

Minutes*

**Faculty Consultative Committee
Thursday, November 4, 2010
1:00 – 3:00
220 Skok Hall**

- Present: Kate VandenBosch (chair), Melissa Anderson, Thomas Brothen, Colin Campbell, Nancy Carpenter, Carol Chomsky, Chris Cramer, Shawn Curley, Barbara Elliott, Marti Hope Gonzales, Michael Hancher, Caroline Hayes, Russell Luepker, (Kathryn Hanna for) George Sheets
- Absent: Peter Bitterman, Elizabeth Boyle, Nancy Ehlke, Jeff Kahn, Jan McCulloch, Michael Oakes, George Sheets
- Guests: President Robert Bruininks, Provost E. Thomas Sullivan, Senior Vice President Robert Jones
- Other: Assistant Vice President Sharon Reich Paulsen (Office of the Provost), Jill Christenson (Office of the President)

[In these minutes: the intellectual future of the University: The Land-Grant University in the 21st Century]

(Prior to the formal start of the meeting, the President and Committee members discussed a recent article in *The Washington Post* reporting on a study from the College Board that the "net price of college tuition and fees, after factoring in student aid and inflation, is actually lower now than five years ago," in large part because of a significant increase in financial aid available to students. The President noted that about two-thirds of the cost of education is now paid for by tuition and fees. Professor VandenBosch reported on a *Wall Street Journal* article that included a graph of tuition increases but provided no information about the national decline in state funding for public higher education or about the increase in financial aid, so readers would be left with the impression that prices have increased for no apparent reason and that students were left to pay these large increases without help. The President said that some overhead instructional cost studies demonstrate that tuition goes nearly 100% toward instructional costs; the goal must be to keep the institution's doors open. Making the case about the fact that the net price has declined is difficult. While the University can obtain some private funding to replace state support, it takes \$22 in an endowment to replace every \$1 lost from the state. At the private colleges, most students receive a discount (through aid) of 50% or more from the posted tuition rates. Understanding the cost of education for students must include a focus on net cost, after substantial discounts for grants and scholarships. At the University, the net cost has increased about 3% per year in the last 10 years.)

The Intellectual Future of the University: The Land-Grant University in the 21st Century

Professor VandenBosch convened the meeting at 1:00 and welcomed President Bruininks, Provost Sullivan, and Senior Vice President Jones. She said that she and Professor Cramer, in

* These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a meeting of a committee of the University of Minnesota Senate; none of the comments, conclusions, or actions reported in these minutes represents the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.

considering what the topic for the meeting should be, thought it would be best to look to the future, and she provided Committee members with a handout of a presentation to the Board of Regents in September titled "Transforming the U: Progress, Impact, and Accountability." The handout provides a history of strategic planning, metrics on important University gains, and provides a context for the discussion today. She invited opening comments from the President.

President Bruininks thanked the Committee for providing the opportunity to talk about the topic but began by acknowledging that it is not clear what will happen in the next few months, given the outcome of the elections in Minnesota. He reported that the presentation to the Board is being updated and should provide a good foundation for the new administration to think about the future of the University. The level of uncertainty in the directions of the state and country is very high, and the President expressed concern that public higher education may not be treated well as events unfold. The University is 47% of the State's higher education budget. If there are no new taxes, the State faces a budget deficit of about \$6 billion, lower if the State does not pay the K-12 shift, so payments will be run into the next fiscal year, which in turn reduces the projected deficit in the next two years. So the state budget needs to be cut about 12%, but if K-12 education and health are protected, the situation could be tough for higher education.

There is also the transition in University leadership, the President observed. He expressed confidence there will be strong candidates for the presidency because the University is much better than it was, which will serve it well in seeking a president. He emphasized that everyone in his administration will do the best they can to make sure the transition goes well.

In the midst of the large political changes that will occur there will also be changes in the membership of the Board of Regents, the President noted; the legislature will elect four Regents in February (two are outgoing and will not be up for re-election; two have served only one term and could be re-elected to a second six-year term). The candidates for the Board are not likely to run on platforms calling for an increase in the University's budget, the President surmised, and some may want to try to obtain more efficiencies. The University will be in a position where it must plan responses—in real time—to both political and financial pressures. The return-on-investment study, which will speak to some of the questions that may be raised, will be ready soon and will be brought to the Committee early in spring semester. The University will need to make the point about its DISTINCT role and essential contributions in the State.

Professor VandenBosch asked if "top three" is still an objective for the new administration or what the University should be striving for.

President Bruininks said the objective should remain as an aspirational goal. What he has said is that the University should be like those top-three public institutions and that it should benchmark itself against them. It is making progress in doing so. It would be a mistake to drop the goal; while one need not emphasize the three, it is appropriate to emphasize excellence. He said he believes people have more pride in the University, and in what it does, today than they did ten years ago. (For example, the President noted a recent comparison that had been made between matriculants at top STEM/science and technology universities and matriculants in the University's honors program; there is virtually no difference between the ACT scores of the two groups, and the scores of University students outrank those of many top-ranked liberal-arts colleges. Of those students, 61% are from Minnesota, 17% from Wisconsin, 2% from the Dakotas, and 14% from other states, and the University has doubled the number

and proportion of non-reciprocity students in the honors program.) The University needs to set high aspirational goals and work toward them, and benchmark itself against top public institutions. The University's metrics are tracking upward and improving faster than those at the top three institutions; the University should not pull back but it can be more nuanced in setting its aspirations—and can be clear about what those aspirations mean in terms of teaching and research. There is not, the President noted, a universally-clear definition of what a top research university should be.

Provost Sullivan reported that he spent two hours the previous day in a meeting with the University of Minnesota Foundation Board of Trustees, a meeting that included discussion of fund-raising and the University's reputation. There were several themes, one of which was that the top-three aspiration was very important and very inspirational. The Foundation's current and past leaders—Mr. Goldstein and Mr. Fischer—have both said the top-three goal was extremely important to fund-raising; the announcement of the goal led to a spike in fund-raising. The President agreed that the top-three goal was high on the list people give for donating.

Professor Chomsky said this was interesting to learn, because Committee members have heard comments how the "top three" goal played with other communities. What they have just told the Committee is a message that needs to be heard internally, from the Foundation. Conversations the Committee has had indicated this idea was a non-starter with internal audiences. But there has been no disagreement about high aspirations, and one still hears about the "top three" without any nuances. The message about the impact of the top-three goal needs to get out—just as information about the "Driven to Discover" campaign needs to get out. People need to hear that message about donations and public support and that these efforts are not silly.

The President said that he would now slip the words "land grant" into the goal. There are about 70 land-grant universities, and the University is in the top 3-4 of that group, based upon traditional academic measures. The President said he has a deep commitment to the land-grant mission, which includes providing access, and he worries that the University will be tagged as elitist. But having pride in saying the University should be excellent resonates with people, and while Minnesotans hate people who put on airs, they also do not want to seek mediocrity. Students and parents see a difference in the University, and that increases pride its future.

Professor Chomsky said she was not quibbling with high aspirations. What also needs to be part of the message is that it is realistic and that the University has made progress in several ways that have increased its standing. Her point is about the message, not the goal.

The President said that if the conversation is to move forward, there has to be agreement on indicators of excellence—and not just easy-to-collect data. The work of Professor Spivak matters [Professor Marla Spivak, who just won a MacArthur "genius" grant]; the number of faculty in the Institute of Medicine matters; the number of students who have been recognized for their outstanding work matters. It's not top three alone that matters, the President said, it's what makes the world better that matters. On the measures suggested by the task force, the University is moving up faster than many in its peer group, and some metrics should be land-grant-based, such as affordable access. And if that is the case, then why should not the University have one of the biggest financial-aid programs in the country?

The report to the Board is a wonderful testament to the outgoing administration, Professor Curley commented, and appropriately so, because the administration can be proud of what it has accomplished. He said he hoped that the outgoing officers would hear from people who are appreciative. His concern, he said, is about where the University is going as it is moving into a milieu where it will have to be making cuts, which is very different psychologically than making investments. He said he is still struggling with the philosophy or approach that will be taken toward handling a scaling back.

The President said he thinks of the glass as half full and that he did not know of any group better able to invent its own future than the members of the University community. That having been said, this is the worst set of conditions he has seen in higher education his entire adult life. It may be necessary to cut more because of concern about tuition increases and the difficult conditions students face in attending the University. He asked for an analysis of which units receive the most state funds; at the top is the Medical School, the College of Science and Engineering is second, CLA is third, and Duluth is fourth. Making cuts in the University budget is similar to trying to make cuts in the federal budget: Once the military and entitlements are removed from the equation, trying to balance the budget on the remainder is impossible. If the University will not cut less from the top units, and goes after the units that receive smaller amounts of state funding, then one must look at the other funds that the state funds help generate, such as in tuition, grants, private support, etc. The state funds provide great leverage in many units. He said he did not believe the University could achieve budget cuts at the limits; it needs to reform its cost structures—that is why he spent three years working on Medical School issues. Without restructuring the Medical School, it would not have been possible to produce a great, stronger medical school. There have to be questions about the curriculum, support systems, and cost structures. Are the faculty willing to revisit the liberal-education requirements? Revisit what students must take in high school that might meet University requirements? Be more aggressive in e-learning? One can cut central administration (e.g., there is no longer an agriculture vice president, after 100 years) and other offices and titles and positions can go, but those are also on the margins. The core operations are what need scrutiny, the President concluded. The University has made significant progress, and there is still more that it can accomplish in reducing administrative costs.

Provost Sullivan, responding to Professor Curley, said that there must be a balance between cutting and efficiency, on the one hand, and sustained and new investments, on the other. It would be a mistake to go forward doing nothing but cut, cut, cut, he said. The University must work to sustain its base, make cuts, and make investments. It may be necessary to cut deeper in order to provide funding for new investments, but if the institution just imposes cuts, it will lose quality and momentum for enhanced improvement.

The President agreed, and said that even in the worst budget years he has insisted on an investment pool. It has often been too low, but the funds should be used to leverage resources at the campus and college level, which is where most of the money is invested. The University should have at least \$20 million for annual investments, and that money should leverage an additional \$1-2. For example, the University needs to fund bioinformatics, which will mean moving people and money around; that investment will be needed to complete and strengthen the University's profile.

Professor Curley said he did not disagree with the need to continue to make investments, but that need just makes the cutting all the more difficult. But if one is to take a long-term view of enhanced quality of the University, it is something that must be done, the Provost replied.

The President said it can sometimes be difficult for a governing board to understand the need for a five-year commitment in order to protect the core. In the case of one top-rated academic department, the senior faculty decided the junior faculty must be protected at all costs, so awarded most of the salary-increase funds to the junior faculty and took virtually no raises themselves—in order that the department did not lose its junior faculty. While he would not necessarily recommend that option to all units, it represents the kind of courageous actions units may take to protect their quality.

Professor Curley reiterated his point that investments are an easy discussion, but they increase the size of the cuts that need to be made. It is the philosophy about cuts that is at issue. Professor Gonzales reported that when she speaks to colleagues, there is tumult and unease about the leadership transition as well as the political transitions and the election outcomes. Faculty agree that there have to be investments as well as cuts; the uncertainty arises when one translates the principles into action—or, to put it more bluntly, when the axe falls. How will the actions affect their work? What practical changes can faculty expect in coming months, given that there will be a new administration?

The President said he did not know what a new administration might do, of course, but he did not believe the new president would not be someone fully up to speed by the time he or she takes office. The axe has already fallen because units are being asked to model 3% and 5% cuts. He will argue for a reasonable tuition increase, accompanied by a strong need-based aid program that is tied to an aggressive fund-raising strategy. He will also ask for serious discussions about the number of programs and the size of graduate programs. Increasing tuition revenue by 10% over the next two years would mean about a \$70-million annual increase in revenue. He would be a lot more aggressive and entrepreneurial as well as do the hardest work possible, which is redesigning the curriculum, departments and service operations. Those would be local decisions, not something handed down from Morrill Hall. But the University cannot do just one thing, it has to do many things to adjust to the new reality in public higher education. That is why the blue-ribbon committees were a good idea, because they represent people talking to each other about things that can be done to protect the University's quality. The University will also need to sunset some activities; one of the consortia he started, the President recalled, has been sunsetted.

That all makes sense, Professor Gonzales said. Faculty (at least those who do not hold extreme opinions) feel uncertain in thinking about how their daily lives will change in the next few months. The President said he did not believe there would be big changes and that any changes that occur will not be abrupt.

If there is a predictable decline in state funding for higher education, and the decline accelerates, and the University must thus reset its expectations for state funding, some units will have to be more self-supporting, the President said. Some colleges will continue to need a significant investment of state dollars because the disciplines are more expensive to support (e.g., engineering), but other colleges can be more self-supporting. There is now a differential in allocations of state funds; the process of allocation is dynamic over time.

One leg of the stool is raising more money, Professor Luepker said, and few would argue that the University should not continue to make investments. How will the decisions be made about what to invest in? Everyone could identify fields that he or she believes should be growing. As for cuts in state funding, one could make the cuts across-the-board, but if there are differential cuts, are there guiding principles or rules for making such cuts? Is leveraging state funds to bring in more money one criterion?

The President commented that it cannot be a scientific formula. One starts with the framing goals of the University, and high aspirations, and then brings the seven planning principles/criteria and qualitative and quantitative analysis. The priorities come from below, not Morrill Hall, or they will not be competitive in a few years—they come from the faculty, from the Vice President for Research, the Provost, deans, and others. Priorities are a combination of ideas that come up through the planning/budgeting process, using the established criteria, and subject to measures to track them as they go forward. He said he believes that leveraging should be on the list of criteria to consider. There is no way simply to grind out decisions; they require judgment at all levels.

Professor Luepker observed that this group could be meeting again in April facing a sizeable reduction in state funding, and cuts will have been made, new ideas considered, and the budget still not balanced. Then what happens?

The University must balance its budget, President Bruininks said. He would put revenues on the table first. They need descriptions from faculty on how to make the case on what happens when the budget is cut. The arguments need more salience, and presumably revolved around the quality of instruction, the opportunity costs to replace faculty, the difficulty in retaining the most productive people. But the budget will balance. The administration can provide bridge funds where they are needed, and there will have to be a serious discussion about resetting state funding over time in units; but the difficult reductions will need to be made.

Provost Sullivan noted, in response to Professor Luepker's question about how decisions are made, that he spent considerable time at the last meeting of this Committee describing the pathway of the decision-making process. It will be very clear how investments are made. And the University has to go after long-term costs, the President added. Some decisions have to be made at the enterprise-wide level, not by the units (for example, in energy costs and in information technology). This university is doing more systematically than many of its peers and is also approaching the risk culture to reduce long-term costs (which adds enormously to costs). The University has started on some of these changes; in some cases, they can lay the foundation for long-term reform.

Professor Hancher said he had a number of questions. The economic crisis confronts universities across the country and also abroad; the recent Browne report in the U.K. is a striking and disquieting response. The Morrill Act (of 1862)--the legislation on which the University was founded--was designed "to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes"; but the Browne report limits public subsidy to practical education only, and abandons liberal education--for all the universities in the country. There are already pressures in the U.S. to privilege practical education at the expense of liberal education. How can the University avoid the U.K.'s bad result?

This reminds him again of the comment that H. L. Mencken made, the President responded: "For every complex problem, there is a solution that is simple, neat, and wrong." There could be a tendency in the state to say that the University should get out of undergraduate education and let the MnSCU schools handle it. The University faced this in the 1980s. The University agreed to reduce lower-division enrollment in return for increased investment in upper division, graduate, and professional education. The investment was not made. The University should resist the idea that education should be primarily practical, the President said. The beauty of universities is that the faculty do research and teach; the University should resist any such pressure because the goal does not fit the University's mission or more substantial purpose. It should fight hard for what will make it excellent. He said he does not know of one

great graduate program that does not have an excellent undergraduate program, and there are only a small number of such integrated educational programs in European schools. The American system has done both, lived up to the Morrill Act and developed outstanding undergraduate, graduate, and professional programs, because it is an entrepreneurial system with an entirely different culture from other parts of the world. The University must continue to fight for its programs, which will be difficult in a tight job market; the practical value is real and can be dealt with by expanding internship opportunities. Perhaps strong liberal-arts majors could have the opportunity to take a more career-oriented minor. Career services will be important. The Law School has set up a fund to provide money for unemployed graduates to work for non-profits—that is the kind of innovation that is needed. But career and liberal education must be joined, not separated, he concluded.

The University's foundation document is broad, Professor Hancher remarked, but the economic pressures in England are forcing a narrowing. How will the University resist? Students will help, the President commented; they do not come to the University solely for a narrow education. It may be that the rules about liberal-education requirements will need to be revisited, he said, as may the residency rules about obtaining the last credits needed for a degree. The University has to fight the kind of proposal advanced by the Browne Committee because it is a bad idea. They are fighting it in England as well, Professor Hancher commented, and while the proposal is across an ocean, one feels there could be a wave coming this way. As a practical matter, Provost Sullivan commented, it would be more useful to ask the CEOs of Minnesota corporations to speak to the worry that Professor Hancher has expressed. The CEOs say that the best employees are those who are liberally educated and well-read and that they can train people in what they need to know about the specific business.

The President said the University needs to think more about better partnerships between the University, the last two years of high school, and the community colleges. There are great examples that already exist that have not been scaled up to the level of the institution.

Professor Anderson said she agreed with the President that faculty are creative, but they are also good at recognizing perverse incentives. The University's financial problems will require creative solutions at the college and department level, but there is a perception that when deans and department heads do something for the good of the University that saves money, their units then see further cuts. The administration must find a way to reward units that do things for the well-being of the University as a whole.

The President agreed. The institution wants cultural incentives, not disincentives. That is why, when they talk about investment, it is not just putting money in, it also means providing bridge support for new possibilities (such as hiring faculty for a different area). He agreed there need to be new incentives but said that some of what people hear is not accurate, some of it is University urban legend, and in some cases people are reluctant to take on their own culture. He said, by way of example, that he looked at the curricula of some other schools, to try to figure out how they established it, and some are entirely favorable to faculty interests while some are more coherent. There are a number of curricula in graduate programs that do not appear to reflect what a serious discussion would produce; they appear to be more an aggregation of everyone's interests. He agreed that the institution needs to reward units that do the right things in addressing these important, common interests.

Provost Sullivan recalled comments by Professor Chomsky at the last meeting of the Committee about the need to do a better job of communication, both from the top down and the bottom up. She was

right, he said. Those in central administration may not hear about innovation or major changes in the departments that can be a model for others. Professor Anderson said that any innovative corporation has established ways for ideas to trickle up.

Professor Hancher's concern notwithstanding, Professor Brothen said, given the current zeitgeist, people expect investments to make money. If so, does the University need to think differently about investments? Professor Hancher interjected that the Browne report calculated on improving economic returns for the country, discounting other values; Professor Brothen replied that the University's situation is even more pointed, with perhaps a \$100-million hole in the budget. The President said that the University needs to do both (career and liberal education). The Browne report uses a short-term lens rather than a long-term planning model, the Provost commented.

The University can do more, the President said. It can be slow to adopt ways to serve people. The Carlson School may be the most flexible in dealing with students, so there are other models that could be scaled to the institution. He said he believes the University can compete; with an additional \$70-80 million, used well, and with a good return on investment (ROI), there could be a significant impact and the University could reach more people.

Professor Elliott said she was intrigued by, and agreed with, the observation that the University should not lop off limbs, but instead think deeply about the future and structure of the education the University can best provide. She asked that the President share his comments from the 40,000-foot level about the role of the University in public education, as it fits in the state's efforts to educate all who are served: the youngest to the most exquisitely-prepared scholar. In addition, she asked his thoughts about how this perspective affects the University, its investments, and investments into the University by outside funders.

President Bruininks said there is a tendency to think that because state dollars are tight, the public mission of the University is less important. He said he completely rejects that idea. If the University practices all three parts of its mission well, the public mission can actually increase new resources. He said he has been intrigued by the NSF requirement that grant applicants indicate the broader public impact of their work. He has also been impressed by the impact of the Urban Research and Outreach Center in north Minneapolis, which has led to the generation of about \$9 million in new grants through the colleges. One of the most important parts of the land-grant mission, he said, is to be closely connected with other educational systems—which is why, for example, the University has worked closely with Art Rolnick of the Federal Reserve Board on early-childhood education. It is important that the University stay engaged and its resources remain connected to the entire educational system—while at the same time the University is not going to run schools. But that connection should be a big part of the University's agenda. In a world with less and less money for education, there needs to be more thought about University connections with the two-year colleges and the high schools, and perhaps with greater engagement of University faculty. The University is in a strong position and can be a leader; he would argue that the "new economic normal" does not mean less emphasis on the public mission. It must be careful about carrying it out, but to de-emphasize it would be a colossal mistake.

Senior Vice President Jones said that it is critical higher education be more strategic and intentional in its role in supporting K-12 education. Given the demographics of the state, and the looming achievement gap, the University cannot say that is only a K-12 problem when it (the University) has resources that could help. There are excellent programs around the state that do well with small cohorts,

but the gap is getting worse nonetheless. The University can be a convener and provide expertise, but not run the schools. It has been somewhat disengaged, but its resources could be leveraged to help develop a strategy to close the achievement gap. There is a model in Cincinnati, where the University of Cincinnati played a leadership role in pulling the philanthropic and business communities together and relied on data-driven research to help the schools. The community colleges have an important role to play in other areas of the state as well, he added, not just the Twin Cities. There are also opportunities to raise new resources, the President said. Senior Vice President Jones can provide several examples of projects funded by external groups.

The President said he had spoken with several people about the framing idea the Committee had posed for this meeting, the land-grant university in the 21st Century. He recalled that the institution considered a similar question during its sesquicentennial and needs to do so again. There are times when the University community identifies big issues and brings people together to solve them.

One of the subsidiary questions that the Committee raised was whether the eight interdisciplinary initiatives are still important topics that should remain the foci for future efforts, or if some should be sunsetted and new ones initiated. Or should interdisciplinary activities still be a priority at all? The President's answer was "yes and yes." In 2003 they tried to frame issues about why interdisciplinary work and a culture to support it were vitally important to the University's future. He still believes that is true. They identified themes and trends where the University had interdisciplinary work going on; the President noted several, such the Institute for Advanced Studies, the study of the brain function across the life spectrum (which led to a recent \$30-million grant to map the human brain), Healthy Foods, Healthy Lives, etc. Some of these themes and trends migrated into centers while other are embedded in academic programs. His point is that these emphases are vitally important to the strength of the University.

The President also agreed that some things need to be sunsetted. Some have been, such as one he helped initiate. He said he does not want to send the message that there were eight things he cared about that should be preserved; they were opportunities to convene a conversation about future interdisciplinary opportunities. It is the University's responsibility to do more and more work in promoting interdisciplinary directions. Provost Sullivan pointed out that to the extent the initiatives became embodied in centers, there is a regular schedule of peer reviews of the centers, including the possibility of sunsetting them.

Professor VandenBosch noted that strategic planning got underway in 2004; to what extent were those efforts farsighted in anticipating the financial situation the University is now in, and to what extent are there new elements that need to be incorporated to take into account the new normal? It is a continuum, Provost Sullivan said. Phase I was to increase academic synergy and redesign a number of colleges to improve efficiency and enhance quality across related academic areas. Phase II was a deeper implementation of the plans. Phase III began with the "financing the future" report, a future very different from what would have been imagined when strategic planning started in 2004. It is now a more stressful time, so expectations and aspirations need to be reset as the institution balances between cuts and investments.

The President said he would argue that they tried to make clear what is very important to the University's future and adopted strategies to get there. Those efforts must continue. The University should not blink when it comes to keeping quality education, advance research, provide cultural support for interdisciplinary work, promote public purpose, and so on. The University must stay the course if it is

to get the results it wants. People often spend too little time discussing goals and strategies for achieving them (e.g., in undergraduate education, if they had not thought about a scholarship strategy and had a value-based discussion about need versus merit aid, and gone out to raise money, the institution would be in a very different place now). He suggested taking the reports that had been developed and identifying where things are missing and what areas must be reduced, maintained, or strengthened.

Provost Sullivan noted that the strategic-planning effort began in 2004-05. One of the Big Ten schools, Michigan State, announced today that it is looking at 42 programs to eliminate. Iowa has identified 26. Ohio State has reconfigured a number of colleges and reduced the number of deans on campus in a short period of time. Other major institutions are doing the same. The University was in front of the curve; the distinction is that its efforts took place at a time when the goal was to improve academic programs and synergies, while today the approach across the country is often to cut. While they might have done some things differently, the President added, they were the right things to do at the time.

Professor VandenBosch thanked the President, the Provost, and Senior Vice President Jones for joining the meeting. She adjourned the meeting at 3:15.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota