

ORGANIZATIONAL DESIGN REQUIREMENTS TO SUPPORT THE COLLEGE OF ARTS & SCIENCES STRATEGIC PLAN

The College of Arts & Sciences Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) was asked by Provost Moore, Dean White, and the Arts and Sciences Council (ASC) to provide input on the future organizational structure of the College as described in the Cumulat/Julien Academic Futures white paper.

Given the SPC's current charter and structure, our evaluation only considers how the proposed "Three Dean' Model for the College will interact with the strategic plan for the College that we are developing. For a comprehensive review and recommendation of any changes to the organizational structure of the College, we recommend a separate committee be formed, with representation from the existing SPC and involvement from the Dean of A&S and the ASC.

The Problem: A strong sense of frustration by colleagues in the Natural Sciences lies at the impetus to think about structural change. A lack of resources devoted to the College has led to an untenable situation where startup costs and faculty hiring has become problematic in the Natural Sciences. In what is largely an attempt to address that problem, a significant number of our colleagues in the Natural Sciences support a restructuring of the College aimed at giving them more influence on decisions made at the Provost level. The size of the Natural Science faculty (and the number of student credit hours) represents over half of the College. If considered separately, the Natural Sciences division would be the largest College on Campus. Yet its representation in the ASC and on the College P&T committee is roughly one third. What is more, the Natural Science division is not a direct report to the Provost while smaller entities (Music School, Education, Business School, Engineering) are direct reports. Given the demand placed on the Natural Sciences by the growth of Engineering and the growing demand in STEM fields, there needs to be significant resources devoted to meeting student demand in the Natural Sciences.

The Solution: It is the opinion of the Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) that these problems can be addressed without changing the structure of the College. In fact, they can be more directly addressed by maintaining the structure of the college. The committee sees the problem as more an allocation question than one of structure. Put simply, the College requires a budget allocation that reflects its relative importance in terms of its size and contribution to the mission of the Campus. The SPC feels that the best way to address the problems spelled out in the Cumulat/Julien white paper is to guarantee the College maintains a strong Liberal Arts focus. Acting as a large and unified community of faculty, staff, and students, the College can more creatively and collaboratively address the current challenges.

The problems detailed in the Cumulat/Julien paper can more directly be addressed by the following: 1) allocate a proportionate share of campus resources to the College of Arts & Sciences; 2) make transparent all budget allocations at the Campus level; 3) bring representation on governing bodies within the college in line with the current size of faculty, staff, and students.

College Structure and the Strategic Plan: the SPC identifies a number of design criteria required to ensure that any changes to the structure of the College support the Strategic Plan currently being socialized with A&S Faculty, Students, and Staff.

Vision: The College of Arts & Sciences cultivates critical, creative, and compassionate thinkers.

Strategic Imperative 1: Teach to inspire the intellectual dexterity, rigorous exploration, and compassion required to engage with our changing world.

Strategic Imperative 2: Prioritize our research enterprise to define the frontiers of knowledge and solve important problems.

Strategic Imperative 3: Create a culture that welcomes all, inspires community, develops the individual, and engages the world.

To ensure progress toward this vision, any new college structure should:

- 1) Foster meaningful collaboration between all the divisions in the College (NS, A&H, SS).
- 2) Build on our strength as a diverse unit by emphasizing and recognizing our differences with the intent of supporting a diverse group of faculty, students and staff and creating meaningful community between all members of the College.
- 3) Be recognized as a leading unit among CU Boulder and be engaged in transparent decision making and shared agency with campus wide decisions.

In addition to the three key themes above, the SPC recommends the advantages and disadvantages listed below be considered by any group reviewing potential changes to the College's structure. Together, the vision, imperatives, themes and advantages/disadvantages can be used as a "scorecard" against which the quality and efficacy of any proposed structure should be evaluated.

ADVANTAGES OF CURRENT STRUCTURE

1. Promotes bringing different voices together in order to address challenges (this committee is an example).
2. Makes A&S the biggest college on campus.
3. Allows more budget flexibility to meet challenges.
4. Allows for a bigger pool of resources in order to make strategic investments.
5. Provides incentives for divisions to work together on projects involving teaching, research, and service.
6. Signals to students and to the outside world that combining the Arts & Sciences produces more robust, persuasive, and innovative solutions.
7. Problems we need to address involve both the sciences and the arts: social justice, sustainability, etc.
8. Proposed Hub will bring faculty, staff, and students together from all units which will make for a more vibrant culture.
9. Research opportunities lie at the intersection of the divisions.
10. Museums, Libraries, and Planetarium reach across all of the divisions and are fostering inter-divisional collaboration.
11. Active learning techniques already developed in the NS can be shared with those in the SS and A&H.

DISADVANTAGES OF CURRENT STRUCTURE

1. Too unwieldy: it's difficult to act in concert with so many different voices.
2. The diverse nature of the College militates against forming an identity, strategy, and brand.
3. Faculty governance is somewhat more difficult, harder to coordinate.
4. Current structure militates against strong advocacy by the individual divisions.
5. Current structure does not give adequate voice to the Natural Sciences. Given their current size, the Natural Sciences are under-represented in governing structures both within and outside the College.

ADVANTAGES OF THREE DEAN STRUCTURE

1. Allows for more effective policy and action.
2. Allows for better identity formation and effective branding.
3. Brings departments in each division closer together.
4. New things can be tried in the divisions and experimented with.
5. Divisional Deans can better represent the interests of their college by having a seat at the table in the Dean's Council.
6. A&S will be better represented on the Dean's Council, giving the College more influence on Campus decisions that affect the College.

DISADVANTAGES OF THREE DEAN STRUCTURE

1. Potential for less collaboration and cooperation.
2. Removes incentives for collaboration.
3. Potential for added costs (replication of administrative structures).
4. Transition period will stall progress in initiatives currently underway.
5. Proposed structure does not guarantee any of the problems identified will be solved.