogarty stated that last year after a position was approved it took 9 weeks to get the advertisement posted. Dr. Kuleck commented that last year HEROES was a new process and items were held up with individuals often unaware their approval was needed. Dr. Kuleck added that this year all are more familiar with the process and can be more vigilant in making sure things happen. Stobaugh stated that HEROES provides a level of transparency and that Chairs can view where documents are at all times.

Todd Breedlove stated that he posted a position description and can see that it has been sitting in Budget for 6 days. Stobaugh suggested reaching out to the BPO to inquire if anything can be done to expedite as there is likely information they need. Dr. Kuleck asked that he be copied on requests as he will help to expedite. Stobaugh added that the adjunct system is not currently set up and to contact her directly with requests.

INNOVATION GRANTS PROGRAM

Prior to the meeting, the following document was sent to the Council and hard copies were distributed at the meeting: *Innovation Grants Fund2 – Power Point*. Dr. Kuleck stated that Dr. Abdy Afjeh has developed the following guidelines to support faculty research. Dr. Afjeh walked the Council through each of the following slides:

Slide 1 – Program Goals

- Promote and support faculty research and innovation
- Foster integration of research and education
- Invest in leading research and highly innovative ideas to raise university research productivity and to help bring together leading research and business to address industrial and societal challenges
- How?
 - Through a new competitive strategic seed fund program that will (1) support high quality research and innovation, (2) faculty research development, and (3) help grow supply of research and innovation talent

Slide 2 – Grant Objectives

- Grants Expected Outcomes
 - New research areas/programs/capacity
 - New community/industry/business partnerships engaging students and faculty
 - New collaborative interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary programs
- Metrics
 - New proposal submissions to external funding agencies, and/or
 - New external partnership relations/commitments
 - Presentation at professional conference/meeting and/or publication

Slide 3 – Available Funding and Timeline

FUNDING OPPORTUNITY INFORMATION FOR INVESTIGATORS	
Total Grant Funds	up to \$50,000; each proposal up to \$5,000
RFP Date	January 1, 2019
Submission Due Date	April 1, 2019
Awards Date	April 30, 2019
Project Duration	December 30, 2019

Slide 4 – Eligibility Guidelines

- All Oregon Tech full-time faculty and staff are eligible to apply
 - Adjunct faculty may participate as co-investigators
 - Students are not eligible to submit proposals as PI but can participate by serving as research assistants to faculty members or co-investigators
 - Individuals unaffiliated with OIT are not eligible to receive grant funds but can participate in projects.
- Proposals will not be accepted after deadline and be returned without review

Slide 5 – Proposal Review Process

- Panel Review
 - Faculty committee will review and recommend funding
 - Funding decision by APRAA & Provost
- Place-based approach to research and innovation support
 - Support research strength in multiple campuses
 - Support significant regional engagement/partnerships

Slide 6 – Review Criteria

- Review Criteria
 - Intellectual merit of the proposed activity (scientific, engineering, healthcare, social, economic, educational significance)
 - Creativity
 - Potential impact on region
 - Effect of the activity on the research capacity and/or research infrastructure of Oregon Tech
 - Achievable proposal outcomes within timeline and budget
 - Long-term goals of the proposal and why they matter

Slide 7 – Proposals

- Full Proposals
 - Maximum of 10 pages, including a two-page biosketch of principal investigator (if more than one, additional pages are allowed, no more than two pages for each additional investigator)
 - Must contain project objectives and address the review criteria
 - Must address qualification of investigator(s)
 - Include amount of funding requested and justification
 - Provide sufficient information with thoroughness and clarity of an article to enable reviewers to evaluate the proposal

- Electronic submission required

Slide 8 – Awards

- Awards
 - Grant funds will be available immediately after awards accepted by principal investigator
 - Grant funds may be expended in accordance with the approved requested budget
 - No-cost extensions not granted as a rule
 - Renewals are not permitted

Slide 9 – Deliverables

- Deliverables
 - A detailed final report on activity that also articulates how proposed work has led to new proposal(s) to external funding agencies, development of new collaborations, regional engagements, and publication of research papers, if applicable.
 - A plan for future scope of research engagement that captures continued faculty research development and integration of proposed activity with educational programs
 - Presentation of project accomplishments at a major professional conference or to OT faculty in AY2019-2020

Slide 10 – Next Steps

- Review awardees' accomplishments, research ideas generated and project outcomes
- Determine needed improvements on process and/or objectives
- Assess program challenges, resource constraints and return on investment
- Recommendations to Provost for next funding cycle

MariaLynn Kessler stated that she does not see IRB approval in the proposal requirements and is concerned about time constraints. Dr. Afjeh replied that during the proposal development process, the PI should contact the IRB committee to ascertain if a review will be required should the award be granted. Dr. Afjeh added that he has volunteered to be an IRB observer and has been included in IRB communications. Dr. Afjeh is hopeful that this process will assist in not overloading the IRB with projects that may not materialize.

Dr. Kuleck commented this is a very exciting time to develop proposals, adding that there are many faculty doing great things. Dr. Kuleck stated that he envisions these funds being a springboard to engage students, industry, and the community. Dr. Afjeh added that the idea is to collaborate and team build with the outside world and that through these projects he is hopeful that contacts will be made to participate in multi-organizational proposals to obtain grants for equipment and infrastructure purposes.

Seth Anthony commented, in thinking about what role research plays in fulfilling our core mission as an educational institution, this is a prime opportunity to shape that. Anthony added that he is pleased to see (in the deliverables sections) how projects have an impact on the educational activities of the University. Dr. Afjeh agreed that this is an important part of the evaluation and stated that in addition to deliverables, the integration of research work is also in the criteria.

Terri Torres stated that colleagues of hers working at research institutions do not teach the load that she teaches. Torres added that while she appreciates the opportunity, \$5K it is not a lot of money and is not meant to buy faculty out of a teaching load. Dr. Kuleck replied that if faculty receive funding to develop a proposal, there might be opportunities to negotiate.

Dr. Afjeh added that Chairs will have greater workload flexibility and can decide on appropriate release time allocations to participate in these activities as they consider the objectives of the department. Dr. Afjeh added that ultimately the work will be used to benefit the program in terms of educational opportunities for students, enhancing laboratories and infrastructure, and connections that will allow students to be placed both as interns and in jobs after graduation.

YEARLONG SCHEDULING DISCUSSION

Dan Peterson thanked all for the time spent submitting yearlong reports and encouraged those who have not to do so. Peterson stated that it is important to discuss challenges specific to each department and to have an awareness of what other departments are doing in order to identify where issues exist. Peterson asked that all come to the Dec. 7 meeting prepared to discuss current issues and creative solutions for: classes that students are having a hard time getting into (possibly offering hybrid classes or offering classes every other year), workload demands (possibly banking workload), and staffing low-enrollment courses.

Ken Usher stated that it may be difficult to have a participatory conversation with such a large group and suggested having discussions within colleges. Peterson agreed that it may be helpful for conversations to begin at the college level and added that, especially for general education courses, it might be helpful to have a larger group discussion.

Tiernan Fogarty asked what problems we are trying to fix and how it affects the entire group. Veronica Koehn stated that in COM there are courses with incredibly long wait lists. Koehn added that having conversations that may uncover problematic areas such as several departments requiring the same course in the same term may allow for corrections to be made. Sharon Beaudry inquired about software to handle this. Wendy Ivie replied that after the Banner 9 upgrade is complete, Degree Works will be delivered and will provide a lot of the data analysis capability.

Peterson stated that as documents move through CPC, departments are asked to reach out to departments, especially general education departments, to considering the impact the changes may have. Peterson continued that much of the issue may simply be awareness, adding that if data can be produced, use it, but often we have data and do not take time to utilize it.

Maureen Sevigny stated that online needs to be considered as well in terms of capacity and need. Veth stated that although offering classes each term with 3-4 students enrolled benefits some students, intentional, more thoughtful planning would be a better approach. Veth continued that each year she surveys online students and each year there are students who are angry that they had to take a course online. Veth added that some students take courses online because on-campus courses are not available when they need them. Sevigny stated that students also go elsewhere to take courses for the same reason. Usher noted that students are often unhappy about taking online courses during the summer as fewer on-campus classes are offered.

Peterson asked Chairs to send thoughts via email to Paul Titus who will compile the information prior to the next meeting to allow for a more focused conversation.

Dr. Kuleck stated that in the future he would like to hold AC meetings only when needed and to utilize them for trainings and items that need to cross over from the colleges. Dr. Kuleck recognized that all are busy with departmental and college meetings and added that he does not want to burden Chairs unnecessarily.

NEXT MEETING

The next Academic Council meeting is scheduled for Friday, Dec. 7, 2018.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Valjean Newsome