

## **Comments on combination, October 18 to October 29, 2004**

### **Apparel, Educational Studies, and Hospitality Management – October 26**

#### **Savings Generated**

- The proposal needs to include an estimation of costs that will be involved in a combination (e.g., signage, business card, letter head, moving people to new office space, renovation, etc) and clarification of where money for these expenses will come from, if central administration does not cover these costs. Does it come out of the \$500,000 savings? From development funds? From department funds?

#### **Deans Office**

- The proposal indicates that several positions will be eliminated but does not specify whether there will be a loss of services for departments. The proposal should clarify whether all services currently provided will be continued, which services will be eliminated, and/or who else will assume these responsibilities.
- Although shown on the organization chart for the dean's office, the written text does not clearly describe the communications and alumni relations staff and support staff function or organization. Some mention of communications is included in the development section. The communications employees are not part of the foundation and should not be included in that section. A new paragraph should be added to the dean's office description to address the communications and alumni relations staff.
- Additional questions that should be addressed in the proposal:
- What will the search process for dean's office positions be like?
- Who will write the job descriptions?
- Who will serve on search committees if all current employees will be reapplying for positions?
- Who will make the final decision on the P & S and merit positions for the new Dean's office?
- Will there be a format like the merit system for the P&S positions (e.g., based on years of service)?
- If anyone can bump into open merit positions, we could lose all institutional memory. Is there any way to only allow those currently in positions to apply for the open positions?
- If merit staff lose their positions, do they have the right to "bump" other merit staff in the university?

#### **Student services**

- The proposal indicates that several positions will be eliminated but does not specify whether there will be a loss of services for the student or for departments. The proposal should clarify whether all services currently provided will be continued, which services will be eliminated, and/or who else will assume these responsibilities.
- A concern was voiced that in one part of the proposal it talks about how important the student services function is, yet 4.5 positions are being eliminated from that area. This seems to send mixed messages.
- If the new positions require an increase in pay grade, will there really be the level of savings as predicted from the loss of merit & P&S positions.
- Additional questions that should be addressed in the proposal:
- What will the search process for student services office positions be like?
- Who will write the job descriptions?
- Who will serve on search committees if all current employees will be reapplying for positions?
- Who will make the final decision on the P & S and merit positions for the student services office?  
Will there be a format like the merit system for the P&S positions (e.g., based on years of service)?

- If anyone can bump into open merit positions, we could lose all institutional memory. Is there any way to only allow those currently in positions to apply for the open positions?
- If merit staff lose their positions, do they have the right to "bump" other merit staff in the university?

### **External funding/Scholarships**

- The effect of the combination on college level scholarships was asked. The proposal should clarify what will be done with current scholarships and the distribution of scholarships in the future.

### **Technology**

- The current proposal does not clarify what the structure of the technology support area will be and how services will be coordinated between the two colleges. The priorities for the technology area are not specified. These priorities and the organizational structure for educational technology should be clearly expressed.
- While technology is important for faculty, staff, and students, why isn't there a closer look at eliminating positions in this area? There has been widespread dissatisfaction among faculty and staff in CFCS with a P&S member of the tech staff in CFCS and yet nothing is being done about it. This is the time to do that and reconfigure the staff members who are competent
- The technology positions should be better defined, new position descriptions written, and all should have to reapply for new combined college positions. The search should be open to more than those currently in the positions.

### **Governance**

- Concern was raised by tenure track faculty of having to shift to a new document when they are within one or two years of tenure. A longer phase in period may be more appropriate.

### **Dean's search**

- What will with Dean's search committee use as criteria for the new Dean's position? What will the timeline for the search be? How will faculty members have an opportunity to provide input to what the criteria should be? All of these issues should be clarified in the proposal.

### **Other**

- Distance education (both credit and noncredit courses and distance programs) administration is not mentioned. How will this be handled in new structure?

## **Curriculum and Instruction – October 26**

### **Discussion on College Combination.**

Tom explained that eligible faculty are encouraged to vote through Access+ beginning October 27 continuing through November 1. If anyone needs assistance getting in to Access+, please see your support person or Clyciane Michelini in the CTLT. There will be two votes – one vote on the name of the college and one vote on the proposal itself. The Planning committee felt that it was important that the proposal be evaluated on its own merits and not tied in with anything else. The following are comments and questions from staff. Tom Andre and Gary Phye jointly answered the questions.

- Director of Licensure – Dean retains the title of Director of Education Teaching/Licensure, an associate director will be assigned and a program coordinator will be hired to handle the licensure. Details are still pending.
- Status of Merit and P&S staff – P&S positions will be opened up for staff from the two colleges. Staff will need to apply for the positions. Because the Merit positions are governed by the AFSCME collective bargaining agreement details are still being discussed between Human Resources and the dean's offices. Our field experiences staff are considered C&I even though they are housed in Student Services, so those positions are not affected.
- Space – where will staff be housed? Since the first year of savings will come too late to be used for hiring, the current plans include using the funds to remodel the east wing of MacKay, if the provost office matches the savings. The Dean's office will be housed in the current location of the

College of Education's Dean's office. Some minor improvements may be done to that location. If the full remodeling to the east wing of MacKay is approved, there will be adequate space for all of Student Services and Field Experiences.

- Does a “no” vote keep things the way they are? That depends on the Faculty Senate's interpretation. There are no limits on what the president can do – he can change the proposal if he wishes. Faculty need to remember that the Board of Regents will be considering their 4-year plan when they address the combination. They also need to consider whether or not the colleges will survive alone or are they better off combining when competing with the remaining seven colleges. The merged college would then be the 4<sup>th</sup> largest college as opposed to one of the smallest.
- Faculty Senate Survey – The survey was done by three members of the task force. It was poorly done and the timing was unfortunate. Faculty should not confuse this survey with the combination vote through Access+.
- Technology – the plan indicates changes may occur but isn't clear on what the changes will be. The plan does request that no resources will be cut. The committee felt there are advantages to both systems and spent a lot of time analyzing both systems. A survey was done to collect data. The committee has also worked with the university's new CIO as the plan will need to fit within his goals.
- Is the CTLT facility at risk? There may be misconceptions about what they do. Their focus on teacher ed and technology was made clear, so it is not believed that the facility is at any risk.
- Has there been discussion on the formation of sub-organizational units that might bring together departments, i.e. School of Education? There has been some discussion but nothing definite.

### **Educational Leadership and Policy Studies – October 21**

Following are some questions that were raised at the meeting, and if you could respond to them, that will be very helpful as we work to understand the plan for combining the colleges.

1. On page two the following language appears:

*As stated in the proposed mission statement, the college will bring together the faculty and staff expertise that provides an integrative approach to the quality of life for the individual, the family, the consumer, the community, and the schools.* (emphasis added)

But on page four the mission statement is provided as follows:

*The College provides an integrative approach to improving the quality of life for individuals, families, consumers, and communities by:*

- linking discovery, science, creativity, and practice;
- applying the knowledge of learning in all endeavors; and
- developing leaders for roles in research, education, business and industry, and health and human services

Is the absence of the language “and the schools” on page four simply a typo or was the intent not to include it? These statements appear to be inconsistent and we hope the page two language is what is really meant.

2. On page 6, the language “*The Planning Committee recommends a department-driven, centralized college system for IT.*” appears to be inconsistent. Could you clarify what is really meant by this statement?
3. The second paragraph on page six, also related to IT resulted in this question from our group: Why change anything?
4. We have read the research committee report, referenced on page 7. Our conclusion is that the research plan really refers to how support structures will be organized? Is that conclusion correct?
5. Assessment, which is addressed on page 8, currently is a departmental function. Why is a common collecting and reporting system being proposed?

6. Also on page 8, related to promotion and tenure under section 7.4, will current faculty be “grand fathered” meaning that they could chose to use the current P+T documents if they chose rather than have to meet a new, currently unstated policy?
7. Faculty had a number of questions about the process for selecting a new dean, which is outlined on page 9. These questions included the following:
  - a. Who will select the new dean?
  - b. Will faculty have input on interim dean candidates?
  - c. Will Associate and Assistant Deans serve on an interim basis until the new, permanent dean is selected?

The faculty also observed that in the following language:

*The Workgroup on Process for Selection of New Dean is continuing to gather information about the best way to select a dean of the new college and will issue a report on November 1, 2004. The selection process will follow standard procedures for administrative searches set up by the Provost (see <http://www.provost.iastate.edu/documents/admsearch/>). Within this framework, the work group will make recommendations about the process (including timing) to ensure that the search results in a strong and effective Dean.*

Sentence one seemed to contradict sentence two but sentence three appeared to clarify sentence one. By this observation the faculty meant that if a process is in place (sentence two), why is a committee working on identifying a process (sentence one) unless that simply has to do the timing (sentence three). Anyway, they would appreciate some clarification of this circumstance.

Many thanks for addressing these questions.

#### **Food Science and Human Nutrition – October 25**

- Name vote—FSHN: 16 Human Sciences, 9 Ed FCS, 1 abstained (60% of faculty voted on name). According to the report to the Planning Committee for the Combination, overall vote was 63% for Human Sciences.
- Faculty Senate doing survey not related to this meeting/report—asks questions related to the process, etc.—reply if you want to.
- LAS seems to be concerned about the proposed name; Interim Dean White is able to explain rationale for name choice to LAS. Oldham and Alekel recommended that the background/explanation of how Human Sciences name is a reasonable choice be included in the proposal. Oldham indicated that students are concerned about the name of the college on their degree.
- FCS faculty vote on the proposed combination document will occur through Access Plus; vote will occur Wed., Oct 27 – Mon., Nov 1, 5 pm. Faculty Senate review Nov. 9 and Dec. 7; Board of Regents review proposal in Feb or March, 2005.
- Foundation scholarship funds: Murphy asked if it is known who will be eligible for these existing funds. At this time, the plan is to keep definition rigid so student must be in specific program/major/college in order to receive discipline-specific scholarships unless receive OK from donor.
- Office plans: Oldham noted that the proposed office plan was great.
- P. 8-- There are many overlapping areas in curriculum between Ed and FCS. The first thing for a combined curriculum committee is to determine common areas, new areas, etc.
- Oldham noted that the Governance portion of the proposal specifically names student involvement in governance committees and this should be encouraged. FCS Student Council expressed concern that there were not many opportunities for student involvement.
- P&T-- During 05-06, 06-07, there will still be 2 P&T documents; in 07-08, there will be one P&T document for combined college. During 2<sup>nd</sup> year of transition, there is potential for 3 documents to select from for review (existing for each college and new combination). The main difference in governance documents is who could vote on P&T, and specified format; departmental P&T stays

the same. Alekel discussed formatting guidelines—consistency would be nice; Reitmeier agreed that information about format ideally should come from University level

- Anderson asked about office staff shift. Yes, some office positions will be lost. The proposed administrative structure was reviewed. Some merit and some P&S positions will be lost; some merit positions will be reclassified to new P&S positions.
- Proposal suggests renovation of east wing of MacKay Hall for Student Services. The Provost indicated support for some matching funds. The proposed Student Services Structure was reviewed.
- Dean White reported that alumni support and concerns vary.

### **Health and Human Performance – October 21**

- Concern that the ~\$515,000 in savings will be subject to reallocation or reversion.
- There is a large salary discrepancy between FCS and COE faculty. This problem will lower morale and distract faculty from their work.
- There is a large discrepancy also in the amount and duration of funding for graduate assistants in the two colleges.
- Are the indirect costs that come back to funded faculty administered similarly in FCS and COE?
- In terms of Promotion and Tenure, how will faculty who have not yet received tenure be handled? The proposal states that policies remain in effect until Spring 2006. Under what procedures will someone who started in 2002 be evaluated?
- How are teaching loads in FCS and COE calculated?
- The name “Education, Family and Consumer Sciences” is unacceptable. This name does not represent our department well, nor does it represent Food Science and Human Nutrition. There are a lot of faculty that want a name that does not just combine the name of the two current colleges, and want a name that represents all stakeholders.
- How will the Research Institute for Studies in Education the various research institutes in FCS function? It does not seem reasonable that there is no opportunity for savings in this area.
- There should also be opportunities for savings in the area of technology.

### **Human Development and Family Studies – October 25**

- Is the vote binding—No, it’s advisory only
- Will tally of the votes on the combination proposal and new College name be kept separate by colleges? If I were a new dean coming in, I would want to know how the vote results were broken down by colleges.
- What is process for getting a more formal sense of the evaluation of this report? What about input from other stakeholders such as alumni?
- Staff input has been solicited through workgroups and open forums. Only faculty can vote though.
  
- May want to weigh input from other constituencies (alumni, staff, etc.) in a more formal way.
- Does outcome of vote change anything? If negative vote, will plan change? The word vote conjures up more than something that will be used for advisory purposes only.
- If go into reallocation mode, what impact does this have as a major reallocation? Will new college take same cuts (reallocations) as other colleges? (Noted that proposal on page 3, bullet 2 states that savings generated by the plan will be accepted as the required reallocation for FY06.)
- If vote is no, will there be political ramifications to the colleges? Concern about consequences of a negative vote and that it could have negative political ramifications.
- President Geoffroy has stated that an alternative to combining Colleges could be to split up the departments and incorporate them into other units.

- If it's not a true vote, then it becomes a threat. Should have been told from beginning that it would happen (combination), as opposed to being told we had a vote and choice. This is not a democratic process, and has a totalitarian "feel" and I respond very negatively to that.
- Surprised to see suggestion that first year of savings would go towards remodeling.
- If doing because of state budget crisis, is this appropriate use of funds? What about the public relations aspects of this—it could be very negative. This doesn't do anything to change the academic programs, and it feels like it is slap in face to those who will lose their jobs. Believe that computer support should be a higher priority for the first year of the savings, to support academic programs.
- The first year savings could instead provide money to recruit outstanding professors and also to bring up salary levels of those who need salary increases. (However salary increases would have to be permanent, not just for the first year.)
- Former CFCS Dean Roskey commented that student services would be a much more efficient operation if student services area was remodeled and could combine the entire area (more efficient use of support staff in particular).
- What does it mean to follow the AFSCME contract about merit staff changes? (There is an issue about whether all ISU merit staff can apply for new positions that develop, or only those in the two Colleges affected.)
- A member of the Extension working group had gathered additional feedback from Extension staff. It's been stated that this combination would maintain all programs and that it would only make changes in administration. Report says that Extension budget will be reviewed and allocated under guidance of new college. This has huge implications in CFCS Extension to Families if reallocations are made from the current Extension budget. There's a strong argument to support the way resources are currently allocated the way they are in the college. Feels there's a "resource grab" going on.
- What is timeframe for administrative positions (when will come available, be interviewed, etc.)? Will new dean be involved in hiring of administrative staff and associate deans? All positions will be developed after the BOR approves the combination, probably in March, and the new dean will be involved in hiring.
- Staff at college level – how can they be loyal to college in future? They have the stress of having to worry about if they have a job or not.
- How are faculty members (without tenure) that have already been hired affected by a changed governance document? Will they be grand fathered in? (Clarified that there is no grandfathering, but a three-year transition to a new College document for all tenure and promotion reviews.)
- The composition of the College Review committee for promotion and tenure is not specified in the proposal, nor is the policy. So how can I evaluate to be able to understand and vote?
- CFCS Faculty Senate Caucus group was told that if no one liked either proposed college name, that new names would be considered. Send recommendations to Ann Marie Fiore.
- Concern for high school students looking for schools if omit Education from college name. Also concerned about using Human Sciences name since many other departments on campus can be categorized as human sciences.
- One person commented that, after participating in many discussions, not one person was found to be supportive of how the President and Provost have structured the combination process.

### **College of Education central units – October 22**

- **Including:** P&S and Merit staff from the Dean's Office; Education Student Services, and RISE (14 of 16 or 88% attendance); Jerry Thomas, Interim Dean
- Questions, clarification and discussion centered primarily on personnel issues.
- There will be 6 full-time P&S positions in the Student Services area.

- One merit position that was initially included on the Student Services org chart now appears as a P&S position on the Dean's Office org chart.
- The classification of the other merit positions in Student Services has not been determined.
- One Student Services staff member commented that the planning committee report does not give enough credit for reduction of personnel in the student services office. The elimination of one of the positions does not result in a monetary savings by COE or FCS, however it does result in a monetary savings somewhere, and by showing a reduction of 2.5 positions, the report does not accurately reflect the loss of one person to do some work. There will be 3.5 less people, and a report which shows a reduction of 2.5 gives a false impression of the amount of personnel to accomplish the work.
- There is still some question as to where the support staff for the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Programs will be housed.
- A plan to remodel MacKay will be one of the first items of business addressed after the Proposal to Combine has been approved.
- The two interim deans as well as one or more P&S employees from outside the college will serve as the search committee to fill all positions.
- The organization of RISE will remain as is when the college combines. This is not to say the new Dean will not review the structure of centers and units but that those positions are not affected at this time.
- In addition to two staff dedicated to Communications and two staff dedicated to Development, an additional temporary staff member dedicated to that work seems a bit excessive from the College of Education perspective. Realizing that there will be a lot of FCS alumni to involve in the change, this may be reasonable for the short term but to commit permanent resources at this time seems unwise.
- Student Services staff emphasized the need for a full-time director or supervisor housed within the unit. Without this connection to administration the unit suffers.
- Jerry highly encouraged everyone, both merit and P&S employees to seek a position in the new college. All our staff are outstanding and the new college will only be enhanced by building a foundation on the experience these individuals bring. This will mean that current merit employees will need to seek P&S positions. Don't feel intimidated to do so.
- For the sake of efficiency, Heidi will coordinate a dialogue with Carla Espinoza including any questions about personnel matters you might have. E-mail or call Heidi any time to discuss these. She will copy everyone in this group with any messages to Carla as well as any responses. It is certainly anyone's prerogative to contact Carla directly and as the process moves along you may have personal details that would be more appropriately discussed one-on-one with her.

Points to clarify with Carla Espinoza include:

1. Will everyone receive a termination notice since the current structure is no longer in place as of June 30, 2005?
2. If someone chooses not to apply for a position in the new college, will they be eliminated from their current position and entitled to related benefits?
3. In what order will the merit positions be filled? Will skills be matched to position responsibilities within classification?

**College of Family and Consumer Sciences central units – October 22**

- At the beginning of the meeting Dr. White present an overview of the personnel policy sheet and addressed questions related to that. She emphasized that this is a difficult/emotional time and that is important that people not become angry with co-workers or place blame as some of the decisions are made.

- Dr. White explained that Extension staff were included in the Administrative meeting, as they are not involved in the department meetings, and the Associate Dean for Families Extension is part of the Dean's Office.
- She emphasized it is important to remember that we are building a new college, something better than we have. The new college will be the 4<sup>th</sup> largest college, with better representation on many university committees, etc. It is anticipated that the Student Services area will be enhanced, with the addition of some new areas that one or both colleges do not currently have.
- Dr. White distributed a handout "Personnel Transitions, October 2004" and discussed the procedure for application for P&S positions, the fact that Merit positions are covered under the AFSCME collective bargaining unit, and encouraged Merit employees, if they have questions to feel free to contact Human Resources.

#### Questions:

- Sue Ellen Tuttle: Is there a trend to change merit into P&S? As you look at the new structure, were merit changed to P&S intentionally. Dr. White's response: If new responsibilities were added, we were inclined to change the position/s to reflect additional responsibilities.
- Lee Van Brocklin: Will all positions have to be applied for? PW: Yes, all P&S
- Sarah Carlson: What do you mean by the search committee will be representative?
- Sue Ellen Tuttle: What if areas of expertise are not included in committee membership? It would be hard for one committee to have information on all areas of expertise. PW: May need some subcommittees, but there will not be a committee for each position.
- Linda Young: Do the positions in Development and Alumni Relations not overlap? Will those positions be included in the positions open to people? PW: They are part of the Dean's Office and are included in the process. Positions in Associate Dean for Research area are included. Extension positions not impacted – it is where the budget comes from, which you would not know without asking. Good question.
- Sue Ellen Tuttle: Can you tell me more about the makeup of the search committee? PW: We are not prepared to answer that yet. The proposal says the 2 Interim Deans will appoint members to the search committee, but as to makeup of the committee that has not been decided yet.
- Dynette Mosher: When would interviews occur? PW: Depends when approval of Regents is received, but we would hope that PIQs/PDQs would be developed and ready to go on approval.
- Sue Ellen Tuttle: If decisions regarding placement in positions (following search, etc) are later, will people still get 90 days notice? PW: That is the law for P&S
- Who will write PIQs/PDQs? PW: Not decided yet, but it is anticipated that many people in this room will be involved in working on these descriptions.
- Lee Van Brocklin: Changes/suggestions to proposal before formal representation to Provost. Can these be considered? PW: Please feel free to send me an e-mail, or other members of the Planning Committee regarding inconsistencies, etc. If you want to talk to me personally, please come in and do so.
- Linda Young: It shows that the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Programs will be housed in the Dean's office area (in Lago) ?? PW: The committee gave that a lot of thought and it is anticipated that the Assoc. Dean will have an office in the Student Services area in MacKay in addition to the office in Lago.

#### **Public Open forum, October 20, 2004**

Attendance: 8 members of the Planning Committee- 7 Forum Attendees

- Susan Carlson chaired the Forum. She began with an overview of each section of the October 18 combination proposal. Although Susan responded to most of the questions and discussion, other members of the PC participated. In the notes that follow, the identity of the speaker not given.
- Were the workgroup recommendations accepted or modified? Answer: some were accepted, some were modified, and some were put on hold.

- The faculty of the two colleges will have the final vote on the proposal before it is officially presented to the Provost. Question: why can't P&S vote? Answer: only a faculty vote would be taken because most of the decisions involved with the combination affected faculty. Avenues for input from P&S exist through upcoming department and administrative discussions. Also written responses may be sent to the PC and Provost. P&S have also given input in previous forums and through workgroup participation.
- Why was a rationale given for keeping two development officers but not for keeping two communication officers? Answer: if the combination is approved there will be considerable work to keep constituents informed as well as increased marketing efforts.
- Will the savings be used to invest in technology? Answer: The proposal calls for maintenance of technology if not improvement. The University is in the process of establishing a campus wide technology proposal and eventually the new college would be part of that plan. And priorities for the savings are only proposed at this point. After July 1, more changes, new priorities could be set.
- What is the timing for hiring a new Dean? Answer: after July 1 there will be one Dean who perhaps will have to be an interim. A workgroup that will report on November 1 is developing a plan for a Dean search. All University policies regarding the search will be followed. Several scenarios have been discussed including if the Regents approve the combination, a national search would begin with the hope that a permanent Dean could be in place on or soon after July 1. Another scenario is to have an interim Dean appointed for a limited term.
- Will the new student services advising coordinator advise freshmen? Answer: no change in student services is being recommended so the current freshman advising in FCS will continue.
- It was understood that if the Student Services Workgroup report was not accepted in its entirety that a "dialogue" with interested persons would occur. Answer: there were no votes taken in the Student Services workgroup. The majority views were represented in the final proposal.
- A student attendee expressed concern that the number of senators to GSB would be affected by the combination. The current number of representatives will be reduced. A related comment was made that scholarships awarded on a quota per college basis might also be decreased with the combination and that discussions to prevent a reduction would occur with the appropriate administrators.
- An assumption in the report is that savings will go to faculty lines. Was consideration given to using the money for technology or enhancement of student services? Answer: the President feels we will serve students better with additional faculty. Administrators ultimately decide where the greatest needs are to be found. Concern was then expressed that a shortage of faculty is not a supportive argument for the combination. Mention was made of the new initiative by the President to see that tuition dollars will follow the students. Also an increase in faculty lines could be made to develop new programs and/or respond to national needs.
- What will happen with the savings the first year? Answer: since there won't be time to hire new faculty, the salary savings the first year likely will go to remodeling part of MacKay Hall for the new combined student services area. Questions then followed regarding the source of the funding: would there be enough money, could this be a capital project, could we find funding elsewhere? Bottom line: if there is a match from the University to the first year salary savings, there should be enough money for the renovation.
- Students expressed concerns and some frustrations regarding the apparent lack of timely information about the combination. And, when their input was solicited, there wasn't enough time to get a representative vote or have a full discussion. Mention was made of previous attempts to get students involved but there wasn't much response. Students were represented on most workgroups. It was suggested that the current undergraduate student leaders in the two colleges take the initiative to try to meet in the next 10 days to discuss the proposal and provide their reactions/suggestions.

- How will the new administrative structure be implemented? Will there be new searches? Answer: a meeting will be held this Friday, October 22, to discuss the process with those who will be affected. Until then no public comment will be made. This is a sensitive issue so the persons affected by the reorganization need to be informed first.
- Has the proposed 4-H and Youth initiative been discussed? Answer: yes, it has been discussed in several planning groups. It is believed that the initiative will be strengthened by having a stronger connection to a college. 4-H programs draw from all ISU colleges but historically a strong tie to FCS and ED make the new college the logical tie. And existing programs, for instance with Agriculture, will stay as they have in the past.
- When collecting information about strategies for hiring a new Dean, were colleges like the proposed new college consulted and/or were schools with departments consulted? Answer: Colleges as similar to ours as possible to determine were contacted. There are no direct comparisons. An emphasis on the land-grant traditions was emphasized.
- Will recruitment of new students be a problem? Answer: in checking with recently combined colleges such as in this proposal, it was found that students look at majors, departments, programs and not look for a college to decide on enrollment.
- Did we look at graduate as well as undergraduate recruitment issues? Answer: emphasis was on undergraduate recruitment but that affects graduate students as well. Mention was made that all faculty will need to take a more active role in recruitment - this will be a university wide initiative.
- Can the new name simply be a combination of the current names - Education and Family and Consumer Sciences? Answer: no - results of polls, surveys, of faculty, staff, alumni, students have resulted in the current two choices: Human Sciences and Education, Family, and Consumer Sciences. An attendee mentioned that FCS alumni hope that the name "family" be retained somehow. Mention was made that the mission is more a driving force for what we are to be and do as opposed to what the new name will be.
- Is it possible that in the future the new college will transition into the social science college for the university? Answer: that could happen - changes in the future are always a possibility.
- Is this proposal official now? Answer: there will be a faculty vote and then it will be presented officially to the Provost. He does have a copy of it now but it is not "official" until all the discussions and votes have been completed.

#### **Open forum, October 26, 2004**

Approximately 25 people were in attendance including six or seven Planning Committee members, a few students, staff, alumni, and faculty. Associate Provost Susan Carlson provided an introduction to the meeting by reviewing the process that has been used to date and informed the group of the twelve working groups that have been working the last six months. She also reminded the attendees of the web site through the Provost's home page where all of the information regarding the combination has been documented.

Carlson then handed out copies of the proposal and reviewed part 3, goals and assumptions. She mentioned that the calculated saving would be approximately \$500,000 primarily from one less dean, fewer associate deans, and less staff in the student services area. She reviewed the changes in staffing shown in section 6 and briefly discussed the naming issue, which has been the point of largest contention.

Carlson then asked for questions or comments from those in attendance. The following questions were posed and a summary of comments follows:

***What has this process cost in terms of staff time and energy?*** Lots of time has been spent and allows people to think in a forward fashion.

The costs should be calculated and added into the final report to the administration ♦ Cost of the reproduction of materials has been high. There will be additional costs if the proposal is passed, due to the implementation (printed promotional brochures, signage, etc.)

**What is meant when it is stated the new college will be 4<sup>th</sup> largest?** Enrollment and faculty size makes it 4<sup>th</sup> largest on campus. Other measures could be used where it could be 2<sup>nd</sup> or higher

**What would the diploma say for graduating students if the combination goes through?** Students might have an option to have either. This will have to be looked into by the Registrar's Office. ♦

**Comment** The elimination of the assistant dean (Dr. Georgia Hale) as the director of COE Student Services has not been counted as part of the reduction of staff. The number of people doing the work has been reduced because she has not been included.

Each of the two interim deans met separately with their staff of members of the student services and dean's office on Friday, will the input given them at that time be taken into consideration and part of the report? Yes

**There is much concern in these offices about changing positions from merit to P&S and visa versa.**

**Will new merit positions be open to entire campus?** The deans and associate provost are working with Carla Espinosa on this issue and they will clarify it with her at an upcoming meeting. ♦

**There seems to be lots of changes in the dean's office organization. How will this work?** One basic principle that will be followed includes, if the responsibility changes so should the title, classification, salary. This is a change from the convocation where the term "enhanced merit positions" was used. The work group did not accept this term nor this proposal.

**Why was the support position for the Associate Dean of Undergraduate Programs moved from a merit to P & S level?** It was thought that the level of work was more at the P&S level and that with additional responsibilities given to the associate dean more responsibilities would be given to the staff member as well.

**Who will write the job descriptions for the new positions?** The two Deans along with Carla Espinosa

**The report was developed as a "consensus" rather than a vote. Is this the right thing to do?** Yes

**Why is all saved money going to new faculty lines rather than technology?** The Technology Work Group and sub groups did lots of work, conducted a survey, and collected many points of data. Survey conducted of students, staff, and faculty showed: Students satisfied with current support and Resources for technology are adequate. Work group is continuing to work. A university-wide technology analysis has been started though the AIT and this new college may serve as a "test model"

**Will the final proposal change with further input?** (Not answered or discussed)

**Why should all of the saved money be used for new faculty lines rather than some going for lab**

**equipment?** Generally funds for lab equipment comes from grants, end of year funding, and departmental funds, but these were not mentioned in the report. Faculty are the primary resource for students.

Additional faculty will mean more sections for students. Not all funds would be allocated at the start of the new college. President's directive was to use the funds saved for new faculty. Students may want more money spent on labs rather than faculty. Parents want more sections because section have been cut, allowing students to graduate on time. Apparel and Design needs more machines in their labs and need more space and more labs.

**Will the student survey on names be attached to the report?** The student name preference survey will be attached to the proposal and forwarded to the Provost ♦

**Will the proposal be changed based on the input that is provided?** No major changes will be made but addendums will be added. Clarifications and suggestions have been accepted

**Why was the web used and therefore no chance for alumni to make "hard copy" input into the process?** Some letters have been received. Post cards were sent out.

**What will happen to the P & T process for faculty?** There will be a phase in process with 2 committees continuing to operate the first year. The P&T process will stay the same until the faculty approves a new governance procedure

**Comments:**

- Workgroups were made up primarily of merit staff, P & S, and alumni, but the faculty are doing the voting. It is hoped that they (faculty) are talking with the staff
- The planning committee is following the directive from the Provost regarding who should vote on this process
- The work groups were formed to get the broadest representation possible
- Merit and P & S were asked to eliminate their own positions and this was hard for them to deal with
- Some other colleges think the combination is still too heavy on administration
- Discussion of time line - Board of Regents probably will make final decision in March

***When could the selection of a new dean occur?***

- Realistically, the work of a search committee could not start until March
- Probably not have a dean in place until January
- We undoubtedly will need an interim dean
- A major “first task” will be to build the “culture” of the new college, and we have been told that that often takes 2 years to accomplish

◆ Tasks to be completed

**FCS Student meeting, October 28, 2004**

Here are the concerns brought up by students at the FCS student meeting last night:

1. We really like our system of faculty advisors and would like to maintain it in the new college.
2. How can students be involved in the next steps as things evolve in the new college?
3. In the college of FCS, we have students appointed to college committees (curriculum, advising, etc.) through our student council. We would like to see this maintained. (This could also help with question #2.)
4. Will the FCS name be total lost (except for FCS Education) if the new college is named Human Sciences? How about having divisions of FCS and Education in the new college?
5. How will this combination affect our ties/affiliations with FCS national honor societies (Phi Upsilon Omicron, Kappa Omicron Nu) and professional organizations (AAFCS)?

I think the meeting went pretty well last night. Interim Dean White and the other committee members were very helpful in answering our questions.