

Oregon Institute of Technology

ACADEMIC COUNCIL RETREAT

September 17, 2018

MINUTES

Provost Gary Kuleck called the meeting to order at 7:50 a.m. Academic Council members present were: Steve Addison, Abdy Afjeh, Seth Anthony, Sharon Beaudry, Todd Breedlove, Hope Corsair, Tiernan Fogarty, MariaLynn Kessler, Tom Keyser, Debbie McCollam, Jeff Pardy, Lloyd Parratt, Dan Peterson, Paula Russell, Maureen Sevigny, Matthew Sleep, Sean St.Clair, Farooq Sultan, Dawn Taylor, Ken Usher, Erika Veth, Adam Wagner, Jack Walker, and Dawn Lowe-Wincentsen. Hallie Neupert and Mark Neupert joined the meeting via Skype. Anna Clark, Lori Harris, Tanya McVay, and Stephanie Pope attended for a portion of the meeting. Wendy Ivie and LeAnn Maupin were absent. Roger Lindgren is on sabbatical and will join remotely when able.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Dr. Gary Kuleck welcomed all and briefly touched on several topics:

Department Chair Selection and Evaluation

Dr. Kuleck stated that last year the Council explored the Department Chair Selection and Evaluation policy, adding that the document went through many revisions and various approval bodies. Dr. Kuleck stated that in May 2018 a recommendation went to President's Council, then to President Nagi Naganathan where it was approved.

Department Chair Administrative Roles and Responsibilities

Prior to the meeting, Dr. Kuleck sent the following file to the Council:

Department Chair Roles and Responsibilities_Guidelines_Final_Sep_18

Dr. Kuleck stated that last year this document went through many revisions and received feedback from many constituencies including Dr. Naganathan. Dr. Kuleck noted that the document defines the roles and responsibilities of department chairs but also indicates where the University must provide support. Dr. Kuleck added that the document is now pretty solid. In terms of strategic visioning it reflects what is in the departmental strategic plans. Dr. Kuleck added that it will also be used as a foundation to pull training pieces together, and asked all to email training recommendations to him.

Matthew Sleep stated that in June, Faculty Senate passed a unanimous resolution that the policy not be put in place until Faculty Senate had an opportunity to review and vote on it. Sleep added that the version recently sent to the Council is different than the version voted on and approved by President's Council and has concern that the approval policy was not followed. Dr. Kuleck replied that under the direction of Dr. Naganathan, President's Council moved unanimously to put it into place, adding that the primary changes were strengthening the role of the dean and their role in supporting the chairs and putting together evaluation guidelines for chairs. Dr. Kuleck added that he believes the policy which Dr. Naganathan approved and signed off on is the same version posted by Dr. Naganathan. Dr. Kuleck stated that he will verify this. Dr. Kuleck added that although the policy was poorly written, it was followed.

MariaLynn Kessler stated that responsibilities of Academic Council and Faculty Senate appear similar and asked for clarification on functions of the two groups; specifically, who has what decision-making authority and what the process is for policy-making at the university level. Dr. Kuleck stated that the two groups are primarily faculty constituted groups that play different but complimentary roles, adding that the vice president

of Faculty Senate also serves on Academic Council. Dr. Kuleck stated that Academic Council makes recommendations but does not make policy decisions. Right now Academic Council is focused on chairs and directors and leading their departments and programs. Faculty Senate may overlap some but has a different focus. Dr. Kuleck asked that the discussion be continued after the meeting to allow time to effectively address the remaining agenda items.

Academic Affairs

Dr. Kuleck handed out a copy of *Academic Affairs* from the Standing Committees, Commissions & Councils 2018-19, showing Academic Council current membership.

Academic Council

Dr. Kuleck also passed out a document entitled *Academic Council* and stated that he wrote the document with the intent of creating a guideline for the Council and to define its role. Dr. Kuleck briefly went through document elements:

- *Preamble* – Dr. Kuleck stated that he used the same preamble found in the Standing Committees, Commissions & Councils.
- *Membership and Representation* – Dr. Kuleck reminded all of the importance of having a departmental representative in attendance at all meetings and added that if you cannot attend a meeting you must have a proxy attend in your stead. Dr. Kuleck suggesting identifying a proxy in advance to regularly share information with.
- *Structure and Functionality* – Dr. Kuleck stated that as the Council is tasked with handling many complex topics over the course of the year, he would like to explore the idea of forming ad hoc subcommittees. Each would take on the bulk of the work and bring ideas back to the Council to move on. Dr. Kuleck is hopeful that in this manner, tasks will be moved on much more quickly and efficiently and will be a time saver in the long run.
- *Meeting Times* – Dr. Kuleck stated that meeting dates and times have been set for the year and sent to the Council. Regular meetings are currently set for 2 hours, tri-weekly.
- *Agenda* – Dr. Kuleck stated that he hopes meetings will be more structured and deliberate this year and encouraged all to send requested agenda items to Valjean Newsome. Dr. Kuleck added that a concerted effort will be made to send agendas out a week in advance, preferably two.
- *AC Training Sessions and Retreats* – Dr. Kuleck stated that he would like the Council to receive more skilled-based training this year. Dr. Kuleck added that extending some already scheduled meetings from 2 to 4 hours makes sense rather than choosing new meeting dates and asked all to respond to the Doodle Poll sent out by Newsome to select the next retreat date.

STIPEND RELEASE MODEL

Dean Tom Keyser stated that he and Dean LeAnn Maupin have discussed the current stipend/release model and the complexities of each department. In terms of number of programs offered and on how many campuses, there seems to be an issue of fairness. Both Deans believe the model to be working for the most part and are recommending no changes for this year; however, they would like to task an Academic Subcommittee to assess fairness and to come up with an improved model. Before changes are adopted or recommended, Deb McCollam asked that ample notice be given for planning purposes.

ENROLLMENT

Farooq Sultan presented slides and discussed enrollment numbers. Sultan stated that the Institution as a whole has seen consistent enrollment growth over past 5 years and that credit hours and FTE are leveling off. Sultan then presented data for each campus and stated that headcount growth is due to dual credit and online enrollment.

K-Falls Headcount, credit hours and FTE have consistently declined

Portland Metro Headcount, credit hours and FTE slowly grew for first 4 years but declined in 17-18

Online Headcount, credit hours and FTE have grown

Seattle Headcount, credit hours and FTE have consistently declined

Chemeketa Headcount, credit hours and FTE have flattened out

Dr. Kuleck stated that in-state competition is fierce and that we should all be very concerned about enrollment – pulling in and retaining students in a variety of ways. Kuleck continued that Oregon Tech has seen declining demographics of non-traditional students and efforts are being made to target international students. Dr. Kuleck stated that while need to pull in more Oregonians, we also need to recognize that we will need funding from other sources – focusing on tuition revenue rather than just state revenue is very important.

Sultan stated that as of Friday, Fall 2018 headcount was down by only 3 students and that numbers will likely look stronger after the next New Wings event. Sultan added that even though we had a 9% drop in applications, admitted students were up by 2.7%. Sultan offered kudos to Erika Veth and Eric Johnson for efforts in following up with applicants who have not paid the application fee – it has paid big dividends. Sultan will send slides to the Council for review.

NEW PROGRAM APPROVAL PROCESS

Dr. Kuleck stated that MariaLynn Kessler, Janette Isaacson, and Tanya McVay have been working on the Program Approval Process.

A flowchart entitled *New Program Approval Process* was distributed to all at the meeting.

Kessler stated that the process began a few years ago and was finalized in spring of last year. Kessler stated that there are now narratives on the Graduate Council and Curriculum Planning Committee (CPC) websites that offer clear instructions and have all necessary forms, noting that the processes are the same with one exception – graduate programs have one extra step. Kessler then walked the group through the flowchart.

Kessler stated that the purpose is to ensure that there are good ideas for growth and innovation, that a clear process is in place, and that there is support along the way. Kessler continued that ideas with viable justification would first be discussed with the Dean, then taken to the Provost, then presented to the Provost Leadership Team (PLT) who would decide whether or not to move forward. Kessler added that knowing in advance whether or not a program will be approved will eliminate faculty unnecessarily investing time and resources.

McVay stated that timing and timelines are very important, and that this process generally takes a little over 2 years if everything is done properly. McVay continued that the various bodies have different deadlines for inclusion in their agendas – some also require being approved at the previous meeting. Knowing what those schedules and targets are in order to proceed to NWCCU in time to be included in the catalog and to offer a program in the fall of the desired year is imperative. McVay stated that with competing institutions the idea is

to make the process as quick as possible. McVay added that offering an existing degree at a new location must go through the same approval process.

Dr. Kuleck stated that the academic piece is very strong but that he has concern that the Board of Trustees will want to see a robust business analysis and a justifiable market analysis. Dr. Kuleck added that while the process is still under development, the goal is to foster fresh ideas and to increase efficiency on the front end rather than putting up barriers and that the University will provide support to get past the incubator stage. Dr. Kuleck commented that there has been much discussion at the Statewide Provost Council on how to work collaboratively and how to speed this process and encouraged Chairs to be proactive and use their strategic visioning to encourage growth.

Dawn Lowe-Wincentsen commented that she previously discussed with Kessler and McVay that when budget goes through there needs to be accurate information about resources and that it does not appear to be in the documentation. Kessler replied that the necessity to talk with individuals involved is implied but not explicitly stated and added that all wanting to submit a new program should use the available resources and to contact her, McVay or Isaacson if additional information is needed. McVay announced that a new software program, *Curriculog*, will be put into place and utilized this fall.

STRATEGIC ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT (SEM)

Veth stated that the following departments currently report to SEM: Admissions, Financial Aid, The Rock, Retention, and Educational Partnerships & Outreach, and added that all need to work together in order to drive enrollment. Veth also emphasized the importance of working with Admissions. Veth gave an analogy of the University as a living body with SEM representing the lungs, breathing students into the University. Veth stated that one lung represents recruitment and outreach and the other represents advising and retention.

Veth stated that at the 2017 Convocation, Dr. Nagi Naganathan charged the University with growing by 7% over five years. Veth focused the discussion on incoming freshman, stating that in 2012 there were over 400 incoming freshmen. In 2017 there were 303 – a decrease of roughly 25%. Veth commented that the University has not previously had a strategic freshman recruitment plan but is confident that implementing one could yield a freshman class of 600 in the next 3 years. Veth stated that the University currently has a high yield problem – high application rates with decreased enrollment, indicating that those enrolling are students who know about Oregon Tech and who know what they want to do.

Veth stated that currently website applicants are required to choose a major. Veth commented that there are opportunities to group programs together to reach a wider audience for recruiting and to improve the application process. In an effort to form next steps that are both faculty supported and driven, Veth asked the Council to participate in a research data collection session. Veth distributed a handout listing all Oregon Tech programs on the front and noted that Civil Engineering and Manufacturing Engineering Technology are missing from the Master's Degrees. On the back, Veth asked all to work together to identify possible groupings.

Veth asked all to keep the following in mind:

- Collaboration.
- Programs with a lot of transition.
- Future growth – how to guide admitted students.

Veth also asked that all apply the following rules:

- Do not assume negative intent.
- Assume positive intent to support students and to have faculty guide the growth process.
- Be honest and direct in feedback.

Veth stated that The Rock works hard to meet many of the freshman needs and acts as a support system. Veth added that statistics show that students who make it through the first year are more likely to complete their

degree. Veth then asked, with the groupings in mind and provided the freshman population doubles, how might the University advise/guide these students? Hope Corsair suggested offering professional advising, especially for transfer students. Todd Breedlove agreed that professional advising would be beneficial in some cases but believes academic advisors to be extremely important especially for transfer students who can only be properly guided by the department. Veth thanked all for their input and requested that additional thoughts be sent to her.

BUDGET MODEL

Stephanie Pope stated that last fiscal year a new budget model was developed and was intended to push budget management and accountability to the Dean and Chair level. Pope added that part of the rollout was to implement a portion of the plan in FY19 and that budgets include S&S, student pay, travel, professional development, adjunct and overload. Pope added that the FY20 budget build will begin in January.

Pope stated that a dedicated service person has been assigned to each college for budget needs – Lori Harris for HAS and Anna Clark for ETM. Pope added that Harris and Clark will assist with budget builds and will meet monthly with divisional leads.

Annual Rollover

Pope stated that in the past there was no consistent process for departmental budget rollovers, adding that departments now have a guaranteed percentage that can be placed into Equipment Savings Accounts.

Equipment Savings Accounts

Pope stated that all academic departments now have an equipment savings account. where annual rollover will be placed. Pope added that the savings accounts can be built into the budget. Amounts should be populated within the next 2 weeks.

Adjunct and Overload Pay

Pope stated that for the FY19, adjunct and overload pay was built into all departmental budgets. Pope continued that loaded amounts were figured by taking a 3-year average of what departments spent on both adjuncts and overload pay and loading 85% of that. Pope added that other funds can be requested if 85% is not sufficient. Hope Corsair inquired why the Chairs weren't consulted on the amounts and estimated needs. Pope replied that since this was the first year, rather than overwhelming Chairs with all of the information at once, it was meant to take ease some of the burden. Pope continued that moving forward conversations with Deans might be better. Dr. Kuleck replied that Deans and Chairs know best how to manage their units and can work together to obtain a level of sustainability and efficiency. Dr. Kuleck added that there was very little structure in the past and this was a first shot at a model that can be tweaked and improved on.

Pope stated that in the future, the Provost will also have opportunity funds to help meet unforeseen expenses. Pope added that there are budget areas currently in a conceptual state which have not yet been built and that FOAC, in conjunction with divisional leads, will likely develop in the near future.

GENERAL EDUCATION WORKGROUP

Dan Peterson stated that this was an ad hoc, multi-disciplinary committee made up of a broad group of faculty and staff, and that he and Wendy Ivie served as co-chairs. Peterson stated that Provost charged the committee with the following:

- Produce a refined model for general education reform that draws on the essential studies model.
- Develop a timeline and implementation plan.
- Provide detail and rationale for changes.

Peterson stated that the committee met over the summer and broke into 4 groups (lenses) to specifically look at transferability, budget, students, and academic & faculty perspective. Peterson stated that one of the

committee's goals was to determine the most important points of the essential studies model and commented that many possible alterations and approaches were discussed. Peterson stated that recommendations will be based on Provost and Presidential approval and will go back to GEAC for implementation. Peterson added that he and Ivey compiled a report that will be available to faculty in the next few weeks.

Dr. Kuleck commended the committee for their work, adding that there are many challenges and constraints such as transfer students, student demographics, program diversity, and HB 2998. Dr. Kuleck added that the report is a huge step forward in developing a model that makes sense and that can be presented to President Naganathan.

NEXT MEETING

The next Academic Council meeting is scheduled for Friday, Oct. 5, 2018.

The meeting adjourned at 11:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Valjean Newsome