

FEEDBACK ON PROPOSED ACADEMIC REORGANIZATION

This is a collection of individual comments by School of Education staff members, organized by topic. It is not a unified statement, we just consolidated for your convenience.

Four Proposals:

Proposal 1: Maintain the University's current college structure but create three schools within the existing CLAS (59 percent endorsed/41 percent opposed in voting within the CAESS).

- Seems reasonable, and the least disruptive, but perhaps having a college over three schools would not correct existing imbalance of power that has been mentioned by others.

Proposal 2: Expand the College of Education (48 percent endorsed/52 percent opposed).

- We have mixed opinions. People want to ensure we are able to focus on Education and associated identity. But without exact information on what would be added it's hard to say.

Proposal 3: Five colleges – four balanced colleges with a separate College of Hospitality, Events and Tourism (66 percent endorsed/34 percent opposed).

- There is a lack of understanding of this proposal. Would this be the existing setup, with SOE changing to a College, and adding HEaT?

Proposal 4: Seven colleges – six smaller colleges with a separate College of HEAT (79 percent endorsed/21 percent opposed)

- All of our notes below pertain to this proposal.

Criteria used in creating this reorganization proposal

- Could the criteria used be shared with the university community? PPT
- How does this structure reflect the university's values?
- Why is Psychology in the College of Science, Engineering & Mathematics?
- Does it benefit the university to group all behavioral sciences together?

Define "college" and "school:"

- Are all of these proposed colleges truly "colleges" or should they be "schools"?
- Are we choosing to be all colleges because it's more appropriate or because it's easier?
- If colleges/schools are seeking professional recognition and subsequent funding via improved identity, we should be careful to use these terms appropriately.
- A School of Education may actually be more correct, and powerful, when it comes to fundraising and identity.

Timeline

- What is the timeline of the reorganization?
- Will feedback being currently provided be shared with the campus community?
- Suggesting a second round of feedback after everyone's ideas have been shared.

- Early and clear communication is essential.

Implementation Plan

- Will there be preparation for the change?
- There should be planning committees to identify upcoming challenges prior to implementation.
- Committees should include equal representation from faculty, staff, and students. (Representation is unbalanced currently.)
- Two years' advance notice and preparation for a change is not unreasonable.
- What is the communication plan?
- What support/guidance will be offered to those destined to build dean's offices?
- Who will be involved in gathering and sharing that support/guidance?
- Will the university offer standardized policies/procedures or will each dean's office have the latitude to determine their own college-level policy?
- Who will guide them in drafting these policies? The process of trial and error has taken years for the School of Education – it would be nice to shorten this period for new colleges.
- Will there be continued support at certain milestones after implementation (e.g. 1 year in, 2 years in, etc.) The process will be slow and lessons will have been learned.

Voting Representation

- Increased sense of identity may increase faculty participation, which is good.
- How will increased faculty participation be balanced in terms of equal representation between employee types?
- Staff may have lesser representation, and can be left to manage the results (good or bad) of university decisions.

Effect on Current Projects

- Data Warehousing is a much needed project that would be heavily affected by this change.
- Updates to coding must be thoroughly considered, with appropriate voices at the table, before any implementation occurs.
- * • No more building the plane while flying it. It leads to burnout and years of residual issues of which decision-makers are not necessarily aware.

Revenue

- Restructuring would strengthen a sense of identity internally and in the community, which could lead to more effective fundraising and increased revenue.
- With a stronger sense of identity programs/departments may be encouraged to be more creative in seeking funding.
- The ability to bring in new revenue should be considered in the grouping of departments into the new structure. Current proposal may not be balanced from this perspective.

- Reorganization could encourage increased general fund requests since there will be more colleges asking for funds.
- It will be difficult for new colleges to know how much to request, and for what.
- The hiring of additional deans allows the opportunity to bring in more expertise in fundraising.

Inclusive Leadership

- More colleges will result in more voices, and hopefully a stronger culture (and literal system) of inclusive leadership.
- More voices are good, but how would existing committees, senates, and other mechanisms accommodate this new interest in university-level participation?

Curriculum process

- Each major would have a stronger voice in the process since those closest to the curriculum could be more directly connected with the SOE.
- Allows for more direct communication with those affected.
- High-level players with many responsibilities on their plates must prioritize their time, so not all proposals are fully discussed within the current structure. Reorganization may allow more attention to proposals not currently considered high-enough priority.
- School of Education would have to work with more people to collaborate on curriculum changes because content majors would be distributed across more colleges, which could be difficult to organize.

Teacher Licensure

- Content majors would by necessity be made more aware of legal requirements. Their understanding could support some processes, and increase a sense of ownership and support in complying with these requirements.
- This could go either way. Having more parties involved in complying with legal requirements could dilute understanding of their importance.

Central Offices and Service

- Central Offices seem overwhelmed and processes can be delayed, particularly relating to student service. Will Central offices having even more contacts/considerations throughout the university be an additional burden to these offices, thereby slowing service further?
- Will funds for more manpower be provided in order to manage the transition period, which will be lengthy?
- What feedback have central offices shared?
- Will more responsibilities be pushed to the colleges?
- Academic departments with direct knowledge of the effects of all work stemming from central offices, particularly regarding curriculum and coding, will have a stronger voice in ensuring better measures are in place from the start, preventing "cart before the horse" scenarios.

Budget Process

- Academic departments will by necessity be closer to the budget process and will therefore have a stronger understanding of how it works, and with what they agree/disagree.
- More deans, hired both internally and externally, could contribute to ideas for effective budget models and funds distribution.

Recruitment

- Colleges more closely connected to what their students want/need will be better situated to identify and contact targeted demographics.
- The time to make personal connections with potential students could encourage them to get started and stay.
- Potential increased burden on central offices could damage student service and deter them from registering. Or, it could go the other way if burdens are relieved.

Retention

- If appropriate resources are supplied (e.g. advisors), smaller colleges will improve retention.
- More personal connections with students is a strong factor in retention.
- Potential increased burden on central offices could damage student service and deter them from registering. Or, it could go the other way if burdens are relieved.

Graduation rates

- As with recruiting and retention, more personal connections with students will allow the support needed to better support more students to graduation.
- Potential increased burden on central offices could damage student service and deter them from registering. Or, it could go the other way if burdens are relieved.