

FINAL REPORT

AD HOC COMMITTEE TO REVIEW THE PROPOSED ALTERATION OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

May 3, 2010

Charge: Evaluate the Arts and Sciences alteration proposal, consult extensively with affected faculty, students, and staff, and relevant parties external to the University, and present a recommendation to the Committee on Academic Affairs and the Provost.

Committee members

Professor James Cogdell, Department of Mathematics
Deborah Haddad, Assistant Dean, Social and Behavioral Sciences
Professor Susan Hartmann, Department of History
Mary Ellen Jenkins, Executive Assistant Dean, Arts and Sciences Advising
and Academic Services
Jamie Lynch, Sociology and Council of Graduate Students
Professor Jeffrey McKee, Department of Anthropology
Professor James Rathman, Department of Chemical & Biomolecular Engineering (Chair)
John Tannous, Political Science and Undergraduate Student Government
Professor Robert Ward, School of Music
Professor John Wenzel, Department of Evolution, Ecology, and Organismal Biology

Summary of the committee's activities

The committee met twenty times between November 2009 and May 2010 and consulted with the following individuals:

Provost Joe Alutto
Vice Provost Randy Smith
Professor Jay Hobgood, Chair of Committee on Academic Affairs
Joan Leitzel, former Interim Executive Dean of Arts and Sciences
Professor Tim Gerber, Chair of Faculty Council
Professor Pat Osmer, Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School
Curricular Associate Deans Dave Andereck, Gene Mumy, Valarie Williams
Research and Facilities Associate Deans Rich Hall, Sebastian Knowles, Pam Paxton
Executive Associate Dean Terry Gustafson (Interdisciplinary Programs)
Divisional Deans Matt Platz, John Roberts, Gifford Weary
Professors Irina Artsimovitch, Nancy Ettlinger, Helena Goscilo (ASC Senate Steering
Committee)

Professors Gordon Aubrecht, Mary Jo Fresch, Barbara Lehman, Vidhyanath Rao
(Regional Campus faculty)
Joseph Steinmetz, Executive Dean of Arts and Sciences and Vice Provost,
Academic Affairs

The committee held two open forums on April 27-28, 2010.

Assessment

The committee evaluated how the proposal addresses each item listed in University Rule 3335-3-37B(2), the rule that governs the process for alteration or abolition of colleges. The evaluation was based on two documents: *Proposal to Alter the Federation of the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences and the Five Colleges Comprising the Federation to Form a New Administrative and Educational Unit called the College of Arts and Sciences*, submitted June 18, 2009 by Joan Leitzel, Interim Executive Dean, and *A Summative Proposal to Establish the College of Arts and Sciences at The Ohio State University*, submitted April 12, 2010 by Joseph Steinmetz, Executive Dean and Vice Provost. The Steinmetz document is a revision of an earlier document (*Unifying the Colleges of Arts and Sciences: Implementation Considerations*) submitted September 12, 2009 by Executive Dean Steinmetz. The April 12 revision addresses specific questions and concerns raised by the committee in its meeting with the Executive Dean on March 8. This document also includes updated information to reflect changes that have taken place since the original proposal was submitted.

- a) *A rationale for alteration or abolition of the unit which includes a history of the formation, activities and evaluation of the performance of the unit.*

The rationale and historical perspective are appropriately provided in both documents. People with whom the committee consulted generally agreed that the unification of the existing five colleges into a single College of Arts and Sciences will provide exciting opportunities for cooperation and collaboration between units, and will properly position the College to become the “cornerstone on which all other academic experiences are built” at The Ohio State University. Bringing together all the faculty, resources and programs within the College of Arts and Sciences will ensure a unified, effective voice for Arts and Sciences within the University, strengthen academic programs at both undergraduate and graduate levels, enhance interdisciplinary opportunities for faculty and students, promote collaborative relationships, and provide for an administrative structure that is efficient, effective, and less costly, and that will enable significant resources to be redirected to academic programs.

- b) *An enumeration of all faculty affected by the alteration or abolition of the unit.*

The Leitzel document lists the number of faculty in each of the units affected by the alteration.

- c) *A person-by-person analysis of the proposed reassignment or other accommodation of the faculty identified in paragraph (B)(2)(b) of this rule, including a statement of the impact on promotion and tenure. No tenured faculty member shall be involuntarily terminated as a result of this process. However, faculty may be transferred to another unit in accordance with paragraph (C)(2) of rule 3335-6-06 of the Administrative Code and with regard to the teaching, research, and service expertise of the individual.*

Understanding how the alteration may impact promotion and tenure policies and procedures was the most common concern of faculty consulted by the committee. The proposed alteration makes no changes to departments and therefore current tenure initiating units are not affected. No faculty will be transferred to another unit. Although there will be some changes in promotion and tenure procedures, there will be no additional level of review, and overall the new process will be very similar to current procedures. The main difference will be that the unified college will have three promotion and tenure committees, one for each division, whereas there are currently five such committees, one for each college. There will thus be some change in the composition of P&T committees.

An important concern expressed to the committee was how the alteration will affect faculty who are expecting to be reviewed for tenure and/or promotion during the transition period. For example, an assistant professor who is currently being evaluated by one of the five college P&T committees might understandably be concerned about his evaluation being assumed by one of the three divisional P&T committees, which could conceivably have different standards or expectations. Will any special accommodation be made for assistant and associate professors during the transition? Along similar lines, recently hired faculty would appreciate an assurance that their hiring agreements and contracts will not be affected by the alteration.

- d) *An analysis of the academic courses now taught by the unit and provisions for their reassignment to other units, if relevant.*

The only courses possibly affected will be some associated with interdisciplinary programs that currently report directly to the Executive Dean but after the alteration will be moved into appropriate divisions that report to a Divisional Dean. Some interdisciplinary programs, International Studies for example, will likely remain

independent within a division, with a director reporting to the Divisional Dean. Other interdisciplinary programs, such as Latino/Latina Studies, will be moved into a department and thus report to directly to the chair. Given the range of possibilities, it is clear that numerous details will need to be worked out.

- e) *An analysis of the students affected by the proposal, including majors, non-majors, professional and graduate students.*

No negative impacts are anticipated. There will presumably be a change in the college name listed on diplomas. Expectation is that unification will make it easier for students to pursue multiple majors, minors, and participate in interdisciplinary programs. College advising within Arts and Sciences is already centralized and the proposed alteration will not have a major impact on student advising.

One question raised by graduate students was how fellowships currently distributed by the Graduate School to the five colleges would be distributed in the unified College. Dean Osmer of the Graduate School indicated that these fellowships would be distributed to Executive Dean Steinmetz, who in turn would distribute to the divisions and departments at his discretion. Dean Steinmetz said he plans to distribute fellowships to the divisions in the same proportions as they currently go to the five colleges.

- f) *Specific proposals regarding support for currently enrolled students until degree completion.*

No changes are anticipated regarding College advising, career services and major advising at the department level.

- g) *An analysis of the budgetary consequences to all relevant units as a consequence of the proposal.*

The two most significant administrative changes made in the recent realignment were the formation of the three divisions (Arts and Humanities, Natural and Mathematical Sciences, Social and Behavior Sciences) and allocation of the collective budget for all five colleges to the Executive Dean. The proposal describes the Dean's plans: "...an annual budget call will be made to department chairs and program directors, who will submit budget requests to the College that include proposals and requests for instructional and non-instructional related funds. Funds will be allocated to departments and programs after funding requests are collectively evaluated by me [the Executive Dean] and the divisional deans. A portion of the budget will be kept at the center of the College to

encourage cooperation and collaboration across units in the College, as well as to support programs, research, infrastructure, and other investments that promote the mission of the College. A portion of the budget will also be set aside for distribution to each divisional dean for needs that crop up throughout the year in individual divisions.” In their discussions with the committee, the current divisional deans expressed support for the new budgetary model, noting that it will be a significant improvement over the current process. Making budget allocation based more on the department and program level is generally viewed favorably, though there remains some level of uncertainty since long term implications are difficult to anticipate.

h) An analysis of the service lost to the rest of the university as a consequence of the proposal.

No service losses are expected. The restructuring is expected to facilitate and improve inter-college and interdisciplinary programming and research due to a more centralized administration of the budget.

i) An analysis of impact on constituencies external to the university, including alumni.

The committee did not talk to any alumni. The committee was satisfied with the Executive Dean’s vision for strengthening development efforts in the College. The importance of continuing to foster excellent relations with alumni is clearly recognized and will be a top priority.

j) An analysis of the impact on governance at all relevant levels as a consequence of the proposal.

Earlier this year, Executive Dean Steinmetz formed two task forces to provide recommendations on how faculty, staff, and students could provide advice and guidance to the Dean’s office on policy and procedures within the restructured College of Arts and Sciences. The recommendation of a task force that focused on faculty involvement was accepted by the Dean without modification and distributed to all ASC faculty on April 25. The Faculty Advisory Council (FAC) will consist of 17 faculty members: 12 elected (4 from each division), 3 appointed by the Dean, and the Chair of the ASC Faculty Senate and the Executive Dean.

Although the formation of a student advisory council is not mentioned in the proposal, Executive Dean Steinmetz has indicated in other communications his intent to form this group as well. The committee suggests modifying the proposal to note this involvement of students.

Another extremely important issue is the apportionment of Arts and Sciences faculty in the University Senate. The five existing colleges currently have a total of 25 faculty senators. The current University rule governing apportionment limits each College to no more than seven faculty senators. The committee's opinion is that the breadth and depth of a unified College of Arts and Sciences will require a revision of this rule because the current one will no longer reflect appropriate levels of representation. This issue is not resolved but a task force is working on options.

k) An analysis of the impact upon diversity.

The committee believes the positive impacts on diversity described in the proposal documents are realistic and attainable. Several of the existing colleges have standing committees and programs devoted to the hiring and development of minority faculty, and to the improved recruitment, retention, and development of under-represented student groups. Within a unified College of Arts and Sciences, other units will benefit from these activities and possibly adopt similar programs and policies. The committee also learned that the merger will make it easier for the University to recruit faculty successfully in situations where spousal hires are desired.

l) An analysis of the impact on the academic freedom and responsibility of all affected faculty.

As stated in the proposal documents: "Academic freedom is a fundamental right for all faculty, regardless of rank. There will be no change for faculty in Arts and Sciences in terms of academic freedom and responsibility as a result of the proposed alteration."

Additional Comments and Concerns

The rationale for organizing all units in Arts and Sciences into three divisions is understandable from an administrative standpoint. Several people with whom the committee consulted expressed concerns about future recruitment of highly qualified and capable divisional deans, given that these positions have limited responsibility and budgetary authority. The College will most likely need to recruit internal candidates for these positions.

The committee is concerned that the unusual structure and role of the Center for Life Sciences Education has not been addressed. This unit is very important to the general education curriculum and to Biology, the largest major on campus. The dissolution of the College of Biological Sciences means that the original administration no longer exists to provide oversight

and policy. The financing, staffing and general policies of CLSE should be addressed (either changed or reaffirmed) in the near future to ensure continued success in the unified college.

Recommendations

The committee unanimously supports the proposal and recommends the establishment of a unified College of Arts and Sciences at The Ohio State University.

Regarding the apportionment of Arts and Sciences faculty to the University Senate, the Rules of the University Faculty require that some change must occur either in the number of senators allowed the new Arts and Sciences College or in the rule that limits a college to no more than seven senators. The committee offers two recommendations: (1) The proposal should include an assurance that this issue will be addressed in time for the next round of Senate elections in winter 2011. (2) The proposal should suggest that reasonable modification of the representation rules be made that will allow the current 25 Arts and Sciences faculty senators to continue as full voting members of the University Senate between the presumed approval of the consolidation of Arts and Sciences this spring and the seating of the next cohort of senators who will be elected in winter 2011 to begin service in fall 2011.

The committee suggests that CAA put forward a single proposal document for approval by Faculty Council and the University Senate in the next steps of this process. This document would combine the Steinmetz and Leitzel documents, preferably following a format similar to the Leitzel document which is structured in a way to clearly show how the proposal addresses the specific items prescribed in the rules for a proposed alteration of a college. The committee believes having the entire proposal in a single document will help deliberations proceed more quickly and productively, and will also better serve the ultimate role of this proposal as an important historical document.

Summary

Establishing a unified College of Arts and Sciences at The Ohio State University is a tremendously challenging, complex, and exciting endeavor. The process for such an alteration takes time and there is unavoidably a lack of detail in some of the issues important to those affected by the change because many of the steps must be taken sequentially. Approval of this proposal is itself but one step in the overall process. The committee is favorably impressed by the progress that has already been made. Dean Steinmetz's efforts to consult faculty in all Arts and Sciences Departments and to organize faculty and staff advisory councils are especially commendable. The committee is convinced that the ongoing and future activities are properly focused, well-motivated, and will effectively guide the many tasks that need to be accomplished over the next few years to realize the full promise of a unified College.