

FEB 27 2003

**Report to the Faculty Senate From the
Ad Hoc Review Committee for the Proposed Reorganization
of the College of Arts and Science and the Mackay School of Mines**

February 13, 2003

In December of 2002 the Faculty Senate formed an *ad hoc* committee to review and make recommendations regarding a proposal for the reorganization of the existing College of Arts and Science (CAS) and the Mackay School of Mines (MSM). Members of the committee were drawn from areas outside of CAS and MSM. One member from the Senate's Executive Board served as liaison. The committee members included:

Christine Cheney (Education), Chair
Bob Brunner (Medicine)
Patty Charles (103 Committee)
Donnelyn Curtis (Library)
Peggy Dupey (Faculty Senate liaison)
Jennifer Greer (Journalism)
Steve Maples (Student Services)
Eric Marchand (101 Committee)
Tya Mathis (Student representative)
Jeanie Pratt (Staff Employees Council)
Yvonne Stedham (Business)
Peggy Troupe (Staff Employees Council)
Jill Winter (Human and Community Sciences)

Activities of the Ad Hoc Committee:

The Ad Hoc Committee has undertaken a variety of activities to gather information, opinions, support, and concerns from multiple sources and from most campus constituencies. We held meetings with individuals, faculty groups, department chairs, and open forums. In addition, we read strategic plans, reports, and correspondence. We solicited input via email, individual meetings, and "Plantalk." The following is a list of the meetings and forums held with individuals or groups with interest in the proposed reorganization:

December 12, 2002	Bruce Shively, Director of Planning, Budget, and Analysis
December 17, 2002	John Frederick, Provost
January 10, 2003	Ann Ronald, former Dean of the College of Arts and Science
January 16, 2003	Open Form for all interested parties
January 22, 2003	Ed Martinez, Chair of the Art Department
January 23, 2003	Forum with Mackay School of Mines faculty, staff & students
January 24, 2003	Marilyn Johnson, VP for Development and Alumni Relations
January 24, 2003	Forum for Arts and Science faculty, staff & students
January 27, 2003	Arts and Science Chairs and Directors
January 27, 2003	Faculty of Mining Engineering Department (MSM)

February 10, 2003	John Frederick, Provost
February 12, 2003	Connie Howard, Development Officer, MSM

Roughly 100-120 persons attended meetings or communicated with the Committee through other means. The total number reflects the presence of some individuals at more than one meeting. In addition, many persons provided materials and information requested by the committee.

A Summary of the Proposed Reorganization

The reorganization plan proposes to create two new colleges: a College of Liberal Arts (CLA) and a College of Science (COS), each with a dean and central support staff. The creation of these colleges would split the current College of Arts and Science. The existing Mackay School of Mines (MSM) would become part of the proposed College of Science, as the Mackay School of Earth Sciences, with one department (Chemical and Metallurgical Engineering) to join the College of Engineering. The reorganization plan presupposes the existence of a separate Core Curriculum Center, although no proposal for this center was available to the Committee during their deliberations. The plan also includes a School for the Arts contained within the College of Liberal Arts. In order to fully understand the recommendations of this report, the proposal should be read in its entirety. It is found at:

<http://www.unr.edu/planning/documents/frederick-proposal.021211.pdf>

The specific objectives of the reorganization are stated as:

1. The more efficient and effective use of existing resources
2. The development of additional revenue sources to supplement support from the state
3. The development of new strategies to promote the visibility of its programs

The proposal is predicated on the principles of organizing areas/units around (a) overlapping interests and curricula; (b) similar modes of scholarship, instruction, and advising/mentoring; (c) similar expectations of faculty performance; (d) common accrediting bodies; (e) similar space needs; and (f) congruent modes of community engagement and external constituencies (see p. 6).

Faced with the daunting task of digesting the information provided and developing recommendations about the reorganization, the Committee decided to evaluate the proposal based on the stated objectives and organizing principles put forth in the document itself.

The following analysis presents each of the objectives, with both positive and negative findings. This leads to a discussion of the degree to which the proposed reorganization followed the organizing principles for areas/units and specific instances where the plan did not adhere to the principles. We conclude our report with specific recommendations for the Faculty Senate.

Evaluation of the Objectives and Principles of the Reorganization

Objective One: The more efficient and effective use of existing resources

Summary of Issues/Solutions Presented in the Proposal: The College of Arts and Science is under-supported with administrative resources i.e. professional, technical and clerical staff and operating budgets. This results in a greater administrative load for departments and faculty. With reorganization, two colleges of similar size are formed, each having approximately 120-160 faculty and equivalent resources at the deans' level. The Core Curriculum would become a separate center, apparently not reporting to a single college.

Ad Hoc Committee Analysis of the Positive Impact of these Changes:

- Funding for the creation of two deans' offices comes, in large part, from a new plan for the distribution of Indirect Cost Recovery (ICR) funds. The proposal for ICR distribution has merit and could be beneficial, if implemented, independent of reorganization. If the reorganization is implemented, attention must be given to insure the long-term use of these funds to support both new colleges and the units that do not generate large extramural "income."
- If deans' offices were more adequately staffed and funded, departments would be relieved of some administrative duties, thus increasing their effectiveness to pursue their primary missions of teaching and scholarship.
- Each college would be able to employ individuals with expertise to fill unique roles within the college. For example, the COS might choose to employ more technicians, whereas the College of Liberal Arts could employ events coordinators. Both colleges would benefit from the addition of development offices with experienced professional staffs.
- The sharing of space, equipment and core facilities could be enhanced with the creation of colleges with more focused missions.

Ad Hoc Committee Analysis of the Negative Impact of these Changes:

- The university faces tremendous challenges in the near future: huge enrollment growth; inadequate numbers of support personnel; need for additional faculty lines; diminishing LOA and lecturer pool; and serious office, research and classroom space issues. It is unclear how this reorganization will directly impact these issues.
- It is important to adequately define objective benchmarks for determining success of any reorganization plan in relation to these important challenges.
- The Committee felt that less costly alternatives to this reorganization should have been seriously considered through discussion, debate and a reconciliation process.
- The involvement of consultants, accrediting bodies, or even academic leaders with a variety of perspectives and experiences would have been a very efficient and effective use of existing resources. The tremendous number of hours that have been devoted to this reorganization by a variety of individuals has cost and will continue to cost the university a great deal in faculty and administrative resources—and perhaps for good reasons. As yet, this proposal has not been

subjected to formal, external scrutiny or review, which are hallmarks of our academic tradition.

- Another hallmark of our academic tradition is the use of data to drive decisions. Certainly the proposal includes projected budgets and similar information. However, no evidence is provided from similar institutions, from detailed cost comparisons, or even from relevant theoretical models of management and organization that guide us in understanding how this type of reorganization, as opposed to a less disruptive restructuring, addresses the issues we face. An analysis of other institutions shows a variety of administrative structures, including at least one that is, after about 10 years of separation, recombining its colleges of science and liberal arts. The Provost reported seeking opinions both within the University and from faculty and administrators at other institutions of various organizational configurations.
- A serious issue, that has raised concerns about increased bureaucracy, is the creation of the Core Curriculum Center. However, lacking a proposal that describes that center and its interconnections with affected departments and deans, the Ad Hoc Committee has been at a serious disadvantage in evaluating its merits. This leaves key questions surrounding reporting lines and sharing resources unanswered and impacts this committee's confidence in the evaluating the reorganization plan as a whole.
- Merging the Mackay School of Mines into the COS adds a layer of complexity to that aspect of the proposed reorganization. This merger results in two colleges that contain engineering departments (the College of Engineering and the COS) and underscores the need to address potentially serious accreditation issues for the engineering department within the COS.
- Two directors are created in the COS (the Academic Director and the Director of the Mackay School), along with some support staff for each. The plan for the COS also integrates eight departments, six of which are academic and two of which are fundamentally different in enterprise and funding support. This contributes to increased complexity and potential misunderstandings of mission and conflicts in evaluating funding priorities and academic success.
- The Committee believes that a central question in this reorganization plan revolves around the Mackay School of Mines. The MSM has been described as generating low student FTE—of being inefficient. However, it is not clear how moving these faculty into another college will solve these FTE issues. Instead, they may become a divisive point of contention within the COS. If FTE generation is a driving force for part of this reorganization, a plan that directly and fairly addresses the issue in Mackay is needed.

Objective Two: The development of alternative revenue sources to supplement support from the state.

Summary of Issues as Presented in the Proposal: The two new colleges would enable greater involvement of deans in focused fund raising activities, including research initiatives. Also, the smaller units could lead to greater student identification with the college, thus creating a more loyal and generous alumni

base. The more central mission of each college would be reflected in focused and well-defined fund-raising objectives, and they would be better positioned to develop natural constituencies.

Ad Hoc Committee Analysis of the Positive Impact of these Changes:

- The proposed School of Arts, on the face of it, creates good potential for fund raising, especially within the local community.
- With appropriate administrative support, deans would be able to devote more time to fundraising.
- Although specific opportunities need to be identified, the proposed realignment makes the argument that the COS as an identified unit would create synergy for grant opportunities from as yet untapped sources.
- Additional development positions would increase potential for focused fund raising, especially within the context of a university-wide development strategy.
- The more focused mission for each college would provide greater potential for naming opportunities for buildings, rooms, and facilities.

Ad Hoc Committee Analysis of the Negative Impact of these Changes:

- Concerns have been raised that the proposed reorganization may cause the university to lose the very thing it is seeking—donors. There are two areas of particular concern: (a) segments of the mining industry are concerned about the loss of the international “brand name” Mackay School of Mines; and (b) current donors will feel that their legacies will not be respected over time as the contributions of the Mackay family and others are put to uses other than their intended targets. It should be noted that this was discussed with the Provost and he believes the reconfiguration of MSM will lead to more outside funding opportunities, not fewer.
- The concern that students (alumni) do not contribute to their colleges after they graduate is not clearly addressed by this plan. The Committee feels that students tend to identify with their departments and programs and with professional schools. It is the nature of the university structure that keeps students more linked to their department and to individual faculty than to the more abstract notion of how departments are organized within a college structure.
- No evidence has been provided from other universities that have gone through a similar realignment showing that this type of structure would increase funding. The Committee was told that the Office of the Vice President for Development and Alumni is prepared to raise funds for all priorities, regardless of the configuration of the colleges and departments.
- The Committee heard from faculty that collaboration in research is not dependent on being in the same school or even the same department. In fact, it has been suggested that it may be easier to collaborate with persons outside of one’s college because there is less competition for the same resources from the same dean. Collaboration is also dependent on good will, common interests, and technologically different, but parallel, approaches to the same problem—not on college structure.

- Research funding and endowment support are strengthened by building a university's reputation and capacity, resulting in recruitment of higher-caliber faculty, increased laboratory facilities, quality library holdings, etc. But an immediate impact of the reorganization could be the loss of one of the most prominent brand names that the university has -- Mackay School of Mines. Some feel that this could substantially harm the reputation of the institution and our ability to attract endowments and external of funding. Although the Provost stated that "Mackay School" was the brand name and that the replacement of the term "mines" would positively impact the School, this is a question to be investigated further.

Objective Three: The development of new strategies to promote the visibility of the university's programs

Summary of Issues as Presented in the Proposal: The proposed realignment will contribute to the university's visibility by raising the profile of many affected departments and programs. Examples include a School of the Arts within the proposed College of Liberal Arts and the creation of a College of Science that would stimulate industry partnerships and attract science-based industries to the local area. In addition, deans would be able to advocate on behalf of each college for resources. It is also suggested that the Core Curriculum would gain visibility because it would be viewed as a truly university-wide program.

Ad Hoc Committee Analysis of the Positive Impact of these Changes:

- The proposed School of the Arts will raise the university's visibility in the local community.
- The COS has the potential to make the sciences more visible in a variety of ways.
- The active advocacy of two deans within the university will have a positive impact on those schools.
- There is a potential for Core Curriculum to become more visible on campus and to potentially expand upon its growing national reputation, but without a proposal for the Core Center, this is hard to gauge.
- The Chemical and Metallurgical Engineering Department appears to be enthusiastic about inclusion in the College of Engineering. This could lead to increased recruiting efforts and visibility for that program.

Ad Hoc Committee Analysis of the Negative Impact of these Changes:

- The engineering programs currently in the Mackay School of Mines that would be moved to the COS could face the loss of accreditation. The committee was informed that the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Mining (ABET) has a bias against engineering programs located outside a college of engineering. A search of their website (www.abet.org) found 15 accredited mining engineering programs. Of these, two were in technical institutions. Of the 13 that were located within universities, none could be ascertained to be a college of science. Most were in colleges of engineering, colleges of mines, or colleges of earth and

mineral sciences. This trend was also confirmed by Ted Batchman, Dean of the College of Engineering.

- A significant loss of international visibility could be felt with the proposed change of the Mackay School of Mines to the Mackay School of Earth Sciences.
- We have not seen evidence/data that this reorganization will improve the visibility of the university or the colleges. It is argued that visibility comes primarily from the reputation of faculty, programs, and departments.
- The proposal cited rankings given by *US News and World Report* as evidence of our needed growth in visibility. We are ranked in the third tier of universities. The reasons for this ranking are: (1) graduation rate, (2) funding level per student (through state and soft money), and (3) donations/giving level of our alumni. If we are aiming to become a tier 1 or 2 institution, this proposal does not directly address several of these criteria. In fact, very little is mentioned about improving the experience for students. However, should the reorganization achieve greater extramural and gift support, it has the potential to improve the components of this ranking in the long-term.

Organizational Criteria Used in the Reorganization. The following organizing principles were used to realign areas/units: (a) overlapping interests and curricula; (b) similar modes of scholarship, instruction, and advising/mentoring; (c) similar expectations of faculty performance; (d) common accrediting bodies; (e) similar space needs; and (f) congruent modes of community engagement and external constituencies.

Ad Hoc Committee Analysis:

- Many of these principles were applied fairly consistently in the reorganization, such as similar modes of scholarship, instruction and mentoring, similar expectations of faculty performance, and similar space needs.
- Serious issues remain in the areas of common accrediting bodies, especially for engineering programs within COS.
- There is also concern about whether congruent modes of community engagement and external constituencies will exist within the proposed COS. There is some concern that the industry ties of some programs and departments (particularly the mines components) could dictate or even limit the research initiatives of other departments.
- The applications of the criteria of efficiency, fund raising, synergy and even similar modes of scholarship were less clear in the case of the placement of several departments or programs, such as psychology, military science, dance, mining engineering, the Black Rock Press, interior design, or even biology (with biochemistry residing in an entirely different unit).

Recommendations of the Committee

Based on the Committee's analysis, we do not recommend that the Faculty Senate endorse the creation of the College of Liberal Arts or the College of Science as currently proposed. There are too many unresolved issues and unanswered questions. When these have been addressed more comprehensively, it may be that such a

reorganization will be indicated. However, until more specific benchmarks, evidence of effectiveness, and review by outside sources provide evidence that such wide-sweeping changes are warranted and productive, this committee does not recommend proceeding with the proposed comprehensive reorganization. Specifically, we recommend the following actions, each of which is discussed in more detail, below:

1. Create a School of the Arts
2. Do not place Mackay School of Mines into a College of Science without further study
3. Include measures to assess the effectiveness of the proposed structure
4. Delineate the relationship of the colleges and departments to the Center for the Core Curriculum
5. Submit the proposal for review by outside experts, and provide data to support the expected benefits of the new structure especially compared to alternate structural interventions
6. The Faculty Senate should review the status of any reorganization after 1 year, 3 years, and 5 years using pre-established measures of effectiveness.
7. Specify level of support for deans' offices

1. Recommendation: The School of Arts should be created regardless of the status of other aspects the reorganization. This aspect of the proposal has consistent support from the units affected, although the placement of the dance program and the Black Rock Press has not been fully determined. There are programmatic, resource, and space issues to be considered, and it is hoped the affected parties will engage in serious and open dialog about the appropriate placement of these programs.

2. Recommendation: The creation of a College of Science (COS) has support from several departments, but issues regarding the placement of the Mackay School of Mines (MSM) are such that we do not recommend its inclusion in the COS at this time. Serious consideration could be given to other options for dealing with issues unique to MSM and its legacy at this university. Low FTE is an issue with MSM and should be addressed. Yet visibility, endowments, and research funding are identified as important goals of this reorganization, and MSM clearly meets these criteria.

3. Recommendation: The proposal should be modified to include benchmarks or other criteria to assess the effectiveness of the proposal in meeting its objectives, along with a time line for achieving each. Examples of such benchmarks could include number of new faculty and staff hired, six-year graduation rate, increased rate of research dollars generated, targeted increases in endowments and giving, number of Ph.D. programs, student satisfaction, alumni donations, and tier 1 or 2 status in *US News and World Report*.

4. Recommendation: The reorganization should not go forward without policy that clearly articulates the relationship of the colleges and departments to the Center for the Core Curriculum. In a practical way, the reorganization proposal divides the College of Arts and Science into three units: a College of Liberal Arts, a College of

Science, and a Center for the Core Curriculum. As such, the proposal is incomplete and cannot be evaluated in its entirety

5. Recommendation: The proposal should be modified to include data from available sources to support claims that benefits to efficiency, external fund raising, and visibility are best addressed through this process as opposed to a less disruptive reorganization. In addition, outside experts, accrediting agencies or a panel from respected institutions should be asked to provide input about this proposal. There should be a method developed through which issues raised by this committee are addressed by the team of consultants.

6. Recommendation: A report on the progress and effectiveness of any reorganization should be conducted by the Faculty Senate after 1 year, 3 years, and 5 years. There needs to be an evaluation process that begins prior to reorganization and allows objective measures of success to be made at these milestones.

7. Recommendation: We would like to suggest more extended discussion of the support provided for the administration of each unit that includes a detailed cost analysis/comparison with the current structure and possible alternatives. The level of support for the dean's office for each of the proposed new colleges is identified, but there is some controversy as to whether the resources are adequate to support each new college. The original proposals for the individual colleges that were merged into the current proposal contained additional resources. The committee has been informed that these were not "wish lists" but true reflections of what was needed by each college. Plans for support beyond the first year of the reorganization would also assist in an evaluation of the proposal.

Additional Procedural Concerns. Throughout our review, faculty have commented that this reorganization is a "done deal." The perception is that the meetings, forums, and comment channels established by the administration have not resulted in meaningful dialog. Instances were presented in which plans and reports prepared by faculty, department chairs, or deans have not been responded to by the top-level administration. Several department chairs and deans who have communicated with us have indicated that the faculty became discouraged and inactive in the reorganization discussions because of the manner in which their questions and concerns were addressed (or not addressed) at previous meetings. There appears to be low faculty morale in many of the affected units.

