DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS AND FINANCE

ARKANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY

2007 Aggie Road
P.O. Box 239
State University, AR
72467-0239

Phone:
(870) 972-2280
Fax:
(870) 972-3417

Thursday, May 7, 2015

**To:** Dr. Tim Hudson, Chancellor
Arkansas State University

**From:** Jeffrey Pittman, Chair
ASU Shared Governance Oversight Committee

**Subject:** Shared Governance Proposal - 15 SP 05 – Realignment of academic colleges

This spring, the Shared Governance Oversight Committee reviewed a proposal for realignment of academic colleges at ASU, Jonesboro. (The proposal follows on page two of this memorandum.) The proposal originated from two task forces examining the issue of college realignment. The SGOC assigned itself as the responsible committee in the shared governance process. Under shared governance, this proposal was forwarded from the SGOC to the ASU Faculty Senate, Staff Senate, Deans Council, Chairs Council, Graduate Student Council, and the Student Government Association. Comments and votes were collected from all shared governance constituencies.

The SGOC sends this proposal to you for your consideration.

**Shared Governance Proposal**
**15 SP 05 - Realignment of academic colleges**

**Date:** April 8, 2015

**Sponsoring Constituents:** Dr. Shivan Haran, Chair of the Faculty Senate Academic Restructuring Task Force, and Dr. Lynita Cooksey, Chair of the Provost's Academic Restructuring Task Force

**Rationale for Proposal:**

Arkansas State University constituencies were charged with recommending the realignment of the nine academic colleges, with the intent being to contribute to the long-term financial health of the university, and/or to better meet the changing academic and career needs of its students, and create ways to enhance academic quality through collaboration.

**Recommendation:**

Upon completion of the work of the two task forces, the following consensus recommendation for academic college restructuring is proposed with each unit represented by one dean:

1. College of Agriculture and Technology, and College of Engineering
2. College of Business
3. College of Education and Behavioral Sciences
4. College of Fine Arts, College of Humanities and Social Sciences, and College of Media and Communication
5. College of Nursing and Health Professions
6. College of Sciences and Mathematics

The new College units will begin transitioning during the 2015-2016 academic year with College nomenclature determined and restructuring at the department and/or program level, as appropriate, to be completed by June 30, 2016.

## Shared Governance Proposal Review Process

**Proposal: Realignment of ASU Academic Colleges**

Date Received: April 9, 2015

+

Is Proposal an SGOC Issue? - **Yes**

Responsible Assigned Committees:

**Shared Governance Oversight Committee**

Type of Review: **Expedited**

Handbook Issue: **No**

**Constituency Groups:**

- ✓ Faculty Senate
- ✓ Staff Senate
- ✓ Dean's Council
- ✓ Chair's Council
- ✓ SGA
- ✓ GSC
- ✓ Vice Chancellor

Notes:

| | **Expedited Review Status** |
|---|---|
| SGOC - establishes disposition of **Realignment Proposal** | Due By: 4/13/2015 |
| SGOC establishes itself as responsible SGC - Sends **Realignment Proposal** to Constituency Groups for comments | Due By: 4/13/2015 |
| Constituency Groups Chairs - forward comments received back on **Realignment Proposal** to SGOC | Due By: 4/22/2015 |
| SGOC - Prepares **Realignment Proposal** final draft & sends final draft to constituency groups for an up/down vote | Due By: 5/1/2015 |
| Consistency Groups - vote & notify SGOC | Due By: 5/8/2015 |
| SGOC - tally votes & sends final report to Chancellor | Due By: 5/12/2015 |
| Chancellor - reviews & responses | Due By: 5/26/2015 |

Responses to 15 SP 05

I. The Academic Deans Council
Voted unanimously on the following response to 15 SP 05. There are no suggested edits to the proposal.
"The Academic Deans' Council accepts the restructuring proposal (15 SP 05) that has been presented to us by the Provost as written. We recognize and appreciate the Provost's open and collaborative processes that resulted in similar academic restructuring proposals from two independent committees of faculty, staff, students, and community members. We are prepared to continue to work collaboratively on the restructuring process."

II. The Faculty Senate
Voted unanimously (two abstentions) in favor of 15 SP 05. There are no suggested edits to the proposal.

III. The Graduate Student Council
Voted in favor (8 yes - 1 no) of 15 SP 05. (The no vote requested a more detailed proposal rationale where one could see exactly how the university would be saving money.)

IV. Staff Senate
Voted in favor (14 yes – 2 no - 3 abstentions). There are no suggested edits to the proposal.

V. Chairs Council
Chairs Council supports unanimously proposal 15 SP 05 (29 yes – 0 no). The following suggested edit from the chairs council was **rejected** by the SGOC at its meeting April 27, 2015. The SGOC rejection was based on a belief that department-level language was specifically excluded by the two task forces during the construction of the realignment proposal. Inclusion of the chairs' language by the SGOC at the April meeting would open 15 SP 05 to a second round of revision, review, and voting, something not desirable at this time.

a. **Rejected language**: "Input from chairs of impacted departments, being those most intimately aware of department and program level needs, will be assured and actively sought during the planning and implementation of the 2015-2016 transition process. "Impacted departments" include, but are not limited to, (1) departments/units for which potential changes in instructional or administrative staffing are being discussed, and (2) departments/units that are being considered for transfer out of the "default" merged college and into a different college."

VI. Student Government Association
Voted 0-16-0, unanimously opposed to 15 SP 05. The vote rationale:

a. Senators have expressed their inability to see the positive effects this proposal would have on the university as a whole. A request has been made to word this proposal in a way that it can be dissected as a "S.M.A.R.T. Goal" (specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, timely).
b. In addition, some fear that this proposal may "cheapen" their degree.
c. In sum, SGA Senators (and their constituents) desire clarity on the short-term/long-term effects this proposal will have on their individual colleges, their constituents, and the university as a whole.