MINUTES

Committee members in attendance: Jon Boeckenstedt, Jessica DuPont, Shaun Bromagem, Frank Chaplen, Zackery Allen, Nicole von Germeten, Tim Carroll, Terri Libert, Joe Page, Muhammad Aatir Khan, John Gremmels

Absent committee members: Aiman Khan, Lily Butler, Alison Johnston, Lisa Gaines, Staci Simonich

Staff in attendance: Sherm Bloomer, Nicci Dolan, Kayla Campbell, Keahi McFadden

1. Quick update on Interim President Johnson’s questions on tuition recommendations—Sherm
   a. Campus charge
   b. Interested in fair share of non-resident share physically in campus.
   c. Recognize the complexities.
   d. Flat charge?
   e. Follow up: revisit work plan when Alison returns.

2. Overview of the Corvallis budget model review and principal takeaways—Sherm
   a. Budget Model – Share SRBM Review Key Issues & Next Steps (ppt)
      i. How do we change the mindset that we have enough, or don’t have enough?
      ii. Change the spectrum of incentives?
      iii. Alternative to CIP codes?
         1. We are asking this group for this. There are differences in cost chemical engineer vs history. What would be used instead?
      iv. How would we calibrate? How much to HR, Science, etc.?
      v. Who manages the space – College level?
      vi. CAS – priority staffing process – a space process like that? Might be a good model to look at.
      vii. Value of engineer to value of philosophy – asking the right question is important.
         1. Ask question in right way and ask the right question.
         2. What do you do in a marketplace environment?
         3. Ageist salary structure.
   b. Clear framework of incentives within the budget model.
   c. What is the purpose of our actions?
      i. Zack. The best experience for the students ought to be the end goal.
   d. Plan for current budget cycle—technical changes
e. Outcomes or goals you want to drive the model. What should it encourage?
   
   f. What is most beneficial to the student body? Is there something else that we should also consider.
      
      i. Small class
      ii. 4-year graduation rate
      iii. Famous research
      iv. Institutional goal – raise graduation rate across all student groups.
      v. R1 – embed scholarship/experiential learning.
      vi. 2 or 3 goals at college level to encourage.

   g. Tim: Provide information about where funding comes from.

   h. Tensions – imbalance between where funding is coming from and going to.
      i. 50% comes from Undergrad, does 50% go to colleges?

   i. Growth – Growing pains with Ecampus. Colleges or Staff – to accommodate the Ecampus students.
      i. Challenging – Ecampus Revenue Share model – Return 80% to the college. Nothing says you have to re-invest.
      ii. Could you revise the agreement?

   j. R1 institution – Research and classroom experience –
      i. Joe: PHHS – not in line, needs validation.
      ii. Zack: R1 is jargon – a lot behind it but doesn’t mean much.
      1. How do we meaningfully involve students?
      2. Enhance student experience by having students at the table.
      iv. Zack: look for a pi that you think you can be success with.
      1. Terminology – student experience vs prestige of researchers would be more approachable.

   k. Research Faculty – map to student experience.
      i. Joe – Undergraduate experience
      ii. Zack & Mak – dotted line.
      iii. Frank – solid line (undergrad/grad level)
      1. Perception of students – how does that help me if money goes to researchers?
      iv. Nicole – If students feel it’s not important that it’s a culture, that’s odd.
      1. Solid line
      v. Joe – might be a cap if undergrad. This is state school – more affordable option. Go to college that is what you do. In-state students are not viewing it as a research university, it’s just the next place that you go to without going broke.
      vi. Mak- Nothing against researchers BUT
1. Not all researchers are good instructors.
2. Not all instructors are good researchers.
   vii. Zack- best learning experience
   viii. Research and teaching are two necessary parts, IVY league is not our competitor.
3. Committee discussion, questions, and ideas—all
   a. Budget model—changes, issues, perspectives
   b. Budget process
   c. Budget communication—what might work better for engagement?