College of Engineering
School of Civil and Construction Engineering
Oregon State University, 101 Kearney Hall, Corvallis, Oregon 97331
T 541-737-4934 | **F** 541-737-3052 | cce.oregonstate.edu

To: Oregon State University Budget and Fiscal Planning Committee

From: Jason Weiss, Head of the School of Civil and Construction Engineering

RE: Request for Additional Information on the Proposed Architectural Engineering Degree

Date: February 14th, 2018

This memo is in response to the email received from Denise Lach, Director of the School of Public Policy on February 9th asking for some clarifications on the Architectural Engineering proposal submission. Thank you for bringing these questions to our attention, and hopefully my responses are sufficient. The questions are provided in italics and the written responses are in standard font.

Comment #1 - My concern about the Architectural Engineering proposal, like the others we read, is the reliance on SCH generated by the new students in combination with the new budget model to "finance" new hires. Seems like an awful lot of estimation on a new budget model.

While I can understand the concern that this may appear as if this is dependent upon only student credit hours and the application of the new budget model, this is not the case. The new budget model used at the university level only applies from upper administration down to the college level. As resources move from the college level to the school level, the new budget model is not directly applied. Budgeting is performed through an annual budget that is prepared by each individual school Head and approved after discussion with the Dean. The School of Civil and Construction Engineering has requested two faculty lines to launch this program and has received support for these positions from the College of Engineering. The funding for these lines will be applied to the existing baseline budget that the School of Civil and Construction Engineering receives from the College. The School of Civil and Construction Engineering also receives a level of support from the college that is based on student credit hours as well as the number of degrees earned. This additional level of support will be used to fund the graduate assistants as well as the instructor listed as supporting staff. Investment in the development of this program has been approved by both the Dean and the Business and Engineering Business Center. It should also be noted that this budget was prepared before the new budget model was implemented.

Comment #2 - Also, they proposers claim that resources for new instructors will be funded by shifting resources "from those of other CCE instructors." There isn't a letter of support or more detailed explanation of how that might be managed; at least, not one that is clear in the proposal.

The School of Civil and Construction Engineering (which is where this degree will be housed) currently has 1200 students, 34 tenure track positions, and between four and six instructors. Each year the school develops a workload plan for the classes taught by the tenure-track professors and instructors. The current proposal will add approximately six new courses to the curriculum. This level of instruction will be able to be covered by the faculty lines approved by the Dean, after the Architectural Engineering faculty have completed the 'start-up' phase. The additional instructor and graduate research assistants have

been estimated to account for the additional students that will be taking the current and new course offerings. The process for assigning instructors and graduate teaching assistants in the Architectural Engineering program will be the same as that used for other classes in Civil and Construction Engineering. The shifting of instructors that has been mentioned refers to the fact that several Civil and Construction Engineering faculty are within the first five years of being hired and as such they currently have a reduced teaching load. As these programs are becoming more mature, the teaching load for those faculty has increased and as a result there is less of a reliance on the instructors to provide the courses for those areas. This will allow the current programs to remain supported. Based on this, the School of Civil and Construction Engineering can reallocate the funds used for instructors in those areas to cover instructors necessary during the launching of this program. It should also be noted that many of these instructors receive support from annual gifts provided the School of Civil and Construction Engineering as well as endowments that are based on previous gifts.

Comment #3 Seems like on our old budget forms we asked people to designate where new money is coming from – that isn't apparent at all on the provided forms so it's hard to track the sources of funds.

We have used the new forms supplied to us but are happy to work with the committee to provide this information in any suggested format that would help to make this clear.

Comment #4 And, there is no signature suggesting that the Business Center for Engineering has approved this.

Regarding the question on the lack of a signature from the Business Center for Engineering, this was provided the original submission; however, in moving this to the new forms we did not see a place to attach the signature. We have attached a copy of an email from January 2017 that describes the review by the Business and Engineering Business Center as well as the approval at both the unit and college level. We hope that this helps to provide clarity regarding the signature.

From: Ainsworth, Dana

Sent: Monday, January 30, 2017 9:02 AM

To: Liu, Judy <Judy.Liu@oregonstate.edu>

Cc: Weiss, William Jason <Jason.Weiss@oregonstate.edu>

Subject: RE: Arch Eng Cat I Proposal Budget

Hi Judy,

Thank you for your patience with me – this is the first curriculum proposal that has crossed my desk in 8 years, and while it was a little beyond my wheelhouse, I was grateful for the opportunity to learn something new.

I did meet with Luke McIlvenny and the BEBC Leadership team last Friday, and we reviewed the proposal. Luke's first comment was that the OUS Budget Outline form in Word format is no longer required, as there is no longer an OUS. The Excel budget form, broken into four years, is sufficient. The budget was sound, and demonstrates that we have the available resources to run the program. He had two suggestions in the narrative: first, for tuition support, he recommended a backing statement that the department would provide additional tuition resources as necessary (in case the current tuition model undergoes changes). Second, a statement of how shifting any current resources (i.e. instructor time) toward the new program would be compensated…basically acknowledge how the current programs would stay supported with the new allocation of resources.

Please let me know if I can provide anything further.

Regards,

Dana

Dana Ainsworth

Business & Engineering Business Center

541-737-4502