

Provost's Office Response to Feedback about Resources

Amount of funding for general education and transparency of funding model

The amount of new fiscal resources needed to support the Pathways curriculum must be understood in the context of the current funding for the CLE. Presently, departments have base funding allocations to cover FTE's for T&R and some instructional faculty with the expectation that these faculty contribute to the teaching mission of the university, including courses in the CLE. Because CLE and other teaching responsibilities exceed this teaching capacity for some departments, annual enrollment support funds are allocated to colleges and then distributed to departments based on a formula that takes into account student credit hours, CLE credit hours, and other factors. The estimated portion of **annual enrollment support for CLE is \$4M per year**. Under a new funding model developed by Provost Rikakis, these funds will be distributed as base funding to the colleges with established metrics for credit hour production, including provision of general education courses.

The Office of Enrollment & Degree Management provides additional funding each year to address specific enrollment challenges in CLE and service courses related to enrollment growth or changes in enrollment patterns. Funding strategies related to enrollment growth include funding for departments and colleges that provide CLE or service courses.

This funding stream remains in place for Pathways, and will be distributed to programs that offer Pathways courses.

Additional funding for Pathways

The CLE requirements total 36-38 credit hours; Pathways requirements total 42 credit hours. For both curricula, general education courses overlap significantly with courses fulfilling major or minor requirements for many students. To support the transition from CLE to Pathways and the increased requirements (particularly in arts, design and computational thinking), **an additional \$0.5M base funding** has been added to support general education. It will take several years to establish which courses become part of Pathways and what enrollments they have. Therefore, for the near term, the \$0.5M will be distributed as grants to faculty and departments to develop and deliver Pathways courses and minors. At the end of the granting period, base funds can be transferred to departments to support long-term Pathways offerings. The Provost's Office will make determinations to add additional funds to this pool as appropriate to keep the Pathways curriculum vibrant and with sufficient offerings.

Transitional funding

Beyond funds to support development and delivery of Pathways courses, there will be additional work in governance processes during the transition period, particularly by department and college curriculum committees that are reviewing Pathways proposals and those responsible for revising checksheets. Requests to support this work should be made by the Academic Dean's office to Vice Provost Rachel Holloway. Requests should include the plan of work and expected results, justification for additional support, requested funding, and time period for implementation.

Professional development for faculty and graduate students

The Office of General Education will continue to collaborate with CIDER, TLOS, Office of Assessment and Evaluation, the Diversity Development Institute and other units to offer professional development during the academic year and summers to support the development and delivery of Pathways courses and minors. These offerings will include proposal writing workshops and assessment workshops that guide faculty through the entire process. Graduate students will be welcome in these workshops but will also be offered professional development for teaching in Pathways as part of the GTA Training Workshop, Graduate Teaching Scholars, and Transformative Graduate Education programs.

Assessment

It is an expectation that all faculty engage in assessment of student learning for their courses, with the goal of continuous improvement. Pathways is no exception. Faculty will be expected to identify a representative assignment that aligns with the learning outcome(s) the course is designed to meet. They will indicate the extent to which that outcome was met across the population of enrolled students. They will post some representative examples of student work. This all falls within the scope of faculty teaching responsibilities. Those individuals who participate in collective assessment across learning outcomes may do so as part of standing committees or with compensation if that work takes place over the summer.

Verbatim comments: Please advise that the comments below were extracted verbatim from Qualtrics, JIRA, and information provided by the Faculty Senate.

Qualtrics

- It seems like training faculty will be a very large expense to the university.
- I am afraid that less wealthy departments can not afford to sustain a Pathways Minor which could lead to a general education at VT generated by affluent departments mainly
- If the idea is that assessment should be "faculty-led", it would seem that it should also be "faculty-compensated". This connects to a larger issues with the implementation plan: there is no public budget, and there are no *specific* new resources committed at the department or college level.
- RESOURCES
- Smaller departments may have a hard time to meet growing demands without funding for additional teaching support
- A general comment about resources: where are they? Beyond the \$500,000 grant program, there is no specific mention of additional new university resources that will be dedicated to Pathways.
- The plan mentions "ongoing support of general education through base allocations to colleges and departments", but there are no details (or budget) outlining how these base allocations will change from the current CLE model.

- What resources will be available to help English, Math and Science GTAs integrate ethical reasoning into their intro courses, for instance?
- Will there be resources at the College or University level to support GTAs and precarious faculty?
- The resources available to faculty (TELOS, CIDER, etc.) are just that: focused on faculty. But much of the gen ed curriculum will be effectively taught by GTAs and non-regular faculty.
- Would non-regular faculty be willing to give up their summers to attend workshops for which they won't be compensated?)
- There is no funding for increased hours of work for faculty in departments to comply with requirements: revise check sheets, look at major requirements to adjust to new gen ed requirements, etc.
- Much of the work of departments will have to occur over the summers in order to ensure that the curriculum is ready for fall 2017, and yet there is no departmental support and faculty, except departmental administrators, are not paid over the summer.
- The amount of money set aside for it is quite small.
- It is not clear that the substantial effort required to do this will be compensated.
- This plan needs an additional appendix that contains a good-faith estimate of administrative burden on faculty and departmental staff in terms of both hours and salary/wage dollars to implement Pathways.
- I would like to see a public and transparent proposed budget.
- As a general education course, one may expect expansive offerings. How is that tempered with limited departmental resources?
- Third, we have heard that \$500,000 will be allocated to support faculty creation of Pathways courses. What is the process for allocation? If it's competitive, it will take faculty time.
- How will it be paid for? How will resources be distributed?
- Adequate funding needs to be promised and allocated, for provision to Departments to use in compensating faculty for their time -- especially in the Summer -- necessary for revising existing courses for use in the new curriculum.
- Many of us already work 70-80 hours a week. I'm sympathetic to the goals here. But without relief from other duties, this is an additional level of burden that I just don't see how we can fit into our ever increasing number of tasks.
- There is all sorts of "support" listed throughout the document, but real concrete support in terms of specific ideas and funding are missing
- The mechanisms for support were questioned – and agreement voiced that the support may need to be at the department level (via curriculum committees, or such) and not only for individuals.
- The overall funding for this process is not clear and if its too time consuming, some of my faculty will not be included to participate

JIRA

- Funding plan needs to accompany the implementation plan (Undergraduate Curriculum Committee) - @ Alison S Craft
- The departmental and college committees charged with course proposal review and approval do not meet during the summer months. Will support be available summer 2016 through the colleges for these committees to continue work? If not, the review and approval process will grind to a halt from the first of May until the end of August (Joseph Dove, Curriculum Committee in the Dept of Civil and Environmental Engineering)
- Does “support” of faculty include funding for smaller class sizes or more TA’s to help with the dramatically increased assessment load? (CLAHS Faculty)

Faculty Senate

- No Indication of funding to departments for implementation (Faculty Senate)
- For some departments with a lot of courses in general education, implementation will be both costly and cumbersome. There is no indication in the implementation guidelines about the differential effect on departments and how they will manage the increased workload over the course of the next two years (Faculty Senate)
- There is no provision for new money to pay of the increase in credit hours. There are 3 new credit hours in discourse between 3 and 6 in arts and design. Where is the ongoing money that will pay for faculty to teach these new credit hours and how will it be disbursed? (Faculty Senate)
- The question of resources including fund allocation, advising load, across campus coordination etc. is a recurring issue that needs to be clearly addressed (Faculty Senate).