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Deans Council Meeting
Aug 3, 2016
11:00 am – 12:30 pm/BAY 205
Minutes

Present: Martin Tadlock, Sridhar Sundaram, Frank Biafora, Bill Heller, Cathi Cardwell, Susan Toler, Gary Patterson, Dan Marlin, Olivia Hodges, Therese Wisoff (notes)

1. Welcome
   Martin welcomed everyone and expressed that the Deans and Associate Deans are not only the academic leaders of their college, but together, they are the leadership group for academic affairs at USFSP. He added that the Deans Council role is critical to the future success of the university. Martin and Patti have been discussing a plan to form an Academic Affairs/Student Affairs Joint Leadership Council which would meet monthly to discuss how the two divisions can work together to better serve our students. The Deans Council will meet every other week and on the “off weeks”, Martin will meet individually with each of the Deans.

2. Standing Items:
   a. Minority Post-Doc Fellowship Program
      Applications were reviewed by CADIC (the Chancellor’s Advisors for Diversity and Inclusion Committee) in early June. Two faculty have been selected and will be notified in the coming weeks. Recruitment for two post-doc fellows will begin this fall; the two-year fellowships will begin in Fall 2017. Consultant Dr. Lisa Jones (from North Carolina State) will be engaged to advise CADIC and faculty members in specific recruiting strategies.

   b. Strategic Enrollment Management Group (SEM)
      Martin will co-chair the committee with Holly Kickliter.

   c. Center for Innovation in Teaching and Learning (CITL)
      Martin attended the CITL Advisory Group meeting yesterday. The CITL director position will be posted soon and announced at the Aug 26 Fall Faculty-Staff meeting. The CITL team will interview the candidates. One of the services CITL will provide is assistance with Faculty professional development. There was discussion about the possibility of adding a student to the CITL advisory board.

   d. New Faculty Orientation
      Cathi shared her past experience at BGSU with a successful interactive orientation program for new faculty. On behalf of CITL, Martin asked if the Deans would be in favor of scheduling a 2-3 hour orientation program for new faculty before the semester starts (in the next two weeks). The orientation would include an overview of Canvas, a workshop on how to write a syllabus (to comply with Federal guidelines), and a wine and cheese reception at the end. All were in favor and identified Tuesday, Aug 16 from 2:00-4:30 pm as a possibility. Cathi will see about reserving
Poynter’s Corner (in the Library) for the event and coordinate details with CITL and the Deans. Martin will attend and the Chancellor will also be invited.

e. Smart Catalog
   No update.

f. FUSE
   There is a plan to work on additional programs to be articulated with St. Pete College in January. The first cohort comprises a group of students that applied to USFSP, were not admitted, but were accepted into the FUSE program (2+2). There may be future discussions about forming similar articulation agreements with other institutions as well.

3. Informational Items:
   a. Searches
      - Chief Diversity Officer
        Recruitment is in process. Final interviews are scheduled for this month.
      - COE Dean
        Frank Biafora will serve as the chair. The search committee has not been finalized. The search will begin this Fall.

b. Tenure and Promotion Candidates
   The list of 2016-2017 candidates was shared with the group. The substance of the annual review process was discussed. It was decided to table the item for a more in-depth discussion in the future.

c. USF CMS Fellowships & Awards Luncheon
   Invitation for Monday October 24 – Sri and Frank offered to represent USFSP on Martin’s behalf.

d. Personnel Issues and Progressive Discipline
   Martin clarified that the role of the Chief Diversity Officer includes working with HR to handle Federal related issues such as Title IX, hostile work environment, protected class violations, etc.

   However, in the case of faculty/staff day-to-day work, it is the Deans responsibility to exercise progressive discipline if needed (CBA documented). The progressive discipline process is as follows:
   - Verbal reprimand including a set of expectations with a timeline to demonstrate corrective action. A written notation documenting the discussion is added to the personnel file. If there is a recurrence of bad behavior, proceed to the next level – a written reprimand.
   - Written reprimand
   - Suspension
   - Termination

4. Decision Items:
   a. Master Academic Planning Process and Retreat
      The process of creating a master academic plan will be data driven and will include a review of each existing program to determine whether to:
      - Revise Existing program
      - Sustain existing program
      - Create new programs

      The plan would be designed and vetted across the university. The Deans agreed they are in favor of working on a Master Academic Plan; an offsite retreat will be scheduled for this fall to develop the process in depth. In Martin’s experience, a draft
recommendation can be written in one semester if everyone engages in the process as a priority. Martin commented that USFSP has only half the number of majors needed to be competitive.

c. Formalized Emergency Plan
Gary and Cathi agreed to compose a 1st draft and share at the next meeting. The plan would be shared at the August 26 Fall Faculty meeting.

d. Emeritus Status Guidelines
Please send any comments to Martin by Friday, Aug 5. Any edits/changes must be reviewed by USFSP Faculty Senate.

e. College Scheduler Update
Cyndie Collins reported to Martin:
I am writing to provide an update on College Scheduler. I met with the USF System College Scheduler Business Case Committee yesterday. Chris Martinez, the Chair, reported that USFSP has been granted a 60 day "grace period" with no charge from Ellucian to provide for time for the USF System to acquire approval through our ITMC (IT Management Council) for tech. fee funding. He also confirmed that Carrie Garcia (Tampa) will serve as the person overseeing the IT implementation of College Scheduler as a pilot for USFSP. The System Business Case Committee will review 5 products and our goal is to have a formal recommendation in to the ITMC by their meeting scheduled for the 2nd week of September. I told the committee that USFSP would like to have College Scheduler functional for spring 2017 registration (which begins for students in November).

f. Invite Directors of IR, IE and Grad Studies:
It was decided to invite the Directors of IR, IE, and Grad Studies to the Deans Council as the need arises or if more information is needed on a particular topic. It was decided to invite Lauren Friedman (IR) to the next meeting to have her interpret the data sets she sent.

g. UG Studies Director
Tabled

h. Friday Classes
Martin emphasized the need to schedule Friday classes as part of the residential experience for students.

i. New Budgeting Model for DL
Martin met with Joe Trubacz and he has agreed to allow each college to pilot a revenue sharing model with one program. How it works: Take an existing program and create a distance learning deliverable context (online, hybrid, or at another site in a two-year college). This model would provide access to a population that we do not currently serve at USFSP and is geared towards working adults who already have associates degrees and want to complete their bachelor’s degrees. The program must be run on 80% of the tuition collected. 20% of the tuition collected goes to the university’s overhead. Net revenue returns to the college/program. A business plan would need to be created and go through an approval process. The newly created program would not compete with USFSP programs. Martin offered to present this idea to the faculty at either the college faculty meetings or at the Aug 26 Fall Faculty meeting.

j. TAs
The question was posed: What is the criteria/policy on hiring TA’s? The item will be tabled.

k. Martin asked everyone to make an effort to stay “green” – please avoid printing!

5. Adjournment:
The meeting adjourned at 12:31 pm. The next meeting will be on August 17, 2016 at 11:00 am in BAY 205.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Therese Wisoff
An Archive of meeting minutes and all related materials will be available at: http://dspace.nelson.usf.edu:8080/xmlui/handle/10806/11878
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Academic Program Planning Process

Phase One

Introduction of fall program planning; due by September 7th

1. All planning indicators will be shared at start-up with faculty/staff. September 7 is deadline for feedback/response to those indicators.

2. Announce the fall planning and format for that planning at fall start-up.

3. A key purpose of the planning process is to adjust to a changing financial landscape so we can avoid the need to undergo a process like recalibration in the future. Financial sustainability of BSU is central to this planning effort.

Phase Two

SWOT-Wish; due by October 1

1. After completion of phase 1, a grid showing where each program currently ranks across all indicators will be shared.

2. As soon as we have that sheet, departmental faculty meet together for a 2-2 1/2 hour Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats – Wishes (SWOT-Wish) exercise, generating a SWOT-Wish Summary (see #2 example attached). Anything is on the table during this session. Do not restrict ideas or discuss implementation. Simply generate best thoughts.

3. Save time to present a blank “What does your department do to...” (see #3 attached). Fill sheet out together, based upon SWOT-Wishes brainstorming session, showing what faculty believe their department does that: (a) maintains on strengths; (b) deals with weaknesses; (c) handles threats; (d) capitalizes on opportunities; and (e) realizes wishes (example attached).

After SWOT-Wish session, department chair or faculty in the department consolidates all information. Summary sheet #2 (example attached) and summary sheet #3 are distributed to faculty for correction, modification, or expansion.
Phase three

Program Planning; due by December 1

1. After completion of Phase two, the program rankings grid and the SWOT-Wish analysis should be considered during this phase. Where a program ranks isn’t necessarily the determinate for how a program will be categorized. There are factors to consider that the listed indicators do not address.

2. Hold a college-wide meeting and distribute an “Areas for Consideration in Programmatic Planning” (see #4), the university-wide sheet showing where programs rank on the 10 indicators, and the results of the SWOT-Wish. Discuss the categories of sustain, grow, revise, and create and ideas for revising programs.

3. Talk about next steps in the planning process, and expect about one hour of time for this meeting. Next steps:

   a. All chairs work with faculty to categorize their existing programs as a program to sustain, grow, or revise and to list future plans/programs to create in the areas outlined on sheet #5, Program Planning Summary. As a general guide, if a program is below the mid-point on the majority of indicators, the program should be considered for revision with a goal to achieve at least the mid-point on the majority of the indicators. However, there are factors the indicators do not address that may affect the decision to categorize a program, so do not hold hard and fast to where a program is ranked by the ten indicators. Factors not defined by the indicators should be considered at this point in the planning process.

   b. Establish a due date for this sheet and for the ‘grow’ or ‘revise’ or ‘create new’ plans to come back to you so that you have time to review with everyone prior to December 1.

   c. Plans for programs to grow or revise or create new should be submitted to Academic Affairs by the deans by December 1.

   d. The dean’s council will hold a retreat in early December to review all program information returned and to develop the final program plan to include in the draft master academic plan.
SWOT-Wish Summary: Biology example

**Strengths**
- Fish and wildlife agency internships
- Alumni affiliated with Fish and Wildlife agencies
- Faculty collegiality
- Modern curriculum
- Facilities and equipment
- Success in grants
- Pre-professional health program
- Connections with external groups and Universities
- Pre-professional health clubs in BA and Tahlequah
- Strength in Undergraduate research
- Commitment to undergraduate research
- Honors scholars
- New hires
- Support staff
  - Laboratory managers
  - Administrative assistants
- Faculty
- Success of the pre-medicine program compared to other OK campuses

**Weaknesses**
- Open positions
- Need faculty
- Recruitment
- Students ETS outcomes assessment
- Banner
  - Inability to enroll students
  - On-line registration process
- Advisement
- Economics for students
  - Cost of books
  - Other expenses
- Lack of or poor student adjustment to College: transfer issue exacerbated
- Resources for promotional materials
- Funding for the graduate program
- Compensation level: need raise

**Opportunities**
- Graduate program
- Online tutorials
- BA-transfer grants
- Technology use in classroom
- Possibly of using adjunct positions to support TA’s.
- MS program
- Pre-professional courses: ethics, interview preparation, resume writing, application processing

**Threats**
- State government view of the value of Higher Education
- Communication (BA and TH; colleagues)
- Retention
- Irregular and inconsistent enrollment patterns
- Scheduling
- Economy
- High school graduates requirement for remediation
- Lack of adequate college preparation for HS
- HB 1551: Educational Committee
- Jobs

**Wishes**
- Laboratory credit hour/contact hour equivalency
- Journal subscriptions
- Better communication:
  - Between campuses
  - Department annual/semi-annual retreat
    - 8 hrs
    - Pre-professional day
- OCAST
- Pre-professional support resources
  - Library in BA
  - Information
- Funds for seminar in BA.
- Smaller classes
- CEL programming
- Tuition waiver option for grad students
- TA’s
3 What does your program do to…

Maintain strengths

Deal with weaknesses

Handle threats

Capitalize on opportunities

Realize wishes
Areas for Consideration in Programmatic Planning
2013-2018

Assumption: There is no new money; state funding will likely not improve. Internal reallocation of resources or external funding support is needed to grow existing programs or create new programs.

All current programs should be placed in one of the following categories:

a. Grow: based upon program indicators and other considerations, we wish to invest in additional resources to grow student headcount and credit generation in the program (plan needed)
b. Sustain: program ranks in the top 50% of BSU ranked programs according to the listed indicators and other considerations, and we wish to maintain the program at its current student headcount and credit generation level
c. Revise: program ranks below the top 50% of BSU ranked programs according to the listed indicators and other considerations, and we wish to revise the program to improve program ranking according to the listed indicators within two years, or we wish to sunset the program (plan needed)
d. Create new: program currently does not exist, but should be considered for implementation. Data related to regional/state/national demand such as employer outlook data, etc. support the need to move in this direction. See DEED data: http://www.positivelyminnesota.com/apps/lmi/projections/

Indicators used to rank programs at BSU

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Student FYE generation per faculty member (FY 12 data) (over 21=10 pts; 17-20 = 5 points; below 17 = 0 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>MnSCU cost study (FY10 or 11 data, if available) (below 90% =10 points; between 90-110% = 5 points; above 110% = 0 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>An average enrollment in upper division courses (FY 12 data) (over 15 students = 10 pts; 10-15 students = 5 points; fewer than 10 students = 0 points)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Number of annual graduates within a major, or within a stand-alone minor (FY12 data) (greater than 10 graduates =10 pts; 5-10 graduates = 5 points; fewer than 5 graduates= 0 pts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Graduate placement rate in related career or in graduate school (Most recent year) (greater than 90% placement =10 pts; 80-90% placement= 5 pts; below 80% placement = 0 pts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Student graduation rate for the program (fall Juniors, average of three most recent years, graduation within a total of six years.) (graduation rate 90% or higher =10 pts; graduation rate 89% to 80% = 5 pts; rate below 80% = 0 pts)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Program must be current in the BSU program review process, which means the program is up-to-date in the following:
   a. Self-study and external evaluation
   b. When applicable, measurement of liberal education outcomes
   c. Assessment plan for most recent cycle
   d. Assessment findings for most recent cycle
   e. Findings used for program improvement (Action plan)
      (Two points for each item completed)

8. State and/or regional data indicates that program graduates should expect employment opportunities over the next decade that are favorable; see DEED data at http://www.positivelyminnesota.com/apps/lmi/projections/

9. Program is essential to the mission of the university as evidenced by the extent of coursework that supports BSU’s current signature themes, and other indicators as provided by the Department and Dean.

10. Other: indicators brought forward by the college dean that should be considered in addition to the above, such as: evidence of academic excellence, i.e. what the department is doing to foster quality in student learning and what evidence they have that students are learning what is expected of them; program review recommendations; college strategic direction; alignment with Lumina Degree Qualification Profile, AACU High Impact Educational Practices, or other national recommendations; need to maintain service in liberal education and service to other programs; etc. (not used in the initial ranking of programs)

New programs and modifications of existing programs
Indicate any new programs planned for the next 5 years. Also, indicate any modifications to existing programs planned for the next 5 years such as moving a program to online delivery, cost-recovery, off-site delivery, etc.

Plans for programs to grow or revise
For programs listed in the grow or revise categories, a plan needs to be submitted to the dean indicating the needed resources for growing the program or for revising the program so that it meets expected indicators. The plan should be succinct, limited to two pages, standard font size.

Some possibilities for program revision

1. Delivery methodology; course redesign
   a. Online/hybrid
   b. Distance delivered through CEL under revenue sharing model
   c. Extensive field-based experience

2. Consortia degrees, especially graduate programs

3. Dual/joint degrees; especially with international partners
4. Applied baccalaureates

5. Articulations with technical colleges
6. Articulations with CC’s and other universities
7. Credentials...credit and non-credit certificates to AA to BA/BS to MA/MS. Some examples of student credentials: leadership, global/international fluency, community stewardship

8. Credit for prior learning

9. Interdisciplinary degree programs

10. Interdisciplinary courses within program

11. Adjust credits in major
12. Assessment based around national expectations

13. Pedagogical models
   a. http://www.psychology.edu/about/four-models-of-adult-education/
Dean’s Academic Program Planning Retreat Format and Agenda

As we wind towards our retreat on academic planning, we all agreed to have digital copies of program planning documents sent to Diane for compilation by college so that they could be distributed to all of us in advance of the retreat. Please keep that on your radar.

Also, please review the below links and bring copies of those documents with you to the retreat, or keep them handy on your tablet, computer for use during the retreat.

1. Capacity of existing programs. If you have that info, please send it to Diane so she can compile it for us. If not, please finish getting that rough estimate from your chairs as soon as possible.
2. The BSU cost study that was sent to you last week showing the BSU program array.

The proposed format for the retreat:

1. Charts will be hung showing all BSU programs, by college, listing the recommendation for each program based upon what is sent to us in advance of the retreat: sustain, grow, revise, or create new. We will also list on those charts any additional considerations noted on the program planning forms such as resources needed to grow or create, distance vs. on ground delivery planned, use of 80/20 model, etc.
2. Each dean will review their charts with us and walk us through their college, speaking to the recommendations and adding any additional considerations that we should all consider. Specifically, this is the chance to talk about issues that aren’t on the chart such as having the right people on the bus to do what is being recommended, timeline considerations not addressed in the recommendations, local/state/national implications not considered, essentiality to the university’s mission, impact on other programs/colleges, etc. We all need to engage with each other as we are walked through each college’s charts.
3. We will try to reach consensus as we go on the final listing of programs to sustain, grow, revise, or create and list those on blank charts.
4. We will then develop a prioritized list of actions to take over the next 3 years to get where we have decided to go...charting those.
5. We will develop a list of priority considerations for the university to use in its strategic planning process (such as what we propose to do in Academic Affairs that will create distinctiveness for BSU).
New Budgeting Model for Distance Programs

**Rationale**

1. Provide greater access to USFSP programs & learning opportunities (access & opportunity) for adult learners and increase enrollment.
2. Provide an additional funding source for colleges & academic departments.
3. Build a fiscal model that rewards outreach and effective planning.

**Criteria**

1. Distance delivered: off-campus, f-2-f, blended, accelerated, online.
2. New degree completion programs.
3. New student market.
5. Departmental distance learning offerings are “integrated into its regular planning and evaluation processes.”

**Funding Model**

1. 80/20 gross tuition model.
2. 80% of gross tuition goes to operational costs (direct instructional costs - cost study data-based).
   a. Faculty salary & fringe.
   b. Equipment, materials & supplies.
   c. Travel costs.
   d. Software licensing (excluding online platform).
   e. Space rental.

   *Direct instructional expenses covered by tuition include: program coordination costs, student employees, tutoring support, distance platform license fees, library/electronic databases.

3. 20% of gross tuition is allocated as follows:
   a. 14.5% of undergraduate tuition to the University to support infrastructure and services.
   b. 10% of graduate tuition to the University to support infrastructure and services.
   c. 4% to marketing/recruiting costs (university advancement support).
   d. 1.5% of gross tuition revenue will go to support expansion of the USFSP grants office (to hire a grant writer/support for faculty).
   e. AA will be the fiscal agent for the agreement and will collect and dispense funds in accordance with University practices. Deans will be the fiscal agent for net revenue transferred to the college.
**Example of 80/20 funding model**

The following example outlines revenue, costs and expenses from a hypothetical distance learning program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>20 students/3 courses (3 cr)</th>
<th>20 students/3 courses (3 cr)</th>
<th>25 students/3 courses (3 cr)</th>
<th>25 students/3 courses (3 cr)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Tuition</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$56,250</td>
<td>$56,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct Expenditures:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Costs (80000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Load/fringe ($4400/cr)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 courses on load</td>
<td>$39,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 course on load</td>
<td>$13,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OL/fringe ($2376/cr)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 courses on OL</td>
<td>$14,256</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Personnel</td>
<td>$39,600</td>
<td>$27,456</td>
<td>$39,600</td>
<td>$27,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent/Purchases Services</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage/Copies/Phones</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Expenses</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies/Misc</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Non-Personnel</td>
<td>$9,800</td>
<td>$9,800</td>
<td>$9,800</td>
<td>$9,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures</td>
<td>$49,400</td>
<td>$37,256</td>
<td>$49,400</td>
<td>$37,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4% Marketing Assessment</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
<td>$2,250</td>
<td>$2,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.5% of Undergrad Tuition</td>
<td>$6,525</td>
<td>$6,525</td>
<td>$8,156</td>
<td>$8,156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% of Grad Tuition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference to Academic Affairs</td>
<td>-$12,725</td>
<td>-$581</td>
<td>-$3,556</td>
<td>$8,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 students/2 courses (3 cr)</td>
<td>20 students/2 courses (3 cr)</td>
<td>25 students/2 courses (3 cr)</td>
<td>25 students/2 courses (3 cr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Tuition</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$37,500</td>
<td>$37,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Expenditures:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Costs (80000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Load/fringe ($4400/cr)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 courses on load = $26400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 course on load = $13200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OL/fringe ($2376/cr)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 courses on OL = $7128</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Personnel</td>
<td>$26,400</td>
<td>$20,328</td>
<td>$26,400</td>
<td>$20,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent/Purchases Services</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage/Copies/Phones</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Expenses</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies/Misc</td>
<td>$800</td>
<td>$800</td>
<td>$800</td>
<td>$800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Non-Personnel</td>
<td>$6,600</td>
<td>$6,600</td>
<td>$6,600</td>
<td>$6,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures</td>
<td>$33,000</td>
<td>$26,928</td>
<td>$33,000</td>
<td>$26,928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4% Marketing Assessment</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.5% of Undergrad Tuition</td>
<td>$4,350</td>
<td>$4,350</td>
<td>$5,438</td>
<td>$5,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% of Grad Tuition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference to Academic</td>
<td>-$8,550</td>
<td>-$2,478</td>
<td>-$2,438</td>
<td>$3,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 students/3 courses (3 cr)</td>
<td>20 students/3 courses (3 cr)</td>
<td>25 students/3 courses (3 cr)</td>
<td>25 students/3 courses (3 cr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Tuition</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>$56,250</td>
<td>$56,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Expenditures:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Costs (60000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Load/fringe ($3300/cr)</td>
<td>3 courses on load = $29700</td>
<td>1 course on load = $9900</td>
<td>3 courses on load = $29700</td>
<td>1 course on load = $9900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OL/fringe ($1782/cr)</td>
<td>2 courses on OL = $10692</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 courses on OL = $10692</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Personnel</td>
<td>$29,700</td>
<td>$20,592</td>
<td>$29,700</td>
<td>$20,592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent/Purchases Services</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage/Copies/Phones</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Expenses</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies/Misc</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Non-Personnel</td>
<td>$9,800</td>
<td>$9,800</td>
<td>$9,800</td>
<td>$9,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures</td>
<td>$39,500</td>
<td>$30,392</td>
<td>$39,500</td>
<td>$30,392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4% Marketing Assessment</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
<td>$2,250</td>
<td>$2,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.5% of Undergrad Tuition</td>
<td>$6,525</td>
<td>$6,525</td>
<td>$8,156</td>
<td>$8,156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% of Grad Tuition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference to Academic Affairs</td>
<td>-$2,825</td>
<td>$6,283</td>
<td>$6,344</td>
<td>$15,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20 students/2 courses (3 cr)</td>
<td>20 students/2 courses (3 cr)</td>
<td>25 students/2 courses (3 cr)</td>
<td>25 students/2 courses (3 cr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Tuition</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$37,500</td>
<td>$37,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct Expenditures:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Costs (60000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Load/fringe ($3300/cr)</td>
<td>2 courses on load = $19800</td>
<td>1 course on load = $9900</td>
<td>2 courses on load = $19800</td>
<td>1 course on load = $9900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OL/fringe ($1782/cr)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Personnel</td>
<td>$19,800</td>
<td>$15,246</td>
<td>$19,800</td>
<td>$15,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent/Purchases Services</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postage/Copies/Phones</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Expenses</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies/Misc</td>
<td>$800</td>
<td>$800</td>
<td>$800</td>
<td>$800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Non-Personnel</td>
<td>$6,600</td>
<td>$6,600</td>
<td>$6,600</td>
<td>$6,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures</td>
<td>$26,400</td>
<td>$21,846</td>
<td>$26,400</td>
<td>$21,846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4% Marketing Assessment</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.5% of Undergrad Tuition</td>
<td>$4,350</td>
<td>$4,350</td>
<td>$5,438</td>
<td>$5,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% of Grad Tuition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference to Academic</td>
<td>-$1,950</td>
<td>$2,604</td>
<td>$4,163</td>
<td>$8,717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>