

7-7-22

Before approving the Letter of Intent for the Engineering Technology BS, the Provost Program Proposal Review Committee would like you to address some concerns.

- The calculus admissions requirement is confusing given that the program is designed to help students avoid calculus. The committee recommends that you reconsider this requirement.
- The committee recommends that you collaborate with CEHD on prior learning.
- CPE will require feedback on this program from similar programs in Kentucky. Please determine the CIP code you would like to use and fill out a Program Duplication Table for every program with the same CIP code. Please refer to the attached CIP Code Research.
- Have you received feedback from the Engineering Technology Department at JCTC?
- Please revise the LOI to sound more like a proposal for a program in engineering technology and less like a proposal for a program in engineering management.

8-4-22

Please fill out the program duplication table for all of the programs with the 15.0000 CIP code. (See the table below).

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Degree</u>	<u>CIP</u>	<u>Program Title</u>	<u>100% F2F in classroom</u>	<u>100% Distance Learning</u>	<u>F2F/Distance Learning Hybrid</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>work ready</u>
Morehead State University	Associate	15.0000	Engineering-Technologies/Technicians	Y	N	N	150 University Blvd, Morehead, KY, 40351	
Morehead State University	Baccalaureate	15.0000	Engineering Technology	Y	N	N	150 University Blvd, Morehead, KY, 40351	
Murray State University	Master's	15.0000	Engineering Management	Y	Y	N	102 Curris Center, Murray, KY, 42071	

Also, please address the feedback below from Dr. DePuy:

Full-time faculty are not typically paid extra to develop or teach courses – that is part of their job duties. Offering these incentives to some, but not all, SSoE faculty/instructors seems problematic. Are these additional funds included in the budget?

10-7-22

Before approving the Letter of Intent for the Applied Engineering BS, the Provost Program Proposal Review Committee would like you to address some additional concerns.

1. Net revenue (revenues less expenses) is erratic—ranging from +122% in Year 2 to -20% in Year 4. Financial stability does not enter the equation until Year 7. That is a long timeframe, which leaves room for a lot of error to enter the equation.
2. The Word document (p. 18) and the Excel spreadsheet (“Budget Template for Proposals” tab) show different tuition revenue projection amounts. The latter is higher. The revenue and expense summary table on Page 28 in the Word document also does not match the same table in the Excel spreadsheet.
3. Gift revenue (\$1M over five years) continues to be a cornerstone to making this program work. Absent those one-time dollars, the program loses money. The proposal mentions three companies who committed support. The committee would like to see that in writing from those companies. It would alleviate the concern that this important part of the financial model will be realized.
4. Page 26 of the Word document continues to reference “general fund reallocations.” Please identify more specifically what activities/programs will be reduced to provide this additional support.
5. The committee suggests that you reconsider the need to develop a new “HR/Human Development” course since both CEHD and COB offer undergraduate courses in HR. Could the program use one of those?
6. Please provide a statement about how ABET treats this kind of degree.
7. The LOI mentions that UK recently started a similar program, but that program is not addressed in the program comparisons in the “Academic Demand” section. Please add a program duplication table for the Engineering Technology program at UK.
8. Please have both Dean Collins and Todd Hoffman review and approve the revised LOI before you resubmit it.

11-4-22

In the last bullet under Graduation requirement, you list a GPA of 2.25 in all courses. Do you mean a **GRADE** of 2.25 in all classes or a **cumulative GPA** of 2.25 **across all courses** in the major program? Unclear as written.

1-18-23

Based upon the recommendation of the Provost Program Proposal Review Committee, the Provost has approved the Letter of Intent for the BS in Applied Engineering with the following stipulations:

1. The budget is built on unstable revenue projections, particularly \$1.2M in expected gifts. If one-third of that amount does not materialize, the program loses money. Speed must agree in writing to hold off, therefore, on any renovation and furnishing expenses until they have an equal amount of gift revenues in hand (i.e., money in the bank).
2. The overall margins are less than 1% per year for the first six years, so there is almost no room for error on the revenue side. Fewer than five entering students than planned will jeopardize the program. Speed must agree to increase their minimum savings threshold from 5% to 7.5% to provide a ready pool of dollars to apply to one-time net income losses should they occur. That means they cannot spend from their savings program if it would take them below 7.5%. (They currently have about 10% in their savings account so this will not create any new undue hardship.) When the program shows that it is financially viable, we will reconsider the 7.5% threshold.