1. Environmental Engineering MS and PhD program cat I (Vinod Narayanan)

Here is a summary of the cat I and my take on it as far as the GC is concerned:

The request is for creating an MS, MEng and PhD program in Environmental Engineering.

Background- EE was a part of the Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering until a few years ago when EE was merged with Chemical Eng to create the School of Chemical Biological and Environmental Engineering (CBEE). Prior to the merger, graduate students in the EE program were getting Civil Engineering PhDs and now they mostly get ChemE degrees. As a “truth in advertising” the ChemE faculty would rather that the EE majors got EE degrees. This sentiment has been apparently felt by the EE grad students as well for several years. So, there is no major change except to create the new degrees. The faculty and courses currently exist to support this graduate program and nothing much changes.

With respect to the GC, there were 4 things to consider:

1. need for this graduate program- the need is not an issue here since this program already existed; it is just that the students graduating from this program will receive a EE degree now rather than a Civil or ChemE degree.

2. Implementation- all courses exist and no major changes are needed; faculty are already bringing in grants to support students.

2. Resources- faculty, staff, infrastructure – all in place.

4. Output- placement, etc- not an issue either since students have been graduating for several years from this program and have found placement.

The only issue that I raised was that the Outcomes and Assessment piece must be rewritten with GLOs and assessment in mind. They will be fixing this bit.

I think overall this should be an easy one for the GC to review.

Vinod
2. MAT in Science Education/MAT in Mathematics Education (Jim Coakley)

Offered as suggestions for improvement, not criticism.

I would highly recommend that you add footnotes to explain the information in the spreadsheet.

As we discussed in the meeting, a footnote needs to break out the faculty FTE. Some of that FTE is subject to OPE, some of it is not. That needs to be clear. For example, in the year 1 budget, three FTE have a total salary of $97,248. That is only $32,416 per FTE. In the document, you mention hiring one faculty, adjuncts to teach six courses, and two part-time evaluators. Typically, the one FTE load for an adjunct is nine sections – so this would be 0.67 FTE for adjuncts. This leads one to conclude that the evaluators are also 2/3 FTE each. The OPE number also appears to be a percentage of this total 3 FTE salary. I think the three FTE number reflects the total faculty needed to deliver the program. It needs to reflect the additional budget required to deliver the program. What is presented in the budget spreadsheet does not appear to be consistent with the information provided in the document.

Also, the document suggests that the support staff is increasing from 0.49 to 0.75 FTE. Yet, the budget has the full 0.75 FTE cost. Should it be the 0.26 FTE incremental cost? You would have also have to absorb the incremental OPE costs (jumping from 10.5% on the 0.49 FTE to 42% on the 0.75 FTE).

OPE needs to be consistently applied across the years. Again, it is important to distinguish those salaries subject to benefits (higher OPE) vs those that are not (typically a 10.5% OPE to cover employer tax deductions). As I calculate OPE as a percentage of total salaries, it varies from 46.7% in year 1, 44.7% in year 2, 44.2% in year 3, and 44.7% in year 4. For our Cat I, we are starting with the current average of 42%, and adding 1% per year (recommended by Mark McCambridge to reflect projected increased employee benefit costs).

In second year, you added 0.5 FTE to faculty. I did not see where this was addressed at all in the document. After adjusting for 4% inflation, the incremental cost for the 0.5 FTE was $6,640. That seems really low, even for an adjunct.

Also please footnote the amount you are using for inflation adjustments. Again, this needs to be consistently applied. As an example, the year four increase in faculty salary from year three is 2.65%, while the increase in support staff is 4%.

Good luck with the proposal.

Regards,

Jim
CLA will be undergoing extensive reorganization, and are planning to do one omnibus proposal rather than separate ones for each new school. Thus, the organization chart is probably the most important part of this of the proposal == it is not clear why did GC said to take the org cht off the web.

Making sure faculty input is critical; not just arranging deck chairs but combining cultures and documenting faculty input.

What are the barriers?

Budget committee got stuck on curriculum; need to be differentiated:

- how much will it cost and who’s paying?
- is it sufficient to make the change
- are there new initiatives/ hires that should be in the budget?
- CLA says there will be no budget change, however, one change is that 17 chair stipends will be replaced by 6 directors with higher salaries
- Are there savings or costs? Have different budget pages for the schools?

One big problem concerns the forms. Cat I’s go to OUS, but Sabah is final person for abbreviated cat I. However, OUS dictates the forms; CPS = curricular proposal system.

Discrepancy between OSU & OUS -- change templates. OSU asks for

- where are savings?
- dean signs off budgets
- account for inflation

What is EC’s role? Inquisitor vs. rubber stamp – neither model is appropriate. CLA challenged the notion that most problems should be resolved before it gets to the floor of the Faculty Senate, but EC representatives say that the approval process can be held up even more if the problems are not resolved before it is discussed at Faculty Senate.

Need summary of proposal. Create new schools and terminate depts.; lots of administrative problems.

In addition to documenting faculty input and that they agree to the proposed changes, the proposal also needs liaison feedback. These need not be external reviews but need to be outside the college.

The Cat 1 should be written from the school perspective. Much information can be included in appendices.

The budget approval process takes 1 to 1-1/2 months. Should come to faculty senate in May.

Should go into system in January; should be posted even if not submitted. Maybe we can have virtual apc, given how hard it was to get everyone to this meeting?
Budget at college level; narrative at school level. Budget is delta dollars, adjusted for inflation. Narrative for individual schools rather than ledger sheet. Curricular Program is at school level.

Other documents
-- administrative team
-- naming team
-- ??

John Edwards will be originating person.

How give feedback? Track changes, phone call.

Carolyn