

A Proposal for the Creation of the Colleges of Liberal Arts and of Science

Submitted for consideration by the Faculty Senate by

John H. Frederick
Interim Executive Vice-President and Provost

November 22, 2002

Part One— Overview of College Realignment Proposal

I. Introduction

This document presents a proposal to realign the academic departments presently in the College of Arts and Science, the Mackay School of Mines, and the College of Engineering. It arises from recommendations made as part of the 2001-2002 strategic planning process of the University of Nevada and announced by the President on May 31, 2002 (see <http://www.unr.edu/planning>).

A. The formulation of the proposal

Subsequent to the President's announcement of the strategic plan, the Provost consulted with the Faculty Senate to devise a process for planning, composing, reviewing, and approving the college realignment recommended by the President. This process can be summarized by the following steps:

- the Departments of Anthropology, Geography, and Psychology were asked to submit proposals to outline their most appropriate placement in the proposed Colleges of Liberal Arts and of Science;
- the departmental proposals were reviewed by an *ad hoc* committee of the Faculty Senate and brought to the full Senate for consideration;
- the Faculty Senate made recommendations to the President and a determination of the placement of these departments was then made, resulting in Geography being assigned to the proposed College of Science and Anthropology and Psychology being assigned to the proposed College of Liberal Arts;
- in early September, planning groups for the two proposed colleges were charged by the Provost to develop plans for the new units that clarify their vision, mission, goals, resource needs, and organization— Travis Linn and Dean Jane Long were asked to coordinate these planning efforts for Liberal Arts and for Science, respectively;
- each planning group, primarily consisting of department chairs, but also including faculty from the affected departments, prepared documents that are included as part of this proposal and were submitted to the Provost by November 15, 2002;
- the College of Engineering was separately asked to consider the addition of the Department of Chemical and Metallurgical Engineering and to formulate plans for internal reorganization— a brief statement from Engineering is also included as part of this proposal;
- the parts of the current document discussing the reasons for proposing college realignment have been prepared by the Office of the Provost.

The two college planning groups were not asked to advocate on behalf of the proposal, but simply to outline the values, goals, and needs of the new colleges. These efforts were coordinated by Travis Linn and Dean Jane Long so that each group would have the benefit of a dean or former dean who knew something about how college offices and activities are organized and could advise on the process of resource allocation and development efforts. Vice-President for Development and Alumni Relations Marilyn Johnson also met with both groups to discuss the development potential of the new units.

The process followed by each of the planning groups is outlined in the relevant sections of this proposal. Although it cannot be said that *all* faculty in affected units took part in this process, the leaders of affected units participated in the formulation of this proposal.

In addition, there have been multiple opportunities for faculty and others to provide consultation and input into the process through open forums with the President, meetings with the Provost, email, and written memos. As this proposal develops further, there will be additional opportunities for affected faculty and others to provide input.

B. The review process

In accordance with UNR Bylaws, the review process for this proposal consists of the following steps:

- this document will be posted on the internet for faculty review;
- faculty from affected units will be invited to respond by email or in open forums that have been scheduled with the three affected colleges on December 2, 3, and 4, 2002;
- the proposal will be revised, as needed, by the Office of the Provost and then submitted to the Faculty Senate for its review by mid-December;
- an *ad hoc* committee will be convened by the Faculty Senate to review the proposal and report its findings to the full Senate, which will then make its recommendation to the President concerning the proposal;
- a summary of the proposal will be developed and submitted by the President first to the Academic Affairs Council of the UCCSN, then to the Academics, Research, and Student Affairs (ARSA) Committee of the Regents; and
- the Regents' ARSA Committee will present its recommendation to the full Board of Regents for its approval.

Altogether the process of suggesting, consulting, recommending, planning, reviewing, and approving the college realignment will have spanned more than 16 months.

C. The structure of this proposal

This proposal is very complex as it affects departments that account for over half of the student instruction at the university, about half of the state-appropriated instructional budget, and the majority of the university's graduate programs. Hundreds of faculty-hours of effort have gone into generating the various parts of this document and the process of planning the implementation of this realignment will require much additional work.

The proposal is comprised of several parts, independently prepared:

- Part One (this part) presents the context for proposing college realignment, the objectives the university hopes to achieve by realignment, and the resource considerations that accompany a reorganization of this magnitude. This part of the proposal contains the arguments that have led to its formulation and submission.
- Part Two contains the planning document prepared by the group of units that would constitute a new College of Liberal Arts. As that proposal suggests, the name "College of Liberal Arts" is, for now, a placeholder with the final name to be determined this winter by its constituents. Henceforth in this proposal, the acronym CLA shall refer to this proposed college.
- Part Three presents the corresponding planning document prepared by the units that would comprise a new College of Science, which shall henceforth be represented by the acronym COS.
- Part Four is a brief statement from the Dean of Engineering concerning his college's process for internal realignment following the addition of the Department of Chemical and Metallurgical Engineering.

Parts Two, Three, and Four are presented here as they were submitted to the Office of the Provost. Following consultation with the affected faculty and, in an effort to focus the proposal, all sections will be edited for formal submission to the Faculty Senate in mid-December.

D. Acknowledgments

Many people have contributed long hours to the development of this proposal. Several are acknowledged in Parts Two and Three of this document for their contributions to the individual college proposals. In addition, I would especially like to thank Travis Linn and Dean Jane Long for their conscientious efforts to coordinate Parts Two and Three. In many ways they have helped this process move forward with a productive and proactive spirit. Dean Ted Batchman has presided over the continuing reorganization process within the College of Engineering and has summarized that effort in Part Four. Along the way, these proposals have benefited greatly from the input, data, analysis, and advice of several people, including Dean Robert Mead, Bruce Shively, Serge Herzog and the staff of Institutional Analysis, Marcy Wehry Harper, Mary Ann Keith, and the Mackay Working Group headed by Richard Perry. A critical resource piece of this proposal has been provided separately by the members of the ICR (indirect cost recovery) Distribution Committee chaired by Special Assistant to the President Ron Zurek. The formal report of this committee is not yet released, but some of its conclusions are included here.

II. Outline of the Proposed College Realignment

This proposal calls for the formation of two new colleges, the College of Liberal Arts (CLA) and the College of Science (COS) to replace the existing College of Arts and Science and the Mackay School of Mines. Under this proposal, a new School of the Arts would be created within the CLA and most of the Mackay School of Mines would be included in a new Mackay School of Earth Sciences within the COS. Finally, the Department of Chemical and Metallurgical Engineering would move to the College of Engineering, and the program in Interior Design would be incorporated in the CLA. The units to be included in each of these new colleges are summarized below:

<p>College of Liberal Arts</p> <p>Anthropology Center for Basque Studies English Foreign Languages and Literatures History Holocaust, Genocide, and Peace Studies Interior Design Military Science Oral History Philosophy Political Science Psychology Sociology Women's Studies</p> <p><i>School of the Arts</i></p> <p>Art Music Speech Communication & Theatre</p>	<p>College of Science</p> <p>Biology Chemistry Mathematics Physics</p> <p>Biological Resources Research Center Nevada Terawatt Facility</p> <p><i>Mackay School of Earth Sciences</i></p> <p>Geography Geological Sciences and Engineering Mining Engineering Nevada Bureau of Mines and Geology Nevada Seismology Laboratory</p>
<p>College of Engineering</p> <p>Chemical and Metallurgical Engineering Civil Engineering Computer Science Electrical Engineering Mechanical Engineering</p>	

Note that other units normally associated with some of these departments, including the Writing Center, the Math Center, and Western Traditions/Core Humanities, will be administered through the proposed Center for the Core Curriculum. A separate proposal for that Center will be submitted later this academic year, but its existence is presumed in this document.

III. Context for College Realignment

Reorganization has arisen as part of the university's strategic planning process. Inaugurated by President Lilley under the direction of the Provost, this process involved establishing the environmental context of the university, evaluating its strengths and weaknesses, devising and prioritizing plans to build on its strengths and reduce its weaknesses, and allocating resources commensurate with its stated goals and strategies. The suggestion to realign the colleges is one of *many* recommendations of the University Planning Council (UPC), all designed to respond to university challenges in the coming decade. The most important of these challenges are:

- The university's enrollment is growing at an unprecedented rate and is conservatively projected to increase by 45% over the next ten years. At present, the university does not have the ability to control its enrollment. The College of Arts and Science has absorbed a greater proportion of this increased enrollment than other colleges. The Mackay School of Mines has historically been under-enrolled relative to other colleges and remains so even in this post-Millennium Scholar environment.
- Despite a growth in student FTE greater than 25% over the past three years, the state-appropriated portion of the university's budget has grown less than 10% in new funds over that same time ("new funds" are defined as the actual increase in the budget minus the increases to the base budget due to COLA and merit). As a result of the budget reductions this year, academic operating budgets remain at the same levels as those of 15 years ago. Unfortunately, the level of state support is not likely to increase substantially.
- During the past three years, the university has added only 42 new faculty, a growth of only 8.5%. One result of this has been an increase in the number of temporary lecturers (LOAs and LOBs) who must be hired to teach our curriculum. The College of Arts and Science accounts for the bulk of the LOAs, yet professional staffing shortages persist in several of its departments.
- The University of Nevada is placed in Tier III by the *U.S. News and World Report* and is commonly ranked between 90th and 150th in quality among all institutions nationally. At the same time, measures of the quality of our faculty (university-wide), including their doctoral institutions, national awards received, research productivity, and external grant funds awarded per faculty member are all suggestive of a higher-ranking institution.
- The university's fund raising effort lags behind similar institutions, and the total endowment per faculty member is about half that reported for comparable or better institutions. At present, the state funding received by the university accounts for 37% of its total budget, compared with less than 25% for most state universities nationally. The difference is the greater amount of money raised privately, through grants and contracts, and through student tuition and fees at other institutions.

Within this context, it remains the university's goal to improve the quality of the student learning experience, to increase the visibility of its instructional, outreach, scholarship, research, and creative activity programs, to support and augment faculty excellence, and establish a campus environment that is conducive to the university's central mission of learning and scholarship.

Given this context, it will be increasingly necessary for the university to

- (i) use its existing resources more efficiently and effectively,*
- (ii) develop other revenue sources to supplement its support from the state, and*
- (iii) adopt new strategies to promote the visibility of the university's programs.*

The present college realignment proposal is intended to address each of these needs. However, it is important that the proposal be considered in its entirety as each of its parts contributes to achieving the university's aims. Thus, this proposal is not exclusively about dividing the College of Arts and Science, dividing the Mackay School of Mines, or merging parts of the Mackay School with the sciences and parts with Engineering. It is meant to be a holistic response to the university's present context and its future aspirations. The proposed reorganizations presented here should help accomplish all of the university's aims.

IV. College Realignment Objectives

A. Principles of organization

As the UPC recognized last spring, academic institutions use colleges and departments to organize curricula, to bring consonant research interests together, and to distribute resources in the form of faculty, operating budgets, space, and infrastructure. Recognizing these realities, it is most desirable to aggregate areas/units that have:

- overlapping . . .
 - interests that could spawn interdisciplinary courses and
 - curricula (*i.e.* reduce similar courses in multiple departments);
- similar modes of . . .
 - scholarship (including funding, support, equipment, *etc.*),
 - instruction (*i.e.* large lectures *vs.* small classes, instructional labs, *etc.*),
 - advising/mentoring graduate students, and
 - advising/mentoring undergraduate students;
- similar expectations of faculty performance (*e.g.* for promotion);
- common accrediting bodies;
- similar types of space needs; and

- congruent . . .
 - modes of community engagement (outreach activities) and
 - external constituencies (support groups, potential employers of graduates, *etc.*).

Any proposal for organization or reorganization should take these factors into account to the extent possible. Although it has not proved possible to satisfy *all* of these conditions in the present proposal, the realignment is generally guided by these principles.

Each new or relocated unit brings together departments with very similar visions, goals, missions, and challenges. The university and its students stand to gain from their structural ability to forge common solutions to challenges and to develop cooperative relationships.

B. Objectives guiding the realignment proposal

The college realignment outlined in this proposal is driven by several objectives. These are grouped below in response to the needs identified in the previous section. (See box on previous page.)

1. The university must use its existing resources more efficiently and effectively.

Presently the university is organized into seven colleges (Agriculture, Biotechnology, and Natural Resources; Arts and Science; Business Administration; Education; Engineering; Human and Community Sciences; and Extended Studies), three schools (Journalism; Medicine; and Mines), the Nevada Agriculture Experiment Station, and Cooperative Extension, as well as a number of statewide programs. Each college and school is headed by a dean who is supported by varying amounts of resources and staff. Each dean reports directly to the Provost and sits on the Academic Leadership Council.

Faculty size of these entities varies from 9 (Journalism) to 230 (Arts and Science) with most having around 50. In all cases but three, Education, Mines, and Arts and Science, the size of the college is roughly commensurate with its instructional load (although one should note that the School of Medicine does not derive its funding from its enrollment and is therefore an exceptional case). Education and Arts and Science tend to carry a greater instructional load than their permanent staffing would indicate, and Mines carries a smaller instructional load. Nevertheless, each college is headed by a single dean who provides administrative, development, and advocacy support for the college's faculty.

By most measures, Arts and Science is severely under-supported with administrative resources. The Dean of Arts and Science not only has the largest faculty to administer (by a factor of four over the next largest college), but also serves as Director of the Core Curriculum. The college is also supported by an associate dean, a student adviser, a personnel and budget coordinator, a single development officer and 3.5 classified staff. The number of college staff per faculty member or per student major in Arts and Science is easily the smallest among all the colleges. Although other factors also contribute to the complexity of a college office operation, the sheer

breadth, variety, and magnitude of the needs of academic departments and students in Arts and Science represent a huge challenge to its dean's office.

One result of the lack of administrative resources available to Arts and Science is the greater administrative load placed on departments and faculty for personnel contract management, grant proposal processing, and budget management. Students majoring in Arts and Science disciplines also do not enjoy the benefit of the kinds of services and administrative attention that smaller colleges are able to provide. This is not a condemnation of the Arts and Science staff, who perform at a high level, but an observation that the *size* of the staff is insufficient. The perceived need for additional administrative resources is very apparent in the new college proposals that comprise Parts Two and Three of this document.

A net effect of the proposed realignment is the shift of administrative resources from a relatively well-served group of faculty (Mines) to a severely under-served group of faculty (Arts and Science). Under this scheme, CLA will emerge with about 160 and COS with about 120 state-funded faculty, with each college enjoying roughly equivalent administrative resources. The two proposed colleges have similar complexities when one takes into account temporary faculty, soft-money faculty, postdoctoral fellows, graduate assistants, classified staff, technical support staff, student majors, and student credit-hours taught; but neither is as complex, or as wide-ranging as the current College of Arts and Science. Furthermore, by creating a Center for the Core Curriculum with its own Director, neither of the deans of CLA or COS would have oversight responsibility for the Core, although it is expected that both would be staunch supporters of and advocates for the Core.

Another gain in efficiency that can be realized through the proposed realignment is in the types of college staff that each new college might add in future years. For example, CLA might develop needs for special events staffing and wish to add college-based personnel in this area. By contrast, COS may wish to add a technical support position that would provide assistance with scientific lecture demonstrations (such a position is mentioned in connection with Department of Biology needs in the proposal). In each case, the staffing can be adapted to the specific needs of each college. Such staffing decisions are more difficult to achieve in the current college configuration and with limited resources available.

The President's announcement of the strategic plan originally called for additional efficiencies that might be gained through eliminating the department structure within the School of the Arts and the Mackay School of Earth Sciences. As the proposals presented in Parts Two and Three attest, the two planning groups seriously considered this possibility, but reached the conclusion that the administrative efficiency represented by the traditional department structure was greater than the economic efficiency to be gained by eliminating departments. There remains the possibility, however, that some efficiencies might be gained by pooling some of the resources within each School

2. *The university must develop other revenue sources to supplement its support from the state.*

Increasing the university's potential to garner resources is one of the most important objectives of the strategic plan and, therefore, of this realignment proposal. However, the arguments in support of this objective are more abstract. In general, the university relies on private fund raising, self-support functions (fee-based services), external grants and contracts and their associated indirect cost recovery, federal earmarks, and entrepreneurial activities to supplement the resources it receives from the state.

Many of these sources provide revenues only for very specific functions (for example, earmarks and grant funds must be used to carry out the activities proposed in the grant application and self-support functions can only charge for actual costs to deliver a service) or depend upon the opportunities available to a given discipline (for example, Psychology has been highly successful using entrepreneurial strategies to augment its resources, but Philosophy may not have the same potential for using this strategy). However, indirect cost recovery and private fund raising are two means for accruing discretionary funds.

Indirect cost recovery (ICR) is directly connected to external grant success, and it could be argued that the proposed realignment will not have any effect on the university's ability to increase the number or size of its external grants. There will be no attempt to argue this point one way or the other here. However, the basis for distributing ICR on campus *is* important and the college realignment recommendation by the President has triggered an examination of that distribution. A special *ad hoc* committee has been charged this fall with recommending how ICR should be distributed on campus. That committee's recommendations affect the amount of discretionary funding for scholarly purposes that will be available to each of the proposed colleges. This is discussed more fully in section IV below.

It was apparent from the data available to the UPC that the university could improve its private fund raising efforts. Since that time, the university has also commissioned an analysis of our development and alumni relations efforts and received some guidance about how those efforts might be improved. Among the factors that contribute to successful fund raising are

- a loyal alumni base;
- personal involvement of deans in fund raising activities;
- focused (well-defined) fund raising objectives; and
- academic structures and buildings that provide naming or constituency-support opportunities.

These are all factors that can be addressed positively overall by college realignment.

In our present alignment, the Mackay School of Mines has been successful in its private fund raising efforts because it has a loyal alumni and constituency base that regularly contribute to its

needs. As a result, it has a combined endowment totaling nearly \$12 million. While it may be feared that some of that success could be compromised through this realignment, President Lilley has engaged the mining industry in the formulation of this proposal. His dialogue with them has resulted in the industry's deeper understanding of the enrollment pressures that compel this realignment and the university's better grasp of the needs of the state's second largest industry. On several occasions this fall, the mining industry has reiterated its commitment to helping the university maintain its educational programs in mining under this proposed college structure.

By contrast, the fund raising capabilities of the College of Arts and Science (CAS) have been hindered by several disadvantages, among which are:

- CAS is a very broad entity with no natural constituency, although parts of CAS (especially the arts) do enjoy wide community visibility and support;
- most students majoring in CAS degree programs identify more strongly with their departmental homes than with the college, and most do not contribute to the college after they graduate;
- resource limitations have left the development office of CAS grossly under-staffed relative to the number of faculty and students it supports— the lone development officer has been left to pursue fund raising objectives ranging from an endowment match for Western Traditions' National Endowment for the Humanities grant to capital projects in the arts and in chemistry; and
- the Dean of CAS cannot devote the same time and effort to fund raising as can the deans of smaller colleges because of the demands inherent in administering the university's largest college.

These disadvantages have contributed, for example, to the fact that no new buildings have been constructed for Arts and Science units since the mid-1980s. In addition, the college's endowments lag behind those of most other colleges at the university despite the much greater size of CAS.

One might suggest that simply providing CAS with greater resources for its development effort would help solve these problems, and there is little doubt that such an infusion would greatly improve fund raising in the college. However, additional development resources could not address the first two points, and they would not necessarily improve the dean's ability to engage in fund raising activities. Of the four points, the dean's participation in fund raising is probably the most important for success.

The proposed realignment has the potential to significantly enhance fund raising success for the affected departments. The new colleges are more focused in their scope and therefore are better positioned to develop external constituencies, well-defined fund raising needs, students who more closely identify with their colleges, and more loyal, contributing alumni. The School of the Arts and the Mackay School of Earth Sciences provide additional focus for their students, alumni, and external constituencies. This could have an important subsidiary effect on the

university's standing relative to other institutions: a commonly-used measure of alumni satisfaction is the percentage of alumni who give regularly to their alma mater. The latest data indicate that only 12% of our alumni participate in annual giving to the university.

Overall, there will be greater opportunity for the Deans of CLA and COS to engage in fund raising activities than the present Dean of CAS. Moreover, in both new colleges, the Directors of the internal Schools would also be able (and expected!) to contribute to fund raising efforts, thereby bolstering development activities.

Finally, the creation of new units provides potential naming opportunities in return for significant contributions or endowments. Only the Mackay School of Earth Sciences, already endowed and named, would not be able to exploit a major naming opportunity. Although such opportunities are not common, the university has at least three examples of units whose names derive from major gifts (Mackay, the Reynolds School of Journalism, and the Orvis School of Nursing).

Most of the smaller and medium-size colleges on campus have found ways to leverage private fund raising to help them meet critical resource needs. Arts and Science has arguably the greatest resource needs, but the least ability to address those needs through philanthropic opportunities. The proposed realignment ideally should act to strengthen the fund raising capabilities of the departments currently in Arts and Science, while not diminishing those of the units in the Mackay School of Mines.

3. The university should adopt new strategies to promote the visibility of its programs.

There are certainly many ways that the university could promote the visibility of its programs without undergoing college realignment. The university fully plans to utilize a number of strategies, including an integrated marketing campaign, more aggressive use of news releases, and coordinated alumni and friend communications to tell its story more effectively. However, there are also significant ways that structural reorganization *can* enhance the visibility of our departments and programs.

There are several important reasons for improving the visibility of the university's programs.

- (i)* Our national reputation as a university depends in large part on having visible degree and/or research programs.
- (ii)* Our ability to attract resources from a number of external sources is directly correlated to having visible programs.
- (iii)* Recruitment of high-quality students and faculty is aided by having highly visible programs.
- (iv)* Public support for higher education in general, and the university in particular, is enhanced by program and activity visibility.

On an internal level, the visibility of programs also plays a role in the university's allocation of resources and its ability to connect societal needs and support to individual programs.

The proposed college realignment will contribute to improving the visibility of several of the affected departments and programs. As an example, the visibility of Art, Music, and Speech Communications and Theatre, should be promoted by the formation of a distinct School of the Arts. It has been suggested that the School be inaugurated with a capital fund raising campaign to raise money for major renovation and addition to the Church Fine Arts building. Arts programming on campus through the School of the Arts could also be made more visible and further contribute to enhancing the quality of life in northern Nevada.

As another example, the sciences likewise would benefit from greater visibility through the formation of a College of Science. Such visibility could aid efforts to fund a new Science and Math Education facility that would provide much needed space relief for several science departments. A separate College of Science could also stimulate opportunities for industry partnerships and student internships, while attracting new, science-based industries to the local area. The services of a student recruiter/adviser within a College of Science could aid science departments in recruiting and retaining student majors. Although Biology is one of the largest majors on campus, the physical sciences have traditionally suffered in the area of student recruitment, due in part to low visibility.

The proposed realignment also addresses some visibility and advocacy issues within the university. Each college is headed by a dean who advocates on behalf of that college for resources. This structure disadvantages larger colleges relative to smaller ones because there is, effectively, proportionately reduced access to the offices of the President and Provost for faculty and departments of large colleges such as Arts and Science. This is not an instance of "one college, one vote," but an observation that in practice, when all colleges have some of their needs met, the needs of the largest college are never adequately met. The suggested realignment would improve the advocacy for departments currently in Arts and Science, while reducing the advocacy for units within Mines. This last factor is allayed somewhat by the presence of a strong external constituency for Mines and by the substantial resources it receives from external sources.

The Core Curriculum also stands to gain visibility and advocacy through the proposed realignment. Because the Dean of CAS has held the additional title of Director of the Core Curriculum, the Core has widely been viewed by other colleges as an Arts and Science activity and its scope has been narrowed as a result. Making the Director of the Core Curriculum a separate full-time position that reports directly to the Office of the Provost will provide the Core with leadership that focuses solely on its needs, enhance the visibility of the Core, emphasize that it is truly a university-wide program, and greatly improve its advocacy for resources at the university level. In effect, the realignment creates *at least* three strong advocates for the needs of the Core: the Director, the Dean of CLA, and the Dean of COS. Both of the new colleges are expected to champion the intellectual ideals and instructional needs of the core curriculum, since their faculty will continue to provide the bulk of the general education for all university undergraduates.

C. Summary

This realignment proposal is built around bringing together departments and programs with common academic features and common opportunities and challenges. The intent is to create two strong, new colleges with coherent, focused missions and goals. Each will then be better able to serve the needs of students, faculty, and society. Since it is unlikely that the university's state appropriation will keep pace with growing enrollment demands, it is also necessary to create structures that allow the university to (i) utilize its current resources most effectively, (ii) enhance its ability to increase revenues from non-state sources, and (iii) improve the visibility of its programs both externally and internally.

V. Issues and Considerations

Any effort to undertake a major realignment such as this is naturally complicated. Some attention will be given here to general issues and concerns raised by faculty though other, more specific, considerations must necessarily be addressed through consultation with the groups affected by the realignment.

A. We will lose the liberal-arts core of the university by dividing the College of Arts and Science.

There is an implicit assumption in this concern that the liberal-arts core of the university can be successfully preserved only by having a single college that embraces and promotes the liberal-arts disciplines. It is also driven by a concern that a College of Science would soon transform itself into a professional school. However, the ultimate survival of the liberal-arts educational philosophy depends on many advocates, not just a Dean of Arts and Science. In particular, without the support of faculty, students, the community, the Provost, and the President, the liberal-arts core values would quickly wither even if there were a College of Arts and Science. This realignment proposal is constrained by the directive that each new college must embrace the liberal-arts ideals and is supplemented by plans to form a Center for the Core Curriculum to further enhance and strengthen the university's liberal-arts core.

The real danger is that, if we are unable to provide sufficient resources to support the needs of liberal-arts departments, they will begin to direct resources solely toward the needs of their student majors and limit their support of the core curriculum. This trend can only be countered by elevating the core curriculum to prominence at the university level and providing the resources needed to preserve its important mission. One of the goals of this realignment is to broaden the resource base for departments that support the liberal-arts education, enhance their visibility both on- and off-campus, and strengthen their advocacy at the university level.

B. The Mackay School of Mines is a treasured part of the university's history and should be preserved.

There can be no dispute with this statement. MSM has been a part of the university's academic structure for over 100 years and has many loyal alumni and friends. However, times change and

universities must recognize and adapt to those changes, particularly in times of limited resources. Many western state universities have discontinued their mining instructional programs, and only a few such programs remain. In most cases, the reasons for abandonment have centered on low student enrollments that make it hard to justify the maintenance of a high cost program in mining, given the decline of the mining industry within those states.

In Nevada, mining remains the second largest industry in the state and is a strong supporter of the Mackay School. After extensive dialogue with many of the leaders of the mining industry, most of whom are alumni of the Mackay School, the President has accepted the need to preserve and transform the educational programs in mining so that the university continues to provide support to the mining industry. At the same time, the industry has accepted that the university must make organizational changes so that existing resources are better utilized. The industry is also committed to assisting with fund raising, internships, and jobs. The results of that dialogue and of consultation with the faculty of the Mackay School are reflected in the realignments proposed here.

C. The College of Arts and Science could be preserved by creating divisions headed by associate deans.

This is an alternative to college realignment that has been extensively discussed within Arts and Science and was proposed as part of the college's strategic planning process in 2000-2001. Indeed, it is a common model among those large state universities that continue to have a single College of Arts and Science. However, it is useful to examine how those universities manage their Colleges of Arts and Science, and then compare to our own situation.

In the majority of cases, large institutions with a CAS have strong divisions with each headed by an associate dean. In some cases, the heads of these divisions actually carry the title "Dean" with the overall head of Arts and Science being titled "Executive Dean" or even "Provost." In effect, the structure of CAS in these institutions creates an additional layer of administration between faculty and the dean and the various divisions function more or less as separate colleges. In all cases, the total staffing of these Arts and Science colleges far exceed that of our own CAS.

To adapt an equivalent model for our university would require the minimum addition of three associate deans with administrative assistants (cost: ~\$420,000). This would provide the kind of administrative support that could potentially free the dean for fund raising and external advocacy activities, but it would not increase the advocacy potential of the college within the Academic Leadership Council. Such a structure would also not address the lack of student identification with the college and their consequent level of loyalty toward the college after graduation. Finally, if such a structure is not tied to a realignment involving the Mackay School of Mines, then it must be done using new resources, as opposed to utilizing some existing resources. In short, this alternative does not represent the most efficient use of our present resources and it does not sufficiently address the need to increase our external sources of revenue.

D. It would be more appropriate to put all the engineering disciplines together in the College of Engineering.

There are certainly advantages to placing all engineering disciplines in the same college. These include the possibility of better designing engineering curricula, developing cooperative research programs, and coordinating engineering accreditation. However, if the mining education programs are to be preserved and evolve, mining and geological engineering should remain with geology in the Mackay School of Earth Sciences. These programs may be at some disadvantage in a college otherwise populated by natural scientists, but the President and the mining industry agreed that it was important to keep these components together.

E. Without the sciences, the departments in the College of Liberal Arts will be deprived of much-needed resources.

The departments proposed for CLA will continue to receive the resources they need to maintain their instructional and scholarship programs, and that support will likely increase over time, if justified through the strategic planning process. It is anticipated that departmental operating budgets, including personnel and operating costs, will not be affected by the realignment. In addition, the support provided to the units in CLA through salary savings both from the college and from the Office of the Provost will continue to be available to support instructional programs. Finally, the *ad hoc* committee making recommendations concerning the distribution of ICR has devised a mechanism by which discretionary funding in support of scholarly and creative activities in CLA will continue to be made available in amounts equal to or exceeding the amounts that have been available to CAS departments in the past. Because this portion will be allotted as a percentage of the ICR retained by the university, it will grow as the overall external grants and contracts activity grows.

It is the aim of this proposal to create strong colleges and any fears that realignment will lead to the financial neglect of any of the new units are being addressed directly as outlined in section VI below.

F. The core curriculum has survived only because it has been guided by the Dean of Arts and Science. Without a unified structure, the Core will be diminished.

The core curriculum has been singled out by the strategic planning process as one of four high-priority areas for emphasis by the university. Shifting the responsibility for the Core to a Director who will report directly to the Provost is an action that would take place independent of any realignment plans. This shift was, in fact, a recommendation of the Phase II plans last fall and is designed to improve advocacy and administrative oversight for the Core.

To support the operation of the Core, significant resources will be given to the Core Director to ensure that the instructional programs of the core curriculum are able to thrive. As a result, departments and faculty participating in the Core will now be able to be recognized and rewarded independently of the college priorities. One purpose for creating a Center for the Core

Curriculum is to provide the wherewithal to continually assess and improve the general education program at the university, in cooperation with all participating colleges. Removing the Core Curriculum from CAS should help correct the misapprehension that the Core is exclusively an Arts and Science program, and position it as the centerpiece of the university's general education.

G. Separating units that are currently in the same college into two different colleges will adversely affect their ability to cooperate and collaborate.

This is an oft-stated concern about the reorganization. It is feared that two units, reporting to different deans, may encounter obstacles to cooperation with one another if their respective deans should not both support the cooperative activity. While this concern cannot be alleviated organizationally, there is both implicit and explicit pressure from the Office of the Provost for faculty and departments to engage in cooperative activities that span academic units.

Among the charges for strategic planning given to colleges this fall was to look for ways to promote inter-college collaborations. Deans have also been encouraged to join forces in formulating new strategic initiatives. One of the motives to form cross-disciplinary, inter-college Centers is to provide a model for such collaboration by creating more nationally visible programs among faculty with common interests, so that they could cooperate and share resources. As strategic planning continues in future years, more such centers may be expected to emerge through this process.

VI. Resource Considerations

In this section, we summarize the resource considerations raised by the proposed realignment. Each college planning group has also provided extensive budgetary analyses in Parts Two and Three. The budgets of individual departments in the affected units should not change upon realignment; however, new policies for allocating faculty positions, for distributing ICR funds, and for distributing campus-wide salary savings funds (still under development) will affect the resources available to all colleges (not just those being created). Some discussion of these points follows.

In this summary, only state-appropriated and ICR funds will be considered. Mines and Arts and Science both have endowment funds that will need to be apportioned between the two parts of each college, but those funds will not be considered here. Once the proposals are sent forward to the Regents, it will be necessary to begin the work of apportioning those endowment funds.

A. State-Funded Academic Budgets

**College of Liberal Arts
Academic Units, FY03 Budgets**

Department	Prof Salaries	Grad Salaries	Classified Salaries	Wages	Fringe	Operating	Total
Anthropology and Historic Preservation	\$ 760,785	\$ 73,500	\$ 33,942	\$ 1,000	\$ 148,061	\$ 22,057	\$ 1,039,345
Art	641,964		118,461	8,000	172,526	43,148	984,099
Basque Studies-Gen	0	21,000	0	0	368	0	21,368
Basque Studies-Statewide	322,427	0	81,348	1,989	86,531	31,605	523,900
English	2,221,284	367,500	98,736	3,000	454,737	34,757	3,180,014
Foreign Languages & Literatures	1,164,299	84,000	49,861	3,730	270,976	24,697	1,597,563
History	1,023,299	105,000	31,858	280	209,313	17,787	1,387,537
Holocaust, Genocide & Peace Studies	84,922	0	0	0	15,061	1,775	101,758
Interior Design	110,232	0	0	5,375	17,579	6,140	139,326
Military Science	0	0	28,007	0	8,272	15,330	51,609
Music	822,297	63,000	98,232	5,648	202,348	80,769	1,272,294
Marching Band	0	0	0	0	0	101,588	101,588
Oral History-Statewide	140,756	0	68,370	0	45,645	1,075	255,846
Oral History-Estate Tax	15,265	0	13,674	0	8,643	13,673	51,255
Philosophy	536,209	10,500	35,228	618	108,108	9,800	700,463
Political Science	957,397	84,000	39,868	1,597	192,653	21,300	1,296,815
Psychology	1,340,685	173,250	77,285	0	264,754	46,797	1,902,771
Psych Service Center	102,308	42,000	35,098	0	31,095	3,733	214,234
Sociology	590,475	42,000	32,514	1,236	117,514	12,163	795,902
Speech Communication & Theatre	621,586	42,000	92,092	3,500	154,247	23,340	936,765
Debate	26,920	0	0	0	5,734	12,700	45,354
Women's Studies	106,131	0	26,309	0	25,277	6,500	164,217
Total CLA Departments	\$ 11,589,241	\$ 1,107,750	\$ 960,883	\$ 35,973	\$ 2,539,442	\$ 530,734	\$ 16,764,023

**College of Science
Academic Units, FY03 Budgets**

Department	Prof Salaries	Grad Salaries	Classified Salaries	Wages	Fringe	Operating	Total
Biology	\$ 1,479,511	\$ 183,750	\$ 54,821	\$ 4,000	\$ 308,589	\$ 97,363	\$ 2,128,034
Biodiversity (Estate Tax)	34,705		13,681	4,000	11,905	14,674	78,965
EECB			13,155		4,025	4,241	21,421
Chemistry	1,468,162	231,000	286,817	16,500	352,561	129,940	2,484,980
Chemistry (Estate Tax)	111,703	286,000	112,956	0	60,627	27,092	598,378
Geography	470,142	52,500	80,716	567	112,984	16,530	733,439
Geological Sciences & Engineering	1,483,641	84,000	37,124	1,030	263,401	32,025	1,901,221
Hydrology	0	10,500	18,332	0	6,530	3,870	39,232
Mathematics	1,535,703	73,500	66,955	2,000	324,865	43,600	2,046,623
Mining Engineering	483,095	10,500	83,714	1,030	104,547	15,750	698,636
Keck Museum	0	10,500	0	0	184	3,288	13,972
NV Bureau Mines & Geology	1,050,825	21,000	404,435	0	309,849	42,357	1,828,466
Physics	947,242	136,500	214,542	5,000	223,669	49,860	1,576,813
Energy & Environ. Physics	115,075				28,616		143,691
NV Seismology Lab	296,760	10,500	34,152	0	69,721	11,044	422,177
Total COS Departments	\$ 9,476,564	\$ 1,110,250	\$ 1,421,400	\$ 34,127	\$ 2,182,073	\$ 491,634	\$ 14,716,048

The data shown in these tables include only the academic budgets and does not include the budgets for the deans' offices (see below). The College of Liberal Arts would have a total of 158.84 professional FTE (academic and administrative faculty), 26.49 classified FTE, and 105.5 graduate assistants (budgeted at \$10,500 per GA) college-wide. The College of Science would have 119.92 professional FTE, 32.82 classified FTE, and 105.7 state-funded graduate assistants college-wide. As Parts Two and Three point out, each college has a number of personnel paid either out of non-state funds or retained as temporary lecturers on state funds not included in this chart.

The College of Engineering budget is not shown here, but it would include the addition of the state-appropriated budget for the Department of Chemical and Metallurgical Engineering. This gives it a total of 52.50 state-funded professional FTE, 9.50 classified FTE, 19 graduate assistants, and a total state-funded budget of \$6,515,510, excluding the dean's office.

Much concern has been expressed about the future allocation of faculty positions. As a campus-wide policy, when vacated all current positions return to the Office of the Provost for allocation. As budgets increase due to enrollment growth, new faculty positions will also be assigned by the Office of the Provost. Each year, all colleges will be asked to submit prioritized lists of new faculty position requests. Those requests should justify the need for a faculty position in a given department based on how it meets the strategic requirements of the university. These requirements are defined as the priorities identified in the university's strategic plan, priorities arising from societal and regional needs, and enrollment pressures.

A department that loses a faculty member to retirement, resignation, or other cause is welcome to place a request to fill a "new" position, but should not specifically link that request to the departed faculty member. In this way, departments will be encouraged to consider new needs and initiatives. It should be noted that FTE-driven funding formulas have not been and will not be the sole criterion for allocating faculty positions within the university. Enrollment pressures are an important consideration in prioritizing the allocation of faculty positions, but other factors will continue to be important in this process as well.

B. State-Funded Deans' Office Budgets

Both new college proposals request a significantly larger college office staff than either present college currently has. The CLA planning group has requested a dean's office staff of 15, including five professional positions (dean, associate dean, student advising coordinator, budget/personnel coordinator, and development director— 4.5 FTE), eight classified staff (8.0 FTE), and two student workers. The COS planning group has requested a dean's office staff of 19, including six professional positions (dean, associate dean, Academic Council director, MSES director, budget/personnel coordinator, student services director— 4.5-5.5 FTE), seven professional technical support staff (7.0 FTE), and six classified staff (5.5 FTE). Given that the combined Mines and Arts and Science state-funded deans' offices have a total of 6.0 professional FTE and 4.56 classified FTE, it will not be possible to honor these requests fully in the next fiscal year should this proposal be approved.

The staffing most needed for each college to be functional in the coming year includes the following positions:

<i>CLA position</i>	<i>Position type, FTE</i>	<i>COS position</i>
Dean	Professional, 1.0	Dean
Associate Dean	Professional, 1.0	Associate Dean
Budget/Personnel Coordinator	Professional, 1.0	Budget/Personnel Coordinator
Student Advising Coordinator	Professional, 1.0	Student Services Coordinator
Office Manager, AA IV	Classified, 1.0	Office Manager, AA IV
Acct./Personnel Technician, III	Classified, 1.0	Acct./Personnel Technician, III
Receptionist	Classified, 1.0	Receptionist

To provide this staffing, several new positions will have to be created, including one associate dean position, one student adviser position, and one receptionist position, while one classified position will need to be brought from 0.5 FTE to 1.0 FTE. The total additional cost for this staffing is approximately \$200,000. These funds will be recycled from other areas of the university through the salary savings pool (see below) to enable these colleges to operate effectively. It should be noted that this staffing is commensurate with the current CAS. Since neither of the new colleges is as large or as complex as the current CAS, staffing at this level should be sufficient until such time as additional resources are available.

In addition, there are new administrative positions in each college that arise from the creation of the School of the Arts (CLA) and the Mackay School of Earth Sciences (COS), respectively. For the present, the directorship of the Mackay School would be filled on a half-time basis by a faculty member from one of the units in those schools who would receive an administrative stipend. This may also be the case for a director of the School of the Arts should that unit ultimately decide to adopt this governance model. The College of Science has also planned for an Academic Council led by a Director. For the first year, and perhaps longer depending on resource availability, that position's responsibilities should be carried out by the college's Associate Dean.

Finally, each college planning group has recognized the need for development staff. In most colleges, the equivalent positions are paid from non-state sources, so they do not appear on this chart. However, it is expected that each college will begin next year with a development officer (or a search for one) who will be paid by a combination of college funds and Office of Development funds as is presently the case for Arts and Science and for Mines. The university will work with each college to see that its budgets are sufficient to support this important position.

C. Pooled Salary Savings

Each year college budgets are assessed a percentage of their classified and professional salary budgets to satisfy a mandated (by the state) salary savings requirement. Salary savings in excess

of this “tax” are available to the colleges to fund LOA needs or to meet other instructional-related demands. The standing policy has been that a college must exhaust its salary savings pool on instructional needs (for example, temporary lecturers) before it can request assistance from the Office of the Provost. Most colleges have enough salary savings to cover their instructional needs and do not require assistance; however, every year CAS fully exhausts its salary savings and requires an additional funds from the Provost to cover its instructional responsibilities. This year, that additional amount was \$ 1.2 million.

The amount of salary savings available to a college fluctuates from year to year depending upon the number of vacancies within the unit. Colleges may experience windfalls one year and shortfalls the next. To a large extent, planning and priorities become a function of the availability of salary savings. This year, salary savings were swept entirely from the units and collected centrally to address both the mandated salary savings return and the budget reductions. Salary savings in excess of these requirements were allocated to meet instructional needs and to fill critically needed positions.

Currently the Office of the Provost and the University Budget Office are working together to devise a new mechanism for pooling the salary savings funds university-wide, then redistributing them to units commensurate with their needs. The difference is that the amount distributed would not reflect year-to-year variations in individual colleges, but would be a consistent allocation that would permit the colleges to plan their budgets.

D. Indirect Cost Recovery (ICR) Funds

One of the recommendations arising from strategic planning this past spring was to examine and reapportion the ICR funds raised by the university’s external granting activities. Over the past two months, an *ad hoc* committee has been deliberating on this question and is in the process of preparing its final report (due December 1, 2002). Because these discretionary funds are important for the support of activities university-wide, and particularly in self-funded areas of scholarship, it is helpful to report in advance some of the recommendations of that committee.

The committee was charged with identifying an appropriate percentage of the ICR funds to set aside for scholarly activities which would be made available to units in which scholarship and creative activity are largely self-funded. They were also asked to examine the distribution of ICR funds back to the units that have been awarded the grants so that we could establish a university-wide policy for ICR fund distribution. They have recommended the following:

	<i>Proposed distribution</i>		<i>Current distribution</i>	
Scholarly activities pool	3.5%	\$ 330,750	0%	0
Generating college	10.33%	\$ 976,185	11.11-16%	
Generating department	10.33%	\$ 976,185	combined: 0 -11.11%	\$ 1,458,285
Generating PI	10.33%	\$ 976,185	11.11-22.2%	\$ 1,047,404

The remainder of the ICR funds retained by the university go to various administrative functions, with the largest share supporting the Office of Research/Graduate School. The details of the full distribution will be released later this fall.

The scholarly activities pool will be distributed to colleges according to a formula based on the state-funded faculty FTEs in each college. Each dean would receive a minimum of \$1,000 per state-funded faculty FTE. Those colleges whose dean's allocation of ICR does not equal or exceed \$1,000 per faculty FTE would be eligible for a distribution from the scholarly activities pool. Under this formula, CLA would receive approximately \$143,000 to supplement the \$22,000 that the dean's office receives from current grants in that college. This is approximately the amount that the current CAS receives, so the net effect is to replace the discretionary funding that the humanities, social sciences, and arts lose by being separated from the sciences in CAS. With this amount tied to a percentage of the overall ICR, it will grow as the overall external grants and contracts of the university grows.

E. Space needs

Each college proposal describes an urgent need for additional space, a condition felt by most units on campus. The most immediate need is for office space to house the two deans' offices next year, with planning to provide for the long-term needs of the colleges.

CLA would house its dean's office next year in the present CAS dean's office on the sixth floor of the Ansari Business Building. This office suite would also house the office for the Director of the Core Curriculum. Office space for the School of the Arts would have to be arranged with the three arts departments in Church Fine Arts. As a long-term plan, a new location for the CLA dean's office and for the Center for the Core Curriculum would be designated, with one strong possibility being a renovated Getchell Library after the new library is built.

COS would house its dean's office in the present MSM dean's office in the Mackay Mines Building. This space is probably insufficient for all the staff that the college would employ and additional offices would need to be found elsewhere. This will be a high priority for the Facilities Resource Committee pending the disposition of this proposal. In the long-term, one attractive option would be to house the dean's office in the planned Science and Math Education Center, which would also house the mathematics department. The office for the Director of the Mackay School of Earth Sciences would have to be arranged among the earth science departments and would likely be located in the Laxalt Minerals Engineering/Research complex.

One of the UPC's tasks this spring will be the consideration of long-range space allocation plans, including the prioritization of new building construction and old building renovation. In general, the strategy will be to maximize the impact of new space so that it relieves overcrowding in as many units as possible.