1. Invited guests included Mike Malone, Dean of Engineering, Janet Rifkin, Dean of SBS, and Joel Martin, Dean of HFA and their colleagues.

2. According to Dean Malone, the two units most frequently included in Colleges of Engineering are Computer Science and Polymer Science. The engineering faculty welcomes those departments in the reorganization. There are two reasons to put colleges together: 1) they share common intellectual values, and 2) the units have common problems to solve. When asked if the reorganization is justified, Dean Malone indicated that the proposed fee increase is a hardship on students in a very tough economic time. The reorganization is expected to save $1.5 million. In terms of synergies, engineering is already engaged with other units and the reorganization will bring only marginal returns on this front.

3. Dean Rifkin is concerned that the reorganization is not driven by an academic vision. Talk of a vision started with the life sciences and the desire for collaboration to take advantage of resources. Units like SBS have been an afterthought and not really considered in the reorganization. The combined SBS and Arts college could work and some interesting things could happen, however, the lack of resources are an issue and their research agendas are different. What hasn’t been talked about is what it means to run two colleges that have huge majors. In the two colleges, there would be close to 8,000 majors. Meeting the needs of those students will require more adjuncts and part-timers, and improved advising, all of which will suck up additional resources. There also needs to be a climate for research opportunities. Both colleges are research oriented but they are not thought of in those terms. Thought needs to be given on how to support research initiatives in the new structure. It is unwise to move forward until the units know what kind of support they will get under a new structure. SBS and HFA need resources to invest in faculty.

One organizational unit that works is at the level of the college. Disrupting that unit can by dysfunctional. Areas such as human resources and scheduling are difficult and may require another task force to assess. The lack of resources in SBS and HFA and the implications of that deficit need to be understood. An examination of these types of issues should come first. A search for a new Vice Chancellor for Research is critical. We can look at opportunities, but we need to know what they will cost. Research funding for faculty is critical.
4. Dean Martin suggested the need for an intellectual rationale for the reorganization. It should reflect the institution’s values. HFA was on a good path – increasing faculty, getting increased support, resources in cluster hiring, new programs that have been put in place, etc. Concern was expressed by faculty that this will be dismantled. Dean Martin questions what the nutrient mix is in the reorganization which will allow support for research and creative activity. This should be on the table. He has had to fund raise for computers for the digital lab in their new state of the art building. It would be helpful to be able to hold on to some of the curriculum fee. In the reorganization, attention needs to be given to transitional costs.

5. Faculty in SBS indicated that Dean Rifkin has been instrumental in taking SBS on a path of increased and transparent funding for research. Concern was expressed that the reorg will destroy this accomplishment. An SBS-HFA merger will result in this unit being the poor unit on campus. These are historically impoverished colleges. They will become a source of general education support and the work horse on campus. While the implicit message is that the college structure doesn’t make a difference, this isn’t the case over the last 7 years in SBS. Structure makes a huge difference in research, students, and faculty lines. Flexibility in research support is needed at the college and department level. Loss of resources is a concern. It has helped more recently when resources were distributed based on FTEs. Policy decisions are made on how resources are distributed. Investment has occurred in the sciences and this has been important for them. Dean Martin indicated that we need to look at how we support research across campus. HFA shouldn’t have to beg the research council for money for those getting Guggenheims.

6. Areas of Concern expressed by Faculty Attending:

- Many faculty expressed concern that the academic vision for the reorganization has not been clearly communicated or they see no academic vision in the proposed plan. It was agreed that it is difficult to create a vision in the absence of discussions about money and funding. The vision should identify priorities and the priorities should be balanced. Research needs to be valued in all colleges. Discussions need to take place on the 70-10-10-10 split. Since 10% goes to the college, it does matter what college you are in. In SBS and HFA, funds don’t include overhead costs by the nature of their research and how it is funded. Vision and funding go hand in hand. Funding is at risk under the merger.

- The APC needs to identify values. These should include support for faculty, support for students, and investment in strategic opportunities. The reorganization should not be driven by public relations, but should be based on a business model and a vision.

- For an A & S model to be considered, there needs to be a favorable climate for research that is fair to all. It needs to have flexibility in funding and funding needs to be transparent and accessible to all faculty. A grave concern of HFA and SBS is the level of support that they will receive from the administration. This is an unknown
and likely to be less than their current level of support. Resource issues need to be addressed head on.

- John Kingston of Linguistics, indicated that what keeps him up at night is concerns over personnel committees, enormous teaching loads, loss of good faculty because their teaching burden will only increase under the Chancellor’s proposed plan and alternatives elsewhere will be a draw.

- Ericka Shar oversees the undergraduate program in Communications which has 800 majors. She identified her two biggest fears in relation to the reorganization: 1) faculty’s capacity to do research and 2) the student experience. The size of the new organization will be an obstacle and challenge in terms of students having a favorable experience. The new advising initiative in SBS has made a difference in the student experience and this is at risk.

- Audrey Alstadt addressed three areas of concern: 1) Change should be based on academic priorities. We need to foster and enrich research productivity and share responsibility for the classroom experience. The size of a unit needs to be manageable and Deans need to understand what faculty do. 2) Processes need transparency. Procedures need to be clear when engaging in a search and in tenure and promotion decisions. The administration needs to recognize the expertise of the faculty and not interfere with the recruiting process. 3) There needs to be mutual respect between the administration and faculty. The faculty seek a vision from the Chancellor. Faculty are not trying to be obstructionist. Outside constituencies need to be educated about what a university looks like, rather than the university having to change to satisfy outside constituencies. The vision should include all units and encompass a range of perspectives. It should be preceded by a statement of our goals.

- More time is needed to organize SBS and the humanities. The timing of the reorganization is in question. It is one thing to move in this direction but another to consider whether it makes sense at this time. Moving quickly is unwise and there may be some wisdom in delaying reorganization.

7. Alternative Models:

- Jane Fountain has been examining how and why universities organize as they do. Ninety percent have a College of Arts and Sciences. This allows them to house all of the scholarly pursuits together. They share an intellectual purpose, research enterprises and teaching. The A & S structure streamlines processes. It is a way to consolidate but needs to serve a strategic purpose. Change can bubble up from the bottom. We spend too much time discussing how to divide up the crumbs. Instead, we need to grow the pie. The Chancellor and Vice Chancellors need to be out there looking for money rather than relying on our appropriation.

- Joe Goldstein suggested we consider organizing applied colleges in some grouping. It makes sense to put the Arts & Sciences together. It fosters interaction and will save
money at the staff level. Associate Deans are needed for each college. In response to the funding discussion, the RTF model serves as a basis of support for the sciences. Departments pay for new faculty expenses, such as labs, from these funds. In engineering, these funds don’t come from the central administration.

- Alternative models can bubble up through the APC and the Reorganization Task Force. The two groups should be bold.