

# **REPORT ON REALIGNMENT AND RESTRUCTURING**

**Faculty Senate Academic Realignment Committee**

**University of Alabama in Huntsville**

**This version: May 15, 2009**

## **Committee Members**

Timothy Newman (Chair), Computer Science

Michael Banish, Chemical and Materials Engineering

Karen Frith, Nursing

Jatinder (Jeet) Gupta, Information Systems

Emil Jovanov, Electrical and Computer Engineering

Jeffrey Nelson, English

Louise O'Keefe, Nursing

Belinda Ong, Library

Andrée Reeves, Political Science

John F. Schnell, Economics

Carmen Scholz, Chemistry

## Table of Contents

1	Introduction .....	6
1.1	Priorities and Principles in Restructuring .....	6
1.2	Acknowledgments .....	7
2	Lessons Learned .....	8
2.1	Observations and Lessons Learned .....	8
2.2	Lessons Learned from Past Realignment .....	11
2.3	Observations on Universities Currently Undergoing Realignment 13	
3.	Procedures for Realignment.....	16
4	Assessment and Evaluation of Realignment Ideas.....	21
4.1	Guiding Principles .....	21
4.2	General Comments that apply to all ideas .....	21
4.3	Assessment of Academic Realignment Ideas.....	22
4.3.1	Establishment of a Freshman College.....	22
4.3.2	Expanding Current Honors Program .....	23
4.3.3	Eliminate Graduate School .....	25
4.4	Assessment of Research Related Ideas.....	25
4.4.1	Investigators Not Affiliated with Research Centers .....	25
4.4.2	Evaluate Productivity.....	26
4.4.3	Strengthen Relationship Among Research Centers and Academic Units.....	26
4.5	Assessment of Management Related Ideas .....	26
4.5.1	Classroom Utilization and Utility Costs.....	26
4.5.2	Elimination of the UA System Office.....	27
4.5.3	Tuition and Fee Structure.....	27
4.5.4	Evaluation of Summer Stipends .....	28
4.5.5	Interim Administrative Appointments .....	28
4.5.6	Provide Incentives to Faculty and/or Staff to Retire, Enhance Emeriti Role (One-Time Incentive Offer) .....	28
4.5.7	Provide Incentives to Faculty to Take One Semester of Leave ..	31
4.5.8	Provide Incentives to Faculty to Take One Semester of Reduced Work Load/Pay.....	31

4.5.9	Identify Short-term Work in government IPA slots and Provide Incentives for Faculty Involvement .....	32
4.5.10	Provide Incentives to Participation in a One-time Voluntary Salary Deferral .....	32
4.6	Assessment of Outreach Related Ideas .....	33
4.6.1	Work with chambers of commerce to have a program for faculty similar to the Leadership Huntsville/Madison County program	33
4.7	Unit Realignment Evaluations .....	33
4.7.1	Combination of Biological Sciences, Chemistry and Chemical Engineering to emphasize Biochemistry and Biotechnology.....	34
4.7.2	Combination of Biological Sciences, Chemistry and Chemical Engineering to emphasize Biochemistry and Biotechnology plus (single) faculty from Civil and Environmental Engineering .....	37
4.7.3	Combination of Atmospheric Science and Physics to form a thrust in the area of Space, Earth and Atmospheric Science .....	40
4.7.4	Create a Thrust in the area of Aeronautics/Astronautics and Space Sciences .....	42
4.7.5	Realignment of Programs involving some aspect of the Atmosphere .....	42
4.7.6	Realignment of Computing programs.....	45
4.7.7	Restructuring of the College of Engineering .....	50
4.7.8	Restructuring Liberal Arts into Two Schools.....	52
4.7.9	Restructuring the Colleges of Science and Liberal Arts into four Divisions.....	55
4.7.10	Restructuring the Colleges of Science, Liberal Arts and Nursing into four Divisions .....	59
4.7.11	College of Professional Studies .....	62
4.7.12	Combining the Colleges of Science and Engineering to create a “new” College of Science and Engineering with rearrangement of current departments and elimination of the Department of Mathematical Sciences .....	68
4.7.13	Elimination-Integration of the Department of Psychology by merging into “new” College of Science and Engineering through likely association with Computer Science and Systems Engineering.....	71
4.7.14	Merger of College of Business Administration, Engineering Management and Public Policy Program .....	71

4.7.14 Merger of Colleges of Engineering and Business Administration (with four schools).....	75
5. Conclusions.....	78
Appendix A Faculty Senate Bill – Updated SB187 .....	79
Appendix B Faculty Senate Bill – Updated SB190 .....	82
Appendix C Proposed Faculty Senate Bill .....	85
Appendix D Errata .....	90

## **1 Introduction**

The Chancellor of the University of Alabama charged the President of the UAHuntsville campus to realign the academic units to position the university for the future and to meet the needs of the community. When the Provost sought input and discussion from the faculty—and the faculty expressed its desire for such input, the Faculty Senate responded by passing a Sense of the Senate Resolution on February 3, 2009, setting up the Academic Realignment Committee (ARC). ARC comprises two members from each college in the university, plus one from the Library, all nominated and elected by faculty in the respective units. Each college’s representation on ARC consists of one member of the Faculty Senate, chosen by that college’s Senators, and one member eligible for the Faculty Senate, elected by the faculty of the respective college. The Senate’s Governance and Operations Committee conducted the election.

The Faculty Senate charged the committee with two tasks: (1) developing a “best practices” report that summarizes (a) faculty input regarding realignment, (b) lessons learned from other academic institutions, and (c) recommendations for academic realignment; and (2) developing a set of formal procedures for faculty involvement to protect academic integrity in cases in which realignment occurs. The Senate asked that ARC’s report be presented to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee and to the Provost and the President by the end of the 2008-2009 academic year.

### **1.1 Priorities and Principles in Restructuring**

After researching the experiences of other universities and the policies concerning restructuring and realignment at other institutions in the UA System, the Realignment Committee considers that, for the University to be sustainable and successful and to grow, certain priorities and principles must guide any restructuring of academic units. Any reorganization done, even for the sake of cost reductions, must be implemented with every effort to preserve the University’s core mission: dissemination of knowledge through research, creative achievement, and teaching. Prior to any reorganization, possibilities for developing synergies without restructuring academic units should be explored. Ideas for streamlining academic units should originate in, be driven by, and be approved by colleges, departments, programs, or research centers. The faculty, chairs, directors, and deans must work out the best strategy, given their expertise and knowledge of critical research areas, educational programs, student needs, and national trends, as well as the impact of these changes on other university programs. Differences in educational mission, curriculum, research focus and approaches, tenure and promotion expectations, faculty workload, and culture must be taken into account. Moreover, maintaining disciplinary identity has value in the profession and, therefore, value to the

university. Reorganizations must maintain our external reputation and enhance recruitment of faculty and students. Any restructuring of academic units also must maintain or improve the integrity and quality of existing academic programs and be done with an eye to growth potential. Whatever realigning of academic units takes place must be accomplished in a manner consistent with policies established by the UA System, UA Huntsville, and in the UA Huntsville Faculty Handbook. Any restructuring or realignment must rigorously adhere to tenure guidelines, as expressed in *AAUP Policy Document and Reports*.

## **1.2 Acknowledgments**

The Academic Realignment Committee acknowledges and thanks all those who contributed in our efforts to complete this report. Their efforts to consider and evaluate various realignment ideas that enhance our University's mission needs while maintaining the academic integrity are highly appreciated.

## 2 Lessons Learned

Universities around the country are currently challenged with reorganizing/realigning their institutions. Realignment can be conducted from the “top down” or from the “bottom up.” “Bottom up” realignments are not heavily discussed in public and are driven mostly by educational considerations and respond to a changing technological and scientific atmosphere. For example, portions of existing units break out and form a new unit in a subject area that had not yet existed when the classic “parent” units were formed. “Top down” realignments are initiated by the administration and driven in most cases by financial considerations. These realignments gather public attention as they often diametrically oppose the vision that the faculty has for its institution. At least that is the perception of the faculty, as “top down” realignments are often conducted hastily within a brief period of time and with a lack of systematic input from the faculty.

In an assessment of U.S. universities, the committee found three different approaches to realignment:

1. Policies have been established with comprehensive input from the faculty, typically well ahead of implementing realignments
2. Policies are established, and faculty input is sought concurrently with an ongoing realignment
3. An ad hoc, “top-down” response to a financial crisis is used.

It is clear that a university should have a clear and agreed upon policy for realignments, mergers and the implementation of new structures. It is advantageous to establish these policies without the pressure of a looming crisis. Ad hoc responses can threaten a university’s academic integrity, because the faculty who have the expertise in their respective disciplines are only minimally involved in the decision-making.

### 2.1 Observations and Lessons Learned

*Indiana University (2003)* has a very explicit policy that covers transfers, mergers, reorganization, reduction and the elimination of academic programs. It clearly distinguishes between (i) transfers, mergers, reorganization, reduction and elimination of programs in an attempt to significantly enhance the educational process and (ii) a state of financial exigency, declared by the chancellor.

1. Transfers, mergers, reorganization, reduction and elimination of programs are brought about by factors that aim at “enhancing the educational process,” “ensuring the long-term viability of the educational mission” and are not an adjustment for temporary budget or enrollment variations. The procedures are laid out clearly and in great detail (responsibilities of deans, faculty and student involvement, impact on other programs and the university as a whole, chain of command in decision making, etc.). Three models are proposed, addressing situations where there is “strong opposition,” “uncertainty regarding the change” and “little to no opposition.” In all the models tenured and untenured faculty members are well protected, and steps are outlined that discuss “phase-in periods” (at least 2 years), “reassignment and retraining” and “preservation of tenure status” and “maintaining rate of compensation and benefits and credits.”
2. If the chancellor declares a state of financial exigency, the ‘Policy on Dealing with the Effect of Financial Difficulties Upon Faculty at IUPUI’ comes into effect. This policy follows closely the guidelines set forth by AAUP.

The Indiana Document does not necessarily call for a “from the bottom up” approach. They see the need for a policy, so that necessary and mostly financially-driven restructurings will be conducted in an orderly fashion. They point out:

“However, such changes should not be undertaken if the savings to be realized are inconsequential, and both the tangible and intangible costs of program changes must be addressed.”

“When an academic program is to be transferred, merged, reorganized, reduced, or eliminated, every effort should be made to phase the changes in over an adequate period of time with due notice given to staff and students, and with consideration of contractual rights of faculty whose appointments will be affected. In case of program elimination, the phase-in periods should not be less than two years. In any such changes, the impact on students, particularly those already enrolled in affected program(s), must be considered.”

*The University of Georgia (2006)* elaborates on procedures as to how restructuring is supposed to be initiated:

The procedure here is based on “proposals” that are generated on the departmental level and are then forwarded up the chain of command. Clearly, a bottom-up approach is advocated here. Furthermore, the academic mission and academic integrity are set forth as governing criteria:

“A proposal for change in the organizational structure of an academic unit shall be justified in terms of the academic mission of the university. If changes are proposed for administrative or fiscal reasons, the proposal should be mindful of disciplinary and interdisciplinary integrity.”

Secondly, the procedures call for the affected faculty to vote on such a proposal, requiring a two-thirds vote for an approval. If the faculty rejects the proposal for reorganization, procedures call for the installation of an External Review Panel, which will be convened by the Provost and must have at least one member from the affected unit’s faculty.

*The University of Minnesota (1999)* strengthens the role of the Senate when it comes to restructuring:

“In general, both the Senate and its committees should be involved in any organizational decision affecting an academic unit made at the level of the campus or college or across colleges.”

“It is the position of the Senate that program changes within colleges should be subject to appropriate consultation with faculty and students from the beginning of planning for such changes.”

Furthermore, the involvement of the entire faculty is emphasized:

“The campus assembly (or analogous body) of an affected campus or college unit shall review and make recommendations on the establishment of new collegiate units, merger or elimination of existing collegiate units, or the addition to an existing campus/college of a major new mission with college- or campus-wide impact or ramification.”

## 2.2 Lessons Learned from Past Realignments

***MIT (1988)*** stresses the fact that: “the key to the success of the Institute has been the maintenance of a system of shared governance.” In 1988 the Applied Biological Science (ABS) division has been closed without the consent of the faculty affected, which led to the following:

“We therefore recommend the introduction into Policies and Procedures of a specific procedural step to be used in future reorganization, which will help insure that a consultative process has been followed.”

The MIT example clearly indicates that policies need to be written before restructuring occurs.

***Northeastern State University, OK (2004)*** reports that administrative restructuring was the result of an 18 month-long organizational review process and led to the consolidation of several colleges based on department commonalities. According to their president, the restructuring did not threaten the autonomy of any degree program or discipline and did not impact teaching loads. Emphasis here was on commonalities in existing programs.

***The University of Northern Colorado (2003-04)*** responded to an “unprecedented” budget reduction with a restructuring plan entitled “Charting the Future,” which is based upon the following guiding principles:

- Value and respect all participants
- Value and recognize individual and collective investment in the university
- Exercise civility and integrity
- Create a culture of trust
- Welcome discourse that will inform decisions in the best interest of the university
- Be committed to open, honest and timely communications
- Implement a timeline driven by the academic and fiscal demands
- Be guided by clearly articulated criteria that are balanced and grounded in the mission
- Be mindful of the various communities that the university serves and those that shape the future

A total of 143 unit reports were reviewed by their respective deans or vice presidents and then submitted to the 'Design Team' that consisted of the president, vice presidents, assistant and associate vice presidents. The university restructured by merging two to five departments into schools, with directors and individual program managers, and these schools into colleges with deans. Five main colleges were formed, not including graduate studies, and each college has at least six schools. Each school then had between two and six programs. Recognizing the roles of the student population and alumni donor support, their advancement and recruitment offices were increased.

Substantial savings occurred by limiting use of part-time faculty, who apparently were paid in the same range as regular faculty. No tenured, tenure-track or clinical faculty were laid off and no programs were terminated.

The restructuring was met with limited success so that the university now considers returning to a more traditional departmental structure.

“While the director position might seem to offer an opportunity for leadership development, the task of recruiting and retaining directors has proven difficult for various reasons, including workload and the move of the directors to exempt employee status.”

“While the grouping of multiple disciplines into schools ostensibly affords a more manageable span of direct reports to college deans, there has been a noticeable decline in the ability of program areas to articulate their needs and concerns at the colleges level, since the director, as a line officer, must serve as a conduit to the dean for formal communication. .... More than two-thirds of the program areas independently identified the additional layer of bureaucracy as impeding the smooth and efficient flow of information.”

“Several programs in multidisciplinary schools have indicated that total administrative costs to support the school/director structure are higher than they would be with a structure with program-level administration.”

In hindsight they feel that the discussion was not sufficient even though 143 reports were requested and studied. They also recognized that the success of a university stands and falls with its students: attracting, keeping and graduating them on time are paramount. Hence, leveraging techniques should be studied, that is, determining the range of financial support necessary to get a student to come to the institution. For example: giving three students one-third support puts the institution 2 FTEs ahead.

## 2.3 Observations on Universities Currently Undergoing Realignment

UMass Amherst (2009) is currently going through a process of restructuring, which was initiated in a top-down approach by the chancellor in an effort to reduce costs. A task force consisting of several department heads and was put in place after the fact by the chancellor in a response to the dismay expressed by faculty. The process is ongoing and guided by the following criteria:

- Efficiencies in administration: immediate and longer term
- Demonstrated responsiveness to the economic crisis
- Minimizing disruption to strategic planning or implementation processes already in progress
- Strategic opportunities/positioning the campus for the future. Potential effect of a reorganization alternative on the ability to position the campus to increase excellence in research, teaching and engagement
- New research and engagement opportunities for collaboration and partnership within and across departments, schools and colleges and with other universities and research organizations
- New education and outreach opportunities for collaboration and partnership within and across departments, schools and colleges and with other universities and research organizations.

UMass has a number of colleges with similar focuses: (College of Natural Resources and Environment, College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics; College of Humanities and Fine Arts, College of Social and Behavioral Sciences) and the aim is to reduce the number of Colleges. The proposal is to merge two similar colleges, thus going from four to two colleges, while keeping all other colleges and schools in place (College of Education, College of Engineering, and the following schools: Management, Nursing, Public Health Science, Agriculture).

In addition, the task force introduced the following alternative suggestions for restructuring:

1. The two mergers of colleges should be considered as two different plans
2. Integration of life sciences should move forward and cohesion in other sciences, (e.g. physical, mathematical and computational) should be considered carefully. “Therefore, even as the campus moves forward with

a new streamlined structure composed of fewer colleges and schools, we recommend that all potential moves of departments from one college or school to another be made only after further analysis.”

3. The formation of a College of Arts and Sciences should be explored
4. A “Seven College Model” as alternative to the College of Arts and Science model should be explored, in an effort to allow the life, physical, environmental and computational sciences to begin developing appropriate administrative structure to harness collaboration and integration.
5. The task force strongly recommended against combining the College of Humanities and Fine Arts and the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences as it will work against strategic advancement of research, education and engagement for the campus.

The proposed saving of \$ 1.3 to 1.5 million looks like a clear financial benefit. However, a closer look at these savings revealed that the calculations are misleading as for instance the elimination of dean position is considered a saving, and the fact that this dean will return to his/her departments with academic salaries is disregarded. UMass Amherst is a unionized campus and no faculty or staff lay-offs are to be expected.

***Brandeis University (2009)*** concentrated its restructuring activities solely on the College of Arts and Sciences in an effort to reduce costs and appointed the Dean of this school to chair the Curriculum and Academic Restructuring Steering Committee. Other schools (International Business, Social Policy and Management, Continuing Studies) are not affected.

The committee was charged by the provost with establishing and coordinating appropriate procedures, consistent with the Faculty Handbook to recommend:

- Changes to the General Education requirements with the School of Arts and Sciences
- Changes to the curriculum in Arts and Sciences that will lead to greater synergies and flexibility and that will enable the Arts and Science faculty budget to be reduced
- The curriculum to be offered during a “third semester” occurring in the summer
- Reductions and changes in the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences’ programs

- Changes in the administrative and/or departmental structures of the Academy that will improve efficiency and /or result in financial savings or facilitate the needed reduction in faculty

Initially, proposals were developed that focused on increasing revenue from tuition-paying students, then the Curriculum and Academic Restructuring Steering Committee suggested to:

- Combine three departments with similar focus into one interdepartmental program
- Cut 10% of the faculty
- Reduce the size of most Ph.D. programs

As a result, the following actions are being taken:

- Faculty reduction (about 30 positions) will be achieved over the next five years through departures and retirements.
- The number of Ph.D. students that are funded by University stipends will be reduced by 20%.
- Classes with less than eight students enrolled after preregistration will not be taught.
- Faculty members are encouraged to teach a greater variety of courses.

### ***Universities of the Alabama System***

Our sister institutions in Birmingham and Tuscaloosa are also in the process of evaluating realignment options.

**UAB (2009)** announced the formation of an academic realignment committee that is staffed with one faculty member and the chair of the faculty senate, one attorney, one company chairman, one school superintendent, two former university chancellors, a representative of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, and an undergraduate and a graduate student representative.

The committee suggested abolishing one Department in the School of Social and Behavioral Sciences and another Department in the School of Business. The School of Business has academic and service departments; it is not clear which type of department is recommended for elimination. The web-page of the School of Social and Behavioral Sciences still lists all six departments.

No current policy on Mergers, Realignment or Discontinuances of programs could be found in the school's Faculty Handbook; only bona fide financial exigencies are described.

**UA (1994)** established Principles and Procedures for Merger or Discontinuance of Academic Units in 1994 and a standing committee called the University Committee on the Merger or Discontinuance of Programs will represent the faculty as a whole in cases where mergers or discontinuance could result in termination of a faculty appointment. All determinations for the merger and discontinuance of programs would be based essentially on educational considerations. Factors to be considered are: program viability, avoiding duplication, economic effects, and strengthening related programs.

### **3. Procedures for Realignment**

A critical element of ARC's mission was to design a set of formal procedures for faculty involvement to protect academic integrity if realignment occurs. The Committee wishes to stress that for a major realignment to be successful, an orderly process must be in place and then followed. Careful evaluation of the options and their potential consequences takes *time*. In the current situation, *no academic unit realignments (including those discussed in this document) should be implemented until at least Fall 2010*. The process must ensure that academic unit realignment is done for educational benefit rather than merely for cost-saving purposes. Realignment of academic units has long-term and potentially deleterious effects and should not be undertaken for immediate financial considerations.

A search into existing policies at UAHuntsville turned up two relevant bills that the Faculty Senate had passed in 1988 but that had quietly disappeared from the *Faculty Handbook*. ARC members determined that these procedures were still on the books and thus were the official governing policy. The first, SB 187, delineated a "policy and procedure for termination of academic programs." The second, SB 190, addressed "rights and privileges of faculty with tenure in terminated programs." The Academic Realignment Committee revised these bills to reflect current university structures (i.e., taking out references to the School of Primary Medical Care, changing the title of the Provost to reflect current status, and changing the names of the appropriate Faculty Senate committees). The Committee then reported these bills to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, which approved them unanimously and brought them to the full Senate. On April 30, 2009, a unanimous Faculty Senate passed *SB 322: POLICY AND PROCEDURES FOR TERMINATION OF ACADEMIC PROGRAMS* (Update of passed SB 187) and *SB 323: RIGHTS AND PRIVILEGES OF FACULTY WITH TENURE IN TERMINATED PROGRAMS* (Update of passed SB 190). See *Appendices A and B* for the text of these bills.

In an effort to address issues that were not included in the two earlier policies and because the university currently does not have a detailed policy regarding the combination, division or termination of academic units, ARC proposes an additional bill (see *Appendix C*) that ensures faculty involvement and protects the academic integrity of the university's programs.

Given that the faculty have the disciplinary expertise as well as extensive knowledge of students' needs, proposals for academic realignment should mandate extensive faculty involvement. No matter where or why they originate, proposals for academic unit realignment should be presented to the affected academic units and then be considered via the process detailed in the proposed bill.

In the first phase, each dean, working with his/her college chairs and faculty, should be asked to develop and present to the Provost an academic realignment plan for his/her college in a timely fashion. Academic realignment plans that could result in the elimination or merger of two or more colleges should only be explored after the affected colleges have examined all their options. If a proposed realignment involves academic units from multiple colleges, affected faculty in each academic unit from all affected colleges must be involved in the preparation and approval of the realignment proposal. Financial crises are not in themselves adequate reasons for ignoring any step of this academic realignment process or forcing a schedule that prevents adequate discussion. No academic realignments should be made if the cost savings or other benefits are inconsequential. The process of realignment may stop at any time if there is evidence of inconsequential benefits or harmful consequences to the educational mission of the academic unit.

ARC recommends the following process (see *Appendix C* for the bill):

1. If the academic unit where the academic realignment proposal originates determines that sufficient reasons exist for realigning academic units, then it shall develop a formal realignment proposal in consultation with faculty, staff, students, administrators, and wherever needed, community stakeholders and professional leaders.
2. The affected academic unit shall obtain evidence of support or rejection of the proposed realignment through methods that allow adequate discussion. Evidence shall include, but not be limited to letters, votes, and survey results. The affected academic unit shall provide sufficient time and means for affected academic units to discuss and approve the proposed realignment. An absolute majority of the faculty (tenured, tenure-earning campus-wide, clinical in Nursing, and lecturers in the Library) of each affected academic unit must be in favor of realignment to constitute support.
3. If the proposed realignment is deemed appropriate by the affected parties, a written statement defining the proposed realignment and rationales for change shall be prepared that includes the items listed below. This written statement and its accompanying evidence of support or rejection shall then be presented to the dean of the affected academic unit.
  - a. an evaluation current and proposed program requirements;
  - b. a transition plan for currently enrolled students;
  - c. a review both curriculum and resource coordination with other academic units;
  - d. an assessment of both the tangible and intangible costs and benefits of proposed academic realignment;
  - e. a clear discussion about how the mission of the academic unit will be enhanced with the proposed realignment;
  - f. evidence of support and rejection of the proposed realignment; and
  - g. A plan to implement the proposed academic realignment.
4. The dean shall, in turn, prepare a written statement concerning the realignment that addresses the same criteria identified above, especially the extent to which education and research at UAHuntsville will be enhanced. The dean shall forward the recommendation to the Provost, along with the evidence of support or rejection from appropriate parties including the following:
  - a. the College's Council of Chairs;
  - b. the College's Curriculum Committee;
  - c. the College's staff; and
  - d. community stakeholders and professional leaders, where appropriate.
5. The Provost, in turn, shall prepare a written statement concerning the realignment, to be accompanied by all materials discussed above. After presenting all the materials to and after consulting with appropriate parties such as the Council of Deans, University Curriculum Committee and the

President, the provost may forward the written proposal along with all the previous statements and evidence described above to the Board of Trustees for review and approval.

It should be noted that UAH Faculty Handbook already provides for a flexible response to immediate needs without a realignment of academic units.

“In an effort to encourage interdisciplinary approaches to teaching, research, and public service, UAH has interdisciplinary groupings of scholars that are more flexible and transitory than academic departments. These groupings bring together faculty from two or more departments and experts from outside the university to address new ideas. They may then disband without altering departmental structures or, if needed on a long-term basis, become a permanent part of the university’s structure” [FH 4.2]. (At UAHuntsville, these programs are often called “cognates.”); and

The UAH Faculty Handbook already emphasizes the importance of faculty involvement in determining academic realignment:

“Major functions of the dean include providing leadership to department and program chairs, faculty, and staff in the development, operation, and improvement of academic and research programs; developing and recommending to the provost of budgets for departments, programs, and academic support areas....” [FH 4.3];

“The performance and relevance of a department normally are reviewed at least every five years or in conjunction with a department’s professional accreditation review cycle. Findings and recommendations of review committees are submitted to the provost. After consultation and agreement with the president, the provost may recommend that a department be continued, or a proposal to dissolve or reorganize the department may be forwarded to the Board of Trustees for review and approval” [FH 4.4];

“The chair is expected to provide academic leadership for the department. . . . The chair has administrative responsibility for ensuring the quality and effectiveness of the department’s instructional, research, and service programs. Department chairs have the responsibility to provide leadership in formulating and in implementing departmental goals and long-range plans; to represent the department internally within administrative and governance structures of the university. . . . ” [FH 4.5];

“Faculty review of administrative performance and program effectiveness is accomplished by conducting formal program reviews at least at five-year intervals, with the faculty also participating in the regular, ongoing evaluation of administrative leadership, program direction, and program quality.” [FH 6.1].

All three Bills are provided in the Appendices.

## **4 Assessment and Evaluation of Realignment Ideas**

### **4.1 Guiding Principles**

In reviewing various proposed ideas for academic realignment at UAHuntsville, this committee assumed that the purpose and goals of the academic realignment are as follows:

1. Fostering the growth of academic programs measured in terms of the (a) increased student enrollment, (b) increased rate of graduation of undergraduate students within four years of study, (c) enhanced quality of academic programs, and (d) enhanced reputation of the university in the community and the nation;
2. Increasing funding for research, development, and creative endeavors that results in high quality academic publications and attraction of undergraduate and graduate students;
3. Maintaining and/or increasing the academic and professional accreditations of various academic programs and colleges; and
4. Reducing cost by increasing the efficiency of various academic units.

### **4.2 General Comments that apply to all ideas**

1. Based on available data from the Office of Institutional Research essentially all undergraduate degrees are at ACHE minimums; those that are not are generally given service department exemptions. Obviously, many of the programs suggested for combination are well above ACHE minimums and are programs that strongly contribute to the fiscal well-being of UAH. Disruption of these programs and their identity with students and alumni could lead to decreases in student populations and alumni support with little definable gain.
2. Programs at UAH are, of course, interdependent. Almost half of the first and second year requirements for nursing and engineering are taught by units in other colleges. Shifting emphasis by combining existing departments into new thrust areas and limiting faculty hires to those areas (a) could cause a serious disruption in available instructors for required courses and (b) could result in faculty being “pigeon-holed” into other college service courses, effectively minimizing their growth potential.

3. Substantial salary differences exist across the various colleges on campus. For better or for worse, this is an accepted fact. Forcing departments or colleges together across these differences can only be termed problematic. Just expecting faculty suddenly thrust together to “just get over it” will not lead to productive interactions.
4. Almost half of the programs at UAHuntsville depend on external accreditation to attract students. It should be noted that in the past UAHuntsville did well maintaining accreditation for its existing degree programs. Merging of departments into different functional units while still trying to keep all programs may well jeopardize future accreditations.
5. Since restructuring is a long-term effort, not a means to address a short-term financial challenge, all ideas for restructuring should be ones that have a positive benefit over a long-term time frame. Restructurings that grow the University are also preferred.
6. Finally, all realignment possibilities have been and should be evaluated for the benefit of the university independent of current personalities involved.

### **4.3 Assessment of Academic Realignment Ideas**

#### ***4.3.1 Establishment of a Freshman College***

Increasing retention can help alleviate University financial pressures. For example, each increase of 100 in-state students or 45 out of state students brings the University an additional \$600,000 per year.

Freshmen retention could be aided with an expanded freshman-focused program, perhaps in the form of a Freshman College (or Division). The goal of a Freshman College could be to guide freshmen through their first year, to wit by providing integrated, seamless, and continuous recruitment, admission, and mentoring of students. It could be the responsible placement testing and advising body for students with fewer than 45 credit hours or during their first transfer semester. Its advising functions are not to decrease the involvement of departmental faculty in advising, which is highly encouraged, but to provide a University-wide and integrated approach to ensuring students receive the services and support that they need. In other words the goal of a Freshman College is to convey to the current and potential students that we have an

interest in their success and to have monitoring and intervention programs uniformly across the campus to retain more students. The College should be created in a way that does not increase bureaucracy substantially; the University may need to work issues between this programmatic element and the Dean of Students. Some functions that could be included: Advising, Counseling, Financial aid, Student Development, Health, Housing, Testing Services, and Tutoring.

#### ***4.3.2 Expanding Current Honors Program***

UAHuntsville currently has an Honors Program in which many students have participated and experienced academic growth. This program can be expanded, with the goal of growing the program into an Honors College. The goal of an Honors College is to build an exciting, prestigious collegiate experience for high achieving students. Expanding the current Honors Program, especially if coupled with generous scholarships, can help make UAHuntsville even more a destination of choice for excellent students. As the Program grows into a College, this expansion could thus greatly aid in recruitment and retention. Strengthening the Honors Program can build a community of learners with a unique identity at UAHuntsville. Graduates of the Honors College at UAHuntsville would also be highly sought by employers for excellence in their fields of study, leadership skills, and sense of community responsibility. The list below contains ideas for increasing student participation in and the success of the Honors College. These could be phased in over a few years; some already exist at UAHuntsville.

- Admit freshmen students into the Honors College using competitive criteria.
- Establish additional recruitment scholarships for students that join the Honors Program upon entry. These scholarships can help bring the best and brightest students to UAHuntsville. Use corporate sponsors to establish connections to students with potential employers (scholarships without strings attached).
- Establish retention scholarships for Honors participants based on merit and sponsored by corporations or endowed by alumni of the Honors College
- House Honors students together. Required for freshmen and optional for sophomores to seniors.
- Provide a student mentor to freshmen.
- Establish a mentoring program with executives or professionals in North Alabama. Place every Honors student with mentor in either a private or public agency. The pairing would necessarily be based on the student's

major. The goal of this type of mentoring is to develop leadership skills, professionalism, and confidence.

- Establish an Honors student association.
- Provide longer library loan periods to Honors students.
- Provide summer institutes that focus on interdisciplinary topics.
- Encourage study abroad and provide competitive grants for proposals.
- Establish a tie to the newly formed Student Success Center.
- Offer priority registration for Honors students.
- Establish cluster classes for freshmen so that small groups of Honors students take at least 3 classes together in fall and spring semesters.
- Designate some sections of courses as Honors and limit numbers of students in these sections.
- Develop service learning opportunities for students in the Honors program.
- Develop a transcript for Honors students that documents service learning, interdisciplinary, international, cultural, and other unique experiences during collegiate years.
- Continue research emphasis.
- Evaluate faculty stipend for developing and/or teaching Honors sections.
- Provide competitive funding opportunities for research.
- Develop an Honors College Journal to publish student manuscripts yearly (scholarly, research, and creative writing).
- Develop an Honors College conference with papers accepted from students around the US.
- Allow Honors students to enroll in graduate classes (evaluated on case by case basis).
- Develop an Honors College Arts event to showcase the fine arts.
- Provide one theater production each year. Honors students, under the direction of a faculty mentor, would execute functions necessary to plan and produce a play.
- Provide web space for a student-maintained social networking site (with guidelines for professionalism).

### **4.3.3 *Eliminate Graduate School***

It is recommended that the Graduate School be eliminated and its work could be handled as follows:

- International admissions should be handled by Office of International Programs and Services
- Regular graduate admissions should be handled by the Admissions Office in collaboration with each College
- Each college will schedule its own defense etc.
- Office of the Provost will coordinate other related aspects in the graduate school.

Best practices note: University of Minnesota recently restructured their graduate office. Georgia College and State University recently eliminated their Graduate Dean, with services decentralized to the units. Other universities maintain graduate offices without having all graduate activities centralized.

One way to accomplish the above would be to reassign the Graduate office staff to the Provost's area. Such a move may allow one or two staff positions to be saved in time.

Salary savings: \$150,000-\$200,000/yr. (does not include benefits or office expenses)

## **4.4 Assessment of Research Related Ideas**

### **4.4.1 *Investigators Not Affiliated with Research Centers***

Research driven education is one of the cornerstones (pride) at the University. Unaffiliated investigators are on the forefront of integrating students in scientific research.

- Develop an infrastructure (on departmental, college and university level) that supports research of single investigators. Current support from OSP is unsatisfactory, especially when considering that unaffiliated investigators carry 46.5% overhead (48.0 % by 2012), whereas the effective overhead rate at UAHuntsville is 20%. That is, single investigators carry a heavy load in F/A recovery and should receive appropriate support.
- Re-evaluate policies for buyouts; faculty members are currently discouraged by the requirement of 40% buy-out for one course.

#### ***4.4.2 Evaluate Productivity***

Evaluate productivity with respect to how research centers strengthen the academic mission of the university.

#### ***4.4.3 Strengthen Relationship Among Research Centers and Academic Units***

We received several requests to evaluate incentives for closer collaboration among research centers and academic units. Closer collaboration will result in synergies, increased research funding for the University, and the transfer of cutting edge ideas from researchers to students.

### **4.5 Assessment of Management Related Ideas**

#### ***4.5.1 Classroom Utilization and Utility Costs***

To the best knowledge of this committee, very little has been done to analyze utility costs at the University. UAHuntsville could consult with its Oak Ridge National Laboratories partner to determine how to save on utility costs. University personnel have analyzed Friday classroom usage and found that only 5% of classrooms are used on Fridays. This is the result of years of trying to satisfy a variety of scholarly and educational needs, primarily student demand. Rather than forcing more Friday classroom usage, UAH should consider moving classes out of minimally used buildings and shutting those classrooms down on Fridays, or even closing major sections of certain buildings, while at the same time maintaining heating/cooling in research-intensive areas and buildings with weekend instructional activities. The fixed costs of classrooms have already been paid (and these classrooms are needed to fulfill the demand of the majority of our students for classes on Monday through Thursday). Forcing more Friday classes would only increase variable costs (lighting, heating, air conditioning, janitorial services, and the like), drive away students who for a variety of reasons do not want to be forced to take classes on Fridays (especially in the afternoon), encourage students to cut more classes (inhibiting their academic accomplishments), reduce faculty research productivity (by limiting travel and reducing uninterrupted blocks of time necessary for research), and further reduce time available for necessary committee meetings. Friday afternoons could be used primarily for classes that would benefit from, say, a three-hour seminar session.

Another option could be to rent out freed-up space.

Best practices note: Many state agencies across the country have saved on utilities by using 4 day work weeks.

At least for the present, difficult fiscal situation, the University should be governed by best-practices rather than by a force-fit dream. The present annual utility costs at UAH are \$5,250,401. We should be able to save at least 10% for a net gain of \$525,000.

#### ***4.5.2 Elimination of the UA System Office***

While quite drastic and perhaps outside the scope of our committee and perhaps university, we need to think about making such a proposal to the State of Alabama. Elimination of the system office could save about \$4-5 M per year.

#### ***4.5.3 Tuition and Fee Structure***

Certain changes in tuition and fee structure could be useful, particularly if recruiting efforts yield more students. Three changes that may be useful to evaluate are listed and described next:

- Differential Tuition/Fees by Level: Evaluate feasibility of differential tuition and/or fees for lower- versus upper-division courses.
- Differential Tuition/Fees by Program: Evaluate feasibility of differential tuition and/or fees for certain programs. There may be unforeseen consequences of this action, for example impacts that could be inconsistent with other educational interests.
- Tuition Insurance: Evaluate feasibility of raising tuition for freshmen, but guarantee tuition amount for next 3 (4?) years.

Two differential tuition models (differential by level) are shown in the table that follows. The table lists yearly tuition by class standing for each model. The models are approximately revenue-neutral (compared to current tuition). The first model (Model 1) has a much lower tuition for freshmen, lower tuition for sophomores, and higher tuition for upperclassmen. The second model (Model 2) has a lower tuition for freshmen only. The tuition values in the table for freshmen are based on a mean of the University's current rate of tuition and that of the nearby community colleges.

Class Standing versus Annual Tuition Income, Two Tuition Models  
(based on *2005-6 Factbook*)

Class Standing	Number of Students	Current Annual Tuition (\$)	Possible Ann. Tuition (\$), Model 1	Possible Tuition (\$), Model 2
Freshman	1554	6200	4400	4200
Sophomore	1119	6200	6000	6900
Junior	1262	6200	7200	6900
Senior	1726	6200	7200	6900
Total	5661			
Income [\$M]		35.1	35.1	35.1

**4.5.4 Evaluation of Summer Stipends**

Consider some change in summer pay arrangements.

**4.5.5 Interim Administrative Appointments**

Make interim appointments by deploying existing administrators in other units to handle short-term financial challenges. For example, Deans and Chairs who hold regular appointments can be designated Interim Deans and Chairs where needed. While not ideal, this solution may be suitable in the short term to produce budget savings while protecting the academic integrity of colleges, keeping the colleges in place during periods of financial challenge. Other examples: use the Chief of Staff (or current Provost) as an interim Provost, Provost as an interim Dean, give an administrator double-duty as Dean of Grad School (e.g., Chief of Staff or line dean to do this) without extra pay, Graduate office staff remain in place as-is with oversight from the new administrator.

Care must be taken with interim appointments not to endanger accreditation or to create other concerns. An additional challenge is that lack of a permanent dean may weaken the external face of the college.

**4.5.6 Provide Incentives to Faculty and/or Staff to Retire, Enhance Emeriti Role (One-Time Incentive Offer)**

Rationale: Cost savings have been mentioned as critical to the University. Furthermore, budgetary issues have been publicly reported by the Administration as one of the bases for realignment/restructuring. There are

many ways to achieve cost savings that can lessen the need for more draconian restructurings that could impact the long-term viability of offerings of the University, especially to the extent that such restructurings impact the ability of the University to meet Power of 10 goals to grow the student body, increase the number of PhDs, and support aims such as improvement of the faculty quality. Some cost savings also reposition the University, for example, by increasing the rate of new faculty influx into the University or by allowing opportunities for faculty to retrain. Other cost savings simultaneously aid University in repositioning toward needs of region. Some ideas that could be considered are listed below.

One-time incentives are voluntary measures that preserve faculty/staff choice, and those who accept may be senior faculty/staff with high salaries. Vacancies allow the university to reposition a unit internally in line with current and projected high-growth areas. However, desired faculty/staff may leave and some who would have retired without an incentive may take the incentive. There may be start-up costs for new faculty in some disciplines, too. Since in Alabama such an incentive can compete against DROP, it has to involve enough money to be an effective incentive. Later in this section, we make a case that a plan can be constructed that is competitive with DROP while positively benefiting both the University and faculty member. However, the faculty member may have unique expertise that the unit loses with the retirement.

For this option to be attractive to units, the position lost due to an incentive-encouraged retirement should remain in the unit.

**Best Practices.** The UC system some years ago was successful in moving professors from university budgets onto retirement system budgets; many professors remained on campus in part-time roles for several years at greatly reduced cost to the institution.

Harvard (February 2009 *Harvard Magazine*) and Iowa State (March 19, 2009 *Inside Iowa State*) have recently announced early retirement incentive programs.

*Offer Types.* Washburn University is offering an incentive of 50% of base pay plus three years health insurance as an early retirement benefit (*Topeka Capital Journal*, Jan. 20, 2009). Ohio University is currently offering an incentive of \$5,000 plus credit of one additional year toward retirement (OU Human Resources, Mar. 10, 2009). Washington State University offered a tax-free medical savings account valued at approximately three years of medical insurance premiums in February 2009 as an early retirement incentive (Washington State Office of the President posting, Feb. 2, 2009). Utah in 2007 reported an early retirement incentive valued at 20% of salary (Univ. of Utah Regulations Library Policy 5-306, 2007).

*Acceptance Information.* The University of Toledo in December 2008 offered an incentive of 2% of salary times years of service plus health insurance assistance for 3 years. 79 faculty have expressed an interest in the program (Univ. of Toledo Office of the Provost web posting, April 7, 2009). Dartmouth recently offered incentives that 70 staff members accepted (according to a Feb. 9, 2009 announcement in *Dartmouth News*). The University of Missouri system offered early retirement incentives in 2002 that 34% of eligible faculty accepted.

**Local Implementation Options and Example:** cash buy-outs paid as salary bonus in final year such that retirement benefit is impacted (e.g, \$30,000 for 25-year faculty, \$20,000 for 28+ year faculty), part-time teaching opportunities (e.g., \$5,000 per class for up to 3 courses total over two years). There are 27 faculty or staff members at the University with 28+ years service.

#### Savings Example:

Considers associate professor of education earning national average salary of \$64,669 (*InsideHigherEd*, April 2009), replaced by new assistant professor at the national average starting salary of \$53,304 (*InsideHigherEd*, April 2009) with \$4,000 search costs. Assumes retiree life expectancy of 20 years.

5 yr. UAH savings: \$56,825 less \$49,000 (search, buy-out, teaching) plus \$7,500 (savings from non-use of other part-timers) -> \$15,325 (plus benefits) plus opportunity to refocus program direction through the new hire. Savings will more than double if full professor retires, assuming pay at national average salary.

Benefit to Professor: \$45,000 in extra payments, retirement benefit increased by \$5,031 for life, and can retire at once or ease into retirement. Total extra lifetime value of taking standard retirement now: \$145,625 (DROP requires 3 more years of work and provides bonus of \$194,000 for 3 years service).

NOTE: Full Professor example would use \$82,226 as salary, with savings to UAH of \$103,110.

Possible total 5 year savings to University from option, assuming 9 faculty/senior staff (4 Fulls, 5 Associate Professors/senior staff; 33% participation) took the offer: \$450,000 (salary, excluding benefits).

*Variations:* Incentive as a percentage of salary up to a limit; partial salary for up to 3 years to continue guiding doctoral students; \$10,000 bonus for faculty member to commit to giving up tenure and retiring after 3 years (greatly aiding future planning).

#### ***4.5.7 Provide Incentives to Faculty to Take One Semester of Leave***

Incentives are voluntary measures that preserve faculty choice. Those who accept may be senior faculty with high salaries. Leave opportunities allow some faculty to focus on scholarly activity that could improve their unit's standing and funding base. During the leave period, the unit's budgetary pressures will be reduced temporarily. The unit has the ability to return to full complement of offerings after budgetary pressures pass is preserved. Some faculty may also decide they enjoy retirement and hasten their retirement. However, the faculty member may have unique expertise that complicates course offerings. Incentivized leave could also impact retirement service credits.

**Best Practices:** Method is an internal idea; we have no information on other schools that have used this method.

**Local Implementation Options:** One-time cash bonus (e.g., \$5,000), reduced load first semester back.

*Variation:* Provide travel and/or training fee reimbursements for faculty member to gain expertise and/or training in new methodologies.

#### ***4.5.8 Provide Incentives to Faculty to Take One Semester of Reduced Work Load/Pay***

Incentives are voluntary measures that preserve faculty choice. Those who accept may be senior faculty with high salaries. Reduced work loads may allow some faculty to increase their focus on scholarly activity. The leave may reduce temporary budget pressure for the unit while allowing for return to full strength of offerings after budgetary pressures pass. Some participants may decide they enjoy the reduced work load and opt to retire earlier. However, department course offerings may suffer, especially if faculty member has special expertise. This recommendation might affect retirement service credits.

**Best Practices:** This method is an internal idea; we have no information on other schools that have used this method. Other schools have used a related concept of job-sharing arrangements, however.

**Local Implementation Options:** Might offer 60% of regular pay to work 50% of regular load. Or, might offer 50% of regular pay to work 50% of regular load *plus* double pay for summer teaching one course the next summer (might

alleviate retirement service credit issue while achieving same cost structure as first option).

#### ***4.5.9 Identify Short-term Work in government IPA slots and Provide Incentives for Faculty Involvement***

*Outline:* University could identify opportunities with Oak Ridge, Marshall, Redstone, etc., for faculty members to rotate there for 1 or 2 semesters with one-time bonus to agency to adopt a faculty member (during the current budgetary pressures).

Voluntary measures preserve faculty choice. The result of this program could be increased collaborations between the UAH unit and the agency. Unit offerings may suffer in the short-term, however. The University receives the benefit of a returning faculty member better-oriented to the needs of the region. Faculty members may elect to remain with the agency rather than return to UAH.

**Best Practices:** Method is an internal idea; we have no information on other schools that have used this method.

**Local Implementation Options:** Institution explores suitable opportunities and makes faculty aware of them; institution initiates cooperative agreements with agencies that commit agency to providing minimal number of opportunities; faculty services offered to agency at 90% of UAH cost.

*Variation:* Offer faculty services to agency at 100% of UAH cost while giving faculty member 10% bonus.

#### ***4.5.10 Provide Incentives to Participation in a One-time Voluntary Salary Deferral***

Incentives and voluntary deferrals preserve faculty/staff choice and do not disadvantage those nearing retirement. This method gives the University the ability to shift costs to future years when budgets may be more robust with low total cost. Allows senior administration to demonstrate buy-in to personal sacrifice, defusing some criticism of recent hire expenses and deferring some of the current costs of those hires until future years when returns begin to accrue to the University. Monies could also be used as funding mechanism for other long-term cost savings efforts (such some of the ideas above) that have up-front costs. Participants may be able to receive some tax savings if method can be

structured suitably. This method also provides a savings-building mechanism for participants.

**Best Practices:** This method is an internal idea; we have no information on other schools that have used this method. Many corporations have utilized comparable methods, especially for high-ranking corporate officers, however. In some cases, such methods are mandatory for the officers.

**Local Implementation Options:** The University would allow each faculty or staff member to defer up to 10% of current year's salary into a deferral account. Monies would be repaid, at a 2-3% APY interest rate, to the faculty member in a series of payments after two or three years (with accelerated repayment in cases of death or disability).

*Variations:* Structure as current-year pay cut with return to regular salary the next year and repayment of deferred amount as a salary incentive in year three, if this method can be structured suitably for TRS. (i.e., a salary incentive may be more beneficial for those nearing retirement if the nominal "interest" received can become part of the TRS salary base for retirement). Another variant is to put the deferred amounts into something like the old 6-accounts, with earnings posted annually but with account principal frozen for two or three years. This variant allows participant to utilize monies for summer salary, student/staff support, equipment, travel, etc.

## 4.6 Assessment of Outreach Related Ideas

### 4.6.1 *Work with chambers of commerce to have a program for faculty similar to the Leadership Huntsville/Madison County program*

- To integrate faculty in the community and retain faculty
- To improve town and gown relationships
- To understand the needs of the community and the role of the university in the community

## 4.7 Unit Realignment Evaluations

In this section, some unit realignment evaluations are presented. Advantages and disadvantages of each idea are described. We note that many of the ideas here seem to be retrenchments of the University and thus should be handled with caution. Some ideas also add layers of hierarchy; such ideas likely have long-term costs, financial and otherwise, that could impede efficiency.

#### ***4.7.1 Combination of Biological Sciences, Chemistry and Chemical Engineering to emphasize Biochemistry and Biotechnology***

##### Current issues:

- Biotechnology graduate program is presently supported as interdisciplinary program and has limited core faculty.
- Biochemistry Program does not exist at UAHuntsville.
  - Why is combining present departments necessary to do this?

##### General advantages

- These new combinations may provide new ways of looking at research and teaching

##### General disadvantages.

- No examples can be found of research universities that have abolished their “free-standing” science and engineering departments.
- Faculty in present departments, are spread across multiple disciplines and not uniquely devoted to biochemistry and biotechnology.
- Faculty are at full teaching loads with their current assignments, with almost no capacity to add new teaching areas.
- Biotechnology is not a unique, well defined subject area. Programs that are identifiable to prospective students, and their parent may be lost, decreasing student population.
- Does the specific wording of this option signal that the proposal would be to terminate the M.S. and Ph.D. in Chemical Engineering (in conjunction with Mechanical Engineering), terminate the M.S. degree programs in Biology and Chemistry and not consider developing these programs into Ph.D. programs?
- Identity loss and accreditation worries.
- This proposal combines departments that depend on accreditation by their respective national organizations with one that does not.
- The continuing success of the pre-professional (pre-med, pre-dent, pre-vet, pre-pharma) programs may be jeopardized.
- Outside support concern

- No new faculty chairs-lines have been created from local industry-government support; may indicate a lack of support for unique “biotechnology” program.
- Could this program suffer the same decrease as optical science-optical engineering?

#### Potential Examples

- UC Berkeley
  - College of Chemistry
    - Chemical Engineering
    - Chemistry
      - Chemical Biology Program
  - College of Letters and Science
    - Biological Sciences Division
      - Department of Integrative Biology
      - Department of Molecular and Cell Biology
      - Also has sub-divisions within the division
- UI Urbana-Champaign
  - School of Chemical Sciences
    - Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering
    - Chemistry

## Combination of Biological Sciences, Chemistry and Chemical Engineering to emphasize Biochemistry and Biotechnology

Model	Advantages	Disadvantages	Possible financial impact
<p>Combined departments of Chemistry, Biology, Chemical and Materials Engineering within College of Science</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased interaction in limited areas.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Emphasis may away from established and required core-competencies.</li> <li>• Most faculty are not involved in new research topic (only 2 of 7 in CHE, 5 of 11 in CH, 6 of 11 in BYS)</li> <li>• If only 2 of 7 CHE faculty participate/move then there is no CHE representation in this option.</li> <li>• Will limit our ability to respond to other subject areas that would more naturally evolve.</li> <li>• A chairman with the capacity to balance 5 different programs successfully will be costly.</li> <li>• Departments are physically separated so increased faculty interaction is not assured.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Saving of chair summer salaries and release time</li> <li>• Possible staff savings</li> </ul>

#### ***4.7.2 Combination of Biological Sciences, Chemistry and Chemical Engineering to emphasize Biochemistry and Biotechnology plus (single) faculty from Civil and Environmental Engineering***

##### Current issues:

- Biotechnology graduate program is presently supported as interdisciplinary program and has limited core faculty.
- Biochemistry Program does not exist at UAHuntsville.
- Why is combining present departments necessary to do this?

##### General advantages:

- These new combinations may provide new ways of looking at research and teaching

##### General disadvantages:

- No examples can be found of research universities that have abolished their “free-standing” science and engineering departments.
- Environmental Engineering topics are a necessary component of Civil Engineering-they would have to rebuild this capacity.
- Faculty in present departments, are spread across multiple disciplines and not uniquely devoted to biochemistry and biotechnology.
- Faculty are at full teaching loads with their current assignments, with almost no capacity to add new teaching areas.
- Biotechnology is not a unique, well defined subject area. Programs that are identifiable to prospective students, and their parent may be lost, decreasing student population.
- Does the specific wording of this option signal that the proposal would be to terminate the M.S. and Ph.D. in Chemical Engineering (in conjunction with Mechanical Engineering), terminate the M.S. degree programs in Biology and Chemistry and not consider developing these programs into Ph.D. programs?
- Identity loss and accreditation worries.
- This proposal combines departments that depend on accreditation by their respective national organizations with one that does not.

- The continuing success of the pre-professional (pre-med, pre-dent, pre-vent, pre-pharma) programs may be jeopardized.

#### Outside support concern

- No new faculty chairs-lines have been created from local industry-government support; may indicate a lack of support for unique “biotechnology” program.
- Could this program suffer the same decrease as optical science-optical engineering?

#### General disadvantages

- Faculty in present departments, are spread across multiple disciplines and not uniquely devoted to biochemistry and biotechnology.
- Faculty are at full teaching loads with their current assignments, with almost no capacity to add new teaching areas.
- Biotechnology is not a unique, well defined subject area. Programs that are identifiable to prospective students, and their parent may be lost, decreasing student population.
- Environmental Engineering topics are a necessary component of Civil Engineering-they would have to rebuild this capacity.

#### Outside support concern

- No new faculty chairs-lines have been created from local industry-government support; may indicate a lack of support for unique “biotechnology” program.
- Could this program suffer the same decrease as optical science-optical engineering?

#### Potential Examples

- None

## Combination of Biological Sciences, Chemistry and Chemical Engineering to emphasize Biochemistry and Biotechnology plus (single) faculty from Civil and Environmental Engineering

Model	Advantages	Disadvantages	Possible financial impact
<p>Combined departments of Chemistry, Biology, Chemical and Materials Engineering within College of Science along with Environment Engineering component of Civil and Environmental Engineering</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased interaction in limited areas.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Emphasis may away from established and required core-competencies.</li> <li>• Most faculty are not involved in new research topic (only 2 of 7 in CHE, 5 of 11 in CH, 6 of 11 in BYS) and joined by only one faculty member of Civil and Environmental Engineering.</li> <li>• If only 2 of 7 CHE faculty participate/move then there is no CHE representation in this option.</li> <li>• Will limit our ability to respond to other subject areas that would more naturally evolve.</li> <li>• A chairman with the capacity to balance 5 different programs successfully will be costly.</li> <li>• Departments are physically separated so increased faculty interaction is not assured.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Saving of chair summer salaries and release time</li> <li>• Possible staff savings</li> </ul>

### ***4.7.3 Combination of Atmospheric Science and Physics to form a thrust in the area of Space, Earth and Atmospheric Science***

#### Current issues:

- None noted; departments have minor overlap and faculty interact as advantages are presented.

#### General advantages

- None noted.

#### General disadvantages

- Both Physics and Atmospheric Sciences are nationally recognized and respected departments.
- Will jeopardize the current rankings of both departments (both are currently in the upper 1/5 nationally).
- The current faculty and department chairs have invested considerable effort and have had corresponding success in student and program growth. What will the new thrust do to programs that are currently enjoying success?
- Faculty are at full teaching loads with their current assignments, with almost no capacity to add new teaching areas.
- The advantages of a Space, Earth and Atmospheric Sciences concentration are not well delineated.
- Outside support concern
- Could this program suffer the same decrease as optical science-optical engineering?

#### Potential Examples

- None

## Combination of Atmospheric Science and Physics to form a thrust in the area of Space, Earth and Atmospheric Science

Model	Advantages	Disadvantages	Possible financial impact
<p>Combined departments of Physics and Atmospheric Sciences to form a thrust in the area of Space, Earth and Atmospheric Sciences</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased interaction in limited areas.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Emphasis away from established and required core-competencies.</li> <li>• Most faculty are not involved in new research topic—what will be abandoned.</li> <li>• Will this limit our ability to respond to other subject areas</li> <li>• Can one chairman balance the number of old and new programs</li> <li>• Departments are physically separated—how will this affect student support, how will this affect faculty interactions?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Saving of chair summer salaries and release time</li> <li>• Possible staff savings</li> </ul>

#### ***4.7.4 Create a Thrust in the area of Aeronautics/Astronautics and Space Sciences***

This proposal would fuse the appropriate elements of Aerospace Engineering, Systems Engineering, Materials, Atmospheric/Space Sciences, and the appropriate research centers.

This idea is what NASA currently does with several thousand employees and contractors. With the implausibility of Unit Consolidation Options 1 through 3 this option was not considered.

#### ***4.7.5 Realignment of Programs involving some aspect of the Atmosphere***

At the University, this realignment involves Atmospheric Sciences (ATS) and Physics (PHYS).

##### Current issues:

- Some overlap of a few specific research interests related to the outer atmosphere

##### Existing examples (Top 5 on U.S. News & World Report field specific: Physics)

- MIT
  - Physics Dept. (Top 5 Physics department)
  - Earth, Atmospheric and Planetary Sciences (EAPS) Dept.
- Stanford University
  - Applied Physics Dept. (graduate only)
  - Physics Dept.
- Cal Tech
  - Physics Dept.
  - Geological & Planetary Sciences Division
- Harvard
  - Department of Physics
  - Also: Applied Physics program in School of Engg. and Applied Sciences (grad. Only)

- Princeton
  - Astrophysical Sciences Dept.
  - Physics Dept.
  - Geosciences Dept.
    - Atmospheric and Oceanic Sciences Program

## Realignment of Programs involving some aspect of the Atmosphere

Model	Advantages	Disadvantages	Possible financial impact
1. Dept. of ATS and PHYS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ possible inclusion of Center(s)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Closer collaboration</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ATS already a Top 10 department; would not be Top 10 if not ATS</li> <li>• PHYS undergraduate enrollment in Top 12% nationwide; muddling of identity may reduce prestige and/or enrollment</li> <li>• May impact alumni giving</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One chair position</li> <li>• Possible staff savings</li> </ul>
2. ??? Dept. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ ATS+PHYS+ part of math</li> <li>○ possible inclusion of Center(s)</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same as above</li> <li>• Different expectations regarding funded research</li> <li>• Unit title may hinder faculty/student recruitment</li> <li>• Coordination of math curriculum will suffer</li> <li>• May create math course duplications</li> <li>• Joint math PhD program support likely to diminish/become less effective with dissolution of math as a unit</li> <li>• Math research focus may suffer with dispersal of math faculty</li> <li>• A research university without a stand-alone math unit</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One, possibly two chair positions</li> <li>• Possible staff savings</li> </ul>

#### **4.7.6 Realignment of Computing programs**

##### Current issues:

- Overlap of research and some common content in courses
- Lack of collaborative research/proposal between Departments/Colleges

##### General advantages

- These new combinations may provide new ways of looking at research and teaching
- Depending on implementation, most faculty believe that inclusion of centers may improve research and teaching
- Main issues are perceived management problems and F&A distribution

##### Existing examples (Top 5 on U.S. News & World Report field specific: Computer)

- MIT
  - School of Engineering
    - Electrical Engineering and Computer Science Department
- Stanford University
  - School of Engineering
    - Computer Science
    - Electrical Engineering
    - Computer Engineering
- Carnegie Mellon University
  - School of Engineering
    - Electrical and Computer Engineering Department
  - School of Computer Science
    - Computer Science Department
- Berkeley
  - College of Engineering
    - Electrical Engineering and Computer Science
- University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign
  - College of Engineering
    - Computer Science
      - Electrical and Computer Engineering Department

##### Other Examples:

- Arizona State
  - School of Computing and Informatics
    - Dept. of Computer Science and Engineering
    - Dept. of Biomedical Informatics

- University of Utah
  - School of Computing
    - Computer Science
    - Computer Engineering
  
- University of North Carolina Charlotte
  - School of Computing and Informatics
    - Computer Science
    - Bioinformatics and Genomics
    - Software and Information Systems
  
- University of Nebraska at Omaha
  - College of Information Science and Technology

## Realignment of Computing programs

Five models were evaluated and are summarized in the table below. In the table, CS = Computer Science, EE = Electrical Engineering, CPE = Computer Engineering, MIS = (Management) Information Systems

Model	Advantages	Disadvantages	Possible financial impact
<p>1. School of ??? with the following options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ CS + EE + CPE</li> <li>○ CS + EE + CPE + MIS</li> <li>○ CS + CPE + MIS</li> <li>○ possible inclusion of Center(s)</li> <li>○ possible inclusion of Systems Engineering (ISEEM?)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No course overlaps</li> <li>• Closer collaboration</li> <li>• Joint project proposals, sharing of TAs and RAs</li> <li>• One umbrella for computer related research &amp; teaching</li> <li>• Possible offering of IT degree</li> <li>• Possible offering of cognitive science degree</li> <li>• Possible home for modeling and simulation degree</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Existing collaborations within the Colleges</li> <li>• Some implementations yield extra level of hierarchy</li> <li>• Problems with separation of EE and CPE programs (courses, research)</li> <li>• In the case of program changes expected curriculum issues</li> <li>• Some combinations have possible issues in general education or College core curriculum</li> <li>• If MIS is included, Business may duplicate its contents within Business</li> <li>• Different expectations regarding funded research for MIS</li> <li>• Tenure expectation differences may affect MIS</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cost savings if not in College</li> <li>• One chair position</li> <li>• Possible staff savings</li> <li>• Expected increase of offered courses/sections due to the elimination of overlaps</li> <li>• Economies of scale – possibly larger courses</li> <li>• New joint proposals may increase funded research</li> </ul>

Model	Advantages	Disadvantages	Possible financial impact
<p>2. ??? Department</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ ECE &amp; CS Departments</li> <li>○ possible inclusion of Center(s)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• VERY close collaboration</li> <li>• Working model with active collaboration with Centers has the potential to provide significant boost for research and funding</li> <li>• Possible increased frequency of course offerings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May impact alumni giving</li> <li>• Department size</li> <li>• Perceived issues with scientists/theoreticians in Engineering College</li> <li>• Perceived problems with tenure and promotion of CS faculty</li> <li>• Different expectations regarding funded research</li> <li>• Some unit titles may hinder faculty/student recruitment</li> <li>• Possible issues in general education or College core curriculum</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One chair position</li> <li>• Possible staff savings</li> <li>• Expected increase of offered courses/sections due to the elimination of overlaps</li> <li>• Economies of scale – possibly larger courses</li> <li>• New joint proposals may increase funded research</li> </ul>

Model	Advantages	Disadvantages	Possible financial impact
3. Model #2 that includes Math or the selected core of Math	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unified Math unit ensures math curriculum coherence</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Coordination of other math courses and curriculum</li> <li>• Support for joint Math PhD program</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No financial impact</li> </ul>
4. CS as separate Department in College of Engineering	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same as above</li> <li>• CPE faculty already have offices in TH building with CS faculty</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Perceived issues with image of scientists/theoreticians in Engineering College</li> <li>• Possible issues in general education or College core curriculum</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No financial impact</li> </ul>
5. CPE & CS as a separate Department <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ College of Engineering</li> <li>○ College of Science</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Same as above</li> <li>• CPE faculty already have offices in TH building with CS faculty</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Significant issues with current sharing of EE and CPE courses</li> <li>• Shared EE &amp; CPE projects</li> <li>• Perceived issues with scientists/theoreticians in Engineering College</li> <li>• Perceived issues with engineers in college of science</li> <li>• Possible issues in general education or College core curriculum</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No financial impact</li> </ul>

#### ***4.7.7 Restructuring of the College of Engineering***

The proposal assumes restructuring the College of Engineering into 3 Departments consisting of Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering (including Materials), Department of Civil and Systems Engineering, and Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering.

##### Current issues:

- None noted; departments have minor overlap and faculty interact as advantages are presented.

##### General advantages

- Less administrative overhead

##### General disadvantages

- Loss of Industrial Systems degree possible?
- Where does Chemical Engineering go?
- Loss of program identity for Civil, Industrial, Systems?
- No example was found of Civil and Systems Engineering departments-degree programs.
- No example was found of Aerospace, Mechanical, and Materials Engineering as a “free-standing” department.
- Unit heads may have quite large and disparate responsibilities

##### Potential Examples

- Most institutions have separate Departments of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering
- Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, or similar title, are common.
- No examples were found of Civil and Systems Engineering, however, examples were found of Civil and Environmental Systems Engineering or Civil (and) Urban Systems Engineering.

## Restructuring of the College of Engineering

Model	Advantages	Disadvantages	Possible financial impact
<p>Restructuring of the College of Engineering into 3 Departments consisting of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering (including Materials),</li> <li>• Department of Civil and Systems Engineering, and</li> <li>• Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Less administrative overhead</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IF MAE becomes MAME what will the program balance be?</li> <li>• Workability of Civil (assume Environmental is moved) and Systems, and Industrial Engineering is questionable.</li> <li>• What happens to Operational Research and Engineering Management Programs.</li> <li>• Unit head responsibilities will be large and possibly disparate</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Saving of chair summer salaries and release time</li> <li>• Possible staff savings</li> </ul>

#### ***4.7.8 Restructuring Liberal Arts into Two Schools***

Each School could be headed by a Director, with the current departments being designated as programs to be coordinated by the Director:

- School of Arts and Humanities (consisting of faculty from the current Departments of Art and Art History, English, Foreign Languages and Literature, History, Music, Philosophy)
- School of Social Sciences (consisting of faculty from the current Departments of Political Science, Psychology, Sociology, Education)

#### Existing Examples:

Many schools with a model of this type are either community colleges (while not identical, Calhoun and Snead have similar divisions of departments) or emerging branch campuses (e.g., UAHuntsville before 1972).

#### Current Issues:

While there is some up-front cost-saving here, there are numerous hidden costs and potential damage to successful programs. Also, where is Comm. Arts?

#### Summary of Faculty Responses

The implications for ED accreditation are very serious: What is the “unit?” Who is the unit “head?” Who will be responsible for all ALSDE and NCATE documentation and accreditation? And who would coordinate the minimum of 200 hours a student must spend in public schools observing, participating and teaching? Placing ED with the social sciences (where it has no majors) doesn’t make sense. A 12-month chair is necessary to meet ED’s obligations as summer is a time when major ALSDE reports and documentation deadlines occur.

With all of the scenarios for restructuring listed, none of them seems feasible unless, below the Director level, there continue to be department chairs, each with adequate staff to complete the necessary tasks to keep the departments running smoothly and efficiently. Music, for example, is a busy department in terms of the multitude of public performances that take place, and Music’s current chair already has much more work than he can handle, and he puts in far more hours than the typical forty-hour work week. This is true for the majority of departments in the college.

There is no information about what the duties of a Director will be, whether there will also be individual program “coordinators” and how the duties will be divided, what the remuneration or other inducement there will be to take

on these tasks, what the teaching loads will be and how that will impact departments and programs, how not having a “Chair” may impact students, etc. You cannot address the usefulness or workability of these ideas without this kind of detail. They may be fine ideas, but you cannot know, and it is irresponsible—even reckless—to run into this headlong without adequate consideration.

In email responses to the UAH Chair of English, three department chairs at institutions where similar restructuring occurred cite the following problems: evaluation of faculty members, reputation of the programs, faculty recruitment, and retention of students. None mentioned any cost savings; in fact, one doubted savings since the administration had not provided numbers. One chair did cite the creation of “synergy” in one “school” but saw no evidence of it in other units. The three schools are Texas Women’s University, Missouri University of Science and Technology, and Northern Colorado (which is attempting *to undo* much of the restructuring).

## Restructuring Liberal Arts into Two Schools

Model	Advantages	Disadvantages	Possible financial impact
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• School of Arts &amp; Humanities</li> <li>• School of Social Sciences</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Few if any</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CLA already lean and efficient</li> <li>• Elimination of chairs a problem, esp. in complex departments like EH and MU.</li> <li>• Identity issues for many programs</li> <li>• Threat to accreditation of ED</li> <li>• Problem of recruitment of students and faculty for whom UAHuntsville looks like a community college or emerging branch campus, a reputation we have been trying to shake</li> <li>• Where is Comm. Arts?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Savings on elimination of Dean and all Chairs offset by need for Directors and some Chairs.</li> </ul>

#### ***4.7.9 Restructuring the Colleges of Science and Liberal Arts into four Divisions***

Each headed by a Director, with the current departments being designated as programs to be coordinated by the Director,

- a. Arts and Humanities Division (See option 8 (Section 4.7.8) above)
- b. Biotechnology and Biochemical Sciences Division (consisting of faculty from the current Departments of Biological Sciences, Chemistry, and Chemical Engineering)
- c. Physical Sciences Division (consisting of faculty from the current Departments of Atmospheric Sciences, Mathematics and Physics)
- d. Social Sciences Division (See option 8 above).

#### **Existing Examples:**

Many schools with a model of this type are either community colleges (while not identical, Calhoun and Snead have similar divisions of departments) or emerging branch campuses (e.g., UAHuntsville before 1972).

#### **Current Issues:**

While there is some up-front cost-saving here, there are numerous hidden costs and potential damage to successful programs.

## Restructuring the Colleges of Science and Liberal Arts into 4 Divisions

Model	Advantages	Disadvantages	Possible financial impact
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Division of Arts and Arts &amp; Humanities</li> <li>• Division of Social Sciences</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Few if any</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CLA already lean and efficient</li> <li>• Elimination of Chairs a problem, esp. in complex departments like EH and MU</li> <li>• Threat to accreditation of ED</li> <li>• Problem of recruitment of students and faculty for whom UAHuntsville looks like a community college or emerging branch campus, a reputation we have been trying to shake</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Savings on elimination of Dean and all Chairs offset by need for Directors and some Chairs</li> </ul>

Model	Advantages	Disadvantages	Possible financial impact
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Division of Biotechnology and Biochemistry</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Biology (12 full-time faculty)</li> <li>• Chemistry (14 full-time faculty)</li> <li>• Chemical engineering (6 full-time faculty)</li> <li>• Loss of department chairs would leave biology, chemistry, and chemical engineering with program coordinators or directors. There will be role confusion and possible reduced grant funding if biology, chemistry, and chemical engineering were not departments.</li> <li>• Threat to accreditation of Chemistry and Chemical Engineering</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of 3 department chairs and dean.</li> <li>• Director would be needed and two associate directors for nursing would be needed. There would be no net loss in administrative personnel in nursing—only titles would change.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Division of Physical Sciences</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ATS already a Top 10 department; would not be Top 10 if not ATS</li> <li>• PHYS undergrad enrollment in Top 12% nationwide; muddling of identity may reduce prestige and/or enrollment</li> <li>• Problem of different expectations regarding research, tenure, promotion</li> <li>• Loss of a stand-alone math department</li> <li>• Joint math Ph.D. program support likely to diminish with dissolution of Math</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of 2 departments chairs, but new Director</li> </ul>

## Summary of Faculty Responses

The implications for ED accreditation are very serious: What is the “unit?” Who is the unit “head?” Who will be responsible for all ALSDE and NCATE documentation and accreditation? And who would coordinate the minimum of 200 hours a student must spend in public schools observing, participating and teaching? Placing ED with the social sciences (where it has no majors) doesn’t make sense. A 12-month chair is necessary to meet ED’s obligations as summer is a time when major ALSDE reports and documentation deadlines occur.

With all of the scenarios for restructuring listed, none of them seems feasible unless, below the Director level, there continue to be department chairs, each with adequate staff to complete the necessary tasks to keep the departments running smoothly and efficiently. Music, for example, is a busy department in terms of the multitude of public performances that take place, and Music’s current chair already has much more work than he can handle, and he puts in far more hours than the typical forty-hour work week. This is true for the majority of departments in the college.

There is no information about what the duties of a Director will be, whether there will also be individual program “coordinators” and how the duties will be divided, what the remuneration or other inducement there will be to take on these tasks, what the teaching loads will be and how that will impact departments and programs, how not having a “Chair” may impact students, etc. You cannot address the usefulness or workability of these ideas without this kind of detail. They may be fine ideas, but you cannot know, and it is irresponsible--even reckless--to run into this headlong without adequate consideration.

In email responses to the UAH Chair of English, three department chairs at institutions where similar restructuring occurred cite the following problems: evaluation of faculty members, reputation of the programs, faculty recruitment, and retention of students. None mentioned any cost savings; in fact, one doubted savings since the administration had not provided numbers. One chair did cite the creation of “synergy” in one “school” but saw no evidence of it in other units. The three schools are Texas Women’s University, Missouri University of Science and Technology, and Northern Colorado (which is attempting *to undo* much of the restructuring).

#### ***4.7.10 Restructuring the Colleges of Science, Liberal Arts and Nursing into four Divisions***

Each division will be headed by a Director with the current departments being designated as programs to be coordinated by the Director:

- Arts and Humanities Division (See option 8)
- Life and Health Sciences (consisting of faculty from the current Departments of Biological Sciences, Chemistry, and Chemical Engineering, and the College of Nursing)
- Physical Sciences Division (consisting of faculty from the current Departments of Atmospheric Sciences, Mathematics and Physics)
- Social Sciences Division (See option 8).

#### Current Issues:

- The only possible reason for such a structure would be cost savings. (And is there any real savings with 4 Directors and the necessary Chairs in ED and Nursing?) It is difficult to see the educational benefits of this structure. There would also be a problem of “identity”—with difficulty of recruiting students and faculty. Those faculty members and units with the designation “Directors” and “Programs” may have difficulty in obtaining grants.

#### General disadvantages

Some components of this model have been tried previously at the University; model seems to be a regression.

#### Existing Examples

This model tends to be found in community colleges or emerging branch campuses.

## Restructuring the Colleges of Science, Liberal Arts and Nursing into 4 Divisions

Model	Advantages	Disadvantages	Possible financial impact
Arts & Humanities Division	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very few</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CLA already lean and efficient</li> <li>• Elimination of chairs a problem, esp. in complex departments like MU and EH</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Elimination of Dean and Chairs, but offset by 4 Directors and some Chairs.</li> </ul>
Life & Health Sciences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The director of nursing programs might have more influence with biology and chemistry to offer additional sections for pre-nursing students.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accreditation standard requires that a director of the division would be a nurse. Likely to be unpopular forced leadership decision for biology, chemistry, and chemical engineering.</li> <li>• Nursing faculty are largely teaching faculty while biology, chemistry, and chemical engineering focused on research.</li> <li>• Large number of nursing faculty (33 full-time) and students (&gt;800 <b>without</b> lower-division students) would consume director's time and attention.</li> <li>• Biology (12 full-time faculty)</li> <li>• Chemistry (14 full-time faculty)</li> <li>• Chemical engineering (6 full-time faculty)</li> <li>• Changing title of Dean of Nursing to Director of Nursing can affect ability to recruit a desirable candidate if position</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of 3 department chairs and dean.</li> <li>• Director would be needed and two associate directors for nursing would be needed. There would be no net loss in administrative personnel in nursing—only titles would change.</li> </ul>

		<p>were vacant.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of department chairs would leave biology, chemistry, and chemical engineering with program coordinators or directors. There will be role confusion and possible reduced grant funding if biology, chemistry, and chemical engineering were not departments.</li> </ul>	
Physical Sciences Division	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Closer collaboration</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ATS already a Top 10 department; would not be Top 10 if not ATS</li> <li>• PHYS undergrad enrollment in Top 12% nationwide; muddling of identity may reduce prestige and/or enrollment</li> <li>• Problem of different expectations regarding research, tenuring, promotion</li> <li>• Loss of a stand-alone math department</li> <li>• Support for joint math Ph.D. program likely to diminish with dissolution of Math</li> </ul>	
Social Sciences Division	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very few</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CLA already lean and efficient</li> <li>• Threat to accreditation of ED since unit must be chaired by someone with degree in field; and ED staff cannot be reduced.</li> <li>• A regression to previous structures</li> </ul>	

## Summary of Faculty Responses

The implications for ED accreditation are very serious: What is the “unit?” Who is the unit “head?” Who will be responsible for all ALSDE and NCATE documentation and accreditation? And who would coordinate the minimum of 200 hours a student must spend in public schools observing, participating and teaching? Placing ED with the social sciences (where it has no majors) doesn’t make sense. A 12-month chair is necessary to meet ED’s obligations as summer is a time when major ALSDE reports and documentation deadlines occur.

With all of the scenarios for restructuring listed, none of them seems feasible unless, below the Director level, there continue to be department chairs, each with adequate staff to complete the necessary tasks to keep the departments running smoothly and efficiently. Music, for example, is a busy department in terms of the multitude of public performances that take place, and Music’s current chair already has much more work than he can handle, and he puts in far more hours than the typical forty-hour work week. This is true for the majority of departments in the college.

There is no information about what the duties of a Director will be, whether there will also be individual program “coordinators” and how the duties will be divided, what the remuneration or other inducement there will be to take on these tasks, what the teaching loads will be and how that will impact departments and programs, how not having a “Chair” may impact students, etc. You cannot address the usefulness or workability of these ideas without this kind of detail. They may be fine ideas, but you cannot know, and it is irresponsible--even reckless--to run into this headlong without adequate consideration.

In email responses to the UAH Chair of English, three department chairs at institutions where similar restructuring occurred cite the following problems: evaluation of faculty members, reputation of the programs, faculty recruitment, and retention of students. None mentioned any cost savings; in fact, one doubted savings since the administration had not provided numbers. One chair did cite the creation of “synergy” in one “school” but saw no evidence of it in other units. The three schools are Texas Women’s University, Missouri University of Science and Technology, and Northern Colorado (which is attempting *to undo* much of the restructuring).

### ***4.7.11 College of Professional Studies***

#### Current Issues:

- There is no compelling reason for this combination. The only similarity is that all programs in business, education, and nursing are accredited. If a

college of professional studies were inclusive of all professional programs at UAHuntsville, it should also include engineering.

### Existing Examples

In university settings, nursing programs are typically structured as stand-alone schools or colleges with department that represent specialties. If combined with other disciplines, nursing programs are found in colleges of health professions which might include respiratory therapy, physical therapy, speech therapy, occupational therapy, dietetics, or social work. Likewise, business programs are stand-alone schools for colleges with departments that represent specialties.

## College of Professional Studies

Model	Advantages	Disadvantages	Possible financial impact
<p>Divisions of business, education, and nursing</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There may be possibilities for synergy in the area of health care administration between some business and some nursing faculty, but they already exist or are being explored.</li> <li>• Offering MSN/MBA degree is a “synergy,” but this option can happen without a change in structure. Such a dual degree would rest in a college of nursing and fall under its accreditation standards. This option has been explored in the health professions task force.</li> <li>• A health care concentration in the MBA degree can be developed without a structural change. This option has been explored in the health professions task force.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All divisions must have a division head and a dean for the college.</li> <li>• Would add a level of bureaucracy that isn’t currently in place for business and nursing.</li> <li>• Research requirements are vastly different among business, education, and nursing.</li> <li>• Having one Dean coordinate three programs with vastly different standards seems time consuming and unreasonable.</li> <li>• Accreditation for the education unit is based on how it carries out its mission, not on other units with which it may be administratively associated.</li> <li>• Public school teachers and administrators are integral to the mission of the department of education. Relationships must be maintained by the Department of Education. It is unclear how the merger of business, education, and nursing would provide any efficiency externally.</li> <li>• The College of Nursing maintains relationships and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convert three dean positions to 3 division directors. Add a Dean of College of Professional Studies.</li> <li>• Would still need the same number of associate directors in business and nursing.</li> <li>• Could delete 3 department chairs in business, but the cost savings would likely to be offset by the need for a new dean position for the newly created college.</li> <li>• This would eliminate one dean, but it is unclear what, if any, monetary savings would be achieved by such a merger. This is because these deans have faculty status and would return to the faculty maintaining the preponderance of their current salary and benefits. Further, it is at best unclear whether either of the current deans of these two colleges would be willing to be the dean of such a merged college without (at least) a substantial increase in their current compensation. Lastly, where one would find an acceptable dean candidate from outside of UAHuntsville for such a merged “College of</li> </ul>

		<p>contracts with over 600 healthcare facilities in Alabama and Tennessee.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “There are few other sensible opportunities for synergy between the colleges. The College of Business has very little emphasis, if any, in the business of health care. While the College of Nursing strongly emphasizes the business of health care in one track of the master’s program (leadership/administration), the major focus is the preparation of nurses for direct care delivery. Recruitment of faculty would likely be negatively impacted in both areas. Accreditation requirements for business and nursing and regulatory requirements for nursing will require administrators with credentials in each area (Dean’s ‘Restructuring of Academia at UAHuntsville,’ April 29, 2009).”</li> <li>• College of Business Administration is AACSB accredited and in a top 10% of U.S. business schools. It seems counterintuitive to change the structure of a college that is recognized by external bodies.</li> </ul>	<p>Professional Studies” is unknown.</p>
--	--	--	--

**Summary of responses from College of Nursing Faculty regarding realignment:**

- Overall the College of Nursing Faculty was concerned with the lack of clarity about the purpose(s) of realignment.
- Issues regarding professional accreditation, certification and regulatory requirements must be strictly followed.
- There are no other health care disciplines on campus. This reality makes realignment with others seemed “forced.”
- There is a danger of alienating the close alignments with the local and regional health care industry.
- Recruitment and enrollment of nursing students might be hampered if nursing were to be subsumed by another department or college.
- There is a risk that the number of graduates from nursing programs would decrease at a time when the demand is high for qualified nurses in North Alabama in Southern Tennessee.
- Recruitment of qualified nursing faculty and nursing administrators would be more difficult if nursing were subsumed by another department or college.
- The growth of the College of Nursing might be compromised at a time when increased growth will benefit the whole University.
- Loss of visibility as a college might reduce the ability of the college to attract the best students to UAHuntsville’s nursing program. Would a potential student look for a nursing program in a College of Professional Studies?
- Loss of identity as a college would send a negative message to the public about the commitment of UAHuntsville to meet the community’s health care needs.

**Summary of responses from the College of Business Administration**

We are concerned that the administration is focusing on structural change for the sake of change or solely for short-term cost-savings. Even if cost-savings is the only motivating factor, savings in administrative costs through economies of scale derived from larger administrative units is likely to be counterbalanced by losses in revenue that result from losing students. Several students have come to CBA faculty to tell them they were going to miss class to go to Tuscaloosa to discuss transferring. When queried about their reasons, they cited quotes of President Williams in a recent Huntsville Times article noting the preeminence of the technical side of the university and rumors they had heard

that the College of Business was going to be merged into the College of Engineering. (Although it could, as well, have been the College of Nursing.) In their view, this signaled a lack of commitment to programs outside of science and engineering that, in the long run, would cause the value of a degree in business from UAHuntsville in the labor market. They were worried that a degree in finance or some other business major would lose value if the College of Business was eliminated or merged with a non-business college. They also worried that such changes would cause UAH to lose its AACSB accreditation and its standing as a top 10% business school, which also would diminish the value of their degrees.

In short, structural changes that result in savings as a result of increase economies of scale may also have the unintended consequences of resulting in losses if the administrative units are not ones that are recognized by prospective and current students and their parents and by employers who hire our graduates. As one labor market specialist in the CBA put it, CBA faculty are convinced that establishing colleges that do not reflect disciplinary groupings that are readily recognizable in by the labor market will hurt student placement and, in turn, student retention and recruiting. Preserving a structure in which colleges, at least, are grouped in ways that are common at other universities is critical to student recruitment and placement. Within colleges that have lots of small departments, it may be feasible to achieve some economies of scale by grouping departments.

### **From Education:**

While the label of College of Professional Studies may seem appropriate, we are not sure how this structure would help us at all. It may, in fact, make our accreditation even more unclear. The only thing we share is that we (ED, Nursing, Business) are all accredited. Having one Dean coordinate all of these seems totally unreasonable and all-consuming. Accreditation for ED is based on how the *unit*—Department of Education—carries out its mission. We interact with public school teachers and administrators. Our process and accreditation agency is entirely different than that of Business or Nursing; we have nothing in common with either of these. It would be very difficult to sustain our accreditation. Again, it would only be workable if we maintained our individual identity within that structure and had a full-time (12 month) chair with a full staff.

**4.7.12 Combining the Colleges of Science and Engineering to create a “new” College of Science and Engineering with rearrangement of current departments and elimination of the Department of Mathematical Sciences**

Current issues:

None noted; departments have minor overlap and faculty interact as advantages are presented.

General advantages

Less administrative overhead.

General disadvantages

There is no research University without a separate Mathematics Department.

Doing both a College and Department restructuring at-or close-to the same time would be highly disruptive and confusing for all involved.

Such a large college would always have a tendency to “overwhelm” the remaining colleges at UAH.

Potential Examples

- Clemson University (14 Departments). **It should be clearly noted that the free-standing departmental structure is maintained.**
  - Bioengineering
  - Biosystems Engineering
  - Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering
  - Chemistry
  - Civil Engineering
  - School of Computing
  - Electrical and Computer Engineering
  - Engineering and Science Education
  - Environmental Engineering and Earth Science
  - General Engineering
  - Industrial Engineering
  - Material Science and Engineering
  - Mathematical Sciences
  - Mechanical Engineering
  - Physical and Astronomy

- San Francisco State University (2 Ph.D. programs-education related)
  - School of Engineering (4 Departments)
  - Department of Biology
  - Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry
  - Department of Mathematics
  - Department of Computer Science
  - Department of Geosciences
  - Department of Physics and Astronomy
- University of Texas-Pan American
- Western Kentucky University
- Texas Christian University (BS program in Engineering)
- St Cloud State University

**Combining the College of Science and the College of Engineering to create a “new”  
College of Science and Engineering with rearrangement of current departments and  
elimination of the Department of Mathematical Sciences**

<b>Model</b>	<b>Advantages</b>	<b>Disadvantages</b>	<b>Possible financial impact</b>
1. Combining the Colleges of Science and the College of Engineering	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Better communication and cooperation between departments on course content material.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• College will be largest on Campus could overwhelm other Colleges</li> <li>• Dean has to be able to both separate and integrate different disciplines will be difficulty to hire and will be costly. Not likely to be accomplished.</li> <li>• Support for joint math Ph.D. program likely to diminish with dissolution of Math</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Probably not much, Clemson has Dean, plus staff and two Associate Deans</li> <li>• Possible staff savings</li> </ul>

***4.7.13 Elimination-Integration of the Department of Psychology by merging into “new” College of Science and Engineering through likely association with Computer Science and Systems Engineering***

Alternative to this option, which is based on option #12, is recast to allow the Department of Psychology to realign with a College of their choice.

Current issues:

None noted.

General advantages

Possible better match of teaching and research interests.

General disadvantages

None noted.

***4.7.14 Merger of College of Business Administration, Engineering Management and Public Policy Program***

Current issues:

Overlap of research and some common content in courses

General advantages

These new combinations may provide new ways of looking at research and teaching

General disadvantages

Takes University back to 1970s when there was a Division of Social and Behavioral Sciences and then a School of Humanities and Behavioral Sciences.

Existing examples:

There are some universities in the USA where business colleges include Public Administration but not Public Policy

## Merger of College of Business Administration, Engineering Management and Public Policy Program

Model	Advantages	Disadvantages	Possible financial impact
Merge Business, Engineering Management and Public Policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minimize course content overlaps</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identity crisis and differences in culture may cause real concerns</li> <li>• Possible rethinking and perhaps loss of AACSB accreditation</li> <li>• The disparity in faculty teaching loads and research productivity and its nature would cause friction in the college and may be detrimental to the students.</li> <li>• It would create a unit that would be housed in multiple buildings.</li> <li>• It may have a detrimental effect on the political science program</li> <li>• No dedicated faculty is available that could teach public policy and/or public affairs and administration</li> <li>• The issue is that the ISEEM faculty does not teach courses in separate areas. Thus, for example, a single faculty member may teach courses in EM, ISE, and others. Also, EM is not an MBA by a different name. Losing Engineering discipline may cause a problem. ABET accreditation may be an issue.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May require additional faculty</li> </ul>

## Summary of responses from the College of Business Administration

We are concerned that the administration is focusing on structural change for the sake of change or solely for short-term cost-savings. Even if cost-savings is the only motivating factor, savings in administrative costs through economies of scale derived from larger administrative units is likely to be counterbalanced by losses in revenue that result from losing students. Several students have come to CBA faculty to tell them they were going to miss class to go to Tuscaloosa to discuss transferring. When queried about their reasons, they cited quotes of President Williams in a recent Huntsville Times article noting the preeminence of the technical side of the university and rumors they had heard that the College of Business was going to be merged into the College of Engineering. (Although it could, as well, have been the College of Nursing.) In their view, this signaled a lack of commitment to programs outside of science and engineering that, in the long run, would cause the value of a degree in business from UAHuntsville in the labor market. They were worried that a degree in finance or some other business major would lose value if the College of Business was eliminated or merged with a non-business college. They also worried that such changes would cause UAH to lose its AACSB accreditation and its standing as a top 10% business school, which also would diminish the value of their degrees.

In short, structural changes that result in savings as a result of increase economies of scale may also have the unintended consequences of resulting in losses if the administrative units are not ones that are recognized by prospective and current students and their parents and by employers who hire our graduates. As one labor market specialist in the CBA put it, CBA faculty are convinced that establishing colleges that do not reflect disciplinary groupings that are readily recognizable in by the labor market will hurt student placement and, in turn, student retention and recruiting. Preserving a structure in which colleges, at least, are grouped in ways that are common at other universities is critical to student recruitment and placement. Within colleges that have lots of small departments, it may be feasible to achieve some economies of scale by grouping departments.

#### ***4.7.14 Merger of Colleges of Engineering and Business Administration (with four schools)***

##### Current issues:

- Overlap of research and some common content in courses

##### General advantages

These new combinations may provide new ways of looking at research and teaching in the proposed four schools.

- Depending on implementation, some savings in avoiding duplicative courses.

##### Existing examples

**There are no universities in USA where an AACSB accredited business College is part of, or is merged, with the College of Engineering.**

## Merger of Colleges of Engineering and Business Administration

Model	Advantages	Disadvantages	Possible financial impact
<p>Merger of Business and Engineering</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minimize course content overlaps</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identity crisis and differences in cultures will cause real concerns</li> <li>• Possible loss of AACSB accreditation</li> <li>• Breaking of Business College into two schools (or Management and Entrepreneurship and Finance and Accounting) would mean lack of cohesive academic curriculum planning.</li> <li>• Breaking up of engineering into two schools would mean some programs, like Industrial and Systems Engineering will suffer.</li> <li>• The disparity in faculty teaching loads and research productivity and its nature would cause friction in the college and may be detrimental to the students.</li> <li>• Differences in tenure and promotion expectations may create faculty unrest and loss of productivity.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Possible savings of one Dean</li> <li>• Possible need for one or two division Directors</li> </ul>

## Summary of responses from the College of Business Administration

We are concerned that the administration is focusing on structural change for the sake of change or solely for short-term cost-savings. Even if cost-savings is the only motivating factor, savings in administrative costs through economies of scale derived from larger administrative units is likely to be counterbalanced by losses in revenue that result from losing students. Several students have come to CBA faculty to tell them they were going to miss class to go to Tuscaloosa to discuss transferring. When queried about their reasons, they cited quotes of President Williams in a recent Huntsville Times article noting the preeminence of the technical side of the university and rumors they had heard that the College of Business was going to be merged into the College of Engineering. (Although it could, as well, have been the College of Nursing.) In their view, this signaled a lack of commitment to programs outside of science and engineering that, in the long run, would cause the value of a degree in business from UAHuntsville in the labor market. They were worried that a degree in finance or some other business major would lose value if the College of Business was eliminated or merged with a non-business college. They also worried that such changes would cause UAH to lose its AACSB accreditation and its standing as a top 10% business school, which also would diminish the value of their degrees.

In short, structural changes that result in savings as a result of increase economies of scale may also have the unintended consequences of resulting in losses if the administrative units are not ones that are recognized by prospective and current students and their parents and by employers who hire our graduates. As one labor market specialist in the CBA put it, CBA faculty are convinced that establishing colleges that do not reflect disciplinary groupings that are readily recognizable in by the labor market will hurt student placement and, in turn, student retention and recruiting. Preserving a structure in which colleges, at least, are grouped in ways that are common at other universities is critical to student recruitment and placement. Within colleges that have lots of small departments, it may be feasible to achieve some economies of scale by grouping departments.

## 5. Conclusions

Academic realignment in a university is a major undertaking and can have significant impact on the future of teaching, research, and community outreach. Goals of realignment need to be articulated clearly. Thus, utmost care should be taken in developing and evaluating plausible proposals for realignment. The process used in this endeavor is important and should not be discarded in undertaking any realignment.

The Academic Realignment Committee believes that a fundamental goal of realignment and restructuring is to attract, retain, and graduate students on time.

The Academic Realignment Committee has worked hard to ensure that appropriate processes are developed and implemented that would safeguard the interests of all those affected by any realignment action. This document contains various bills, which will be proposed or have been passed by the Faculty Senate, that clearly delineate the process to be used in any academic realignment.

During this spring semester of 2009, the Committee sought and was presented with several ideas for realignment. After seeking inputs, suggestions, and comments from various faculty members and administrators, we researched, discussed, assessed, and evaluated these ideas and have included our findings in this report. We strongly recommend that no realignment idea/proposal, including items discussed in this document, be implemented without thorough discussion and agreement by the concerned parties (faculty, staff, and/or administration). Further, prior to the start of any academic unit realignment activity, an appropriate time-phased implementation plan must be prepared, made transparent to all those involved, and acted upon while faculty are available to be fully engaged in the process (e.g., not during summer). These implementations will take time; *no academic unit realignments should be undertaken prior to Fall 2010.*

## Appendix A Faculty Senate Bill – Updated SB187

The bill that follows offers cosmetic updates to Senate Bill 187, which was passed in May 1988. Senate Bill 187’s aim was establishing—for the first time at the University—policy and procedures for termination of academic programs. The 1988 bill refers to a school that no longer exists (the School of Primary Medical Care) and an administrative position whose name has changed slightly (from VPAA to EVPAA). The attached bill merely removes the name of the departed school and refers to the administrative position by its most common current moniker (Provost).

The original Senate Bill 187 passed unanimously on its third reading.

### (Update of Passed SB 187): POLICY AND PROCEDURES FOR TERMINATION OF ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

WHEREAS: SB 187, passed by the Senate in 1988, referred to the School of Primary Medical Care and used the title “VPAA” for the position now known as “EVPAA/Provost”, and

WHEREAS: It is advantageous to update this expression of policy using current language, and

WHEREAS: Prior to SB 187, the University did not have a policy regarding the procedure for terminating academic programs, and

WHEREAS: The AAUP Policy Document and Reports, 1984, is the prevailing resource in matters relating to program termination,

THEREFORE: Be it resolved that the following policy be adopted.

#### I. Scope of the Policy Statement

This policy statement defines the procedures to be followed in the termination of academic programs. These procedures should be congruent with those for program initiation. Also, this policy statement discusses the criteria for

terminating academic programs and the process for reaching such decisions. These criteria follow AAUP. guidelines.

## II. General

The provisions of this section are not intended to prevent the University (UAH) from altering its educational policies by means other than terminating of appointments; nor are they intended to encourage major redeployment without due consultation. Termination of appointments under this section may not be used to redeploy resources in those cases where attribution over a period of time is a reasonable alternative. Moreover, any merger, consolidation, or similar reorganization of two or more units of instruction into a single unit, which continues to provide instruction in the same or equivalent subject areas, shall not constitute a discontinuance of the preexisting units that could justify their termination of appointments under the provisions of this section.

## III. Long Range Plans

The establishment and/or termination of colleges, departments or programs must be in accordance with the long term plans and mission of the University. Full deliberation by the faculty of the college and of the University must be provided for in the decision process.

## IV. Definition of Programs

For purposes of this section, a program is defined as (a) an independent administrative, educational, and budgetary unit, which usually corresponds to widely recognized disciplinary designations; or (b) a college.

## V. Factors To Be Considered For Terminating a Program

It is here appropriate to quote AAUP. guidelines: "The decision to discontinue formally a program or department of instruction will be based essentially upon educational considerations, as determined primarily by the faculty as a whole or an appropriate committee thereof. [Note: Educational considerations do not include cyclical or temporary variations in enrollment. They must reflect long-range judgments that the educational mission of the institution as a whole will be enhanced by the discontinuance.]

## VI. Decision Process For Termination of a Program For Educational Reasons

The Provost or the President may initiate consideration of whether a college shall terminate a program for educational reasons by referring the matter to the Senate Curriculum Committee. Program termination within a college is initiated by the Dean and appropriate college committee. The Dean presents the college's recommendation to the Senate Curriculum Committee. The Senate Curriculum Committee shall consider whether the termination will serve the educational mission of the University. In making a recommendation, the committee shall consider the criteria stated in subsection V, above. After due deliberation, the committee shall make a written report and recommendation to the Provost concerning the proposal. This recommendation shall also include a complete evaluation of the academic program in terms of the number of faculty employed, the tenure commitments of those faculty, options for placement of faculty within the University, the number of students pursuing majors in the program and the effect on other academic programs supported by the program. In performing the duties prescribed by this section, the committees shall obtain the views of the faculty of the program; of the appropriate faculty and student committees in the academic unit immediately affected and in the larger academic unit or units of which it is a part; and of other units of the University which will be affected by the action. In addition, the committees shall hold at least one open meeting at which anyone may comment upon the proposed action.

## VII. Methods of Notification of Termination

If the President should decide to terminate a program, the Provost shall give each affected faculty member notice in writing at least one year in advance of the effective date of program termination.

## Appendix B Faculty Senate Bill – Updated SB190

The bill below offers cosmetic updates to Senate Bill 190, which was passed in May 1988. Senate Bill 190 was aimed another component of the program termination equation: the statement of faculty rights and privileges.

The 1988 bill refers to institutional regulations on academic freedom and tenure that have been superseded and an AAUP policy document that has also been superseded. The attached bill updates these references to the current standards, as expressed in the Faculty Handbook and in the University's statements in its SAC accreditation.

The original Senate Bill 190 passed with very strong support on its third reading. The bill below passed unanimously on April 30, 2009.

### (Update of SB 190): RIGHTS AND PRIVILEGES OF FACULTY WITH TENURE IN TERMINATED PROGRAMS

WHEREAS: SB 190, passed by the Senate in 1988, referred to 1982 Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure and AAUP 1984 standards, and

WHEREAS: It is advantageous to update this expression of policy using the current institutional regulations, which are stated in the Faculty Handbook's Statement on Academic Freedom (currently, Chapter 7, Section 14), and

WHEREAS: The AAUP Policy Document and Reports, 1990, is now the prevailing resource adopted by the University in matters relating to faculty rights in program termination,

THEREFORE: Be it resolved that the following policy be adopted.

It is expected that the University shall place tenured faculty members of terminated programs in other appropriate positions within the University or

find appropriate placement within the University system. Subsequent to notification of termination, the University shall make serious and strenuous efforts to place terminated faculty with tenure in any position within the University and the University system for which their education, special training, experience, and abilities are appropriate, and which are open or become open for the faculty member's employment. These efforts will continue at least six months after the actual termination of the program. Retraining of up to one year shall be provided to faculty if necessary for placement.

Tenured faculty members with a minimum of ten years of service at the University and who are within five years for service retirement when they are notified of termination may not be terminated involuntarily because of termination of a department or program.

No position of such a terminated faculty member shall be filled by a replacement within a period of five years after the faculty member's employment in the terminated program actually ends unless the faculty member is beyond the mandatory age of retirement, the faculty member has been offered the position and a reasonable time to accept it and has not accepted it, or the University is unable to contact the person involved.

Terminated faculty who had tenure shall be granted full privileges as a retired faculty member.

All terminated faculty shall receive one year of severance pay for every five full years of service to the University; but in any case severance compensation shall be at the very minimum no less than the equivalent of one year's salary. The letter of termination will include a statement giving the termination date and the amount of severance compensation.

## I. Grounds for Review of Termination

A faculty member whose status is affected by termination of a program may request the Faculty Appeals Committee to review that action on one or more of the following grounds:

a) The decision was affected in significant degree by the faculty member's personal beliefs, expressions, or conduct which fall within the liberties protected by law or by the principles of academic freedom as established by academic tradition and the Constitutions and Statutes of the United States and the State of Alabama.

b) The decision was affected in significant degree by factors prohibited by applicable federal and state law regarding fair employment practices.

c) The faculty member was not a member of the faculty of the program.

d) the program was not actually terminated.

- e) The faculty member was unreasonably denied an opportunity to participate or present evidence in the decision to terminate a program.
- f) The faculty member was not given timely notice of the termination as required.
- g) The University failed to make a good faith effort to place the faculty member in a position as required.
- h) The procedures described in this policy were violated
- i) The procedures as described in AAUP 1990 Policy Documents and Reports were violated.

## II. Review Committee

Following the effective date of the termination of any tenured faculty, the Faculty Senate Personnel Committee will review the rights (including the rights to severance pay) and privileges of tenured faculty affected by program termination. This committee will review whether the termination procedures followed the policies specified in this document and will make recommendations for change in the policy or procedures, if any. Findings of this committee will be reported to the Faculty Senate President.

## III. Policy Guidelines

The assessments of the rights and privileges of faculty in terminated programs will follow interpretations of academic freedom, due process, and adequate review given in the AAUP Policy Documents and Reports, 1990 edition, including but not limited to the following:

- a) 1940 Statement on Academic Freedom and Tenure;
- b) Statement on Procedural Standards in the Renewal or Nonrenewal of Faculty Appointment;
- c) Procedural Standards in the Renewal or Nonrenewal of Faculty Appointments;
- d) The Standards for Notice of Nonreappointment;
- e) The institutional regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure (as expressed in the Faculty Handbook Statement on Academic Freedom);
- f) Statements on Professors and Political Activity;
- g) Statement on Professional Ethics.

## **Appendix C    Proposed Faculty Senate Bill**

Whereas UAHuntsville does not have a detailed policy regarding the combination, division, or termination [hereafter “realignment”] of academic units [“units” referring to departments, colleges and centers];

Whereas the realignment of academic units must consider the educational benefits rather than mere cost-saving;

Whereas the faculty have the disciplinary expertise within their own fields and have extensive knowledge of our students’ needs;

Whereas the realignment of academic units has long-term effects and cannot be undertaken for immediate financial reasons;

Whereas the UAH Faculty Handbook already provides for a flexible response to immediate needs without a realignment of academic units:

“In an effort to encourage interdisciplinary approaches to teaching, research, and public service, UAH has interdisciplinary groupings of scholars that are more flexible and transitory than academic departments. These groupings bring together faculty from two or more departments and experts from outside the university to address new ideas. They may then disband without altering departmental structures or, if needed on a long-term basis, become a permanent part of the university’s structure” [FH 4.2]. (At UAHuntsville, these programs are often called “cognates.”); and

Whereas UAHuntsville already emphasizes the importance of faculty involvement in determining academic realignment:

“Major functions of the dean include providing leadership to department and program chairs, faculty, and staff in the development, operation, and improvement of academic and research programs;

developing and recommending to the provost of budgets for departments, programs, and academic support areas..." [FH 4.3];

"The performance and relevance of a department normally are reviewed at least every five years or in conjunction with a department's professional accreditation review cycle. Findings and recommendations of review committees are submitted to the provost. After consultation and agreement with the president, the provost may recommend that a department be continued, or a proposal to dissolve or reorganize the department may be forwarded to the Board of Trustees for review and approval" [FH 4.4];

"The chair is expected to provide academic leadership for the department. . . . The chair has administrative responsibility for insuring the quality and effectiveness of the department's instructional, research, and service programs. Department chairs have the responsibility to provide leadership in formulating and in implementing departmental goals and long-range plans; to represent the department internally within administrative and governance structures of the university. . . . " [FH 4.5];

"Faculty review of administrative performance and program effectiveness is accomplished by conducting formal program reviews at least at five-year intervals, with the faculty also participating in the regular, ongoing evaluation of administrative leadership, program direction, and program quality." [FH 6.1];

Therefore, be it resolved that the Faculty Senate adopt the following and include it in the UAHuntsville Faculty Handbook.

### **Section 1: Scope and Purpose of Realignment**

1.1 Proposals for the deletions or modifications of undergraduate or graduate courses and/or academic programs that do not alter the structure of the academic units are covered in [FH 8.3] and hence are not covered by the academic realignment process described in Section 2 below.

1.2 The realignment of academic units in established colleges is the province of the collegiate faculty and University administration.

- 1.3 Proposals for academic realignment may originate from any interested faculty members and/or administrators. However, each proposal must clearly identify the purpose, goals, and objectives of realignment.
- 1.4 No matter where or why they originate, proposals for realignment should be presented to the affected academic units and then be considered via the sequential process outlined in Section 2 below.
- 1.5 As and when academic realignment is appropriate and/or deemed necessary by the faculty or administration, a phased approach should be deployed to develop and implement academic realignment plans. In the first phase, each dean, working with his/her college chairs and faculty, should be asked to develop and present to the Provost an academic realignment plan for his/her college in a timely fashion.
- 1.6 Academic realignment plans that could result in the elimination or merger of two or more colleges should only be explored after the affected colleges have examined all their options.
- 1.7 If a proposed realignment involves academic units from multiple colleges, affected faculty in each academic unit from all affected colleges must be involved in the preparation and approval of the realignment proposal.
- 1.8 Financial crises are not in themselves adequate reasons for ignoring any step of this academic realignment process in Section 2 below or forcing a schedule that prevents adequate discussion.
- 1.9 No academic realignments should be made if the cost savings or other benefits are inconsequential.
- 1.10 The process of realignment, described in Section 2 below, may stop at any time if there is evidence of inconsequential benefits or harmful consequences to the educational mission of the academic unit.

## **Section 2: Sequential Steps for Academic Realignment**

- 2.1 If the academic unit where the academic realignment proposal originates determines that sufficient reasons exist for realigning academic units, then it shall develop a formal realignment proposal in consultation with faculty, staff, students, administrators, and wherever needed, community stakeholders and professional leaders.
- 2.2 The affected academic unit shall obtain evidence of support or rejection of the proposed realignment through methods that allow adequate discussion. Evidence shall include, but not be limited to letters, votes, and survey results. The affected academic unit shall provide sufficient time and means for affected academic units to discuss and approve the proposed realignment. An absolute majority of the faculty (tenured, tenure-earning campus-wide, clinical in Nursing, and lecturers in the Library) of each affected academic unit must be in favor of realignment to constitute support.
- 2.3 If the proposed realignment is deemed appropriate by the affected parties, a written statement defining the proposed realignment and rationales for change shall be prepared that includes the items listed below. This written statement and its accompanying evidence of support or rejection shall then be presented to the dean of the affected academic unit.
  - 2.3.1 an evaluation current and proposed program requirements;
  - 2.3.2 a transition plan for currently enrolled students;
  - 2.3.3 a review both curriculum and resource coordination with other academic units;
  - 2.3.4 an assessment of both the tangible and intangible costs and benefits of proposed academic realignment;
  - 2.3.5 a clear discussion about how the mission of the academic unit will be enhanced with the proposed realignment;
  - 2.3.6 evidence of support and rejection of the proposed realignment; and
  - 2.3.7 A plan to implement the proposed academic realignment.
- 2.4 The dean shall, in turn, prepare a written statement concerning the realignment which addresses the same criteria identified in 2.3 above, especially the extent to which education and research at UAHuntsville will be enhanced. The dean shall forwards the recommendation to the

Provost along with the evidence of support or rejection from appropriate parties including the following:

- 2.4.1 the College's Council of Chairs,
  - 2.4.2 the College's Curriculum Committee;
  - 2.4.3 the College's staff; and
  - 2.4.4 community stakeholders and professional leaders, where appropriate.
- 2.5 The Provost, in turn, shall prepare a written statement concerning the realignment, to be accompanied by all materials discussed above. After presenting all the materials to and after consulting with appropriate parties such as the Council of Deans, University Curriculum Committee and the President, the provost may forward the written proposal along with all the previous statements and evidence described paragraphs 2.1 through 2.4 to the Board of Trustees for review and approval.

## Appendix D Errata

Changes and updates since the initial draft of the report are:

May 15, 2009 final version (in addition to removing "DRAFT" watermark)

- p. 22, Section 4.3.1, line 3: Added "per year" after "\$600,000".
- p. 28, Table at top of page: Added "Annual" to tuition items
- p. 29, Changed "to internally reposition" to "to reposition ...internally"
- p. 35, UC Berkeley and UI Urbana-Champaign bullets: Added "of" after School
- p. 35, Clarified college names and departments at UC Berkeley
- p. 35, Removed "Berkeley" after "UI Urbana-Champaign"
- p. 47, Disadvantages: Added three bullets -
  - If MIS is included, Business may duplicate its contents within Business
  - Different expectations regarded funded research for MIS
  - Tenure expectation differences may effect MIS
- p. 52, Current Issues, line 2: Added "Also, where is Comm. Arts" at end of line
- p. 54, Disadvantages: Added two bullets -
  - Identity issues for many programs
  - Where is Comm. Arts?
- P. 55, Clarified that "option 8" is in Section 4.7.8
- p. 57, Division of Physical Sciences, Disadvantages: Added bullet -
  - Joint math PhD program support likely to diminish with dissolution of math
- p. 61, Physical Sciences Division, Disadvantages: Added bullet -
  - Joint math PhD program support likely to diminish with dissolution of math
- p. 70, Disadvantages: Added bullet -
  - Support for joint math PhD program likely to diminish with dissolution of math
- p. 73, Disadvantages, Bullet 1: Changed "inn" to "in"