

Minutes of the Budget Committee of the Academic Senate Meeting of Sept. 29, 2017

PLEASE NOTE YELLOW-HIGHLIGHTED ACTION ITEMS IN MINUTES AND AT END FROM EARLIER MEETINGS REQUIRING ADMINISTRATIVE FOLLOWUP

Present: Linda Beale (Chair), Obadiah Bitar*, Kristen Chinery**, Victoria Dallas, William Decatur***, Brian Edwards, Mahendra Kavdia, Santanu Mitra, Charles Parrish, Louis Romano, Heather Sandlin, Richard Smith, Tim Stemmler****, William Volz,

Absent with Notice: Thomas Anderson *****, Diana Goode***, Nancy George, Christopher Lund, Bryan Morrow, Beena Sood, Ricardo Villarosa, Sudip Datta

Invited guest: Keith Whitfield

*Student Liaison
**AAUP-AFT Liaison
***Administration Liaison
****Graduate Council Liaison
*****UPTF Liaison

The meeting began at 11:15 am.

I. Enrollment and Budget Update

Vice President Decatur and Provost Whitfield provided a brief enrollment and budget update. They indicated that FTIAC and transfer credit hours were up somewhat more than expected (2.89% for FTIAC, 0.9% for Transfers), while graduate enrollments—in particular, masters enrollments and international students, especially in Engineering—were down somewhat less than expected (-9% instead of -33%). The budget is therefore essentially stable, with perhaps slightly more revenue (between one and two million) than anticipated.

ACTION ITEM: ASBC would appreciate a detailed update by student status on headcounts, credit hours, revenues, and projected budget surplus/deficits for the October 16, 2017 ASBC meeting.

RCM (responsibility centered management) planning has developed apace over the summer. The six “teams” working on specific topics—revenue allocations, cost allocations, strategic initiatives, infrastructure spending, communications—have developed preliminary recommendations. There will be an RCM Town Hall meeting (to be announced shortly) with Provost Whitfield and VP Decatur, with the possibility for simultaneous streaming and recording for those unable to attend. There will then be a meeting of the co-chairs of each of the teams with the RCM Steering Committee. VP Decatur did not share any of the directions of the preliminary recommendations.

The relationship between the Pediatrics plan (UP) and the School of Medicine (SoM) remains unresolved and the subject of much discussion and disagreement. VP Decatur indicated that a major problem is that the practice plans have not complied with the existing agreements, including payment of the so-called “Dean’s Tax” which was set at 8.9%

until this year. Prof. Parrish noted that the University held a meeting in August at which it indicated that a decision must be made regarding updating the agreement with UP and threatened to stop making payments from the University if the agreement were not finalized. Prof. Romano asked whether the University had studied and come to any conclusions regarding the financial implications to the University if UP were to terminate its connection with the University. Apparently, there is no official information on that issue.

The Chair noted that it had been brought to various Senate members' attention that the University had decided to shut down the current pharmacy on campus. The matter was covered in one of the local papers, and the story indicated that no rationale had been given for the decision. VP Decatur noted that dealings between the University and the current independent pharmacy owner had been quite difficult for a long time. The University has made multiple rent concessions to enable the pharmacy to remain, but as a result does not receive a market rent on the space. Although at one time our Pharmacy students were able to do residencies at the current pharmacy, the School concluded that that was no longer viable because they were not getting an adequate experience. Students have also indicated that they would prefer one of the national retailers. The University is therefore planning to bring a national pharmacy such as CVS into the new housing complex on Anthony Wayne as one of several new retail tenants that will pay market rent for the space, provide appropriate services to students. The expectation is that the new pharmacy will offer suitable residency positions for our Pharmacy students.

[Note: After the meeting, a member who checked with the School's leadership reported that the School was not concerned with the quality of the experience at the pharmacy, but rather was hesitant to assign students to the pharmacy because of the uncertainty regarding whether the pharmacy was going to remain on campus and thus concern about the ability of students to complete a residency there.]

II. BoG Documents

A. Various contingency planning documents

ASBC reviewed various BoG documents, including the contingency reserve report covering various dean and other administrative searches, a conditional term extension for the Corvias Campus Living arrangement if it proves necessary beyond the anticipated 40 year term for bond payoff, authorization to utilize developer's contingency funds for Phase I and Phase II of the campus housing facilities master plan as needed (with Phase I being the Anthony Wayne housing project and demolition of DeRoy for slightly over \$119 million and Phase II being remodeling of Chatsworth for \$28 million).

B. Chatsworth

The Board is also being asked to authorize the implementation of the Chatsworth renovation for \$28 million. VP Decatur noted that this is a renovation that will reconfigure the interior of the building to create suites for undergraduate student housing, and that this is in line with the original expectations when the Corvias partnership was entered into.

ASBC members were generally supportive of this project, but did note that there seems to be an exclusive focus on undergraduate students. VP Decatur responded that the cabinet has seen this focus as important in the effort to retain students by creating a better sense of

community on campus, and that it reflected market studies of undergraduate student demand. Prof. Romano noted that a study of the relationship between retention/success and living on campus here had shown that there was no improvement in retention or GPAs that can be correlated with on-campus living arrangements. Several members also noted that in the past we were able to use the possibility of on-campus graduate housing as a significant recruitment tool for our graduate programs (filling both DeRoy and Forest with graduate students), an incentive that has almost disappeared, other than whatever graduate students end up being able to find housing in University Towers. This may be a factor impacting our ability to attract masters and Ph.D. students generally, and certainly also affects our ability to attract and retain post-doctoral students with families.

The committee urged Provost Whitfield and VP Decatur to look more closely at this issue, especially as the Master Plan is developed, and consider ways in which the University can offer accessible housing for graduate students and post-doctoral students, including those with families, even while attempting to satisfy the demands of undergraduates for more comfortable on-campus housing.

C. Electrical Utility Conversion

VP Decatur noted that the project for converting from PLD to DTE is slated for completion for a lower cost than originally expected--\$6 million instead of \$11 million. DTE is taking responsibility for more of the costs outside buildings and there are fewer underground vaults that must be established than expected. Members asked whether this should end the "brown-outs" that many of the science laboratories experience, and VP Decatur responded that it should completely fix any of the problems connected with PLD, since the University is revamping the electrical grid appropriately in each of the affected buildings. Members expressed surprise that this project could be completed at such a relatively low price, since many departments on campus purchased very expensive (\$10 million or more) and nonetheless unsatisfactory generators as an interim remedy to the brown-out problem. It would have been preferable to go directly to replacement of PLD, if that had been possible. This was before VP Decatur's term on campus, so he was unable to respond to that issue.

D. C&IT Data Center Construction Authorization

The University plans to move forward with construction of a new building (essentially, a secure 'box' for the data center) in the parking area behind the current C&IT structure. The Chair asked about plans for use of the vacated space, and VP Decatur indicated that the use is as yet undecided. Prof. Smith asked whether this data center was the correct response and whether there had been adequate consideration of cloud (leasing) versus dedicated physical space and equipment (owning). VP Decatur indicated that this decision was made after extensive consideration by C&IT, and the Chair noted that there had been discussion of that issue at the Information Systems Management Committee (ISMC).

E. Day Care Facility

This item is not included in the BoG documents, but the Chair asked for an update on the current status of planning for a campus day care facility. VP Decatur indicated that the committee that had been working on the day care facility concluded that it did not have sufficient expertise to select an existing campus site for the facility. Accordingly, an RFP was developed, and Rainbow was selected to be the operator of Wayne's day care facility.

Under the RFP, Rainbow would be responsible for constructing and managing the facility. The Chair asked that a copy of the RFP be shared with ASBC so that the members can understand how this facility is envisioned to operate and what the budgetary implications are.

ACTION ITEM: VP Decatur agreed to provide a copy of the Day Care Facility RFP to the ASBC.

F. Capital Projects Update

VP Decatur noted that a “slimmed down” capital projects list was used for presentation, awaiting this fall’s planned Master Plan process to re-prioritize and settle on appropriate future projects.

1. STEM Building

The STEM building remains the requested priority for State funding: although the project has already been approved for State funding, the money must nonetheless be appropriated by the Legislature and thus we are required to put the STEM building project in this iteration of the request.

2. Hilberly Gateway Project vs. Scott Hall Research Facilities

The Chair noted that the Capital Projects report includes expectation of funding for the Hilberly Gateway project, for which the new study (shared with ASBC as requested the morning of the meeting and attached to this report) indicates an increased cost to \$65 million, exactly as ASBC had predicted a year or so ago.

The Chair asked about fundraising for the project, since only about \$7 million of donor funds had been raised of the original \$10 million target (set when the overall project cost was \$50 million). VP Decatur indicated that it is expected that the University will do the project and will use debt to finance \$55 million, with *no increase in the fundraising target* (emphasis added). In response to a question about debt capacity, VP Decatur noted that it depends in part on how much we are willing to undergo a ratings decline (resulting in at least slightly higher interest carrying costs) in order to finance needed campus facility improvements. Currently, the expectation is that we get about \$109 million of debt off our books through the Corvias partnership, and that we would take on about \$125 million of new debt for the five projects listed.

The Chair noted that meant that the Hilberly project would take almost half of the total new debt, leaving very little for much-needed research laboratory and classroom improvements. Various members spoke to the difficult juxtapositioning of undertaking the **Hilberly project** now (even though it is unlikely to have a significant impact on increased revenues for the University and is being done mostly with bonds instead of donor funds, in an area where one would anticipate that there should be considerable donor interest) and continuing to neglect any attention whatsoever to **Scott Hall**, an acknowledgedly deteriorating research facility that is critical to our standing as a research university and to our ability to hire stellar faculty with grants and provide appropriate research opportunities in the SoM. Other classroom facilities remain in similar outdated and crumbling states. Prof. Romano noted that AVP Wyatt had indicated that Scott Hall is the

one building on campus that keeps him awake at night because of its deteriorated state. The Policy and Budget Committees of the Senate have attempted to draw administrative attention to this issue for a decade at least, and yet it continues to be shoved down in priority.

In summary, although everybody agrees that the idea of revamping the Theater complex into an attractive Midtown draw is appealing, we are very concerned about the budgetary impact on two counts:

- 1) fundraising should be able to raise considerably more of the costs of the performance complex and
- 2) the University's inattention to Scott Hall is a costly mistake that directly affects the ability of the University to carry out its research mission.

III. Budgetary Implications of the Gen Ed Proposal

ASBC members received the August 29, 2017 administrative proposal for changes to the General Education (Gen Ed) program. It essentially reduces the number of credits by 14. There would be only one science requirement (current University-wide Gen Ed requires both a life science and a physical science; current CLAS Gen Ed requires a third science). In addition to science departments, it can be expected that Philosophy, languages, and communication departments would lose credits, in some cases significant revenue sources. Further, the Proposal calls for new courses with vague generalities re expected outcomes and no indication of the faculty that will house and take charge of them—in fact, the administration appears to think that academic staffers in the Academic Success Center under Monica Brockmeyer would be entirely responsible for teaching and supervising the “Wayne Experience” course, which is envisioned as a one-credit “how to get along in College and enjoying the college community experience” course. The Wayne Focus one-credit course (maybe or maybe not required) has even less substantive content. There is no indication of plans to revamp the Math 1000 course that has proven a significant stumbling block for student, or consideration of placing these types of courses in Education rather than Math, which has not indicated much interest in teaching non-Math majors. There is no information about content of, nor planning for staff, the math co-curricular courses.

Accordingly, the Chair had asked Darin Ellis, the Associate Vice Provost working most closely with the Gen Ed proposal, a series of questions, set out in the attached Appendix, that followed his responses to questions asked by the Faculty Affairs Committee (on which the Chair serves as Policy liaison).

The ASBC members discussed a range of budgetary questions regarding the following: (i) the credit-hour losses to key University departments (the sciences, Philosophy, Communications, foreign languages, social sciences, among others); (ii) what impact that is likely to have on various part-time faculty who have been hired long-term in these areas and on ability to replace senior faculty who retire or otherwise leave the University; (iii) whether there will be any transition funding to ease the burden of the shift in resources; (iv) the curricular development, staffing, training, supervision and scheduling for the vaguely set out skills-oriented WE and WF one-credit courses; (v) the curricular development, staffing, training, supervision and scheduling for the new math one-credit co-curricular course; (vi) the means that would be used to incentivize faculty to develop FYI and other courses with emphasis on diversity and participatory techniques (whether workload relief or semester or summer funding for developing new courses); (vii) whether

there would be RPFs to faculty for developing WE, FYI, and math courses (such as the new quantitative course), both to ensure a broad array of well-considered new inquiry and WE and math courses and to support faculty in ensuring that the new Gen Ed program has some substantive benefit other than mere reduction in credits; (viii) estimates of administrative costs of implementing the new proposal, including the expected need for extensive one-on-one advising time for most of our current and new students; (viii) consideration in the revenue allocation process under RCM for balancing the revenues from Gen Ed courses across departments; (ix) costs of a rushed implementation of the full proposal, when most of the planning for any new ideas is remarkably incomplete and may well result in missteps and inefficiencies that will be costly to various departments and schools; and (x) development of a well-considered and multichannel “marketing” proposal for explaining the changes to parents, potential students, existing students, and the broader community in ways that will benefit rather than damage the reputation of the University.

Specific issues raised in the discussion follow.

a. WE:

One member asked what the GERC and GEOC planners of the new Gen Ed proposal thought was the need being addressed by the new WE and WF courses. The outcomes seem to be quite broad for a 1-credit course, and it is not clear what substance supports those outcomes. Some members were concerned that a one-credit, one-size-fits-all WE course would be both too much and not enough—too much for students who already have good study habits and would be offended by being pushed into a for-credit “baby” course and too little for students who really need a strong skills-development period. It was suggested that the study skills outcomes of the WE course are more suited to a non-credit orientation program than to a for-credit one-size-fits-all course. Another member suggested that students should be able to test out in some way from the WE requirement, if it is retained as a single, study-skills course.

Members seemed to agree that the WE requirement would be more reasonable as a for-credit course if there were various options (including, perhaps, a Great Books course, a community engagement course connected to an Inquiry course, or similar options), as proposed by the Policy Committee in mid-summer.

Other members pointed out that the University had tried a required credit course in study skills in the past, which had ultimately ended up in the Library and was largely panned by both faculty and students as a wasteful course that didn’t help students. Parents may well object to paying the credit-hour fee for their students, if they think their students are well-prepared for college. Another member mentioned that various schools have some type of first year inquiry course, but the materials covered and the purposes vary widely, and it is not clear what would work best for Wayne. One member asked Provost Whitfield about Duke’s first year inquiry course—it is required of all students, but there are a number of options within the fixed structure and it is topic-oriented, not skills oriented. The current Wayne State first year seminar is completely voluntary—students choose to sign up. It has only about 20 sections, so upscaling that to accommodate the entire freshman class would be a major undertaking with significant budgetary costs since it would require a faculty (or administrative) supervisor to ensure consistency and quality in the programming, and would either require training of academic staffers to teach it or, as several members of the committee suggested, finding ways to incentivize the professoriate to undertake it.

Implementing this course without more careful consideration could create problems and could well lead to costly expenditures without much gain.

It might be advisable both from a substantive and a budgetary perspective for the University to consider pilot programs for these types of courses—perhaps experimenting with an orientation approach and a for-credit approach based on calling for faculty RFPs for new course proposals—before adopting this as a permanent part of the Gen Ed curriculum.

b. Math 1000 and Math Co-Curricular

ASBC members noted that there has been no development of the math co-curricular, which ideally should be done through RFPs to faculty for proposals for developing the course. Although there is general support for the idea of providing a concurrently offered support class for those with lower scores on the math placement test, it is not clear whether a one-credit course is sufficient. Other problems that will need to be addressed and that may have budgetary implications are staffing for the course and scheduling to work with the regularly scheduled math courses that the co-curricular is supplementing. It was not clear from Darin Ellis's answers whether these considerations had been taken into account. Presumably, these co-curricular courses will need to be small classes (15 students) that are taught by someone with math skills and teaching ability. One of the ongoing problems with the regular math courses is that they are generally taught by Math graduate students who often have limited English skills and no training in teaching. That suggests that there will need to be budget expenditures to support development of the courses and training of the graduate students to teach those courses (or support for faculty to take these on as an additional workload assignment).

ASBC members continued to express concern that the current proposal, after an 18-month suspension of the math competency requirement, still includes no clear information about the means of development the new math quantitative experience course or the support for faculty in either Math or Education to develop and teach it. There also seems to be no budgetary consideration of ways to support Math in improving Math 1000, which has long been a problematic course, again because of the lack of English and teaching skills by many of the graduate students in Math who teach these lower-level math courses.

c. Advising

ASBC members noted the need for considerable additional support for advising during any transition period to a new Gen Ed curriculum. Academic staff member Vicki Dallas noted that most students will need one-on-one advising sessions, usually taking about 30 minutes. Scheduling and conducting those sessions can't take place until advisers themselves receive appropriate training in the answers to the many questions students will have (must I take WE; can I opt to take the math co-curricular even if it is not required for me, etc.). Even if only 80% of the students require a special advising session about Gen Ed, that is essentially 9000 hours of advising that need to take place in a rather short time frame.

d. Credit for credit hours for WE if it is taught by the Academic Success Center

If academic staffers teach the WE course (as suggested as ideal from a 'brain science' perspective by Darin Ellis), that means that the tuition and fees for that course will be, at least initially, allocated to that center. Is that an appropriate result? Should some of that

tuition and fees go back to the schools and colleges, especially to departments that lost credit hours because of the changes?

e. Provost's Office concerns

The Chair asked the Provost to address, to the extent possible, the various questions raised in the discussion and in the email exchange with Darin Ellis. Provost Whitfield said that he is "committed to fund the development of courses, but it is a short timeline and thus unlikely that everything will hit for the Fall 2018 semester. Some will have to be phased in later." Not considering WE for now, Provost Whitfield asked what the group thought was needed to invest in faculty to ensure development of new curricular options. He noted he would not want it to be excessive, but enough to incentivize faculty. There were various suggestions in the group, with most suggesting funding course development with a 6-10 thousand grant that might support a faculty over the summer to develop an entirely new course. Prof. Romano suggested that the Provost should ask the chairs for proposals for WE and FYI courses, with the understanding that there would be appropriate funding from the Provost's Office. Others noted that there needs to be support for developing new courses and also support for changing the workload from a course taught in the past to a new, perhaps more cross-disciplinary and participatory course. Some faculty of course may be enthusiastic and willing to develop such new courses without extra incentives. (The Chair notes that there has long been a University committee under the Provost's Office that parcels out faculty development grant money to faculty for exactly these kinds of purposes: that process could easily be expanded with a pot of money to support development of WE, FYI, WF, math co-curricular and other Inquiry courses.)

The Provost also noted that he hoped that the consultation with the Academic Senate would result in "solutions that work within the timeline we're given." Prof. Romano suggested that a better solution would be to implement a math competency replacement requirement now for the Fall 2018 semester and delay the other changes for another year in order to give faculty a chance to submit proposals for courses and give the university a chance to determine the best way to handle the WE and WF and FYI courses. The Board of Governors seemed to be particularly concerned with getting a new math competency requirement in place, in part because the "temporary suspension" was originally okayed for a period of 18 months, and that is ending. The lower-level math courses are also a major hang-up for students in terms of GPA and retention: focusing on those courses and getting a really good solution in place for Fall 2018 would be budgetarily efficient and likely have positive impact. That way, the WE and WF and FYI courses, and the decisions about what courses should count as each type of inquiry, can be made in a more efficient process that gives faculty a chance to develop good new courses with appropriate Provost support.

.....

The meeting adjourned at 12:45. The ASBC will **meet again on October 16 at our regular meeting time (Monday, 11 - 12:30)** for a further discussion of the Gen Ed proposal budgetary implications.

ACTION ITEMS FROM EARLIER MEETINGS TO BE FOLLOWED UP ON:

1. **Master Plan.** At the April 2017 meeting, VP Decatur indicated that he expected a Master Plan process to get underway as soon as possible when the faculty return in the fall. The Chair suggested that VP Decatur send Policy Committee a charge for the Master Planning Committee and a request for nominees, so that the Committee can be named before the Fall semester begins.
2. **Parking Rates.** In our April 2017 meeting, we discussed winding down of major expenditures on parking structure improvements. The justification for the regular increase in parking rates over the last 8 or so years was that this was needed to undertake key modernization projects. Former VP Nork also claimed that the administration was merely increasing charges to the going “market rate” in the University vicinity. The Budget Committee had objected, however, for two reasons: 1) the rate would quickly rise to much higher than the rate for paid parking on the edges of the campus and 2) once the planned projects were completed, there would be a continuous surplus generated unless the rates were moved back down to a market rate. VP Decatur was not familiar with that history and indicated that he would need to study the issue. It was suggested that Tim Michael come to a meeting in the future to discuss these concerns.
3. **Rationale for delay in posting endowment earnings** to beneficiary accounts.
4. **Amount paid by SoM for consultants in FY 2016.**

APPENDIX: CORRESPONDENCE WITH DARIN ELLIS REGARDING VARIOUS QUESTIONS ABOUT THE GEN ED PROPOSAL

- A. FAC questions from Chair renee hoogland (in blue) and responses from Darin Ellis (in red).

1. Who is expected to teach the new Math course, and to set up and take on the co-requisite? Have Math faculty been consulted on this? It is our understanding that the “old” (failing) math requirement course was primarily taught by grad students, whose English tends to be rather poor. Is there a blueprint or draft for the new course, and have Math faculty have had any input? Are there faculty available to teach this course in Fall 2018? Will students who have been exempted from the Math requirement in the past two years be expected to take the new course in order to complete their GE?

DE. Many individual experts from my Wayne State community have been consulted over the past year. The starting blueprint, much like the rest of generated, is to take what we have and do our best to renew and re-invigorate it. That is, MAT1000 is still the starting point for quantitative reasoning classes that service as an alternate to algebra or statistics.

Exactly who is qualified to teach which courses is, of course, a matter for faculty input. It would be appropriate and welcome in my opinion for the academic senate to weigh in on this. Ultimately, chairs and deans have to make trade-offs based on assigning people to their highest need, and availability. If a language barrier is determined, in fact, to be the primary driver behind continued problems with math, then we should definitely undertake an intervention.

The Provost has asked me to convene a task force of folks from math, math education, and other stakeholders from around campus. This task force should have a kick off meeting in the next two weeks. I will be sure to put these questions to the task force as well

2. Are the various colleges at this point being consulted as to the feasibility of having the new program in place by Fall 2018? Since CLAS, Social Sciences, and Philosophy appear to be among the programs/departments to be most immediately affected by the proposed changes, has the administration been in consultation with these units to take on the new challenges and potential opportunities?

DE. We have a position statement from from philosophy and I have been in active consultation with the chairs of both languages and history. I have also been approached by and provided guidance to numerous faculty interested in shifting courses or developing new courses for the new framework.

As for feasibility of implementation, notwithstanding big knowledged issues with FYI and WE, I am confident that a rollover of last year's classes with new tags and a new DW audit should solve 90+ percent of our implementation issues. That's the reason that GEOC wanted to make sure that almost all of our existing Gen Ed courses were valid under the new classification. I would even propose that the critical thinking class be valid as an FYI (with perhaps some rework), for example.

3. Is there any information (concrete) as to what the Wayne Experience and the Wayne Focus courses will actually entail? What will be the content of these courses and who will teach them? Is it clear at what level these courses will be offered/taught?

DE. Tbd, to some extent. I happen to believe a good starting point is our first year seminar, taught out of the academic success center. It is solid brain science centered on learning and could be modified to include social science of belonging and academic success. I know others don't share this view, but I think we can come up with something over the next few years that everybody will be happy with, if GEOC and other shared governance bodies are charged with undertaking this.

4. As to the new courses, esp. the "Inquiries," is it clear who will be expected to teach these? Will there be any incentives for faculty to develop (and teach) these courses? Will there be compensation for faculty undertaking these new initiatives? How is the development and implementation of new courses to fold in with the simultaneous rolling out of RCM?

DE. Again, the vast majority of these courses already exist. All PS and LS courses make up the starting point NSI list, for example. As for development and implementation of new courses under RCM, it will have to follow the same rules as other courses, I suppose. Departments create new courses all the time, so I am genuinely unsure what the issue is here. I'm happy to continue the discussion on this topic though, if I am missing something

5. Will there be enough time to develop and evaluate (GEOC) of the new courses before F2018? Will it be possible to get all the new course info into the Banner system before F2018? Is there a plan in place to do so? How and when will student advisors be trained to help students find their way in and through the new program?

DE. I have discussed this with our course records people in the registrar. Given that many of the courses will just need a addition of a new channel tag, it won't be an issue. New courses will go through the GEOC process - we are meeting biweekly. Advisors will be oriented in Nov/Dec and trained after DegreeWorks is coded (Jan/Feb)

6. Is there a plan to prepare and advice faculty who will be most immediately affected by the changes in the program? When will they have an opportunity to express their concerns and ask questions?

DE. Senate meeting or memo to me would both be good venues.

What is the power/authority of the colleges in the implementation of the new program?

DE. I can give a better answer to specific scenarios. GEOC has a lot of authority, but so do Deans. Provost has ultimate authority delegated by the Board through the President. Keith may be more or less willing to side with the deans on certain issues, but may prefer to side with GEOC on others.

7. Is the administration prepared (not just willing, but actually prepared) to implement the proposed FYI, Wayne Experience, and Wayne Focus courses in F2018, even if, at this point—or rather, at the moment the BOG cast their vote--it is not quite clear what any of these courses will be or are supposed to accomplish?

DE. Not clear to me, but I am not the whole admin and can't commit on behalf of others. That's why GEOC supported a phased roll-in of FYI with an "inquiry elective" in <OR> with FYI

B. ASBC Chair Questions (in Green) and Darin Ellis responses (in red)

Thanks for your responses, [above], to the Faculty Affairs Committee. As Chair of the Academic Senate Budget Committee and a strong supporter of faculty governance, I have a few questions in response as well as some budget-specific questions (numbers 8-13, below). If possible, it would be helpful to have your response before Friday morning, since the Budget Committee is meeting then to address these issues, among others.

DE. Thanks for your thoughtful consideration of my responses. I appreciate being able to continue the discussion below. See answers in line. Please take all my answers in the form of ongoing discussion. None of them are meant to be official position or policy statements in this forum.

Re 1 and 2 and 7, below: The point of faculty governance through the Academic Senate is that the *Senate's elected representatives of the faculty* are, indeed, representative of the faculty and that an administrator-level discussion between an Associate Provost and a Chair is not "faculty consultation." You talk about consulting with "my colleagues". You say that the math decisions require "faculty input". Yet what is planned is yet another administratively appointed task force. If you really support representative faculty input, then you should ask Policy to give you members for your new, additional Gen Ed task force on math, as is appropriate to a system of faculty governance. Will you do so?

DE. I can't remember which policy committee meeting it was, but the idea for this task force actually came from you guys, so yes, I also think it would be a good idea to get folks from Senate involved. I think the best place to sort this out would be in the policy committee meeting with Keith. I am happy to be present if it would be helpful but that's his and your call.

ACTION ITEM: ASBC would appreciate a copy of the charge to the Math Competency Task Force, a list of any membership in place, and a request for Academic Senate nominees for faculty members of the group.

Re 2 and 3 and 7, below: From these responses, it appears that you favor kicking off a 'new' Gen Ed curriculum that is essentially the same as the old curriculum, just with fewer credits and a 'new' course or two (WE and WF, maybe FYI) that have not been set forth in any detail, and as to WE/WF are envisioned as taught to 100% of entering FTIACs by someone other than the professoriate--maybe by advisers or other staffers hired and supervised by the "academic success center". Where would the kind of funding needed to create these new curricula come from? Why would it be appropriate to use staffers for this curriculum rather than members of the professoriate? Why would it be appropriate to have these courses supervised by administrators rather than faculty?

DE. "Favor" isn't the word I would use. I just see it as the most practical and feasible option. [Regarding funding,] I don't speak for the whole administration, but I have not been party to discussions on those details. [Regarding use of staffers rather than professors,] Those in favor of using staffers as instructors in WE view it as a natural outgrowth of the social science behind advising and the brain science behind learning. Many of our staff would already have expertise in this area.

In my view, there is a practical issue as well. I have not had any regular faculty approach me wanting to teach these courses. I think that advisor capability and willingness to do this would solve a shortage of potential instructors for this course. [Regarding administrative rather than faculty supervision of the courses,] Faculty oversight for WE would have to come in the form of GEOC assessment, I suppose. I grant that there is the possibility of other more direct faculty oversight, but I just don't see a mechanism existing right now.

Additional questions from my perspective as chair of the Budget Committee (which is meeting Friday morning and 10/16 to discuss):

8. Who will teach, supervise and coordinate the co-curricular 1-credit math course for those requiring it under the proposal? How will that development of that course be funded? Can students who wish to opt into the co-curricular course take it? What scheduling and room allocation issues does the co-curricular course create?

DE. TBD pending task force work ref above

9. Given the acknowledged failures of Math 1000, why should the Academic Senate support a math competency requirement that hasn't bothered to revamp the course itself and the way it is taught?

DE. I'm not sure what failures you are referring to specifically with MAT 1000.

10. What is the cost of the Math Accuplacer test on an annual basis?

DE. Max about \$50/student including administration via Testing Services.

11. Has the Registrar's Office taken into account the scheduling of the WE courses and the math co-curricular courses in connection with the upgrade from banner 8 to banner 9 and what staffing/funding costs are associated with the implementation of the changes to the coding and scheduling of the inquiry, WE and math co-curricular courses?

DE. Yes. Banner upgrade is on track. Coding changes are being modeled now.

12. Has the administration considered moving the basic math curriculum for freshmen (including the lower-level math courses currently problematic because they are often taught by graduate students whose teaching and English language skills are insufficient) into Education rather than the Math Department of CLAS, given the Department's general scorn for teaching non-math majors? What would be the budgetary costs and consequences of such a move?

DE. Again TBD pending task force work above, but yes the idea heard of these crossed our minds —plan is to involve math ed in the task force.

13. To what extent is the administration willing to provide cross-subsidies to departments, at least during a transition period, that lose significant credit enrollments because of the elimination of a second science requirement and similar loss of credits as suggested in philosophy, communication and fine arts, and languages? If the administration does not provide such cross-subsidies, to what extent will the Gen Ed proposal result in release of long-term contracted part-time faculty and or the failure to replace faculty in various disciplines through attrition?

DE. I am not on the RCM committee, but I imagine that at least of the college level revenue will be credit generation dependent in the future. To the best of my ability to estimate, the credit losses (on average) were represented in the enrollment implications appendix of one of the last versions that Keith and I sent you guys on Policy. I think that the biggest potential loss is probably in philosophy is critical thinking, part-time assignments would

probably take a hit. I have a meeting scheduled with the undergraduate program officer and the interim chair next week to brainstorm.

As for subsidies, I think that that would have to be handled by the Dean's and the Provost through the RCM budget process. As far as I am aware there is a averaging function in the proposed budget model that would limit the rate of change in budget to dampen the effect of rapid shifts in headcount or credit generation. That mechanism could perhaps be tweaked to take into account general education changes. Again, though, I'm not on the committee and not aware of the particulars.

Thanks, in advance, for your consideration of these issues. The Academic Senate Budget Committee members may have more questions after the Friday meeting.