

**Emails from Faculty Listserv and feedback submitted to facultyoffice@wright.edu**

Since Matt Filipic left, the current administration has allowed millions in losses and has used WSU reserves to pay for it. Last fiscal year alone, we lost over \$22 million and we continue to bleed financially.

Our Moodys credit rating was recently downgraded, our fiscal score with the state is dropping, and there are significant deferred maintenance needs. The campus master plan should be shelved until finances are in order and we're on solid ground again.

---

I really liked one person's comment about having a parking garage in Lot 4 instead of the Nutter Center. That seems to make more sense to me because it's reachable by foot and not dependent on a shuttle.

<staff member>

---

After reading your email information, I must conclude that the proposal is either a very early April Fool's joke or is the thinking of real April fools. If this is a serious suggestion, it ranks right up there with that absurd "window wall" proposal of years ago.

---

Neither the rationale for this plan, nor accommodations that it will require over 5-10 years are clear in this material. Many of the questions already posed require thoughtful answers.

In particular, I wonder who or what lies behind such a massive proposal. Were I still on the faculty, and in particular were I on the faculty senate, I would stoutly oppose any approval of what is here presented.

[Preceding comment has] my complete endorsement.

---

At a time when rising tuition and advancing technology create serious questions about the economics of higher education, the cost of this dream seems to doom it.

---

... I wanted to thank Carol for sharing the plan and the administration for thinking boldly about improving the campus. One of the things that outsiders first notice when they come here is the architectural deficiencies in our campus relative to where we came from. I came from Penn State and thought the campus at times resembled a high school. It would be a real plus for the kind of institution we want to be -- 3-2 teaching load with good union salaries -- if the university's capital budgets allowed for substantial architectural overhaul.

Aesthetics matter. I was just at Davidson last week and could not believe the school, though filthy rich, was a fraction of our enrollment size. I could never see this because of the way they laid the campus out with huge trees and the pretense of walking through paths instead of an open yard.

All universities have capital budgets. These things are separate from operating costs. We're lucky: we don't have a football program that would waste hundreds of thousands of dollars each year. Instead, we target money wisely to faculty salaries, which are very competitive, to efficient workloads, to good benefits -- and to improving the buildings and infrastructure.

As someone who has only been here a handful of years, I'm looking forward to being here when a bigger and better campus arrives.

Thanks for the hard work!

---

I encourage you to look at the "dashboard" that is linked from the master plan site that Carol pointed to.

[https://www.wright.edu/sites/default/files/page/attachements/03\\_WSU%20Academic%20Dashboard%209.17.2015.pdf](https://www.wright.edu/sites/default/files/page/attachements/03_WSU%20Academic%20Dashboard%209.17.2015.pdf)

That dashboard includes a lot of details beyond just overall configuration of buildings. For example, it includes a summary of the ongoing and projected capital improvement projects (p. 2). Does that list include funding to replace the demolished science buildings (which, as <redacted> noted, would need to happen in advance of the demolition if it is to avoid substantial interruption of research)? Is there another source for that funding?

The dashboard also includes some projections for personnel. For example, on p. 4 it indicates that in the short term the number of full time faculty will increase by 87 (from 861 to 948). Then, on p. 5, it details that essentially all of that increase will be in the number of Principal Investigators (grant-funded researchers), and almost all of those will be in the areas of "Agriculture, Biology, Engineering, Life Science, Natural Resources, Conservation." That increase in the number of PIs is projected to lead to an approximately 50% increase in grant expenditures over the short term

---

I have some concerns about the demolition project proposed for campus:

- Will the State of Ohio support this project financially?
- How is this demolition and redevelopment of the campus to be funded? Might those funds be better spent on students, faculty and research?
- The demolition of the major research buildings would put a major hit on funded research. There will be huge, potentially unrecoverable research delays.
- Alternative research space must be in place before destruction.
- Who is behind this effort and why?
- Will this effort have to be sanctioned by the State, as it was mostly state money (taxpayer money) that paid for the majority of buildings proposed to be demolished?
- This seems like an unprecedented number of buildings to be destroyed. This is a huge waste of prior investment capital.
- The buildings are not that old, mostly built in the 70's and 80's. Other campuses have buildings that are hundreds of years old, and they are not destroyed.

- How is a parking garage at the Nutter Center going to help students get to their classes on campus? A series of shuttle buses? What about security issues related to a remote garage?
  - The parking garage is too far from main campus. Lot #4 would be better for the parking garage.
  - What little history and legacy Wright State currently has (being such a young University) will be destroyed. Loyal alumni might feel disconnected, potentially having a negative effect on future endowments.
- 

It seems most unwise to me to embark on such a project when currently we are "in the hole" nearly exactly the same amount as our new buildings cost us. Even if the two amounts were completely unrelated, it seems to me that fixing our current financial problems before incurring more would be wiser.