

**Dean's Council
September 15, 2020
Academic Affairs
3:30 – 5:15pm**

3:30 – 3:50

Ken Wester – Laptop vs. PC & Technology in Classroom

Follow-up discussion from a previous meeting. No additional information on the laptop choices. Deans agreed it was a good idea to transition to laptops but funding will need to be addressed. Unless there are funds for special projects such as this, then funding will be short. The first round will include docking stations, wireless mouse, and keyboards, and each setup will be about \$1200. Decisions will need to be made for the spring semester when purchases are taking place.

Mr. Wester also reported that the student laptops and PTZ cameras for classrooms have arrived.

He also encouraged the Deans to please start thinking about VR and AI. Dr. Robertson shared the A&P labs have a VR setup. Sim labs in Chemistry, Physical Science, and Biology are set up for simulation labs. Mr. Wester stated this could be a pilot program if other colleges would like to explore the options. Dr. Cezeaux asked for clarification on how far these need to go. Mr. Wester indicated we actually may be doing some of these and already have packages that just need to be used. Other universities will be exploring these options and advertising they have them and these types of technology as a selling point. This could also be a way to add sections when physical labs can't be used but the need is still there; costs could be a factor and this could be a solution. Dr. Johnson stated this could be used in the College of Education. Dr. Bean indicated they were not able to continue the avatar program with live actors due to cost however there are more cost effective options available. Dr. Cezeaux would like industry brought to the table and explore the way they are trending as students may be expected to operate some of these tools. Mr. Wester indicated he could poll the industries to see what will be pertinent to ATU graduates. There may also be tools faculty are using that we are not aware of so please seek information from your faculty about what they may be using. Dr. Cass suggested a virtual orchestra so

the students can hear all parts. Virtual would allow students to practice on a large scale.

Action: Deans, please talk with your faculty to see what they are using relative to AI and VR or what they would be interested in using.

Action: Mr. Wester will put together a few scenarios for the Deans to review for a pilot laptop program.

3:50 – 4:10

Wyatt Watson – Explanation of Data Provided to Gray & Associates

Mr. Watson stated there are four sets of figures that went into the data provided to Gray Associates, gross revenue, discount revenue, net revenue, and instructional cost. The gross revenue figure is all tuition and fees, including course fees, a student paid to take a course. If it was an online class, the distance education fees would be assessed. Discount revenue is only what the institution paid, non-foundation, and E&G based scholarships. Mr. Watson provided an example: a biology faculty member who teaches an overload in the fall and has a research release (three different types of pay); taking all instructional pay, adding together, and dividing by total credit hour productions by semester. Distribute that expense to every student in the biology class. These numbers will never line up in the budget book. Faculty member salary and benefits, distributed across all students, revenue follows students and across the university. Student means by declared major. A heavy entering freshman class will report more than likely have a smaller net return. If a program is heavy junior and senior, then the report will reflect opposite. If a graduate program, with a lot of GAs, the net return will be greater. He reiterated this is not the same way we have looked at data in the past and will not line up with the budget book. Dr. Robertson asked if a flat rate could be applied to all students rather than by program major. Mr. Watson indicated this could be done but then this does not fit Gray & Associates data request. This initiative is based on marketing, so that would like apply here. With this particular data set, it would be unfair to compare departments to each other but rather should be a university overview. Dr. Schoephoerster asked about revenue and how state appropriated revenue per student comes into play. If the formula driven based on discipline? Mr. Watson stated legislators give one lump sum of funds but it is not set on a strict formula and all funds are distributed at the university level. This is only tuition and fees and no state appropriations are included. The only way to show it here, would be an equal distribution at the university level and there would not be a true reflection. Dr. Schoephoerster asked about Student Affairs Administration specifically. The data shows

an 18% discount, which is the highest at the university, but 18% seems low because this program has more GAs, staff take classes, and it is difficult to believe 72% of those students are paying full tuition. Mr. Watson stated ATU is fairly employee heavy in that program but he will investigate as this would be incorrect but the data may not be reflected correctly from Gray & Associates. Dr. Robertson inquired about taking out all FA, not GAs. Mr. Watson stated for an internal report, would make sense but is it not what Gray & Associates requested. Dr. Cezeaux stated there are majors who have more scholarships, such as engineering and nursing, who have high academic profiles and these discounts need to be reflected to keep programs more accurate. Dr. Cass asked about incentives for marketing expensive programs. Mr. Watson reiterated Institutional Research does not make these decisions but simply supply data in support of the decision makers. Music is a good example. The program is expensive but there is more to a dollar amount and a spreadsheet. The band is well known, the music department is well known. Dr. Cass stated there may be an argument to fund the better music students rather than all the music students. Dr. Cezeaux asked if adjuncts are reflected in the report. Mr. Watson indicated yes, they are included at their actual compensation rate plus benefits. Dr. Cezeaux stated so if you have a program that has a lot of adjuncts, then in this report, that program would look better but that is not necessarily a good thing. Dr. Robertson pointed out there is no program in the red so where is the money going? Overhead is a large chunk. We may not be making enough and to subsidize other areas, the university may be living beyond their means. Tuition and fees funds 72% and state appropriations fund 28% of the university. Dr. Cezeaux added the supplies are not included in this report and the entire expenses are not reflected appropriately.

Action: Andrea will set up a follow up meeting in the coming weeks to continue discussion.

4:10 – 4:20

COVID-19 & Pandemic

- Spring Schedule Accommodations
 - Current accommodations expire with HR expire December 31. Faculty will need to make a new request for spring but their current accommodations need to be considered for the spring teaching schedule.
- VC – Synchronized Online Class
 - To be clear, Video Conferencing (VC) is an online course that has synchronized meetings times. Considered an online class by the Registrar and not

face-to-face and will incur the \$10/SSCH as an online course.

4:20 – 4:30

HLC

- Faculty Credential Review
 - Dr. Robertson and Dr. Cass have reviewed these but have the other Deans? Dr. Robertson also completed Business. He could complete EAS and eTech if needed. Dr. Austin was completing Education. Dr. Cass offered to assist.

Action: Dr. Robertson, please check with Dr. Austin and see what needs to be done in terms of credential review.

- Syllabi Repository
 - Dr. Aulgur sent out and update, please make sure your faculty are uploading these.

Action: Please stay on your faculty to get this done.

- Faculty Engagement on Blackboard
 - Please make sure your faculty are utilizing Blackboard. Dr. Cezeaux indicated the majority of her courses that were listed on the inactive Blackboard courses were internships, senior projects, and independent study. If possible, the Deans would like to add a college or department column so the spreadsheet can be sorted in the future. Faculty Senate was notified Department Heads would be reaching out if they did not see the engagement.

Action: Please provide the VPAA with an update on what is going on with the courses that did not have a login since before Labor Day!

Action: Request that A. Manly run the list by College so it can be sorted.

Strategic Plan

4:30 – 4:45

Department Heads Council

Dr. Johnson met with Dr. Jason Patton, chair of the Department Heads Council (DHC). The Council had questions about international students taking mixed technology courses, as some countries will not allow this, and Dr. Patton was referred to Tammy Weaver. The Council would like to meet with the Deans a twice a year in which they will provide an agenda. There were no major issues with this request. The DHC has asked for a representative on BAC. This is a handbook change because they are not listed. Ms. Fiorello will send Dr. Patton an invite to the upcoming meeting.

Vacation time is still a topic of discussion for the Council. There is a concern about the 15-hours they are required to teach. Because of the amount they are teaching, other aspects of their job are being over looked such as the assessment. They asked Dr. Johnson her opinion and she agreed the 15-hour requirement is too much but with the financial state of the university, we can't afford to cut out teaching as a responsibility. She also noted that the equity between small and large departments was an issue because the workload was so much more significant. The Council was instructed to put forward a proposal. Pat shared for Department Heads to be counted as faculty, they have to teach six hours each fall and spring on a regular basis. Less than that on a regular basis, they no longer qualify them as faculty per IPEDS definitions. It was noted that the discussion regarding Department Heads versus Department Chairs can be addressed with the restructuring discussion. Some departments with small faculty need to have these discussions. In addition, there needs to be discussions about larger departments and program coordinators.

There was some discussion about the micro-management from some Deans regarding the MT49 classes. Dr. Johnson noted she is concerned about the course becoming a correspondence course. It was mentioned that it was the MT99 courses that are of a concern and what the level of interaction is.

4:45 – 5:00

Budget Advisory Committee Preview

Dr. Johnson shared a verbal overview for the BAC meeting on Thursday. Worst-case scenario for next fiscal year, with no tuition increases and if SSCH remains the same, the university is looking at an 8.6% expense reduction, which is \$12.7 million in addition to what we already cut. The reduction goes up approximately \$3 million every year with the new fiscal year. The \$12.7 million does include \$1 million for salary increases, if and only if we get B & C funds, and would establish a maintenance budget and technology budget. A, B, and C funds are state appropriations based in three pots of money given to universities. We always get A but B & C can differ. Dr. Bowen plans to ask the BAC for opinions about salary increases. Enrollment is expected to decrease.

If there is a 2% tuition increase across the board, then that would result in a 7% reduction, which would be an \$11.4 million cut.

Things previously not budgeted: classified pay plan increases, bad debt expenses, vacation leave, pension expense, OPEB expenses, \$500,000 for maintenance reserve and a 2% contingency.

P&T increases are included in the budget. The most P&T raises given in the past at one time was \$225,000. The idea was mentioned relative to a cap per rank instead of based on CUPA median but there was no action or request to move forward with this possibility.

Mr. Branson has provided some budget suggestions, Institutional Effectiveness Committee talked about the TIAA match; and there will be discussion about tuition waivers.

Programs/services will need to be evaluated and the bottom 20% will need to be addressed. All areas across the university will be evaluated based on this rate.

5:00 – 5:10

College Highlight Reel

5:10 – 5:15

Announcements, Future Agenda Items
Laury Fiorello – 9/29/2020

5:15

Adjournment