

CURRICULUM ADVISORY TEAM: BUDGET CONSIDERATIONS

Paul Doescher, Charles Brunner, John Sessions, Lisa Ganio, Marv Pyles, Jo Tynon and Susan Morre, Ed Jensen

The Committee was concerned about future impacts on the educational quality of current COF offerings. Many of the options provided below place a burden on temporary faculty and students to help alleviate future financial constraints. We would like to see a careful planning effort so that structural realignment of the College minimizes impacts to these individuals.

Options:

1. Strive for teaching efficiency through elimination of temporary instructors, and the realignment of tenure track faculty and full-time instructors to cover essential course offerings.

There are a fairly large number of courses across all departments that are currently being taught by temporary faculty. These courses need to be assessed as part of a College-wide curriculum review as to their relevancy for future undergraduate degrees. Some of these courses may be retained, some may be dropped. In addition, some courses that are offered multiple terms might need to be taught only one term of the year, especially if temporary instructors are involved in their offering.

The College may need to make more efficient use of current faculty and full-time instructors to teach essential core classes. This might include faculty that currently have limited teaching FTE or are engaged only in graduate education. For instance, FOR 240 (Forest Biology) is an essential course for several of the College's majors, but has been taught by temporary instructors for several years. Assignment of a currently tenured faculty member (or a team of faculty) course may be necessary for its continued offering.

We estimate potential savings if this policy is implemented to be ~2.0 FTE (~\$150,000-200,000/year).

2. Move the funding model for the Interdisciplinary Natural Resource Program (248 students) to the Provost level.

Funding for this program currently comes through contributions among 4 Colleges that participate in its offering. COF is currently the largest contributor. Difficulties with curricular actions, differential record keeping, and lack of consistent college degree requirements result in an inefficient administrative structure.

This program could be funded much like the Graduate Program in Environmental Sciences, with COF providing office space and some degree of administrative support (as it currently does). Cost saving to COF ~\$100,000/yr

3. Consider moving faculty members to OSU-Cascades in support of the ORLT and NR Programs.

Failed searches in each of these programs over the past several years have limited the potential for growth at the Cascades Campus. Having OSU-Cascades pay these individuals, but maintaining their tenure home in COF would reduce FTE on the Corvallis Campus. Cost savings could amount to 2 FTE (~\$200,000/yr).

4. Assess student fees for COF majors and some COF courses.

COF could impart a fee to all students within the college that would help to support various infrastructure needs such as computer labs, technology labs, field equipment, and student activities. In addition, courses which have historically had field trips and high transportation costs paid for by departments could require a \$50/course fee to support vehicle rental. Cost savings through revenue generation could amount to ~\$50,000/year (rough estimate).

5. Consider development of additional Ecampus courses that are attractive to students outside of the university, and support development of additional graduate programs that might be available via distance.

Currently, departments and instructors receive a fairly generous return on distance course tuition. (\$85/credit hour/student returned back to the departments that house the instructors of record). Increasing offerings, development of a Professional Masters Program in Natural Resources, and additional graduate certificate programs could provide a source of revenue for COF. Revenue generation could amount to ~75,000/yr (rough estimate).

6. Consider moving Forest Engineering to the College of Engineering.

Shared financial responsibility for this program with COE could lower costs to COF. The committee was not sure on potential cost savings, but the idea was offered and asked to be put on this report.