

Provost's A&S Strategic Planning Committee Meeting, 6.23.22

Meeting Notes

- A. The provost shared a summary of what he learned on his recent call with the provost of the University of Nevada, Reno. He shared that when Reno reorganized from 1 large liberal arts college into 3 separate colleges it did not yield savings, but since then all 3 colleges have grown and they widely believe it was a great thing. About 5% of people would vote to have it go back to the way it used to be. They felt that the split into 3 separate colleges made things more manageable. They did not downgrade the department chairs in the process, they brought in external reviews, there were no positions eliminated, and the reorg created a fight for space. Initially, they didn't experience improvement in morale but as they worked through the transition they found that morale did get better. The reorg also yielded new departments and new majors. The decision to do their reorg came from the president.
- B. David Schultz shared that he also learned from the provost that a large share of the work to reorganize into 3 colleges was driven by the faculty.
- A. Committee members asked Schultz and Bradley a series of follow-up questions about their discussions with the Reno provost.
- B. Schultz presented a [diagram of a proposed divisional model](#) that positions department chairs as reporting to a divisional leader and divisional leaders reporting to the dean.
- C. Aaron Rollins, who worked with Schultz and others on the development of the diagram, explained that associate and assistant deans would consult with the divisional leaders and department chairs. He anticipates the different divisions having some positions that aren't necessary for another division, for example the sciences might need a research dean where other divisions might not.
- D. Schultz clarified that the titles used in the proposed model are just suggestions. These working titles are malleable.
- E. A committee member stated that their biggest concern with autonomous divisions is that it could create silos. Schultz argued that it breaks silos. Further discussion unfolded on these points.
- F. A committee member stated that their colleagues would prefer breaking into new colleges instead of divisions within one college. Another committee member argued that it's important to remain together as one college and dividing into 3 divisions can help streamline processes for better efficiency.
- G. Rollins proposed that the committee meetings going forward focus on specific topics concerning the model ([see attachment](#)).
- H. Committee members discussed the pros and cons of 3 divisions vs. breaking into 3 different colleges.
- I. A committee member said the proposed model is similar to what the college used to have but this new version is more fleshed out.
- J. A committee member strongly advised against the president or provost making a top-down decision to implement the proposed model. They added that the benefits of the model should be thoroughly explored and clearly articulated to maximize buy-in from the college.

- K. The committee voted to shift the focus of subsequent meetings to further exploration of the divisional model that was presented and will utilize proposal's outline of suggested topics to determine items that need to be further explored.