

College of Arts & Sciences
Budget Advisory Committee
MINUTES
Monday, November 11, 2013

Present:

Voting members: Professors Stepan Simek, Bryan Sebok, Susan Glosser and Ellen Seljan

Ex-officio: Tuajuanda Jordan - Dean of the College, Gary Reiness - Associate Dean of the College,

Guests: Harrison Chase – student representative

Absent: Voting member - Janis Lochner, Ex-officio member - George Battistel - Associate Vice President of Finance

Recorder: Anne Boal - Mathematical Sciences

The minutes from the previous meeting were approved with corrections.

Professor Ellen Seljan and Chair Stepan Simek met with the Registrar, Judy Finch, and the Associate Director of Institutional Research, Renee Orlick, concerning compiling data to access the budgetary implication of the Core proposals. Renee Orlick is confident that she can deliver data to Professor Seljan within several days, for our modeling.

We are still considering all seven Core proposals. At the December 3rd faculty meeting, the faculty could vote to pare down the number of proposals and also could vote on which proposal to adopt.

Chair Simek asked for clarification on who are considered adjunct faculty, in order to look at lowering the number of adjuncts teaching Core classes. Dean Jordan replied that visiting faculty are considered adjuncts, however faculty with term should be considered part of the permanent faculty pool.

The committee discussed the budgetary implications of some of the Core proposals, using the summary list of the 7 proposals distributed at the last faculty meeting.

Option #1 is the current Core model, which will be the baseline model for the budgetary analysis.

Option #2: Fall Term – same as current core. Spring Term – these core courses would also count towards general education requirements. This double-dipping for courses would reduce the budgetary effects of the general education, so would be advantageous overall for the budget. Professor Seljan thought that we could obtain the data to model this option.

Option #3: Fall Term – same as current core. Spring Term – first-year-only introductory departmental courses. The increase in class cap size from 19 to 25 students would require about 8 less sections for Spring Term Core. These two factors would reduce the expenses for Core. Double-dipping would lessen the budgetary effects of the new general education model. Only departments in AH and SS, plus mathematics, would offer these new courses. None would be required by the other sciences. We have a list of possible current courses that could be converted to this core course from the author of this proposal. We will look at how full current 100 level courses are, possible double-dipping and the higher cap in our budgetary models.

Option #4: Fall Term – same as current core. Spring Term – AH or SS “research-designated” course. This model does not say if double-dipping for General Education of the major would be allowed. “Research” would need to be re-defined by the Curriculum Committee and attached to specific courses. Some courses may need to be restructured to include a research component. There is a list of the proposed current courses to be converted to these core courses that this committee can use in our modeling. Committee members will research which departments already require a research course for their major.

Option #6: Fall Term – same as current core. Spring Term – “Idea Lab” course. The cap could remain at 19 students, so no cost savings here. Proposals for these first-year only, introductory level courses would be managed by the Core office, the same as the current Core procedures. Unclear if double-dipping would be allowed for general education.

Option #5 and #7 will be discussed at a future meeting.

Some budgetary modeling should be completed by the next meeting on Tuesday, November 19.