

## MINUTES

Committee members in attendance: Jon Boeckensdt, 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.
  - iii. Mak: Part of the experience. Marketability. University experience.
    - 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?