Oregon Institute of Technology

ACADEMIC COUNCIL
December 7, 2018

MINUTES

Provost Gary Kuleck called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. Academic Council members present were: Seth Anthony, Sharon Beaudry, Phil Howard for Todd Breedlove, Tiernan Fogarty, Wendy Ivie, Tom Keyser, Veronica Koehn, Jeff Pardy, Dan Peterson, Elizabeth Wells for Paula Russell, Matthew Sleep, and Ken Usher. Steve Addison, Abdy Afjeh, Hope Corsair, MariaLynn Kessler, Dawn Lowe-Wincentsen, Debbie McCollam, Maureen Sevigny, Dawn Taylor, Erika Veth, and Adam Wagner attended remotely. Jim Jones and Tracy Ricketts also attended a portion of the meeting. Todd Breedlove, LeAnn Maupin, Brian Moravec, Lloyd Parratt, Paula Russell, Sean St.Clair, Farooq Sultan, and Jack Walker were absent. Roger Lindgren, Hallie Neupert, and Mark Neupert are on sabbatical and will join remotely when able.

UNIVERSITY ADVANCEMENT

Tracy Ricketts presented a slideshow and gave an overview of the Oregon Tech Foundation. Ricketts stated that the Foundation is the charitable partner for the University and has net assets of about $29M. Ricketts handed out the following document and reviewed it with the Council, outlining efforts on the current $4M campaign.

Campaign for the Future

Programs – $750,000
    An Owl's Worth – Fiscal Literacy Program
    Student & Faculty Innovation Fund
    Rural Communities Development Fund

Projects – $3,100
    Engineering Complex: New Center for Excellence in Engineering & Technology & Cornett Hall Renovation
    Equipment & Technology

People – $150,000
    Oregon Tech Merit Scholarship Program
    Society of Scholars
    Staff Innovation Award

Ricketts stated that to date $3.4M has been raised, adding of that, most came from major donors – $3.3M in donations of $10K or more, and $3.2M in donations of $25K or more. Ricketts stated that mailings and phone calls can be effective, however, if the University is not purposefully seeking major donors, departments will not receive major gifts. Ricketts explained the process for obtaining major gifts as follows, adding that it involves a lot a work and strategy:

- Identifying donors – making sure they are philanthropic and have an interest
- Relationship building and engagement – speaking with donor, tours, meetings
- Matching needs and interests – Each department sending Development a list of needs
- Asking for the gift – typically requires several weeks of follow-up with many individuals involved including leadership
- Holding meetings to ensure all are consistent on talking points

After the gift has been given:
- Telephone calls to thank them
- A personal meeting with leadership
- Inviting donor for a tour to see what they have funded
- Using the gift as it was intended, in the timeframe requested
- Reporting back, gaining donor trust to qualify for future gifts

Ricketts stated that at any given time, Development is working on several projects with many individuals and is in various stages of the process. Ricketts stressed that because of this, it is important to touch base with Development prior to reaching out to contacts as initiatives are often underway that can be identified to ensure that all are on the same page.

Ricketts stated that Development is available to assist departments with the following:
- Identifying alumni to serve on IAC boards
- Helping with alumni events – setting up online registrations, providing nametags and freebies
- Identifying donors and creating strategies for priority projects

Provost Gary Kuleck commented that alumni cultivation is a continuous process starting as students. Dr. Kuleck asked if there is a plan to expand efforts. Ricketts replied that this generally starts with faculty and added that there are events happening to help build philanthropy amongst students such as Philanthropy Awareness Week. Ricketts stated that the next investment will be hiring a Development Officer for ETM. Dr. Kuleck stressed the importance of keeping alumni engaged and tied to the University as they develop their careers. Ricketts stated that Development publishes a monthly newsletter and asked Chairs to forward content to be included.

COMPUTER REPLACEMENT PLAN

Jim Jones stated that he has developed a University-wide computer replacement program and presented a slideshow. Jones added that computers should be replaced on a regular basis – every 4 years for laptops and every 5 years for desktops and that the current average replacement on the Klamath Falls campus (laptops and desktops) is 6.5 years and Portland-Metro is 4.2 years.

Jones stated that the current model is unsustainable with many faculty oversubscribed with some using a laptop, desktop, tablet, and slate and that the new model will allow for one device. Jones spoke about the cradle to grave life cycle and how it will help to manage ordered devices. Jones stated that currently when computers are ordered IT does not always receive the old model back, particularly with laptops. Jones added that 9 out of 10 desktops are returned as opposed to 1 out of every 10 laptops. Jones added that old models are being used for other areas within the department and have potential for problems as they likely contain FERPA and personal data.

Jones stated that the renewable budget should be $350K in order to fund the entire campus (including classrooms, labs, and faculty and staff computers). Jones added that currently approximately $150K is spent annually on replacements on an ad-hoc basis, which is not a good system.

Jones continued that for FY19, there are $67K in restricted funds available for lab computer replacements. Jones added that the physical computer labs are not sustainable and that $120K would be needed annually to keep them refreshed on a regular basis. Jones stated that because of this, it is a good time to start a conversation around the necessity of physical computer labs and if we can virtualize, adding that Portland-Metro is a good example of virtualization where students are required to bring a laptop. Jones stated that the Academic Technology Advisory Council (ATAC) will determine which labs will receive replacements and that units will be purchased during winter term and deployed during spring break.

Jones stated that a Computer Standards Committee, comprised of faculty and staff, will be formed to make determinations on models and standard configurations for faculty and staff desktops and labs. Jones added that the main goal will be to keep costs down.

Jones stated the following:
- There will be a 1:1 replacement. If upgrading from a desktop to a laptop the department will cover the cost difference.
- Grant computers are exempt from this process unless the department funds 20% of the desktop or 25% of the laptop.
- All computer assets will be listed in the IT database.
- Currently new faculty computers are funded from the Provost budget. In the future, we should be able to predict the number of new faculty members and add them to the fund.
- There will no longer be computer redeployments – often faculty members purchase new computers and a domino effect is initiated with older computers being given to other faculty.

Classroom Computers FY 19
Jones stated that ATAC has approved the replacement of 25 classroom computers this year and are scheduled to be deployed during winter break and winter term. Jones stated that in total, IT will have replaced over 40 computers in Klamath Falls classrooms and predicts being in great shape by F19. Jones added that 8 projectors will also be replaced. Ken Usher commented that many projectors are outdated and of extremely poor quality and that 8 seems to be inadequate. Jones agreed and stated that Part of ATAC's work this winter has been to inventory all classroom equipment and develop a budget for replacement. Jones added that with the exception of labs, funding received has been one time funding and that moving forward it needs to be a sustainable fund and part of the budget request in Feb.

Faculty Computers FY19
Jones stated that IT is creating a list of all faculty computers by age and will begin replacing them from oldest to newest. Jones will send the report to the Deans and Chairs for discussion. Jones stated that the Provost has committed $30K for faculty computers this fiscal year and that Dr. Kuleck is working to increase this amount to $45K to be more sustainable. Tiernan Fogarty inquired about nonfunctional faculty computers that do not make the cut. Dean Tom Keyser responded that it may be a on a case-by-case basis, but that nonfunctional computers will trump old computers. Jones added that the goal is to have several faculty computers replaced over winter break.

Sharon Beaudry thanked Jones for his work and inquired if this process will continue with his successor. Jones stated that he is working on a transition plan and is hopeful to select his replacement to help ensure continued momentum.

EQUIPMENT REQUESTS

Dr. Keyser stated that he, Dean Maupin, and Dr. Kuleck have reviewed the equipment proposal process with the goal of awarding funds earlier to allow more spending time. The following form was distributed at the meeting and Paul Titus stated that he will also send it to the Council electronically:

Equipment Proposal Form 2018-19
Changes to the form are as follows:
- February 1 – Proposals due to the Academic Dean/Provost
- February 22 – Announcement of awards
- Requests of less than $10,000 can now be combined into a single proposal if the items are related
- Requests exceeding $100,000 will require at least a 50% matching fund component
- Departments that have not expended previous year equipment awards are ineligible to apply (with the exception of multi-year projects)

Dr. Kuleck stated that last year over $2M in requests were made and asked all to remember to tie requests to strategic plans and to how it will help departments grow.

Sharon Beaudry asked how to handle equipment requests for Cybersecurity, assuming it will be offered next fall or winter. Dr. Keyser stated that as a new program it could easily use all available equipment funds. There was a question of whether the Board would approve a program without fully funding it. Dr. Kuleck responded that state funding is not sufficient to provide all program equipment needs and that other funding sources need to be explored.

Dr. Kuleck continued that Cybersecurity will be taken to Board in January for approval review and that the equipment piece will surely be discussed. Dr. Kuleck added that he has already vetted the executive summary to the Statewide Provosts Council and has received positive input. Dan Peterson stated that this will be interesting as it is the first equipment heavy program to go before the Board.

YEARLONG PLANNING

Dan Peterson stated that he had an opportunity to view many of the departmental plans posted to Teams. Peterson noted that several included spring term only and added that they will need to be yearlong plans going forward. Peterson stated that at the last meeting the question of *why yearlong planning is necessary* was asked. Peterson continued that there are many reasons to begin thinking about it and that knowing when courses will be offered is valuable for many reasons – students, advisors, course planning, course cancellations, accreditation, faculty releases, sabbatical discussions, and for considering needed resources.

With respect to College and University planning, Peterson stated that it is easy to be short-sighted and to think only about our own departments and where they are located. Peterson added that in order to maximize efforts it is important to consider impact on all campuses and departments and on other students and groups. Peterson stated that the University and each department should start considering interconnection between locations and medium of delivery and the impact on staffing, equipment, and students. Peterson also asked that all consider general education departments and how it relates to their departments with respect to supply and demand.

There was discussion around the difficulty of assigning day and time to courses when planning a year out. Peterson stated that knowing the quarter is important but that day and time is not necessary. Peterson added that this is where the process that the Registrar's Office has in place comes into play and stressed the importance of looking closely at the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd looks. Peterson suggested that the Registrar's Office make the schedule viewable more than one term out. Ivie replied that this is doable and stated that at the beginning of winter term Degree Works (which has some great analytic tools) will be upgraded.

Wendy Ivie asked if course offerings greatly vary from the previous year – all replied that they are typically the same or very similar. Ivie added that essentially the 1st and 2nd looks come from the previous year and that this would be very easy to pull from Banner as a yearlong document to send to Chairs. Ivie suggested taking the information from Teams and publishing it in an easy to read format for students to use as a planning guide. Several had concern about publishing a year out for students to review and noted that previous year offerings are already available to them via the catalog.

Peterson stated that the intent is to create awareness and that having schedules available for all to view will allow for conversations and coordination with other departments. Peterson asked all to review their schedules and to keep them up to date and relevant with term offered rather than day and time. Provost Kuleck added that Deans being aware of scheduling within their College can be beneficial especially for identifying efficiencies.

Fogarty asked that information requests be made to scheduling coordinators with the preferred format and information on where to publish. Peterson agreed that a uniform format and making scheduling coordinators aware is a good idea. Dr. Keyser, Peterson, and Ivie will meet to determine the best format.

SABBATICAL APPLICATIONS

Provost Kuleck stated the he has extended the Sabbatical Application to Monday, December 10. Dr. Kuleck asked Chairs to carefully review applications to ensure that guidelines have been met, that a plan has been made to cover courses, and that all signatures are in place.

POST-TENURE REVIEW DEADLINES

Paul Titus stated that he is missing department information regarding post-tenure reviews and reminded all of the following due dates:

Nov. 15   Department chairs form a departmental post-tenure review committee and convene a meeting within one week to select a chair.

Dec. 7   Deadline for tenure review committees to notify ASOIT of comment meeting details and publicity.

Titus sent email reminders to Chairs with needed information and asked that it be submitted by end of day.

NEXT MEETING

The next Academic Council meeting is scheduled for Friday, January 11, 2019.

The meeting adjourned at 3:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Valjean Newsome