

A Proposal to Establish the College of Arts and Sciences at The Ohio State University

Joseph E. Steinmetz, Ph.D.

Executive Dean of Arts and Sciences and Vice Provost

May 10, 2010

Pursuant to Faculty Rule 3335-3-37 on the alteration or abolition of units, the Executive Dean of Arts and Sciences and Vice Provost submits a proposal to alter the five Colleges within Arts and Sciences, to form a single College to be called the *College of Arts and Sciences*.

Background

Until 1968, the Arts and Sciences at The Ohio State University were organized as a single, centralized structure. In 1968, with the addition of some Departments and Schools that had previously been affiliated with other Colleges, the Arts and Sciences were divided into five Colleges: Arts, Biological Sciences, Humanities, Mathematical and Physical Sciences, and Social and Behavioral Sciences.

In February 2002, Provost Edward J. Ray appointed an ad hoc Committee on the Status of the Colleges in Arts and Sciences, with the following charge: “to implement effectively our Academic Plan, it is essential that we have a highly visible and nationally prominent Arts and Sciences, and that we have a coherent, collaborative and financially sound core of Arts and Sciences programs of the highest possible quality. Every top tier research university has a strong Arts and Sciences core.” The Report (attached as Appendix A) recommended a federated structure for the Arts and Sciences. In May 2003, a report entitled “Federation of the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences” (attached as Appendix B) identified the formal structure of that Federation, and established the Office of the Executive Dean of the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences. Among the goals of the Federation were the following:

- enhance the reputation and quality of all Colleges by using the strengths of each to benefit others;
- enhance coherence, collaboration, and synergies;
- decrease wasteful College-centric competition and lower College boundaries.

In April 2008, a Review Committee co-chaired by Vice Provosts Martha M. Garland and W. Randy Smith submitted its Final Report (attached as Appendix C), recommending the creation of “a single, integrated College of the Arts and Sciences that brings together all the faculty, resources (budget, space), and academic programs that currently reside within the five colleges.” The report further recommended that the College “would be led by a Dean with ultimate decision-making authority for the college in all realms of college life, reporting directly to the Executive Vice President and Provost.” Working with the Dean in the proposed model were “Divisional Deans,” individuals with the relevant academic expertise to represent clusters of Departments/Schools.

In August 2008, Professor Joan R. Leitzel was appointed Interim Executive Dean of Arts and Sciences and Vice Provost. Three Interim Divisional Deans were appointed: Professor John W. Roberts (Arts and Humanities); Professor Matthew S. Platz (Mathematical and Physical Sciences and Biological Sciences); and Professor Gifford Weary (Social and Behavioral Sciences).

The Executive Dean was given responsibility for strategic planning, budget/resource allocation, and representation of the interests of the Arts and Sciences within and outside the University. In the role of Vice Provost, the Executive Dean was given additional responsibility to provide advice and counsel to the Provost on promotion and tenure recommendations and other academic matters. The Office of the Executive Dean also provides undergraduate advising, career services,

and diversity services for Arts and Sciences, and administers many undergraduate interdisciplinary majors and minors. The three Divisional Deans were given responsibilities at the level of the Arts and Sciences as a whole, as well as responsibility for overseeing the units and programs in their academic areas.

Throughout the 2008-09 academic year, the restructuring of the Arts and Sciences was widely discussed on campus. For example, issues related to Arts and Sciences restructuring were on the agendas of the Arts and Sciences Executive Committee and the Arts and Sciences Faculty Senate, and a set of town meetings was held. A "rationale statement" for the restructuring was developed in response to these discussions. The rationale was circulated to all Arts and Sciences faculty and staff on May 13, 2009 and discussed at the Arts and Sciences town meeting on May 19, 2009. Only one suggestion for change to the document was received, and that change, correcting a statement describing Arts and Sciences history at Ohio State, was made.

On June 18, 2009, pursuant to Faculty Rule 3335-3-37 on the alteration or abolition of units, Interim Executive Dean Leitzel presented a proposal to the Council on Academic Affairs and the University Senate to alter the five colleges within Arts and Sciences by forming a single college to be called the College of Arts and Sciences.

On July 1, 2009, following a national search, Professor Joseph E. Steinmetz was appointed Executive Dean of Arts and Sciences and Vice Provost. To provide his input and outline possible directions for the restructuring, on September 15, 2009, he distributed a document entitled "Unifying the College of Arts and Sciences: Implementation Considerations," that identified several issues to be addressed during the reorganization process, and articulated some basic ideas and principles on which the reorganization would be based.

In adherence to Faculty Rule 3335-3-37, in October 2009, the Council on Academic Affairs appointed an ad hoc committee, chaired by Professor James F. Rathman, Chair, University Senate Steering Committee, to review the proposal and all related materials, and bring a recommendation to the Council. The ad hoc committee's report was received on May 3, 2010.

This proposal reflects the content of the initial proposal submitted by Interim Executive Dean Leitzel, supplemental information provided by Executive Dean Steinmetz, and suggestions from the ad hoc committee and the Council on Academic Affairs.

Since 2008, some basic decisions have been made about the structure of the proposed College. However, many more procedures and policies need to be explored and worked out as the concept of a unified arts and sciences college becomes reality. It is a work in progress and will remain so for at least a few years as new traditions, procedures and policies are created with input from faculty and the College administration.

Responses to Proposal Requirements of Faculty Rule 3335-3-37 on the Alteration of Units

(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 basic components of the history of the unit are outlined in the background section of this document (above), and in the supplementary materials.

This formal rationale statement was produced and discussed during 2008-09:

"The Arts and Sciences are the intellectual and academic core of The Ohio State University and of distinguished universities worldwide. These areas are the University's primary laboratory for inquiry into human expression; social and cultural systems; and

physical, biological, and cognitive processes. Study in the Arts and Sciences helps develop the rigor of the mind—and openness of the mind—that provide the basis for quantitative as well as creative thought; computational, technological, and communicative skills; historical consciousness and ethical perspective; literary understanding and artistic appreciation; international literacy and curiosity; and regard for values unlike one's own. Thus, the areas of study that comprise the Arts and Sciences are foundational to all university education and professional preparedness. Now, as complex ethical, environmental, cultural, economic, and political challenges lay claim to the world's collective attention, it is to the Arts and Sciences that Ohio State—and communities beyond—looks for the skills, knowledge, and imagination to understand and bring solutions to these issues.

A unified College of Arts and Sciences offers students more opportunities to integrate what they learn in studying a range of fields, and it facilitates the combining of disciplines in faculty research and creative activity.”

Given the importance and centrality of the Arts and Sciences in research and teaching, there are many reasons for unifying the Arts and Sciences into a single administrative unit at this time in Ohio State's history. Central among these reasons is that the implementation of the Federation structure in 2003 failed to produce the desired results. That is, lowering barriers between units and encouraging cooperation and collaboration between units in the five separate colleges has not occurred. An even more compelling reason for creating a unified College is that it addresses the current state of affairs in academia. Indeed, many of the exciting developments in research and teaching in higher education are at the intersections of our traditional disciplines in the arts, humanities, natural sciences, and social sciences. A unified College will make it easier to develop these new interdisciplinary areas, while at the same time providing the means to preserve the disciplinary-based areas of excellence that have made Ohio State a great institution. Unifying the College should encourage the exploration of creative new ideas, provide our undergraduate and graduate students with new experiences and new opportunities, and allow our faculty to develop interdisciplinary ties with other colleagues that can be career defining and enhancing. At great institutions like Ohio State, the Arts and Sciences should be the cornerstone on which all other academic experiences are built. The College should be more prominent and influential, both here at Ohio State and around the world. A unified College will make it easier to have the collective voice of Arts and Sciences heard both on and off campus.

Therefore, the new administrative structure offers opportunities for the Arts and Sciences to build on their centrality to *all* university education and become Ohio State's most engaged and visible constituency.

Bringing together all the faculty, resources, and programs within the Arts and Sciences, the new structure is expected to:

- Ensure a unified, effective voice for the Arts and Sciences and, so, position the Arts and Sciences for stronger leadership within the University;
- Strengthen academic programs, assuring and reinforcing the quality of graduate education, the undergraduate curriculum, and undergraduate advising;
- Enhance interdisciplinary opportunities for faculty and students and promote collaborative relationships that strengthen both individual units and the whole;
- Provide for an administrative structure that is efficient, effective, and less costly and enable significant resources to be redirected to academic programs.

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

<u>Tenure Initiating Unit (by Division)</u>	<u># tenure track faculty (2009)</u>
Arts & Humanities	
African American & African Studies	16
Art	23
Art Education	15
Comparative Studies	19
Dance	15
Industrial, Interior and Visual Communication Design	13
East Asian Languages and Literatures	18
English	103
French & Italian	19
Germanic Languages & Literatures	16
Greek & Latin	14
History	79
History of Art	15
Linguistics	15
Music, School of	58
Near Eastern Languages & Cultures	14
Philosophy	22
Slavic and East European Languages & Literatures	11
Spanish & Portuguese	31
Theatre	19
Women's Studies	8
Total, Arts & Humanities	543
Biological, Mathematical & Physical Sciences	
Astronomy	17
Biochemistry	13
Chemistry	37
Earth Sciences, School of	35
Entomology	28 *
Evolution, Ecology, and Organismal Biology	32
Mathematics	84
Microbiology	16
Molecular Genetics	16
Physics	59
Plant Cell & Molecular Biology	7
Statistics	27
Total, Biological, Mathematical & Physical Sciences	371
Social & Behavioral Sciences	
Anthropology	17
Communication, School of	30
Economics	39
Geography	28
Political Science	41
Psychology	60
Sociology	41
Speech & Hearing Science	11
Total, Social & Behavioral Sciences	267
Total Faculty, Arts and Sciences	1181

* Entomology is currently in the process of reorganization between Biological Sciences and Food, Agricultural and Environmental Sciences.

Faculty on the regional campuses are included in this list, although the day-to-day operations on campuses other than the Columbus campus will be unaffected by the proposed 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.**

The proposed alteration will have no significant impact on the promotion and tenure (P&T) of any faculty member. The tenure initiating unit of faculty members will not change. Faculty are currently appointed in one of 41 Schools or Departments. These units will continue as the tenure initiating units for faculty. There will be slight changes to the composition of the Promotion and Tenure Committee at the College level (see below). The promotion and tenure documents at the Divisional level will be rewritten and will be subject to appropriate review.

While faculty appointments will not be altered, the total number of administrative appointments will be reduced (some already have, as listed in (g) below). Current administrators with faculty appointments who are not appointed to administrative positions within the new College will return to their faculty positions.

Tenure and Promotion Procedures

Second only to faculty recruitment, tenure and promotion are the most important decisions made concerning our faculty. The basic tenure and promotion process will be very similar to what is already in place; that is, a three-stage process will be used that involves reviews at the tenure initiating unit (TIU) level, the College level, and the Provost level. After the TIU-level reviews have been completed we believe the process will likely be as follows:

- Three College committees of 8-12 members will be selected by the Divisional Deans, one for each of the College's three divisions: Arts & Humanities, Natural & Mathematical Sciences, and Social & Behavioral Sciences. Faculty members who serve on the committee will be drawn from the departments that make up each division.
- Each committee will be chaired and convened by the Divisional Dean, who will serve as a non-voting member.
- The divisional P&T committees will examine the dossiers of tenure and promotion candidates and eventually vote on each P&T case. A 2/3 majority will be necessary for a positive recommendation on the P&T case.
- The Divisional Deans will also review the cases in their divisions and make recommendations to the Provost concerning tenure and promotion.
- The dossiers and accompanying recommendations from the divisional committees and deans will be sent to the university committee and Provost.
- The Executive Dean of Arts and Sciences will be available for consultation with the Provost if asked.

For a candidate with an appointment in two or more different divisions, a subcommittee made up of 4-6 members of the divisional committees will be appointed by the Executive

Dean to review the tenure and promotion dossier. One department will be designated as the lead department for the review (typically in a MOU created at the time of the hire) and the Divisional Dean of that department will make the recommendation to the university-level committee.

Faculty Recruitment and Hiring

Arguably, the most important activity we engage in each year is the recruitment, hiring and retention of faculty. It is the quality of the faculty that ultimately determines the excellence of the institution. Hiring new faculty at the cutting edge of their disciplines helps assure that The Ohio State University remains a vibrant and exciting place for students and scholars. Hiring new faculty provides important opportunities to start and develop new programs, strengthen existing programs, and advance the general goals of the College and the University. To this end, the College will allocate resources for faculty hires in a way that reflects these goals and objectives. Sometime in the spring each year, department chairs and school directors will be asked to submit proposals for hiring new faculty. These proposals will provide a rationale for the hires being requested. The divisional deans and Executive Dean will then discuss the proposals that have been submitted and select those that will go forward in the following year. Several factors will be considered during this selection process, including whether or not the proposal addresses College and/or University priorities, addresses needs or wants identified during the departmental and individual college strategic planning processes that have been conducted, and/or strengthens one or more departments or programs while also keeping in mind our continuing desire to diversify the faculty. To this end, eventually an overall College strategic plan will be created that blends the individual college strategic plans that have been articulated to date.

Because diversity and faculty retention is important, the ongoing mentoring of faculty at all stages of their careers will be a priority for the unified College. The new Associate Dean for Diversity and Recruitment will be involved in retention and diversity efforts. Opportunities to share in hiring with other Ohio State colleges and schools will also be aggressively pursued. Overall, the goal in hiring new faculty will be to advance the department/school or program, the College, and the institution through solid disciplinary or interdisciplinary hiring decisions.

(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. As a result of the alteration 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 directly to the Chair. Given the range of possibilities, it is clear that 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.

Students will not be negatively affected by the alteration. However, the alteration is expected to stimulate interest in the three interdisciplinary majors currently administered by the Executive Office in Arts and Sciences (Film Studies, International Studies, Middle Childhood Education) and the twenty-one interdisciplinary minors similarly administered by the Executive Office in Arts and Sciences (Aging, American Indian Studies, American Sign Language, Asian American Studies, Cognitive Science, Critical and Cultural Theory, Disability Studies, Evolutionary Studies, Film Studies, Forensic Science, Globalization Studies, International Studies, Latino/a Studies, Legal Foundations of Society, Media

Production and Analysis, Neuroscience, Popular Culture Studies, Sexuality Studies, Societal Perspectives about Science and Technology, Survey Research, Work in a Changing Economy), as well as the special programs administered by the Executive Office in Arts and Sciences that cross department boundaries (Freshman Seminars, Professional Pathways). There is every expectation that these opportunities will continue to grow in the future, as well as the many other interdisciplinary offerings that currently flourish at the divisional and departmental level.

Graduate student fellowships, currently distributed by the Graduate School to the five colleges, will be distributed in the unified College. The Graduate School will distribute these fellowships to the Executive Dean, who in turn will distribute them to the divisions and departments at his discretion. The plan is to distribute them 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 negative impacts are anticipated. Presumably there will be a change in the college name listed on diplomas. The 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. The proposed alteration will not have a major impact on 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 April 2008 Review of the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences recommended a new budget model for Arts and Sciences -one in which the “resources of the current five colleges could be combined, providing more flexibility to enhance quality and academic excellence across the College and to move resources to respond to challenges and opportunities.” The Provost has given the Executive Dean and Vice Provost for Arts and Sciences budget authority for all Arts and Sciences resources. A budget model has been developed to allocate resources in a manner that elevates the stature of our academic programs, promotes collaboration, attracts and retains the best talent and assures and reinforces the quality of undergraduate and graduate education.

In past years, budget allocations were made to the five Arts and Sciences colleges by the Provost using the current budget system. The colleges then made allocations to individual departments and programs using a variety of different methods. Beginning this year, the combined budgets of the five colleges of Arts and Sciences were distributed to the Executive Dean for subsequent allocation by the Executive Dean to the three college divisions. Starting in spring 2010, budgeting from the College will be more department/program based. That is, 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 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. 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 the individual divisions. Throughout the year, the Divisional Deans will oversee the management of the budgets for the departments and programs within their divisions. In this system, budget planning each year will be guided by strategic planning and from a college-wide perspective.

The reorganization of Arts and Sciences has presented a number of opportunities for efficiencies and cost savings. Arts and Sciences has been able to eliminate 13 College

and Executive Dean’s office administrative FTEs. In addition, during Autumn 2008, Arts and Sciences engaged Navigator consultants to conduct an analysis of business processes in Arts and Sciences and to make recommendations to improve services to units; to standardize and streamline processes related to human resources, payroll, financial management, and procurement; and to deliver an efficient model that can serve as a standard for the university.

The Navigator report projected that the creation of business service centers provides the opportunity for service improvements, process efficiencies and reduced personnel costs. Recommendations for technology improvements offer additional opportunities for cost savings. The following table represents the potential 5-year savings relative to the Navigator recommendations.

Category Estimated	5-year Cost Savings
Purchasing Improvements	\$6,100,000
FTE Reductions	\$3,750,000
Technology Solutions	\$1,200,000
Service Center Efficiencies	\$800,000
Implementation Costs	(\$1,040,000)

Planning and implementation of the new model for Arts and Sciences, which includes shared service centers, is now underway. The estimated annual savings of approximately \$2 million will be directed to academic programs in Arts and Sciences.

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

The result of the alteration will be a net gain in services within Arts and Sciences, and a strengthening of bridges to areas outside Arts and Sciences within the rest of the University. 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 expectation is that a centralized Arts and Sciences will elevate the stature and visibility of programs within the College internally, nationally, and internationally, and will strengthen the presence of Arts and Sciences within organizations such as the Association of American Universities (AAU), the Association of Public and Land Grant Universities (APLU), and national consortiums such as Imagining America: Artists and Scholars in Public Life. A strong Arts and Sciences presence will have tangible benefits with the state, with business and industry, and with alumni. Arts and Sciences will assist the Capital Campaign by increasing fundraising opportunities, highlighting the work of faculty and students, and linking Deans and faculty more effectively to donors. Alumni and development activities will be more closely coordinated, and undergraduate students will be made more fully aware of their privileges and responsibilities as OSU Alumni. Arts and Sciences will work to establish a high visibility in the state, and will open lines of communication to bring the importance of its programs home to the citizens of Ohio.

Outreach is being increasingly recognized as an important component of research, and the means by which The Ohio State University can show itself to be a national leader in higher education. Arts and Sciences has a long and rich tradition of outreach and engagement, particularly in terms of K-12 education. Faculty and students in Arts and

Sciences will work with organizations and communities in strengthening educational and research partnerships on behalf of the common good.

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

The College of Arts and Sciences is led by an Executive Dean for Arts and Sciences and Vice Provost. The major duties of the Executive Dean include managing a unified College budget, representing the College in meetings and at functions both on and off campus, fund-raising for the many units in the College, and strategic planning. In the role of Vice Provost, the Executive Dean has been given additional responsibilities to provide advice and counsel to the Provost on promotion and tenure recommendations and other campus-wide academic matters.

In addition to the Executive Dean, three divisional deans will head three divisions that make up the College: Arts and Humanities, Natural and Mathematical Sciences, and Social and Behavioral Sciences. Retaining the divisions recognizes the history and traditions of arts and sciences and also provides a convenient means for administering the College given its large size and great diversity. The goal, however, is to make the College department- and program-oriented and not division-oriented. The divisional deans will report to the Executive Dean and serve as the primary contact for the many departments and programs that make up the unified Arts and Sciences. Their major duties include the following:

- Faculty Recruitment
- Department Chair Selection and Evaluation
- Representation of Departments in ASC Discussions
- Divisional Budget Management
- Faculty Evaluation
- Divisional Academic Staff Management
- Membership on Key University Committees
- Divisional Strategic Planning
- Divisional Development Activity

While the Divisional Deans will have division-related duties, it is important to note that the goals and objectives of the unified College will be at the forefront of their considerations when dealing with issues related to the operation of the College and its units. They will often represent the unified College in areas relevant to their individual areas of expertise. Each Divisional Dean will be assisted by two Associate Deans, who will have responsibilities defined by the divisional dean as well as College-wide duties assigned by the Executive Dean in areas like research, space and facilities, graduate studies, undergraduate studies, faculty affairs, and international programs. An Associate Dean for Diversity and Recruitment will also be part of the administrative team. The existing position of Executive Associate Dean will, for the next two years, concentrate on matters related to semester conversion and curriculum. This position will be discontinued in 2012.

As noted above, to facilitate cooperation and collaboration between units in the College, the interdisciplinary programs that have in the past reported directly to the Executive Dean will be moved into appropriate divisions, and one of the Divisional Deans will serve as the contact dean for the programs and their directors. Some of the programs will remain independent with the director reporting to one of the divisional deans while other programs will be moved into departments if it seems likely that they would be better served being located closer to our traditional discipline-based departments. For example, with regard to the latter, the Director of the Center for Life Sciences education will report to the Divisional Dean for Natural and Mathematical Sciences.

The administration of the Colleges of Arts and Sciences is committed to the idea of shared governance in the College. Early in 2010, two task forces to make recommendations about college committee structures and faculty /staff student input on College matters were established. They currently are meeting to explore possible structures and functions of faculty and staff advisory and policy committees. Those committee recommendations to the deans on policies and procedures will be incorporated into a single Pattern of Administration for a unified College of Arts and Sciences. A number of issues will require faculty input, including: methods of accounting for the student credit hours taught by faculty to encourage collaboration and cooperation between units; creation of team teaching policies that enhance student experiences; development of flexible policies for course load assignments that help faculty balance their teaching and research responsibilities; creation and management of interdisciplinary programs involving units inside and outside the College; the recruitment and development of jointly hired faculty; and studying the curriculum development and change procedure especially in light of the ongoing move to a semester calendar.

The recommendation of the task force that focused on faculty involvement was accepted by the Executive Dean, without modification, and distributed to all ASC faculty on April 25, 2010. 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.

The recommendations from the task force that focused on staff involvement have been received and are currently under consideration. For continuing student input, the Executive Dean will use the current Arts and Sciences Student Council as the base for a student advisory committee.

The matter of University Senate representation will need to be resolved, since the proposed alteration may affect the current distribution of delegates to the University Senate. No change should be made in this area until the University Senate determines the appropriate proportion for the newly configured College. An ad hoc committee of the University Senate has already been appointed to address this issue – to explore options and ultimately propose rule changes to insure that representation of Arts and Sciences faculty on the University Senate is not negatively affected by the alteration.

The change from five smaller colleges to one unified College has necessitated a variety of procedure and rule changes at the level of the university and college senate bodies. Indeed, the multi-step procedure laid out in the University Faculty Rules for creating the unified College currently is being followed.

The current reorganization process also has provided an excellent opportunity to assess the ways we deliver important services to faculty and students in several areas. For the most part, these services have been distributed to the level of the departments and the five existing colleges. Over the last few months, the effectiveness of how we deliver basic services to our students and faculty with an eye toward improving services while realizing financial savings, which then can be redistributed to the College departments to meet important needs and program development, has been examined. The process of combining the service offices of the five existing colleges into more centralized college offices that will be responsible for providing services to the faculty, staff and students of the unified college, is underway. These offices include finance and human resources (including the new Business Service Center), information technology, communications and marketing, alumni outreach and engagement, academic student services, and development. The goal is not to centralize all services; local delivery models are sometimes better than centralized models. Rather, a hybrid model where general oversight of the services will take place at the College level with some delivery and organization of the staff largely along department or division lines, is being used.

(k) An analysis of the impact upon diversity.

The impact on faculty diversity is expected to be positive. Arts and Humanities currently supports diversity in a variety of ways including through the work of a standing Diversity Committee. It also has the Arts and Humanities Minority Enhancement Program designed to enhance the social and intellectual climate for junior faculty of color. In addition, it has established a program for undergraduate students from underrepresented groups - the Program for Arts and Humanities Development - to encourage them to apply to doctoral programs. An Arts and Humanities-wide conference on "The Future of Diversity" was held on June 5, 2009, with wide attendance from all ranks of the faculty from both Arts and Humanities.

Arts and Sciences programs in the Social and Behavioral Sciences are part of a seven-university alliance funded by the National Science Foundation (NSF) to improve the recruitment, retention, and professional development of under-represented students in the social, behavioral, and economic sciences, one goal being to increase the overall pool of minority faculty in these fields. SBS has also increased its number of postdoctoral fellowships for candidates from underrepresented groups.

Former Dean of Biological Sciences, Professor Joan Herbers, is directing the NSF funded Project to increase the representation and advancement of women in academic science, technology, engineering, and mathematics at Ohio State. Arts and Sciences programs in the Biological, Mathematical, and Physical Sciences are central participants in that project.

As best practices are shared, the climate changes. There is strong effort in Arts and Sciences to grow diversity from the ground up: a central focus is being placed on faculty recruitment and retention for persons of color, on teaching and mentoring, on the quality of life for faculty who bring diversity to the campus in terms of race, sexual preference, nationality or in any other aspect, recognizing that the more success Arts and Sciences programs have in building diversity, the better the College of Arts and Sciences will be.

Moreover, 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.

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.

Concluding Comments

During the 2009-10 academic year the Executive Dean has: met individually with every chair and director from the departments and programs that will make up the new, unified College; attended at least one faculty meeting of every department and school in the College; and conferred for many hours with the deans of the existing arts and sciences colleges, with the associate deans of the colleges, with staff from the colleges and from the Executive Dean's office, as well as with faculty and staff groups, other College deans, vice provosts, as well as the Provost and the University President. From all of these discussions, as seen in this proposal, some concrete ideas have emerged concerning the basic operating principles and procedures for the unified College.

However, there are many details concerning the restructuring that need to be worked out. The Executive Dean will continue to consult closely with faculty, staff and student advisory groups while working on these procedures, policies and details and to plan vigorously and aggressively push forward in a thoughtful way that is mindful of the long-term future of the new College.

We want The Ohio State University to have a College of Arts and Sciences that is dynamic and able to react to important developments in our many disciplines that reflect important changes and developments in academia. We want a College that encourages collaboration and cooperation among faculty and the units in which they are affiliated. The overall long-term goal for the reorganization of the College is a lofty one: the College should serve to enhance the research and teaching experiences of its faculty and students. Simply put, the College at The Ohio State University should strive to be among the best colleges of arts and sciences in the world.

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.



EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST

May 20, 2010

To: Council on Academic Affairs
Joseph E. Steinmetz, Executive Dean of Arts and Sciences and Vice Provost

From: Joseph A. Alutto 
Executive Vice President and Provost

Subject: Establishment of the College of Arts and Sciences

I have reviewed the proposal from Joseph E. Steinmetz, Executive Dean of Arts and Sciences and Vice Provost, to establish the College of Arts and Sciences that will include three divisions: Arts and Humanities; Natural and Mathematical Sciences; and Social and Behavioral Sciences.

I have also reviewed the report and recommendation of the Ad Hoc Committee to Review the Proposed Alteration of Arts and Sciences, established by the Council on Academic Affairs, to assess the proposal, following established guidelines.

I support the Ad Hoc Committee's recommendation to establish a unified College of Arts and Sciences at The Ohio State University.

As the Committee has noted, a rationale and historical perspective have been provided; the expected impacts on faculty, students, staff, academic programs, diversity, and external constituencies have been presented; the budgetary consequences have been specified; and particular attention has been given to the issue of faculty hiring and tenure and promotion, and to the impact on governance at all levels. These are all issues identified in my May 19, 2008, memorandum describing "A Revised Federation for the Arts and Sciences."

As noted, Executive Dean Steinmetz reports directly to me and will be asked to provide me with regular updates on progress on the various dimensions of the establishment of the College. It is also appropriate that annual updates on progress be made to the Council on Academic Affairs.

**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
As per Faculty Rule 3335-3-37**

Pursuant to Faculty Rule 3335-3-37 on the alteration or abolition of units, the Interim Executive Dean of Arts and Sciences presents this proposal to alter the five Colleges within Arts and Sciences, to form a single College to be called the *College of Arts and Sciences*.

Until 1968, the Arts and Sciences at The Ohio State University were organized as a single, centralized structure. In 1968, with the addition of some Departments and Schools that had previously been affiliated with other Colleges, the Arts and Sciences were divided into five Colleges: Arts, Biological Sciences, Humanities, Mathematical and Physical Sciences, and Social and Behavioral Sciences. In February 2002, the Provost Edward J. Ray appointed an Ad Hoc Committee on the Status of the Colleges in Arts and Sciences, with the following charge: "to implement effectively our Academic Plan, it is essential that we have a highly visible and nationally prominent Arts and Sciences, and that we have a coherent, collaborative and financially sound core of Arts and Sciences programs of the highest possible quality. Every top tier research university has a strong Arts and Sciences core." The Report (attached as Appendix A) recommended a federated structure for the Arts and Sciences. In May 2003, a report entitled "Federation of the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences" (attached as Appendix B) identified the formal structure of that Federation, and established the Office of the Executive Dean of the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences. Among the goals of the Federation were the following:

- enhance the reputation and quality of all Colleges by using the strengths of each to benefit others;
- enhance coherence, collaboration, and synergies;
- decrease wasteful College-centric competition and lower College boundaries.

In April 2008, a Review Committee co-chaired by Martha Garland and W. Randy Smith submitted its Final Report (attached as Appendix C), recommending the creation of "a single, integrated College of the Arts and Sciences that brings together all the faculty, resources (budget, space), and academic programs that currently reside within the five colleges." The report further recommended that the College "would be led by a Dean with ultimate decision-making authority for the college in all realms of college life, reporting directly to the Executive Vice President and Provost." Working with the Dean in the proposed model were "divisional Deans," individuals with the relevant academic expertise to represent clusters of Departments/Schools. This model was adopted, and an Executive Dean and Vice Provost was appointed by the Provost, together with three divisional Deans. The Executive Dean was given responsibility for strategic planning, budget/resource allocation, and representation of the interests of the Arts and Sciences within and outside the University. In the role of Vice Provost, the Executive Dean was given additional responsibility to provide advice and counsel to the Provost on promotion and tenure recommendations and other academic matters. The Office of the Executive Dean also provides undergraduate advising, career service, and diversity services for Arts and Sciences, and administers many undergraduate interdisciplinary majors and minors. The three divisional Deans were given responsibilities at the level of the Arts and Sciences as a whole, as well as responsibility for overseeing the units and programs in Arts and

Humanities, or Biological, Mathematical, and Physical Sciences, or Social and Behavioral Sciences. As the following rationale statement, “Restructuring Arts and Sciences at The Ohio State University,” establishes, the next step is to request approval for the alteration of the Federation to form a new administrative and educational unit called the College of Arts and Sciences.

**Responses to Proposal Requirements of Faculty Rule 3335-3-37
on the Alteration of Units**

(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.

Issues related to Arts and Sciences restructuring were on the agendas of the Arts and Sciences Executive Committee, the Arts and Sciences Faculty Senate, and the Arts and Sciences Town Meetings at each scheduled meeting in winter and spring quarters. A rationale statement for the restructuring was developed in response to these discussions. The rationale given below, with one change, is the document of review circulated to all Arts and Sciences faculty and staff on May 13, 2009 and discussed at the Arts and Sciences town meeting on May 19, 2009. Only one suggestion for change to the document was received, and that change, correcting a statement describing Arts and Sciences history at Ohio State, has been made. The rationale document is also provided as a separate attachment at the beginning of this proposal.

Restructuring Arts and Sciences at The Ohio State University

The role and importance of Arts and Sciences.

The Arts and Sciences are the intellectual and academic core of The Ohio State University and of distinguished universities worldwide. These areas are the University’s primary laboratory for inquiry into human expression; social and cultural systems; and physical, biological, and cognitive processes. Study in the Arts and Sciences helps develop the rigor of the mind—and openness of the mind—that provide the basis for quantitative as well as creative thought; computational, technological, and communicative skills; historical consciousness and ethical perspective; literary understanding and artistic appreciation; international literacy and curiosity; and regard for values unlike one’s own. Thus, the areas of study that comprise the Arts and Sciences are foundational to all university education and professional preparedness. Now, as complex ethical, environmental, cultural, economic, and political challenges lay claim to the world’s collective attention, it is to the Arts and Sciences that Ohio State—and communities beyond—looks for the skills, knowledge, and imagination to understand and bring solutions to these issues.

A unified College of Arts and Sciences offers students more opportunities to integrate what they learn in studying a range of fields, and it facilitates the combining of disciplines in faculty research and creative activity.

Historical overview.

Until 1968, the Arts and Sciences at Ohio State were organized as a single, centralized structure. In 1968, with the addition of some Departments and Schools that previously had been affiliated with other Colleges, the Arts and Sciences were divided

administratively into five Colleges: the Arts, Biological Sciences, Humanities, Mathematical and Physical Sciences, and Social and Behavioral Sciences. In 2003, these Colleges were described as a Federation, each retaining its own Dean with an Executive Dean assuming a coordinating role. A review of the Federation, requested by the Provost and undertaken by a committee of faculty and administrators in Spring 2008, led to recommendations that the Arts and Sciences be more tightly integrated and that they be restructured with a more effective and visible administrative center.

The Arts and Sciences organizational structure today.

In light of these recommendations, the Provost established the position of Executive Dean of Arts and Sciences and Vice Provost with responsibility for strategic planning, budget/resource allocation, providing advice and counsel to the Provost on promotion and tenure recommendations within the Arts and Sciences, and representing the interests of the Arts and Sciences within and outside the University. In addition, the Provost appointed three divisional Deans, each with responsibilities at the level of the Arts and Sciences as a whole and also with responsibility for overseeing the units and programs in Arts and Humanities, or in Biological, Mathematical, and Physical Sciences, or in Social and Behavioral Sciences. In the second of these roles, the divisional Deans oversee undergraduate course and program development, the recruitment and retention of a strong and diverse student body, the recruitment and retention of a world class faculty, the shaping of research emphases, and the operation of an effective development effort.

Opportunities for the restructured College.

The new administrative structure offers opportunities for the Arts and Sciences to build on their centrality to *all* university education and become Ohio State’s most engaged and visible constituency.

Bringing together all the faculty, resources, and programs within the Arts and Sciences, the new structure is expected to:

- Ensure a unified, effective voice for the Arts and Sciences and, so, position the Arts and Sciences for stronger leadership within the University;
- Strengthen academic programs, assuring and reinforcing the quality of graduate education, the undergraduate curriculum, and undergraduate advising;
- Enhance interdisciplinary opportunities for faculty and students and promote collaborative relationships that strengthen both individual units and the whole;
- Provide for an administrative structure that is efficient, effective, and less costly and enable significant resources to be redirected to academic programs.

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

Tenure Initiating Unit (by Division)	# tenure track faculty
--------------------------------------	------------------------

Arts & Humanities

African American & African Studies

16

Art	23
Art Education	15
Comparative Studies	19
Dance	15
Industrial, Interior and Visual Communication Design	13
East Asian Languages and Literatures	18
English	103
French & Italian	19
Germanic Languages & Literatures	16
Greek & Latin	14
History	79
History of Art	15
Linguistics	15
Music, School of	58
Near Eastern Languages & Cultures	14
Philosophy	22
Slavic and East European Languages & Literatures	11
Spanish & Portuguese	31
Theatre	19
Women's Studies	8
Total, Arts & Humanities	543

Biological, Mathematical & Physical Sciences

Astronomy	17
Biochemistry	13
Chemistry	37
Earth Sciences, School of	35
Entomology	28
Evolution, Ecology, and Organismal Biology	32
Mathematics	84
Microbiology	16
Molecular Genetics	16
Physics	59
Plant Cell & Molecular Biology	7
Statistics	27
Total, Biological, Mathematical & Physical Sciences	371

Social & Behavioral Sciences

Anthropology	17
Communication, School of	30
Economics	39
Geography	28
Political Science	41

Psychology	60
Sociology	41
Speech & Hearing Science	11
Total, Social & Behavioral Sciences	267
Total Faculty, Arts and Sciences	
	1181

Faculty on the regional campuses are included in this list, though the day-to-day operations on campuses other than the Columbus campus will be unaffected by the proposed 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.**

The proposed alteration will not have any impact on the promotion and tenure of any faculty member. The tenure initiating unit of faculty members will not change. Faculty are currently appointed in one of 41 Schools or Departments. These units will continue as the tenure initiating units for faculty. The promotion and tenure documents at the Divisional level will be rewritten and will be subject to appropriate review.

While faculty appointments will not be altered, the total number of administrative appointments will be reduced (some already have, as listed in (g) below). Current administrators with faculty appointments who are not appointed to administrative positions within the new College will return to their faculty positions.

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

No courses are affected.

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

Students will not be negatively affected by the alteration. However, the alteration is expected to stimulate interest in the three interdisciplinary majors currently administered by the Executive Office in Arts and Sciences (International Studies, Middle Childhood Education, Film Studies) and the twenty-one interdisciplinary minors similarly administered by the Executive Office in Arts and Sciences (Aging, American Indian Studies, American Sign Language, Asian American Studies, Cognitive Science, Critical and Cultural Theory, Disability Studies, Evolutionary Studies, Film Studies, Forensic Science, Globalization Studies, International Studies, Latino/a Studies, Legal Foundations of Society, Media Production and Analysis, Neuroscience, Popular Culture Studies, Sexuality Studies, Societal Perspectives about Science and Technology, Survey Research, Work in a Changing Economy), as well as the special programs

administered by the Executive Office in Arts and Sciences that cross department boundaries (Freshman Seminars, Professional Pathways). There is every expectation that these opportunities will continue to grow in the future, as well as the many other interdisciplinary offerings that currently flourish at the divisional and departmental level.

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

Not applicable.

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

The April 2008 Review of the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences recommended a new budget model for Arts and Sciences - one in which the “resources of the current five colleges could be combined, providing more flexibility to enhance quality and academic excellence across the college and to move resources to respond to challenges and opportunities.” The Provost has given the Executive Dean and Vice Provost for Arts and Sciences budget authority for all Arts and Sciences resources. A budget model will be developed to allocate resources in a manner that elevates the stature of our academic programs, promotes collaboration, attracts and retains the best talent and assures and reinforces the quality of undergraduate and graduate education.

The reorganization of Arts and Sciences has presented a number of opportunities for efficiencies and cost savings. Arts and Sciences has been able to eliminate 13 College and Executive Dean’s office administrative FTEs this year. In addition, last fall, Arts and Sciences engaged Navigator consultants to conduct an analysis of business processes in Arts and Sciences and to make recommendations to improve services to units; to standardize and streamline processes related to human resources, payroll, financial management, and procurement; and to deliver an efficient model that can serve as a standard for the university.

The Navigator report projects that the creation of business service centers provides the opportunity for service improvements, process efficiencies and reduced personnel costs. Recommendations for technology improvements offer additional opportunities for cost savings. The following table represents the potential 5-year savings relative to the Navigator recommendations.

Category	Estimated 5-year Cost Savings
Purchasing Improvements	\$6,100,000
FTE Reductions	\$3,750,000
Technology Solutions	\$1,200,000
Service Center Efficiencies	\$800,000
Implementation Costs	(\$1,040,000)

Planning and implementation of the new model for Arts and Sciences, which includes shared service centers, is now underway. It is expected to be fully operational by January 1, 2010. The estimated annual savings of approximately \$2 million will be

directed to academic programs in Arts and Sciences.

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

None. The result of the alteration will be a net gain in services within Arts and Sciences, and a strengthening of bridges to areas outside Arts and Sciences within the rest of the University.

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

The expectation is that a centralized Arts and Sciences will elevate the stature and visibility of programs within the College internally, nationally, and internationally, and will strengthen the presence of Arts and Sciences within organizations such as the Association of American Universities (AAU), the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, and national consortiums such as Imagining America: Artists and Scholars in Public Life. A strong Arts and Sciences presence will have tangible benefits with the state, with business and industry, and with alumni. Arts and Sciences will assist the Capital Campaign by increasing fundraising opportunities, highlighting the work of faculty and students, and linking Deans and faculty more effectively to donors. Alumni and development activities will be more closely coordinated, and undergraduate students will be made more fully aware of their privileges and responsibilities as OSU Alumni. Arts and Sciences will work to establish a high visibility in the state, and will open lines of communication to bring the importance of its programs home to the citizens of Ohio.

Outreach is being increasingly recognized as an important component of research, and the means by which The Ohio State University can show itself to be a national leader in higher education. Arts and Sciences has a long and rich tradition of outreach and engagement, particularly in terms of K-12 education. Faculty and students in Arts and Sciences will work with organizations and communities in strengthening educational and research partnerships on behalf of the common good.

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

Faculty governance at the Department and School level will be unchanged, though all Patterns of Administration will need to be revised to accommodate the new language of the College. Similarly, the Patterns of Administration for the five existing Colleges will need to be revised into one document for a single College. That process will be subject to appropriate oversight consistent with TIU, College, and University policies, standards, and criteria.

Arts and Sciences governance is currently comprised of the Arts and Sciences Executive Committee, an elected body made up of 10 Faculty and 5 Staff, and an Arts and Sciences Faculty Senate, which largely devotes its attention to curricular issues at the present time. The incoming Executive Dean, Joseph E. Steinmetz, anticipates naming and working with an Arts and Sciences Task Force on issues of shared governance in the coming Autumn, particularly addressing questions such as the best way for Arts and Sciences to engage faculty, staff, and students in decision-making, and

whether faculty and staff issues should be separated in the governance structure.

The matter of University Senate representation will need to be resolved, since the proposed alteration may affect the distribution of delegates to the University Senate. We request that no change be made in this area until the University Senate takes up the question of appropriate proportion for the newly configured College.

(k) An analysis of the impact upon diversity.

The impact on faculty diversity is expected to be positive. Arts and Humanities currently supports diversity in a variety of ways including through the work of a standing Diversity Committee. It also has the Arts and Humanities Minority Enhancement Program designed to enhance the social and intellectual climate for junior faculty of color. In addition, it has established a program for undergraduate students from underrepresented groups, called the Program for Arts and Humanities Development, to encourage them to apply to doctoral programs. An Arts and Humanities-wide conference on "The Future of Diversity" was held on June 5, 2009, with wide attendance from all ranks of the faculty from both Arts and Humanities.

Arts and Sciences programs in the Social and Behavioral Sciences are part of a seven-university alliance funded by NSF to improve the recruitment, retention, and professional development of under-represented students in the social, behavioral, and economic sciences, one goal being to increase the overall pool of minority faculty in these fields. SBS has also increased its number of postdoctoral fellowships for candidates from underrepresented groups.

Former Dean of Biological Sciences, Joan Herbers, is directing the NSF funded Project CEOS to increase the representation and advancement of women in academic science, technology, engineering, and mathematics at Ohio State. Arts and Sciences programs in the Biological, Mathematical, and Physical Sciences are central participants in that project.

As best practices are shared, the climate changes. There is strong effort in Arts and Sciences to grow diversity from the ground up: central focus is being placed on faculty recruitment and retention for persons of color, on teaching and mentoring, on the quality of life for faculty who bring diversity to the campus in terms of race, sexual preference, nationality or in any other aspect, recognizing that the more success Arts and Sciences programs have in building diversity, the better the College of Arts and Sciences will be.

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

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.

Appendix A

Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Status of the Colleges of the Arts
and Sciences

October 11, 2002

Joseph C. Ferrar, Chair
Department of Mathematics

David W. Andrews
Dean, College of Human Ecology

Kathy Borst Jones
School of Music

Robert J. Gustafson
Associate Dean, College of Engineering

Barbara A. Hanawalt
Department of History

Rebecca D. Jackson
Department of Internal Medicine

Richard E. Petty
Department of Psychology

Roy A. Stein
Department of Evolution, Ecology, and Organismal Biology

L. Alayne Parson, Liaison
Senior Vice Provost

W. Randy Smith, Liaison
Vice Provost

1. Charge to the Committee

In February 2002, Provost Edward J. Ray appointed an Ad Hoc Committee on the Status of the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences. Each of the five arts and sciences colleges is represented on the Committee by a senior faculty member. In addition, the Committee includes the dean of the College of Human Ecology, an associate dean from the College of Engineering, a senior faculty member from the College of Medicine and Public Health who is a current member of the University Senate's Council on Academic Affairs and, as liaisons to the Office of Academic Affairs, the Senior Vice Provost and the Vice Provost for Curriculum and Institutional Relations. The committee was chaired initially by former president Edward H. Jennings. When he assumed the interim presidency, Joe Ferrar from the Department of Mathematics became chair with Barbara Hanawalt from the Department of History assuming the role of acting chair during the summer.

In his letter of appointment to members of the Committee, Provost Ray described the charge to the Committee as follows:

In my speech to the University Senate on January 10, 2002, I indicated that to implement effectively our Academic Plan, it is essential that we have a highly visible and nationally prominent arts and sciences, and that we have a coherent, collaborative and financially sound core of arts and sciences programs of the highest possible quality. Every top tier research university has a strong arts and sciences core.

At The Ohio State University, five separate colleges make up the arts and sciences—Arts, Biological Sciences, Humanities, Mathematical and Physical Sciences, and Social and Behavioral Sciences. They represent the core of our undergraduate curriculum—the majority of courses in the general education curriculum instruction and a large proportion of our undergraduate major and minor programs. Some of our strongest research and graduate programs are found in these colleges. They have received the majority of the University's Selective Investment and Academic Enrichment awards. Clearly we already have great strength on which to build in many disciplines.

However, we have not taken maximum advantage of the synergies that can exist among those units and programs. We need to examine whether or not the Arts and Sciences colleges are appropriately configured for implementing the Academic Plan and for working collaboratively to strengthen our national reputation. I am interested in developing a plan for the advancement of the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences that will help differentiate between genuine opportunities for progress and changes that may not serve our long-term interests. Your work is an important first step.

Given these considerations, the charge to the Committee is to assess the current status of, and make recommendations regarding three broad areas:

- The optimal configuration of the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences.
- Whether the academic units and programs within the colleges are assigned to the appropriate colleges.
- What authority should reside with the Executive Dean of the Arts and Sciences, and whether or not this should be a separate position.

2. Background Information

In order to understand the issues, the committee:

1. Reviewed the Academic Plan, the rule for alteration or abolition of units, the current structure of each of the colleges in the arts and sciences, the history of the formation of the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences, and enrollment patterns, academic program offerings, patterns of administration, faculty size, and expenditures for each of the five colleges.
2. Reviewed the organizational structure of our benchmark institutions: University of Arizona, University of California Los Angeles, University of Illinois at Champaign-Urbana, University of Michigan, University of Minnesota, Pennsylvania State University, University of Texas at Austin, University of Washington, and University of Wisconsin-Madison.
3. Reviewed a summary of rankings of programs at Ohio State and benchmark institutions.
4. Met separately with the deans of each of the arts and sciences colleges. The deans were asked to comment on the following topics: the college's role in undergraduate education; whether we should move to a more coherent undergraduate program within the arts and sciences; to what extent there is a common mission among the colleges and how it might be affected by structural change within or among the colleges; the strengths and weaknesses of a decentralized budgeting system as compared to a centralized budgeting system for the collectivity of the arts and sciences; the culture within the college with respect to promotion and tenure procedures; ideas about possible changes of the location of departments and schools within and among colleges; and the status of the current position of executive dean for the arts and sciences and whether or how it should change.
5. Held video conference calls or telephone conference calls with the chancellor of the University of Wisconsin, the chancellor of the University of Illinois, the provost of the college of letters and sciences at UCLA, the dean of the college of the arts and sciences at the University of Washington, the director of the School of Music at the University of Minnesota, and the chair of the Department of Mathematics at UCLA. The goal of the interviews was to determine how different reporting structures operated at different levels within these organizations.
6. Reviewed an analysis of the Arts and Sciences Colleges' office administrative structures at Ohio State compared to those at several of the benchmark and CIC institutions.

Throughout this process, the committee was kept apprised of other activity relating to the arts and sciences that Michael Hogan, in his role as executive dean for the arts and sciences, was simultaneously overseeing at the request of Provost Ray. In particular, as of July 1, 2002, development operations for the Arts and Sciences Colleges were consolidated under an assistant vice president for arts and sciences development who reports jointly to the executive dean for the arts and sciences and the vice president for university development.

3. Criteria for Optimality

Prior to consideration of specific alternatives for the configuration of the arts and sciences at Ohio State, the committee drew up a short list of measures of the success of any configuration. They are:

- An optimal configuration will provide a strong advocate for the Arts and Sciences point of view in the highest administrative circles of the university, reflecting the reality that the Arts and Sciences contribute 40% of Ohio State's faculty, 84% of the total hours of lower division instruction, 47% of Ohio State's bachelors degree recipients and 50% of the Ph.D. recipients.
- Already home to several research and graduate programs ranked among the top 20 in the United States by the National Research Council, the Arts and Sciences Colleges will play a leading role in the attainment of the goals of Ohio State's 20-10 Plan.
- The Arts and Sciences Colleges will be seen as an intellectually stimulating home to motivated undergraduate students, offering a plethora of disciplinary major programs and cross disciplinary programs, as well as providing the broader undergraduate student body with core courses on which the General Education Curriculum is based.
- Activities that emphasize the commonalities of the arts and sciences disciplines, such as cooperative activities among the colleges/departments both in faculty research and in undergraduate programs of study, will be rewarded.
- The Arts and Sciences will lead the way in recruiting "top 10%" high school students to attend Ohio State, closing the performance gap between Ohio State and higher ranked benchmark institutions.

4. Administrative Responsibilities Related to the Arts and Sciences

Subsequent to the discussion of the characteristics of an optimal configuration for the Arts and Sciences, the committee identified the most critical administrative responsibilities that would normally fall under the purview of Arts and Sciences administrators. They are:

- Budget and fiscal matters
- Personnel/Promotion and tenure
- Research and Graduate Programs
- Curriculum oversight
- Undergraduate advising
- Undergraduate recruitment
- Development and fundraising
- Outreach/Engagement

5. Feasible Alternative Configurations

A study of the organizational charts of our benchmark institutions, interviews with our current Arts and Sciences deans, and interviews with selected individuals from benchmark institutions with varying Arts and Sciences configurations suggested three alternative configurations, each of which is represented in at least one benchmark institution:

- **Decentralized structure:** The departments and schools aligned with Arts and Sciences are grouped into autonomous colleges, each with a dean who reports directly to the provost (Arizona, Minnesota, Ohio State, Penn State, Texas).
- **Fully centralized structure:** A single College of the Arts and Sciences, headed by a dean, encompasses all Arts and Sciences aligned departments and schools. Each department chair/school director reports directly to the dean (Illinois, Michigan).
- **Federation of colleges:** The departments and schools aligned with Arts and Sciences are grouped into colleges, each headed by a dean. These colleges are further combined into an Arts and Sciences federation reporting to a person whose title varies depending on the university - at UCLA: Provost, College of Letters and Science; at Washington: Dean, College of Arts and Sciences; and at Wisconsin: Dean, College of Letters and Sciences. In the Ohio State University organizational structure the person in charge of the federation would be equivalent to Executive Dean and Vice President for the Arts and Sciences. That person then reports to the provost.

Note 1: Until 1968 Arts and Sciences at Ohio State had a fully centralized structure, though several academic units now in the Arts and Sciences were then in other colleges such as Agriculture, Commerce and Administration, or Education.

Note 2: The current Ohio State Arts and Sciences structure is not completely decentralized. Currently, one of the Arts and Sciences deans is designated as executive dean by the provost. The executive dean functions as convener and chair of meetings of the Arts and Sciences deans and as a conduit of information between the Arts and Sciences deans and the provost. Moreover, the newly adopted centralized Arts and Sciences Development Plan places the executive dean in a leading role in development activities for all of the Arts and Sciences.

Note 3: While all of the peer institutions considered, except Arizona, ranked in the top 25 public universities in the 2002 US News Survey, the institutions with centralized or federated structures for the Arts and Sciences all ranked above the highest ranking institution with decentralized Arts and Sciences.

6. Recommendation on an Optimal Configuration and the Authority of the Executive Dean for the Arts and Sciences

The Committee recommends that the Arts and Sciences administrative configuration currently in place at Ohio State be modified to create a federation of the five current Arts and Sciences colleges headed by an Executive Dean and Vice President for the Arts and Sciences who reports to the provost and who is a member of the President's Planning Cabinet.

Specifically,

- The Colleges of Arts, Humanities, Social and Behavioral Sciences, Mathematical and Physical Sciences, and Biological Sciences, with their current complements of departments/schools remain intact as administrative units, each headed by a dean.
- An Executive Dean and Vice President for the Arts and Sciences is appointed as administrative head of the federation of Colleges of the Arts and Sciences. The five college deans report to the Executive Dean and Vice President for the Arts and Sciences, who recommends candidates for dean positions to the provost for approval, and who is responsible for coordinating the activities of the deans.
- In addition to responsibility for overseeing activities of the college deans, the Executive Dean and Vice President for the Arts and Sciences will be responsible for centralizing undergraduate advising, development, space and facilities, communications (especially as it relates to undergraduate recruitment), and Outreach/Engagement (including Arts and Sciences activities in support of the University's K-12 education initiatives).

- A federation curriculum committee will replace the current arts and sciences curriculum committee and will be expected to take an active role in setting curricular direction within the arts and sciences, and to monitor regularly the General Education Curriculum. College curriculum committees will function as subcommittees of the federation curriculum committee. The development and review of undergraduate courses and programs – from the academic unit to the federation curriculum committee - will not be subjected to any additional procedural steps from current practice as a result of this approach. Graduate-level curricular matters will follow current procedures.
- The Executive Dean and Vice President for the Arts and Sciences will be expected to play an important role in advancing interdisciplinary research and graduate programs.
- Administration of Research and Graduate programs in the Arts and Sciences will be the responsibility of the individual departments, working in concert with the Graduate School and the Office of the Vice President for Research.
- Reviews of departmental recommendations for promotion and tenure will be the responsibility of each college dean, though the Executive Dean and Vice President for the Arts and Sciences will be consulted and serve as the conduit for passing recommendations forward to the provost.
- Since it is critical both in the recruitment of a qualified Executive Dean and Vice President for the Arts and Sciences and in the recruitment of qualified college deans that the positions carry a reasonable level of budgetary responsibility, we recommend a division of budgetary authority:

The provost establishes a base budget for the federation of the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences based on the same budget restructuring principles applied university-wide (see below for transitional budgeting).

The Executive Dean and Vice President for the Arts and Sciences, after consultation with the college deans, is responsible for setting base budgets for each college with due regard for the University's commitment to budget restructuring and ongoing commitments to rebasing college budgets.

College deans will exercise full control over their budgets.

7. Rationale

In choosing between the alternatives listed above, the Committee first considered the current configuration since adoption of any other alternative would have the disadvantage of creating some level of discomfort and inconvenience for faculty and administrators as changes are initiated. Our interviews with the college deans made clear that they generally feel that the current configuration is working smoothly and effectively.

Moreover, recent Selective Investment awards to eight departments in the Arts and Sciences attest to both the quality of the graduate programs and research efforts in these departments and the likelihood that these programs will be among the leaders in attaining the goals of the 2010 Plan. On the other hand, there is no single advocate for the Arts and Sciences point of view, except in cases where the interests of all colleges converge; there is little sense of commonality of purpose among the colleges apparent to an undergraduate or prospective applicant; recruitment of “top 10%” high school students significantly lags behind that of many of our benchmark institutions; there are bureaucratic obstacles facing a student who might wish to construct a program of study which crosses college boundaries; the curriculum approval process is far from transparent to interested parties from units outside the Arts and Sciences, and the lack of centralization of the process makes approval of curricular initiatives a very time consuming process. Most telling, the system has been in effect for many years, and Ohio State is still a considerable distance from its goal to be among the world’s truly great universities.

Concluding that change to a centralized configuration is necessary if Ohio State is to aspire to the top ranks of public universities, the committee settled on the federated model for several reasons. We had serious concerns about the feasibility of a fully centralized configuration, in large part because of the extraordinary burden it would place on the Dean for the Arts and Sciences, to whom approximately 40 department chairs/school directors would report. The sheer logistics of the reporting apparatus would require valuable time which the dean could far better spend on Development, student recruitment and pressing the cause of Arts and Sciences within the university community.

The federated model positions the Executive Dean and Vice President for the Arts and Sciences in the top decision making councils of the university, thus putting the Arts and Sciences point of view in play in all major policy discussions and, in particular, promoting increased communication between the Arts and Sciences and the Vice President for Research. Centralized advising and curriculum management present obvious opportunities for putting forth a unified vision of Arts and Sciences to undergraduates and establishing barrier-free opportunities for interdisciplinary teaching and studying. Moreover, by decentralizing the day-to-day management of the departments to the college level, the Executive Dean and Vice President for the Arts and Sciences frees time to advocate for Arts and Sciences in the important recruitment and Development arenas. Thus the federated model responds affirmatively to those criteria for optimality which deal with the undergraduate program in the Arts and Sciences. It is less clear how the change to such a model would affect research and graduate programs, though we note that among our benchmark universities, those with centralized Arts and Sciences configurations have more NRC-top 20 Arts and Sciences programs than those with decentralized configurations.

The Committee gave weight, in preparing its recommendation, to the fact that creating a federated model based on the existing college structure is relatively painless for the university community since, for the most part, the necessary ingredients for success are already in place and working efficiently. Rather than facing the daunting task of taking apart the current configuration and building a new one, we propose to enhance what we

now have with the ingredients that we believe are necessary to move Ohio State to a higher plane among public universities in the United States.

8. The Price of Success

The Committee is unanimous in its opinion that several conditions must be met for a federation of colleges as outlined in the previous section to gain acceptance of the faculty and to produce meaningful improvements in the quality of the Arts and Sciences at Ohio State:

- The Executive Dean and Vice President for the Arts and Sciences must be a member of the President's Planning Cabinet.
- The Executive Dean and Vice President for the Arts and Sciences, the deans of the five colleges, and top-level administrative staff must be housed in the same building, facilitating regular interaction and fostering a sense of unity within the Arts and Sciences. This works well at other institutions (UCLA , Washington, and Wisconsin, for example) and is deemed important to their success.
- During the first years of transition from the current configuration to a federation of colleges, the budget allocation from the provost must be sufficient so that the budget allocation from the federation to each college equals or exceeds what that college would have been allocated under the current configuration, reduced by the savings in college budgets attributable to centralization of administrative functions that previously were the responsibility of colleges. In particular, commitments to increment college budgets under the provost's five year rebasing plan and Selective Investment should remain in force.
- The transitional budget allocations from the provost to the federation should also include supplementary cash allocations providing the Executive Dean and Vice President for the Arts and Sciences with discretionary funds to initiate meaningful new programs which will move the Arts and Sciences forward. Once the transition is complete, it is expected that the Executive Dean and Vice President's discretionary budget would be provided by savings from economies of scale realized in centralizing college administrative functions (See Appendix) and by a tax on annual incremental funding to the federation of the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences.
- The new administrative structure must be organized in such a way as to avoid adding any new levels to existing review processes (e.g. promotion and tenure, curriculum revision, etc.)
- Faculty must be fully consulted in planning for and implementing any change in the configuration of the Arts and Sciences.

- Particular attention must be paid in the creation of a new configuration to insure that not only the Arts and Sciences undergraduate program, but also the research and graduate programs of the Arts and Sciences Colleges, are moved forward.
- The Executive Dean and Vice President for the Arts and Sciences should not serve simultaneously as dean of one of the constituent colleges.

9. Distribution of Arts and Sciences Departments/Schools Among Colleges

The composition of the individual colleges within the Arts and Sciences has remained quite stable since their creation in 1968. The Committee discussed with each college dean her/his opinion of what, if any, realignment of departments among colleges would improve the functioning of the colleges and/or the Arts and Sciences as a whole. Those discussions led to identification of two important criteria that influence the effectiveness of a college:

- The number of departments/schools in a college should be small enough that the dean can be knowledgeable about each unit and meet regularly with the chair/director.
- Each department/school in a given college should have common intellectual bonds with many, if not all, of the other departments, and all should share a common academic culture.

The college deans appear to be comfortable with the current distribution of programs among the colleges and reported no strong sentiment among their faculty to institute changes.

Two ideas were presented for consideration: merger of the College of Biological Sciences with the College of Mathematical and Physical Sciences to form a College of Science; and separation of the College of Arts from the Arts and Sciences cluster to form a free-standing college, perhaps aligned with the Professional College cluster. We believe that a good argument could be made for either of these realignment proposals especially since the more highly-ranked fine arts and music programs tend to be in free-standing colleges or schools, and note that Colleges of Science and free-standing Colleges of Fine Arts are common among our benchmark institutions. The Committee also briefly considered a suggestion that the Colleges of Humanities and Social and Behavioral Sciences could be combined into a single college, though such a union would appear to fail both of the criteria set forth above.

10. Recommendations Regarding Composition of the Colleges within Arts and Sciences

The Committee feels that the current distribution of departments and schools among the five colleges of the Arts and Sciences is working well. While it may be advisable in the future to revisit the possibility of realignment, such action at this time would complicate efforts to move expeditiously to a centralized structure for the Arts and Sciences. We

recommend no changes in alignment of colleges until such a centralized structure has been instituted and its effects on the interactions among departments/schools measured. The new federation of Colleges of the Arts and Sciences should re-address this issue later, after a careful assessment of the outcome of the change in structure.

11. Concluding Observation

In our conversations with representatives of benchmark universities, there was one recurring theme; the effectiveness of their organizational structure for the Arts and Sciences is a consequence of the quality of the people in leadership positions. Simple adoption of a federated structure for the Arts and Sciences may have little effect in moving Ohio State towards the goals of the Academic Plan if the University does not proceed carefully in the selection of an Executive Dean and Vice President who, on the one hand, can speak to the faculty and administration with the authority of an established scholar and, on the other hand, is an adept judge of people, who can build a cohesive, dynamic team of deans to provide the day to day leadership of the colleges.

Appendix B

Federation of the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences
at
The Ohio State University
May 2003

Edward J. Ray
Executive Vice President and Provost

Karen A. Holbrook
President

Background

Universities often engage in administrative changes in which they disassemble existing structures or consolidate currently separate programs. There is no simple blueprint for accomplishing either. Meeting strategic goals, and increasing efficiencies or improving function, provide a rationale for such changes. Timing is often a motivating factor. The Ohio State University, within the framework provided by the Academic Plan, has been deliberating a consolidation in administrative structure of the arts and sciences - at a time when excellence and advancement within the arts and sciences require the strength of the whole.

Since 1968, the Colleges of Arts and Sciences at The Ohio State University have existed as five independent colleges: Arts, Biological Sciences, Humanities, Mathematical and Physical Sciences (MAPS), and Social and Behavioral Sciences (SBS). All are led by deans, two of whom (MAPS and SBS) soon will be retiring. One of the five deans, currently the Dean of Humanities, also serves as Executive Dean of the five colleges. The role of the Executive Dean is to coordinate discussions among the five deans regarding policy issues facing the university; to serve on the Council of Deans' Steering Committee; and to oversee the newly consolidated arts and sciences development staff. The Executive Dean has no administrative support, other than an executive assistant and associate executive dean (part-time).

The question has been raised as to whether the existing structure is optimal in assuring that this core element of the university - the arts and sciences - is as strong and productive as it can be, or as lean and efficient as it needs to be in this era of budget constraints, and whether it provides the right configuration for growth, serves students to greatest advantage and, as one colleague asked, "promotes excellence, intellectual breadth, and innovation."

In February 2002, an ad-hoc committee that included one senior faculty member from each of the arts and sciences colleges (recommended by the college dean), and chaired, initially, by former President Edward H. Jennings, was appointed by the Provost and charged to provide specific recommendations for strengthening the arts and sciences at The Ohio State University. The committee's report (Appendix A) was completed early in October 2002, under the direction of Professor Joseph Ferrar, and contained a set of recommendations for the optimal configuration and the authority of the Executive Dean of the Arts and Sciences. The report was submitted to appropriate University Senate committees and the faculty and staff in the arts and sciences, with a request for comments by early December 2002. The Provost, and members of the committee, met with numerous groups and held two open forums for the arts and sciences faculty and staff.

On January 16, 2003, as part of his annual speech to the University Senate, the Provost proposed a plan (Appendix B) for the administrative operations of the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences. It included a number of changes from the recommendations proposed by the committee, reflecting a consideration of the discussions and written recommendations that had been received. The University community was asked to respond to this plan by March 14, 2003. Discussions then were held in the University Senate Steering Committee, Fiscal Committee, Rules Committee, and the Faculty Council, and by two discussion panels at University Senate meetings. Additional comments were also received from a number of groups and individuals. All of this input enlightened the thinking regarding the plan and provided a strong sense of faculty ideas and concerns on the topic. Much of the commentary dealt with the broad question of whether or not the arts and sciences should become a federation; however a number of helpful questions, concerns, and suggestions were expressed that have informed changes in the proposed administrative structure of the federation.

We believe The Ohio State University would benefit substantially from a coherent, collaborative, and financially sound core of arts and sciences programs of the highest possible quality. Every university in the top tier of public teaching and research universities has strong arts and sciences at its core. Our Academic Plan demands strength in this critical area. If we maximize the synergies that exist among the programs in the five separate colleges of the arts and sciences, we can enhance the availability of interdisciplinary courses, sequences, minors, and majors available to undergraduate and graduate students, and build upon existing interdisciplinary academic program offerings in the arts and sciences. We can more effectively create collaborative interdisciplinary clusters of teachers and scholars across the arts and sciences. We can initiate more teaching, research, and service collaborations within the university and with external partners that draw upon our strengths across the arts and sciences.

The remainder of this document provides a rationale and goals for a federation of the colleges of the arts and sciences, and with regard to implementation, it specifies roles and responsibilities for a newly-defined Executive Dean position and the deans of the five colleges and outlines financial arrangements.

The Federation of the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences

Rationale and Goals

Some steps have already been taken to rearrange the arts and sciences colleges into a federation. The Development staff, for example, serves the five colleges individually and collaborates on behalf of all of the arts and sciences; the deans of the arts and sciences have begun to develop a strategic plan for the arts and sciences and to solicit faculty and staff recommendations; and the arts and sciences deans have been asked to build upon the curriculum review efforts of the Undergraduate Curriculum Review Committee (March 2003). However, beyond these recent changes the present structure has been characterized, by a significant number of arts and sciences faculty, as having rigid boundaries and displaying college-centric competitive behavior. Currently, intellectually indefensible barriers stand in the way of program development, cross-

college curricula, joint hires, and the collaboration and creation of a collective strength that could accrue with greater coordination and interaction.

The following goals exist for establishing a tighter union of the arts and sciences colleges:

- Elevate the stature and visibility of the arts and sciences internally, nationally, and internationally;
- Enhance the reputation and quality of all colleges by using the strengths of each to benefit others via new programs;
- Enhance coherence, collaboration and synergies;
- Bolster and assess efforts in enhancing diversity of faculty, staff, and students;
- Reduce administrative costs so that resources conserved could be invested in new faculty positions, support services for students, and advance most of the other goals of the Academic Plan;
- Strengthen advising and career counseling;
- Improve joint hiring and cluster hiring;
- Promote new curricula;
- Strengthen the presence of Ohio State arts and sciences within organizations such as the Association of American Universities (AAU) and the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges (NASULGC);
- Decrease wasteful college-centric competition and lower college boundaries; and
- Benefit undergraduate and graduate student interdisciplinary study and research opportunities.

Integration does not need to reduce the significant role of individual deans and can expand their portfolio of responsibilities. Maintaining the appropriate balance between autonomy and the integration of these deans' responsibilities will be a charge to the new Executive Dean.

Implementation: Structure

The effective and efficient advancement of the arts and sciences within the University, and on behalf of the University, will require a clear understanding of the roles and responsibilities of the Executive Dean, the dean of each of the five colleges, and the faculty within the arts and sciences. A clearly defined division of labor must be articulated for the key offices within the federation to ensure that academic initiatives are developed, managed, and advanced as seamlessly as possible and that associated services and administrative oversight are provided efficiently, by eliminating duplicative efforts.

Executive Dean of the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences

The new federation would benefit from a different configuration of leadership in which the Executive Dean does not also hold the deanship of one of the colleges. Such a change would remove a potential conflict of interest for the Executive Dean. Therefore, the current position of the Executive Dean of the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences will be made a separate position from that of the five deans of the colleges of the arts and sciences, and a separate Office of the Executive Dean of the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences will be established effective July 1,

2003. The term of the Executive Dean will be converted to five years. An Interim Dean of the College of Humanities will be named after consultation with the faculty, staff, and students of the College of Humanities to serve beginning July 1, 2003. A search will commence for a new dean of the College of Humanities.

Roles of the Executive Dean

The Executive Dean of the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences will serve in the following roles:

- Conditional on a University rules change, the Executive Dean will advise the Provost on appointment, tenure and promotion decisions in the arts and sciences. Dossiers will be sent by the college deans to the Office of Academic Affairs. The Provost will seek advice from the Executive Dean in any case in which the Provost believes that the perspective of the arts and sciences collectively would be useful to the Provost in reviewing the case.
- Advise the Provost regarding the base budgets and re-basing allocation schedules for the five arts and sciences colleges. He/she will distribute these funds to the five colleges, subject to review by the Provost. The college deans will be responsible for the day-to-day management of their funds, subject to review by the Executive Dean;
- Allocate common funds, defined below, within the arts and sciences, in consultation with the five deans, and /or committees created to make program recommendations;
- Promote interdisciplinary undergraduate and graduate programs and research excellence within and across college boundaries;
- Promote diversity among faculty, staff, undergraduate, and graduate students and in all programs throughout the arts and sciences;
- Lead the faculty of arts and sciences in re-thinking the proper organizational structure for curricular development; this may or may not lead to a revised committee pattern, but the emphasis should be on enabling curricular improvement and cooperation across the five colleges;
- Develop and implement a strategic plan for the arts and sciences, in consultation with the five deans and appropriate representative bodies in the colleges of the arts and sciences, and ensure that the plan is discussed broadly before it is finalized;
- Develop a pattern of administration document for the arts and sciences, in consultation with the faculty of the arts and sciences, to be reviewed and approved by the Office of Academic Affairs. As with all such documents, the pattern is to be reviewed and revised, as necessary, within one year of the appointment or reappointment of an Executive Dean;
- Provide administrative oversight for development activities and communications in the arts and sciences;
- Collaborate with Undergraduate Student Academic Services (USAS) in the oversight of academic advising and career counseling services and in the recruitment of undergraduate students in the arts and sciences;

- Require the realization of economies of scale from enhanced collaboration regarding the provision of services such as personnel and fiscal services common to all arts and sciences colleges;
- Oversee the effective administration of the collaborative and distributed elements of the Arts and Sciences Honors and Scholars Program;
- Oversee the management of the University Press;
- Oversee interdisciplinary academic programs that draw faculty expertise from more than one college among the arts and sciences such as, but not limited to, the Undergraduate International Studies Program, the Asian American Studies, Latino/a Studies, and Disability Studies undergraduate minors, as well as course sequences that draw from more than one college such as the American Sign Language sequence. Changes in current reporting lines for these programs will be determined in consultation with the five deans and the Provost;
- Select the chair, in consultation with the Provost, for the search committees for the five college deans, advise the Provost on the selection of other committee members, and on the appointment of all deans, and work with the Provost on the annual evaluation of these deans. The deans of the five colleges, together with the Executive Dean, will serve on the Council of Deans;
- The Executive Dean will share his/her Annual Report with the University Senate Fiscal Committee.

Responsibilities of the Executive Dean

The responsibilities of the position are different from the roles of the Executive Dean. The success of the federation will depend substantially on the respect commanded by the Executive Dean and the extent to which he/she exhibits the leadership and collaborative qualities that the new organization will require. Specifically, the Executive Dean has the responsibility to:

- Work with the five college deans to assure that there is continuous and expeditious communication of arts and sciences issues. One of the first responsibilities the Executive Dean will spearhead with his/her colleagues will be to develop specific plans to create a federation management structure that will reduce existing overlapping and extraneous administrative structures among the five colleges. It is recognized that this cannot occur immediately, but action should be as expeditious as possible;
- Demonstrate an understanding of all aspects of the arts and sciences and pursue opportunities to promote collaboration within the arts and sciences and on behalf of elements of arts and sciences with other programs across the University and across the country.
- Work to assure department chairs are part of and involved in the federated colleges;
- Promote a faculty culture of federation in addition to discipline specific alliances;
- Define opportunities for attracting new financial resources for the federation. The funding offered by the Provost described below should be viewed as a start-up investment or challenge funding to attract new resources from external sources;

Reporting Relationships

The Executive Dean is appointed to a five-year renewable term, subject to acceptable annual reviews by the Provost and a satisfactory formal performance review in the fourth year. The Executive Dean reports to the Provost.

The College Deans

There will be a dean for each of the five colleges of the arts and sciences.

Roles of the College Deans

The Deans of the five colleges of the arts and sciences will:

- Manage their budgets according to the budget restructuring policies developed within their colleges and approved by the Office of Academic Affairs, subject to the review of the Executive Dean;
- Provide college leadership for the recruitment and retention of high quality faculty and send tenure and promotion cases directly to the Office of Academic Affairs for University level review;
- Provide college level leadership in the efficient organization and management of programs, including the appointment and re-appointment of department chairpersons and directors of schools;
- Provide college level leadership for the creation and expansion of new programs and the consolidation and elimination, as appropriate, of existing programs;
- Advance the quality, diversity, and substance of college teaching, research, and service opportunities for faculty, staff and students, through collaborative contributions to the effective management of the federation; and
- Serve on the Council of Deans and be evaluated by the Provost and the Executive Dean.

Responsibilities of the Deans

The responsibilities of the Deans of the Arts and Sciences within the context of the federation are to:

- Work with the Executive Dean to develop plans that streamline the administrative structure within the federation and facilitate the communication of information regarding the arts and sciences within their own colleges, departments and schools;
- Encourage and facilitate the involvement of department chairs and school directors in federation activities;
- Encourage and facilitate a faculty culture of federation, as appropriate;
- Contribute to collaborative planning and activities that can enhance external funding of activities and programs that reach across the arts and sciences.

Reporting Relationships of the Deans

Each college dean is appointed to a five-year renewable term, subject to acceptable annual

reviews by the Executive Dean and the Provost, and periodic formal review as provided in Board by-law 3335-1-19 (R). For matters relating to the “roles” of the Executive Dean, the college deans report to the Provost through the Executive Dean.

The Faculty of the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences

The structure and the leadership of the federation of the arts and sciences still have issues that need resolution with input from the coordinated arts and sciences faculty. Some of these issues include:

- Creation of new resources beyond institutionally assigned resources;
- Function and streamlining of a central curriculum committee;
- Research investment;
- Compatibilities of budget restructuring under a federation model; and
- Re-alignment of reporting lines for existing cross-disciplinary programs – including guidelines and criteria for centralization versus college oversight of such programs

The Executive Dean working with the five deans and the faculty of the arts and sciences should review the current governance structure for the arts and sciences, with a goal of establishing task forces or committees, as appropriate, to work quickly and make progress on such issues.

A formal review of this administrative structure will commence in the fourth year

Implementation: Financial Arrangements

1. The Office of Academic Affairs will provide continuing funding to cover the staffing and operating costs of the Office of the Executive Dean.
2. The Executive Dean, in consultation with the five deans of the arts and sciences, will be charged with streamlining administrative costs among the five colleges and distributing the resulting savings among the colleges primarily for interdisciplinary faculty and program enhancement purposes. This process is expected to be continuous but within three years there should be savings of at least \$500,000 in continuing administrative costs. The annual evaluation of the Executive Dean and each of the Deans of the Arts and Sciences and formal reviews for renewal of their appointments will include an assessment of the contribution that each has made to streamlining administrative costs in the arts and sciences administrative structure and to redirecting resources to faculty and staff recruitment and retention, student support, and program needs within the arts and sciences. Consistent with our institutional commitment to excellence through diversity, these resources should be used to enhance the diversity of our faculty, staff, students, and program offerings throughout the arts and sciences.

During the first year of operation, the Office of the Executive Dean should develop metrics to demonstrate cost reductions and efficiencies in the provision of administrative services among the five college and executive dean offices that will be updated and

reviewed annually as part of the performance review of each of the college deans and the Executive Dean.

While it is always a matter of both art and science to make comparisons of administrative staffing for academic units across time and across institutions, it is instructive to compare the administrative staffing of the arts and sciences at Ohio State in 1992 and 2002 and to compare the current administrative staffing of the arts and sciences at Ohio State with staffing at other universities, including several of our benchmark peers. Table I compares the number of executive staff and other staff affiliated with the college offices among the colleges of the arts and sciences at Ohio State with the arts and sciences staffing at other major universities. The ratios of faculty to executive staff across institutions and of faculty to other staff suggest that economies of scale and scope in administering to the needs of the arts and sciences faculty through a coordinated federation of colleges could result in substantial cost savings.

Table I

If we define executive staff to include deans, associate deans, and the principal fiscal and/or personnel officers in the college offices the following comparative data for Autumn 2002 are instructive:

University	#College Office		# Arts & Sciences Faculty	Ratio of A&S Faculty to College Office	
	Exec Staff	Other Staff		Exec Staff	Other Staff
University of California at Los Angeles	7	28.4	850	121:1	30:1
University of Illinois at Urbana/Champaign	6	7	620	103:1	89:1
University of Iowa	5	16	630	126:1	39:1
University of Washington	6	18	890	148:1	49:1
University of Wisconsin	7.25	30	908	125:1	30:1
The Ohio State University - Sept 2002	23	31	1004	44:1	32:1

The other staff category consists of non-executive staff assigned to the functions currently performed in Ohio State's five college offices: faculty matters, curriculum processes, and fiscal and personnel issues.

These data suggest that a number of our benchmark peers do manage to have excellent arts and sciences core programs with relatively lean administrative structures. The Executive Dean and the Deans of the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences should be held to a comparably high standard of administrative efficiency in the performance of their duties.

In addition to the comparative data for administrative costs in the arts and sciences across some of our benchmark institutions, it is instructive to review the growth in administrative staffing for the combined college offices within the arts and sciences over the last ten years. As indicated in Table II below, the number of executive staff and total staff positions for the five college offices has increased from 21 to 26.6 and from 59 to 76, while the number of FTE faculty has declined slightly from 985 to 954. The combined cost of executive staff positions alone is now equal to \$3,408,000. This is not a trend that can be sustained in the face of the financial challenges facing the University.

Table II

	College Executive Staff FTE		Total College Staff FTE		Tenure/Tenure Track Faculty FTE		Ratio of Faculty FTE to Executive Staff FTE		Ratio of Faculty FTE to College Total Staff FTE	
	AU92	AU02	AU92	AU02	AU92	AU02	AU92	AU02	AU92	AU02
ART	6.00	5.00	17.50	18.60	142.10	142.45	23.68	28.49	8.12	7.66
BIO	3.41	3.30	9.41	13.13	85.84	89.10	25.17	27.00	9.12	6.79
HUM	4.60	6.90	17.10	23.90	304.60	298.30	66.22	43.23	17.81	12.48
MPS	3.00	5.90	8.00	10.90	237.12	210.55	79.04	35.69	29.64	19.32
SBS	4.00	5.50	7.10	9.50	215.40	213.35	53.85	38.79	30.34	22.46
TOTAL	21.01	26.60	59.11	76.03	985.06	953.75	46.89	35.86	16.66	12.54

Executive Staff for 1992 includes Deans, Assc/Asst Deans and the following staff: Conti, Riechel, Wernet, Tomei, Dantuono, Newman, Krygier, and Conrad. Decision rule for other staff inclusion as Executive Staff is 1) college administrative staff; 2) salary > \$40,000 (salary of lowest paid asst/assc dean); and 3) not computing staff

Executive Staff for 2002 includes Deans, Assc/Asst Deans and the following staff: Miller, Riechel, Tomei, Dantuono, Newman, Naber, Krygier, Vonville, and Conrad. Decision rule for other staff inclusion as Executive Staff is 1) college administrative staff; 2) salary > \$53,750 (\$40,000 increased 3% each year); and 3) not computing staff

Total College Staff FTE does not include staff assigned to college office fiscal numbers but employed in the Melton Center for Jewish Studies, the Council of Colleges of Arts & Sciences, the Hopkins Hall Gallery, The Robert Shaw Institute, or as Biological Sciences Laboratory support staff.

Data Source: Office of Human Resources Management Information and Analysis Reporting

3. The Office of Academic Affairs will provide the Office of the Executive Dean with \$500,000 in cash for each of the next three years to seed program initiatives that should be funded long-term through reductions in the administrative costs for the five colleges. The effectiveness of those allocations will be reviewed annually as part of the general University budget process.
4. Administrative cost reductions among the five colleges in excess of \$500,000 or the costs associated with the Office of the Executive Dean, whichever is greater, will be matched by continuing central investment funds up to a total of \$500,000 for distribution by the Executive Dean in consultation with the five deans. In effect, these additional central funds will be made available only if the combined administrative costs for the Executive Dean and the five colleges are less than the current costs of administrative services in the five colleges.
5. Given the central role of the arts and sciences in the successful implementation of the Academic Plan, it is expected that the Office of Academic Affairs will provide periodic cash and continuing funds in support of collaborative initiatives within the arts and sciences through the Office of the Executive Dean. At the same time, interdisciplinary innovation and fundamental contributions to knowledge are often the products of collaboration among excellent disciplinary programs. Central investments, including all competitive awards, will continue to flow directly to disciplines and colleges within the arts and sciences as appropriate and without regard to any allocations targeted for the arts and sciences as a whole through the Office of the Executive Dean.
6. The five percent University strategic investment tax on marginal income from tuition and the state share of instruction will continue. There will be an additional three percent internal reallocation of the marginal growth of tuition and the state share of instruction revenues within the arts and sciences. This internal reallocation at the discretion of the Executive Dean, in consultation with the five Deans, will be used primarily to promote collaborative hires, programs, course offerings, and research initiatives. Based upon marginal income gains for FY03, the three percent internal reallocation would yield at least \$650,000 per year. The three percent internal reallocation should be reviewed after several years to determine if it is sufficient to meet the needs and opportunities for collaboration within the arts and sciences. The authority to change the common pool for internal reallocation purposes resides with the Provost.

Conclusion

After more than a year of planning and deliberation, with arguments from all perspectives presented and considered, we believe that a Federation of Colleges of Arts and Sciences with a newly-defined Executive Dean position is needed and have determined that it will now be established. The advancement of The Ohio State University, clearly laid out in the Academic Plan, demands excellence from the Arts and Sciences. Indeed our students deserve no less. The timing is appropriate. The budget situation underscores the need for strategic decisions to streamline, add efficiencies, and reduce duplication. Within the arts and sciences, working together in a coordinated, consolidated way on programmatic issues will help us move in this direction more easily. Creating the Federation of the Colleges of Arts and Sciences is an opportunity for the faculty to use their talent, expertise, and broad networks to be creative and innovative, and to use this basic plan to help make arts and sciences a central and pivotal element of the academic excellence and advancement of The Ohio State University.

Appendix C

COLLEGES OF THE ARTS AND SCIENCES REVIEW COMMITTEE

FINAL REPORT

April 2008

Martha M. Garland, Vice Provost for Enrollment Services and Dean of Undergraduate Studies, **Co-Chair**

W. Randy Smith, Vice Provost for Academic Programs, **Co-Chair**

Professor Ralph E. J. Boerner, Department of Evolution, Ecology, and Organismal Biology

Professor Lisa C. Florman, Department of History of Art

John W. Heimaster, Director of Computing Services, College of Mathematical and Physical Sciences

Professor Anne B. McCoy, Department of Chemistry

Professor William T. McDaniel Jr., School of Music and Department of African American and African Studies

Professor James P. Phelan, Department of English

Patricia W. Riechel, Associate to the Dean, College of the Arts

Linda S. Seitz, Assistant Vice President, Office of Development, Colleges of the Arts and Sciences

Professor Sandra A. Stroot, Interim Dean, College of Education and Human Ecology

Professor Gifford Weary, Chair, Department of Psychology

INTRODUCTION

Until 1968, the arts and sciences at The Ohio State University were organized as a single, centralized structure. In 1968, with the addition of some departments and schools that previously had been affiliated with other colleges, the arts and sciences were divided administratively into five colleges—Arts, Biological Sciences, Humanities, Mathematical and Physical Sciences, and Social and Behavioral Sciences—a pattern that persisted for thirty-four years.

In 2002, in an effort to enhance the centrality and importance of the arts and sciences and to ensure that they were appropriately configured for implementing the goals of the University's Academic Plan, the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Status of the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences ("The Jennings Report") recommended a new organizational structure.

The actual form that the new structure took emerged through the Federation of the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences at The Ohio State University (2003), commonly referenced as the "white paper", issued by then-President Karen A. Holbrook, and then-Executive Vice President and Provost Edward J. Ray. A formal "Federation" was identified, and an Office of the Executive Dean of the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences was established. Goals for the Federation, and roles/responsibilities for administrative levels and constituent groups within it, were specified. The goals were:

1. Elevate the stature and visibility of the arts and sciences internally, nationally, and internationally;
2. Enhance the reputation and quality of all colleges by using the strengths of each to benefit others via new programs;
3. Enhance coherence, collaboration, and synergies;
4. Bolster and assess efforts in enhancing diversity of faculty, staff, and students;
5. Reduce administrative costs so that resources conserved could be invested in new faculty positions, support services for students, and advance most of the the other goals of the Academic Plan;
6. Strengthen advising and career counseling;
7. Improve joint hiring and cluster hiring;
8. Promote new curricula;
9. Strengthen the presence of Ohio State arts and sciences within organizations such as the Association of American Universities (AAU) and the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges;
10. Decrease wasteful college-centric competition and lower college boundaries;
11. Benefit undergraduate and graduate student interdisciplinary study and research opportunities.

A formal review of this new administrative structure was to be conducted during its fourth year of operations.

In Spring 2007, then-Executive Vice President and Provost Barbara R. Snyder, with input from the Office of the Executive Dean of the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences and the deans of the five colleges, identified a 12-member review committee, co-chaired by Vice Provosts Martha M. Garland and W. Randy Smith.

In September 2007, Interim President and Provost Joseph A. Alutto charged the Committee to:

- “assess the progress made on the goals/objectives of the federation of the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences ...”; and
- “based on that assessment, provide recommendations ... on the optimal organizational structure for the arts and sciences”;

From September to December 2007, the Committee met weekly, often more frequently, and:

- reviewed the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Status of the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences (2002) and the Federation of the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences at The Ohio State University (2003);
- reviewed the Internal Review, Office of the Executive Dean, Federation of the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences (2007);
- reviewed the structure of arts and sciences at peer institutions;
- gathered and reviewed institutional data relating to the operation of the Federation;
- met with Professor Jacqueline J. Royster, Executive Dean, Colleges of the Arts and Sciences;
- met with the senior staff of the Executive Dean who hold leadership roles for budget, curriculum, development, technology, communication, and advising;
- met individually with: Paul A. Beck, Dean, College of Social and Behavioral Sciences; Karen A. Bell, Dean, College of the Arts; Joan A. Herbers, Dean, College of Biological Sciences; Matthew S. Platz, Interim Dean, College of Mathematical and Physical Sciences; and John W. Roberts, Dean, College of Humanities;
- met with the Executive Committee (chairpersons/directors) of each college;
- held four separate meetings with the senior staff of the five colleges – one for each of the following functional areas: curriculum, development, technology, and communication;
- met with the directors of the three interdisciplinary major programs housed within the Federation: international studies, middle childhood education, and film studies;
- held two open forums for faculty and staff;
- solicited written comments from faculty and staff within the five colleges, from deans of the 13 colleges that are not part of the Federation, and from the four regional campuses;
- participated in a special meeting of the Arts and Sciences Senate;
- provided progress reports to the University Senate Steering Committee.

In addition, the Committee Co-Chairs had the opportunity to discuss arts and sciences organization structures with administrators, and their counterparts, at peer institutions.

ASSESSMENT

This Report does not provide a detailed description of the current structure of the Federation—patterns of enrollment, staffing, and funding. Such information was collected and used, and is available elsewhere—Internal Review, Office of the Executive Dean, Federation of the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences (2007). The Report presented here focuses on the analysis and assessment of the information gathered, and on the issues that emerged.

Based on its own analysis, and supported by the majority of those with whom it met:

- i) **The Committee strongly reaffirms the central goals presented in both the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Status of the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences (2002), and the Federation of the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences at The Ohio State University (2003).**

The disciplines that make up the arts and sciences are central to the research, teaching (general education, undergraduate majors and minors, and graduate and professional programs), and service missions of our University. Indeed they are critical to the future of higher education in general, and especially to the preparation of students who will move among multiple employment opportunities during their lifetimes.

To make certain that these central fields reach their full potential, the University must continue aggressively to pursue the goals listed previously.

- ii) **The Committee concludes that the organizational and administrative structure adopted in 2003 is highly dysfunctional.**

The Executive Dean was never given real financial authority, or effective control of personnel policies. Instead, the deans of the five colleges continued to hold those important responsibilities at the college level and to operate accordingly, supported by the college-level senior staff that works with them.

Reinforcing that situation was the simultaneous implementation of a new budget model that identified colleges as budgetary responsibility centers, enhancing their roles and authority dramatically. The Committee quickly

realized that the University's budget model effectively works against any attempt to mold an integrated and effective Federation.

The Executive Dean and her staff have been able to work only within the limited authority assigned to them through the "white paper," which significantly constrained their efforts to achieve some of the broader goals of the Federation. Lacking any real budget authority, they have tended to focus on activities viewed by the colleges as marginal or unnecessary, and utilizing resources that could have been put to better use back in the original units. Indeed, because it was able to find its own revenue sources only through a tax on the colleges and whatever enrollments were generated from academic programs housed in its Office, the Federation became in effect a "sixth college", perceived by the others as duplicating, competing with, or inhibiting their own individual efforts.

This "sixth college" approach to the operations of the arts and sciences will not enable the goals of the Federation to be achieved, and should not be sustained.

iii) The Committee determined that progress on achieving the major goals identified for the Federation in 2003 is uneven, and the organizational structure adopted then is a central reason for the lack of success of many of them. Progress on each of these goals needs to continue to be monitored in whatever organizational structure is ultimately adopted.

- Some of the most active and visible work of the Federation has related to curriculum: its efforts to offer a strong voice for the liberal arts and sciences within the institution, to support curricular innovation, to maintain quality standards for these central core disciplines, and to encourage interdisciplinary activities (Goals 1,2,3, 8, and 10).

The results are mixed. A positive aspect of the federated model has been the development of the more integrated management of curriculum through the new Committee on Curriculum and Instruction (CCI), now a stronger faculty-based committee—with particular success in interdisciplinary programs, in the area of learning outcomes assessment, and in leadership in the creation of freshman seminars, interdisciplinary minors, and the new freshman clusters. Indeed, during the recent review of the general education curriculum, the CCI took the lead in articulating the response of faculty in the five colleges.

However some college officers and faculty members expressed serious concerns about the day-to-day management of curricular processes in the Federation Office: the length of time needed for curriculum approval, the top-down approach used in the early development of interdisciplinary minors, and the resultant

negative impact on college-level curriculum decision-making and related processes.

In any case, the competition among the five colleges, reinforced by a budget model that treats them as separate responsibility centers, continues to play a major role in significantly limiting the scope of curricular reform, and preventing a number of recommendations in the 2007 general education revision from being implemented.

- Support for undergraduate advising (Goal 6) has been well provided by the federated structure, with a central operation overseeing students' general education programs, and decentralized structures—either in the five colleges or within departments—providing advising for major programs. Even in this relatively effective area (whose arrangement actually predates the creation of the Federation), however, there have been some challenging issues. For example, in dealing with the Office of Undergraduate Admissions, the Federation and the colleges have sometimes been in conflict with each other, undermining recruitment effectiveness.
- With respect to academic quality control within the arts and sciences disciplines, (Goals 2, 3, 5 and 10) the federated structure has played only a very limited role. Ongoing program reviews of individual departments or schools have included the Executive Dean, but the college dean (who controls the fiscal and personnel resources) has clearly been the more important decision maker in this process.
- From the earliest days of the Federation it was tacitly accepted that graduate education (Goals 8 and 11) did not lie within the purview of the Office of the Executive Dean, on the assumption that graduate curricular oversight would create an additional, unnecessary bureaucratic level of review. Thus, graduate course and program approval is not linked to the CCI in any way. But this assumption also meant that in the recent Graduate School doctoral program review, one of the most important processes within the University in recent decades, almost no role was assigned to the Executive Dean, with evaluative central data being distributed to, and preliminary college responses being developed by, the college deans.
- The flexibility and agility necessary to deal with new opportunities and challenges, including the ability to deploy financial and other resources flexibly/quickly, have not been evident.

All five of the colleges contribute significantly to the University's revenue stream (~90% of general education instruction), and together, in FY07 the five colleges have a total budget of \$360 million, with a surplus of resources over expenditures. In the present configuration however, this strength cannot be used to advance really imaginative trans-institutional initiatives or otherwise support as effectively

as possible the University's aspirations toward a range of efforts to achieve academic excellence. Furthermore, recent changes in state funding have led to increasingly unfavorable cost/earnings patterns that are distributed unevenly across disciplines. The extraordinary "collective" resources of the arts and sciences have not been available to provide any buffering against such financial challenges.

Indeed, it was clear to the Committee that competition among the five colleges across the whole range of academic resources (budget, personnel, space, institutional influence) creates a situation that weakens the effectiveness of the arts and science disciplines, both inside and outside the University.

- One of the premises of the original restructuring had been that the colleges would achieve efficiencies and cost savings by merging some of their support functions, savings that would then be matched by the Office of Academic Affairs to support increased programming or faculty hires. As it turns out, the expectation of such efficiencies was probably unrealistic. Simultaneous to the arts and sciences restructuring and the imposition of the new budget model, an increasingly demanding compliance and control environment developed across the campus in general, requiring more, not less, staff effort in several arenas. And in fact, in general no evidence of the hoped-for economies at the colleges was presented (with the exception of some reductions in staff in the College of Humanities.) Indeed in several areas, and in several of the colleges, there has been growth in support staff. The Committee did examine efforts at collaboration and efficiency across five areas: development activities, information technology support, communication, personnel, and finances. (Goals 5 and 10).
 - **Development**—Pulling together a joint arts and sciences development organization was one of the earliest efforts at collaboration (predating the White Paper), and in this area there have been some visible accomplishments. The University Development Office has collaborated with the Federation in establishing a central office, with professional leadership and staff and in which each of the colleges has a representative. The development staff members from the colleges expressed real appreciation for the collegial professional support they receive from the central office, but it was very clear that the staff members regard themselves as working for their "own" individual deans. No culture has developed of passing a prospective donor from one part of arts and sciences to another. This failure is especially frustrating inasmuch as the arts and sciences development officers believe that they have identified a number of potential donors who are actually committed to a vision of a unified, integrated enterprise focused around the liberal arts and sciences.
 - **Information Technology**—The delivery of technological support naturally is very sharply differentiated among the various disciplines, and the Committee was not surprised to learn that extensive cross-college

collaboration had not developed in this area. The Federation has established an IT group that has undertaken a number of projects of cross-college interest. The most visible and successful was technological support for undergraduate advising and the five colleges are appreciative of this support. The technology experts from the five colleges do seem to operate in a loose cooperative confederation; staff members pointed out that information technology connections reach out to a wide range of other relationships (Office of Information Technology, non-ASC colleges) so that cooperation within the Federation is only a relatively non-central part of the IT officers' organizational structure.

- **Communication**—It was the hope that the five colleges would collaborate on communication efforts, developing a recognizable arts and sciences vision, and collaborating on (or at least cross-referencing) each other's events, but this is another area in which very little significant activity has developed. An arts and sciences communications council has been organized, and some of the college communication officers did express appreciation for assistance they had received from the central office, but it was clear that local loyalties were viewed as far more important than was any sense of group identity.
- **Personnel** —The documents that established the Federation left somewhat unclear the relative roles of the Executive Dean and the college deans in personnel matters, particularly promotion and tenure and the appointment or reappointment of the college deans. These issues were not resolved completely, and so the Executive Dean has played only a very marginal role in personnel matters. Certainly there has been no sense in which the Dean could reclaim or reassign a vacant line from one college to another. The Federation has had occasional success, however, in fostering several cross-college spousal hires and in collaboration on some cluster hiring for diversity (Goals 4 and 7).
- **Finance**—There is no area in which a lack of collaboration was more clearly demonstrated than that of fiscal management, although it is the Committee's understanding that the Federation asked the five fiscal officers to work together to establish some broad collaborations. The Executive Dean and the five deans individually made it clear that no satisfactory mutual understanding of financial resources has ever been developed.

In general, however, the Committee notes that communications about Federation funding are not well understood by faculty and staff. This has led to inaccurate perceptions about the total costs associated with the establishment of the Office of the Executive Dean; the extent to which individual colleges have contributed to expected reductions in

administrative costs; or the ways in which taxes have returned to the colleges in some form.

- There is no evidence that this structure has yet been able to provide a unified and effective voice for the University's arts and sciences through participation in national higher education conversations (Goals 1 and 9). The Associate Executive Dean, and the Director of Assessment, recently have begun to attend some national meetings, but as yet we have no real presence. Indeed, the Executive Dean lacks the authority to commit faculty or staff, whose essential loyalty and resources lie with the five colleges, to such efforts.

At the time of the establishment of the Federation, there was a strong desire for the Executive Dean to serve on the President's Cabinet to provide a voice for the arts and sciences within the University. She is now a member of the President's Cabinet. However, the membership of that body has evolved, and so the Executive Deans of the three other college clusters are also members. The distinctiveness of an arts and sciences presence has not been realized.

- As was revealed in the individual meetings with the deans, collaborative relationships between the five deans and the Executive Dean have not developed adequately, nor have the relationships *among* the deans been particularly enhanced by the new structure. (Goals 3 and 10).

RECOMMENDATION

It is clear to the Committee, and to the vast majority of those with whom it interacted, that the structure that was created in 2003 is not working effectively and needs to be changed soon. Given that the Committee believes strongly in the overarching goals of the centrality of the arts and sciences, and efforts to enhance it, then what would be an optimal organization? As Executive Vice President and Provost Joseph A. Alutto asked the Committee at its charge meeting: "If not this structure, then what?" In turn the Committee posed this question to every group with whom it met.

Three options emerged from those discussions.

- Return to a multi-college structure but with fewer colleges, arranged in new ways.**

Few peer institutions have five separate arts and sciences colleges. If they have a multi-college structure, they typically have two or three colleges. One science college is common, but there is a mix of the other possible

combinations of colleges, often a reflection of the history and culture of the institution.

Although there was discussion of various combinations of the five colleges, and although some with whom the Committee met offered their own suggestions, the Committee did not conduct the kind of detailed analysis that would be needed to determine why particular combinations would be correct—based on the history and culture of *this* institution. And clearly such a recommendation would need to be more than a speculative matter.

More importantly, the Committee believes that a slightly altered configuration—simply identifying a smaller number of colleges—does not, by itself, provide gains with respect to the original goals of the Federation.

The Committee rejected this option.

ii) **Return to the five separate colleges and disband the “Federation.”**

One of the five deans could serve as a convener of the group, but without any real central authority. This was the pattern in the arts and sciences throughout much of the 1990s, and continues to be the structure used currently by the health science and the professional college clusters.

However, a slightly modified version could occur, because the Committee identified (and again many of those with whom it met concurred), that there are several functional areas that *have* improved under the federation. These are primarily related to undergraduate education—the new CCI and its monitoring of the general education curriculum, learning outcomes assessment, interdisciplinary programming—and undergraduate advising. They should be preserved and continue to be managed centrally. Absent an empowered executive dean, these and perhaps other activities, would probably need to be overseen by the Office of Academic Affairs.

While an advantage is that this option would not require substantial or dramatic institutional change, this approach does not respond to the central goals of the original re-organization plan. Indeed, it returns to a college “silo” approach that prompted the establishment of the federation in 2003, and that the current budget model has in some ways reinforced.

For these reasons the Committee does not endorse this option.

iii) **Create a single, integrated College of the Arts and Sciences that brings together all the faculty, resources (budget, space), and academic programs that currently reside within the five colleges.**

During its analysis the Committee came to recognize and articulate a fundamental reality of academic life: the foundational unit of organization at the University is neither a “college” nor a “federation” but a “department or school”. Faculty members, undergraduate and graduate students, and staff all identify themselves—their research area, their academic program, the very name of their profession—with their discipline as defined by their department/school. Indeed, as it relates to enhancing the centrality of the arts and sciences, the Committee came to see the “extra” layer in Ohio State’s bureaucracy as lying not in the newly promulgated Federation, but rather in the five colleges established in 1968.

In suggesting any reorganization, we need to recognize and hold stable the identity implied in the departmental/school affiliation, and thereby avoid real disruption in the academic community. In this third option, departments and schools would retain their identities, but they would now report to the central College of the Arts and Sciences.

The college would be led by a dean with ultimate decision-making authority for the college in all realms of college life, reporting directly to the Executive Vice President and Provost.

Working with the dean would be “divisional deans,” individuals with the relevant academic expertise to “represent” clusters of departments/schools, but presumably without ultimate decision-making authority for their clusters. These divisional deans would be the “cabinet” of the new dean, serving as a close team of advisors and working to help the dean be highly effective in optimizing the value of the whole collection.

An additional set of associate or assistant deans would be responsible for programmatic areas such as faculty and research, undergraduate education, or advising. Senior staff would be responsible for functional areas such as fiscal operations, human resources, communication, development, or information technology. Those functions clearly would also need to be replicated at the department/school level, with individuals in departmental functions working directly with the college staff.

In this model, the dean would provide voice and vision for the arts and sciences, serving as a powerful spokesperson for the centrality of the arts and sciences within the University (on the President’s Cabinet, reporting directly to the Executive Vice President and Provost), and as a single representative for the arts and sciences on the national/international stage.

In this model, the resources of the current five colleges could be combined, providing more flexibility to enhance quality and academic excellence across the college, and to move resources to respond to challenges and opportunities.

In this model, curricular competition ought to be reduced as funds would flow to the college instead of to five separate colleges. Special programmatic needs, interdisciplinary efforts, and technology could be enhanced and significant opportunities for institution-wide excellence could be supported.

A model very much like this is followed at such aspirational peer institutions as UCLA, and the University of Washington. This approach was outlined in the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Status of the Colleges of the Arts and Sciences (2002), but it was not the model adopted when the Federation was established in 2003.

Organizational change is often disruptive, and change on this scale is almost certain to be. However, the Committee believes that the disruption in this case would be relatively short-term, and in the end outweighed by the benefits of the reorganization. We nonetheless urge that a careful plan be developed to minimize the negative impact on the academic community, and to allow important work of faculty, students and staff to continue unabated during the changeover.

In light of all these considerations, the Committee believes that the single college option provides the best route to replacing the current dysfunctional structure of the arts and sciences with a sound and effective one, and it therefore strongly endorses this option.