



**MINUTES**  
**FACULTY SENATE MEETING**  
**OCTOBER 15, 2008**  
**DODD HALL AUDITORIUM**  
**3:35 P.M.**

**I. Regular Session**

The regular session of the 2008-09 Faculty Senate was held on Wednesday, October 15, 2008. Faculty Senate President Jayne Standley presided.

**The following members attended the Senate meeting:**

T. Adams, M. Allen, T. Baker, K. Bearor, J. Beckham, S. Bellenot, W. Berry, P. Bowen, G. Burnett, M. Cai, E. Chicken, J. Clendinning, J. Cobbe, R. Coleman, E. Cormier, F. Davis, L. deHaven-Smith, J. Dorsey, J. Druash, I. Eberstein, K. Erndl, J. Fiorito, S. Fiorito, A. Gaiser, A. Gallard, J. Geringer, P. Gilmer, C. Greek, J. Hinterlong, W. Hochwarter, M. Kabbaj, E. Klassen, W. Landing, D. Latham, S. Lewis, L. Lyons, C. Madsen, T. Matherly, K. McCullough, W. Mio, R. Morris, J. O'Rourke, R. Pekurny, G. Rogachev, H. Schmidt, R. Schwartz, J. Sickinger, J. Sobanjo, S. Southerland, J. Spraggins, J. Standley, E. Stewart, M. Sussman, S. Thomas-Tate, E. Trowers, C. Upchurch, P. Villeneuve, D. VonGlahn, E. Walker, L. Wakamiya, Y. Wang, M. Wasko, C. Weissert, W. Weissert, C. Wiebe, P. Young, X. Yuan.

**The following members were absent. Alternates are listed in parenthesis:**

F. Abbott, C. Alamo, I. Audirac, R. Blaufarb, J. Bowers, R. Bruschteiler, D. Butler, R. Clarke, B. Diskin, J. Dodge, L. Edwards, A. El-Azab, T. Houpt, P. Iatorola (**T. Luschei**), G. Knight, W. Leparulo, C. Luongo, V. Mesev, J. Milligan, S. Milton, D. Moore, A. Mullis (**E. Haymes**), P. Munton, J. Pignatiello, R. Radach, V. Richard Auzenne, R. Romanchuk, K. Rost, O. Steinbock, H. Tang, N. Trafford, J. Turner, C. Ward, P. Ward, L. Wexler, J. Zheng.

**II. Approval of the Minutes**

The minutes of the September 17, 2008 meeting were approved as distributed.

**III. Approval of the Agenda**

The agenda was approved as distributed.

#### IV. **Report of the Steering Committee, E. Walker**

Since the September Senate meeting, the steering committee has met four times in weekly session and once with Provost Abele. Members of the steering committee also represented the faculty at the September meeting of the Board of Trustees.

Our main task over the past month has been gathering and summarizing the responses you all helped us gather to the report of the committee to study the organization of academic affairs. Subsequent to our September 24 deadline for responses, and prior to our October 9 meeting with the Provost, we packaged these responses in three parts. One is a three page chart summarizing responses from all the colleges across the university; the second part is a two-page memo with a summary response composed by the steering committee, after reading and discussing the full responses from all units; and the third part is the set of full responses themselves as shaped by the units and their senators.

We forwarded this three-part set of materials to the Provost on October 7. At our meeting with him on October 9, we reviewed and highlighted these materials, which we presented to him for his information. The faculty senate coordinator forwarded the summary chart to you last week with today's agenda; printed copies of the summary chart and the response memo (See addendum 1.) are also available at the sign-in table today, for your information and review. A few senators have forwarded to us clarifications of information reported on the chart; we have forwarded those clarifications to the Provost. The steering committee wants to emphasize the fact that, with your timely help, we have opened up a conversation with the administration about the report and its recommendations, and we remain hopeful that any action on those recommendations will occur only after all affected parties are further consulted and more details of any specific proposals are forthcoming.

In addition to this primary work on the academic affairs organization report, the steering committee this month received a report from the Torch awards committee and unanimously approved its nominations for three Torch awards; we discussed the current status of the university membership in the Workers' Rights Consortium; we referred a request from the College of Nursing to reconsider the definitions of honor categories for graduation to Undergraduate Studies and Dean Laughlin; and we met with David Johnson, the chair of the Graduate Policy committee, to discuss the final implementation plan for the new system to determine Graduate Faculty Status, passed by this body last spring. That implementation plan is forthcoming soon in a memo from Professor Johnson.

This concludes the report of the steering committee.

**V. Report of Standing Committees**

There were no reports of Standing Committees.

**VI. Special Order: Update on Enrollment Plan, B. Bradley**

Thank you, President. I'm here to talk about enrollment policy. Enrollment policy seems simple but it's actually one of the more complicated things we do. Maybe I'm just preaching to the choir here. You have how many students. You have to take in on what level FTIC, AA, other transfers at what cost matriculation versus tuition where main campus online Panama City international how many credits are you taking, high school accelerated, private, the new state college system, the eight new colleges that are coming on, the residency – in state/out of state, what level of performance you're going to take people at, GPA, SAT, GRE, and other things: whether or not you're going to give them waivers, financial assistance, what stipends levels you'll give out, what sort of mix, first generation, socioeconomic status, ethnic, racial, female, male – it's got a lot of variables in it. And it's actually hard to do well, I think. I should say it's not one of my major responsibilities but I know about it. Really you should – the Provost should be here instead of having Hills doing something or Ralph Alvarez – he's otherwise occupied – so I'm sort of filling in. From my view, the legislature has traditionally found itself to be compelled in every one of those areas I just talked about. So they are deeply involved in enrollment policy. And they're going to stay involved even under the new Board of Governors arrangement because a lot of this has to do with appropriations. At least you could make the case that it should be dealing with corporations. And so they're always going to be involved with things such as the numbers, whether they're fundable or non-fundable credit hours, residency requirements, and the like. The context that we find ourselves in is in several different predicates.

One: The Legislature has traditionally set the funded enrollment numbers by level in the Appropriation Bill. So it's usually low-level, upper-level, grad one, and grad two, and then professional. So they've traditionally done that and they'll continue to do that. So if you'll look in the Appropriations Bill in the provisional language, you will see those numbers. That's how many folks they're going to fund, how many FTEs they're going to fund at each university. They, for years, they've changed over time but for years, they've had what is called a neutral policy on out of state students. In other words, there is a strong incentive on the part of all the universities to drive down the number of in-state students and go for out of state students, charge them more, and make money.

In fact, some legislatures have even encouraged their universities to do that. So if you're from Vermont or Colorado, we've been there recently. We know that's the official state policy is to try to live off of the out of states coming in. Florida's traditionally had the policy where if you went up in the number of out of state students, you had to remit some of that money and you actually threw a certain tax on the GR (general revenue) that you got. So there is always some balancing going under what has been the traditional policy.

The Legislature has also said that tuition. That's changed a little in recent years. Most recently, the BOT has been given latitude for doling out of state tuition and the Legislature has set the matriculation levels. Starting in the mid-90s, there was a strong prejudice against out of state students – in other words, we charged higher amounts of money for out of state students. So this last year, these states had a 6% matriculation fee for in-state students and then the BOT said that 10% for the out of state experience. So an out of state student got a 16% increase in tuition. Well, if you do that over a number of years, that's what we have which is one of the highest out of state tuitions in the country. So that's been going on for a while. There is also a policy on enrollment. What happens if you don't quite meet your enrollment level – if you're under it by a lot or if you're over it by a lot? The Legislature has literally changed year by year on how this works. Often times in the past, if you were over enrollment, you would get that money. UCF was especially a big beneficiary of that. Here recently, the last two years, they have decided not to do that, and that has really hurt FSU because we have, for two main reasons, been over enrolled, especially at the end of graduate level for the last couple years. We've been over enrolled because we have increased the number of summer enrollees; in part, because we're doing more things with CARE, but for some other reasons as well. And secondly, because our retention rate has been going up; the more you retain, the more your enrollment goes up. So we tried to make the case to the Legislature that you shouldn't penalize us for doing what you said you wanted us to do: retain students and graduate them. They disagreed. They said you're over enrolled. And so two years ago, they gave us money for two undergraduates and growth and last year, they gave us some. And so that's the context of policies. The policies are changing. Like I said, the Legislature has decided not to fund over enrollment. And they're made a major policy change this last year. There are only going to control the in-state levels; they're not going to control your out of state enrollment. So, specifically, what that means, is they're gone away from the revenue neutral policy. There's now an incentive to go meet your in-state plan but you can go out and get as many out of states as you want. So several of the universities are trying to do this. They are continuing to set tuition at the undergraduate level but they're giving us discretions at other levels, allowing us to waive dollars. So where does that leave us? Where we were a year in 2007 and 2008. The Legislature said

we're not going to fund you if you're over enrolled. If you ever want to get any more monies again for growth, you have to get back to your plan limit. So that's what we tried to do initially. We're still doing it. We began limiting transfers right away. We began discouraging special students and that depressed our enrollment and we have been admitting 6,200 or 6,300 FTIC (first time in college) students a year. We rolled that back to a plan of 5,300 all to get within shooting distance of the state plan. And we did that. We actually came in with around 5,100 FTICs this year. So we're in the ballpark. Our idea is that when we did this two years ago, our economy would get better next year. It's not going to get better and we haven't had revenue estimating conferences on all pieces of the process yet. They just did the national economy forecast last week and of course, the revenue estimators (if you saw them on television), they were clearly chastened by the events at the national and international level over the last year. They were in a much more conservative mood and so what they did was push the estimates of the economy down and flattened the recovery period considerably. What we're anticipating is, where before we thought there would be a relatively steep dive all the way through this year and then maybe coming out at the end of 2009, the beginning of 2010, in our own thinking, we're beginning to flatten out. That's going to have dramatic implications for the finances at FSU. It's in that context that we've been trying to think about the enrollment plan for next year and actually for this year. Given that the Legislature is likely in the short run maybe even several years run is likely to have no money for growth, whether we're on plan or not, is increasingly irrelevant. The main thing is that we need the cash, like the Music Man – cash for the merchandise. So here's what we've been thinking and this the plan that the folks have in their mind now: we need to in the spring, bring in 300 + transfers; plus would be good. We need to get those levels up at the undergraduate level as soon as we can. We need the money, frankly. We need the money even more. We need to grow; we had had the transfers at 2,500; these are transfers of AA. We need to get that up to 2,800. We probably need to think about some other transfers as well. We need to get the FTIC growth; we're at 5,300 this year. Remember I said earlier, for several years, we've been at 6,200 or 6,300. We need to get those up to 5,800 in state students with the in state/out of state mix we have right now and we need to recruit 600 out of state students at a waiver amount – taking 50% or probably less off of their tuition. All that will help a bit but it won't keep the wolf totally away from the door because, my own view is, that the financial situation is, as soon as we get the final forecast November 23, I think it's going to look bad, much worse than we had anticipated. But that's the enrollment plan and that's why we're doing it. Karen Laughlin – she made a plea that we should keep the enrollments down; everybody likes the enrollments down. Pedagogically we like the enrollments down because the students are better; we like the enrollments down because

there are fewer of them to teach. We like all of that about it; what we don't like is the cost of having them down. It turns out that even with the numbers that we have, it's not the E&G services that would suffer but the auxiliary programs offered to the students for students' fee might suffer as well. This is the course that we think, just to go over it again: we're going to start taking transfers in the spring; we're going to go up to 5,800 FTIC. We're going to add on top of that 6,000 out of state students. And we're going to be waiving. (question from the audience – "6,000 students?") What did I say? Oh, 600 out of state students. Yes, 6,000 would be impressive. 600 out of state students with waivers so we're hoping to get better students. The out of state tuition for an undergraduate now is \$18,000. The competitive amount, before this down turn, was probably in the \$11,000 range. It might be in the \$9,000 range. We are already experiencing more losses of out of state students that we anticipated. People, you know, it seems like their families can't afford to come here anymore. \$18,000 is just not a competitive amount so we're going to lower that for a sizable amount of our students.

Questions:

"So what number should we expect in the fall?"

Answer: Well, 5,800 FTIC and up to 600 out of state so it could be 6,400. It's going to be really hard to get these 600 out of state students. Best case scenario. If it's worse than that, than that has some financial implications that are unpleasant.

"Last spring, we were told that 200 or 300 student applicants got letters who would have otherwise been qualified entrance. Because we didn't have room for them, they were turned down. Can we get some of those back?"

Answer: Well, that's the hope. Because we were following what the Legislature told us to do. Get back on plan or you'll never get any growth money again. Well now we've gotten back on plan but we're still never going to get any money again. So, the idea is if you're not going to get any money from the Legislature, you got to get some money from students. So that's what we're going to do. There are some positive things. I shouldn't do all negative things; I suppose that would be unkind. The tuition differential kicks in next year; we will get some money out of that, maybe \$4 million. The technology fee kicks in next year; if it stays the same, we'll get around \$6 million from that. At least some of that money is fungible with money we already have. So that's a good thing. So those are some positive developments but overwhelming that is just the financial situation of the state. It's not looking good. And I'm usually not ... well, Larry thinks I'm pessimistic but maybe I am. But I tend to think I'm realistic. We had a plan in place that would have taken us through next year very smoothly if the

economy had picked up. That's not going to happen. I think our existing plan is blown out of the water by what's been happening and we're just going to have a hard patch is my view.

No more questions? Usually Jim has some questions. I was going to be so disappointed.

Question: You didn't say anything about graduate student enrollment.

Answer: Yeah, well, the waiver situation. There are several aspects of graduate students. We're going to keep on our plan of trying to bring in some more graduate students. The way we've been thinking about doing it ... Just looking from a financial perspective which I unfortunately often do, we do get some money out of that. We will of course give waivers, but the waiver situation will not get better. We're still stuck in the same mode that we are. We've been for awhile, ever since the Legislature has got out of paying for waivers and we've been taking it out of the money they give us, it's been a difficult situation. Independent of this, there's a strategic planning process that I'm running and been working with a committee for awhile. We shot the economic for the university out five years under two scenarios and the top initiative that we're going to send out to the universities is that the top priority facing the university is graduate students' stipends. There's a whole list of priorities but this is over five years and the chances of us being able to do anything in the next couple years is diminishing, I think, unless there are things the Legislature can do. Once upon a time, we had one of the highest cigarette taxes in the country, just over 39 cents. We haven't increased that in a long time because we're engaged in a theological battle within the Legislature about the nature of taxation. Some people worship it as good; some people see it as an evil incarnate and so you can't do anything. If we just wanted to get competitive with other states, we could just raise it by a \$1, up to \$1.39 a pack. Given the nature of our tourist economy and tourists tend to more addicted to tobacco at this point than we are, and so we could make about \$800 million out of that. That would be significant. We could go back and change the intangibles tax and take the deduction to \$500,000, \$600,000, \$700,000, -- that would bring in \$200,000,000. They could do something on video gaming -- I don't know that intangibles tax is a \_\_\_ tax but the rest are designed to change people's views and behaviors. \_\_\_ taxation has usually been approved of by conservatives but our theology is much stronger than most conservatives so we'll see how that goes. So there are things the Legislature can do. They haven't shown much inclination to do it. Of course they haven't been faced with the prospect of smashing K-12, the universities, not funding the prisons for the people that they've consigned to long term jail sentences nor paying the bill that's going to come to for Medicare as the economy turns down.

**VII. Old Business**

There were no items of old business.

**VIII. New Business**

There were no items of new business.

**IX. University Welfare****a. Chancellor Search Committee, J. Standley**

The search committee for the new Chancellor will be chaired by Carolyn Roberts.

**b. Updates on Bargaining and Related Matters, J. Fiorito**

Since our last Senate meeting faculty members overwhelmingly ratified our new collective bargaining agreement (CBA). Thank you for your help with that. As usual, we were able to carry out a relatively complex voting process spread across three days and at least six different polling places only through the help of the scores of faculty volunteers that attest to the truth of the motto on our UFF-FSU bookmarks, "Faculty Power, Faculty Powered." We will try to get a hard copy of the new agreement to all UFF-represented faculty as soon as the agreements are available.

Believe it or not, we are scheduled to return to the bargaining table in less than three weeks to begin discussions for next year. Salaries are one of the issues we'll discuss, but we also expect to discuss reclassification of non-tenure track faculty and other issues. All indications are that the coming year will be even worse than this one for budget matters. The good news, possibly, is that an idea we've long championed, that to neglect current faculty is "penny wise and pound foolish," seems to be gaining currency. That's reflected in the retention adjustments we negotiated for this year for nearly all FSU faculty, and in a recent statement by Governor Crist's higher education advisor, who was quoted in last Sunday's Tampa Tribune saying: "It costs a lot more money to bring [faculty] in than it does to retain them. You have got to find the money to stop this talent exodus."

For the upcoming negotiations, we want to refresh our understanding of FSU faculty views on issues and priorities. We will hold a Collective Bargaining Advisory Council meeting on November 12<sup>th</sup> at 12:30 in the



Askew Student Life Building, with a hot lunch provided by the UFF-FSU Chapter. All faculty members are invited. There will be further announcements, of course, but please make a note of it and try to attend.

I feel compelled to address a somewhat unpleasant issue. Dean Marcus' "Do's and Don't's" memo regarding graduate assistant employees' efforts to form a union is being widely distributed. I can't help but feel a sense of déjà vu about several objectionable elements of this memo. Many of you will recall that during the faculty re-organizing campaign in 2002-03, it was similar overly broad FSU administration efforts to define artificial dividing lines between work time and non-work time, work areas and non-work areas, and similar nonsense (for an academic setting) on a highly discriminatory basis that led to what I call the "Gag Order Case." UFF prevailed at PERC on nearly all points in that case. (See: <http://www.uff-fsu.org/art/gosetl.pdf> and <http://www.uff-fsu.org/art/gonotse.jpg>)

Here again, however, it seems that overly aggressive FSU legal counsel or administrators are encouraging overly broad efforts to suppress the grad assistants' campaign, perhaps counting on any legal reversals to come too late to undo the damage intended for the organizing campaign.

There is also a suggestion of the standard anti-union fodder that individual freedoms will be repressed by collective bargaining: "It would no longer be possible for a graduate student to negotiate his or her own terms and conditions of employment on an individual basis with department administrators." Aside from the questionable premise that individuals generally have effective bargaining power in dealing with an employer the size of FSU, this statement neglects the fact that our CBA allows individual negotiation so long as those arrangements are consistent with the CBA. Individualized assignments of responsibility are one example, and perhaps a more striking one involves our CBA's provision for discretionary raises (CBA Sec. 23.9). Since July 1 this year, our administration has awarded more than \$300,000 in discretionary raises to individuals. These are not the retention adjustments most of us received, nor are they promotion raises. These are individual discretionary raises based on such considerations as increased responsibilities, special achievements, and external offers, and in a very real sense are based on individual negotiations.

I have one final comment on Dean Marcus' memo, and specifically its reference to an FSU "philosophy" that opposes collective voice for

employees, using the standard anti-union terminology characterizing that collective voice as an external “third party” (see above re faculty volunteer efforts!). I am delighted at the opportunity to once again remind the administration that the faculty’s response to this “philosophy” in 2003 was a vote of 736 to 33 in favor of UFF representation.

**X. Announcements by Deans and Other Administrative Officers**

There were no announcements by Deans and Other Administrative Officers.

**XI. Announcements by Provost Abele**

The Provost was not in attendance.

**XII. Announcements by President Wetherell**

The President was not in attendance.

**XIII. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 4:18 p.m.



Melissa Crawford  
Faculty Senate Coordinator

Faculty Senate Steering Committee Summary Response  
Re: The Report of the Committee to Study the Administrative Organization  
of Academic Affairs

The Faculty Senate Steering Committee appreciated the opportunity to solicit faculty input and comment on this report, and to provide this summary to the administration. We thank the administration for providing adequate time for feedback. We feel that continued teamwork and collaboration with the faculty on consideration of the recommendations made by the Provost's committee, and on the details of any implementation actions decided upon, is clearly a healthy and effective administrative course and the Faculty Senate can fully support that process of review for FSU.

Overview

There was a wide range of specific responses systematically gathered from faculty by Senators from across the entire university. That material is summarized in the attached chart with complete copies of the responses provided to the Provost.

We offer the following observations based on that data:

- There is strong support for one recommendation: the proposed merger of the College of Communication and the College of Information.
- Overall, there is widespread opposition to many, if not most, of the recommendations. Clearly, the report has not generated a wide base of support.
- In specific instances, there is very strong opposition to proposed changes:
  1. The proposals affecting the following units were unanimously opposed by their faculty: the College of Music, the Department of Computer Science, the College of Motion Picture and Recording Arts, and the College of Nursing.
  2. The proposals affecting the following units were opposed by the majority of their faculty: the College of Criminology and the College of Social Work.

Recommendations

The Senate Steering Committee recommends that the administration recognize the extreme distress of some groups within the faculty over specific recommendations in the committee's report. We believe the administration would be well advised to refrain from mandating highly unpopular changes until and unless they receive greater acceptance from those who will be directly affected. Such support seems unlikely without clearer connections between the committee's criteria and its recommendations, and more detailed and persuasively-argued enumeration of expected benefits. We suggest that the following immediate actions would produce very positive faculty reaction:

- Colleges with faculty agreeable to reorganization should be allowed to do so and facilitated in accomplishing desired changes.

- The administration should continue discussion with faculty who show support for the idea of reorganization but who also have many concerns about unknown details, in order to develop a possible plan with details that can be evaluated by the involved faculty.
- The administration should announce that no reorganization changes will be mandated for colleges or departments where the faculty overwhelmingly oppose the change.

The Steering Committee feels that implementing the above recommendations will move the university toward an organizational structure that has the full support of the university community and will boost morale rather than damage it.

#### Other General Concerns

- In the early 70s, the university was reorganized into four Divisions, each with a collection of colleges. This system did not work, and FSU abandoned it after only a few years. The consensus view of that decision, which was mandated without faculty support, is that it was a costly mistake. Those parts of the committee's recommendation that combine groups of colleges into "super-colleges" seem too reminiscent of that bad idea.
- There is no evidence that reducing the number of colleges will save money. Therefore moving colleges without such evidence seems outside the objectives stated for the study. The Steering Committee feels that the committee's current recommendations have the potential to add layers of bureaucracy without demonstrated financial benefits; it seems likely that any savings will have infinitesimal impact on an annual 1.1 billion dollar budget.

**Faculty Senate Steering Committee**  
**Summary Response to the Report of the Committee to**  
**Study the Administrative Organization of Academic Affairs**

| <b>College</b>                     | <b>Report Recommendation</b>  | <b>Summary of Input</b>   |
|------------------------------------|---|---|
| <b>Arts and Sciences</b>           |   |   |
| Science Area                       | Entire Report and response to moving Computer Science out of Arts and Sciences. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Majority of departments are against moving computer science out of Arts and Sciences.</li> <li>2. There is some support for examining institutes and centers</li> <li>3. Several faculty suggested splitting Arts and Sciences into 2 colleges</li> <li>4. Several faculty suggested eliminating administrative offices in addition to combining smaller colleges.</li> </ol>   |
| Computer Science Department        | Move Computer Science To Engineering  | Faculty are UNANIMOUSLY OPPOSED; Faculty Senate Resolution: if Computer Science is moved, courses and degree programs should go with them. (Resolution unanimously passed 9/17/08, attached).   |
| Department of Scientific Computing | Move Computer Science to Engineering  | The department feels it might benefit from Computer Science departing from Arts and Sciences, but feels it has a conflict of interest so it prefers to make no comment.   |
| Humanities Area                    | Entire Report   | No strong opinions (no units directly affected). Two remarks that Art History has stronger ties to Humanities area than to Visual Arts, Theater, and Dance (see also the Art History department response). A few remarks expressing concern about perceived lack of faculty input in the overall proposal.  |
| <b>Business</b>                    | Entire Report   | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The reorganization of the University should be driven by strategic objectives, not reactions to budget shortfalls.</li> <li>2. There is skepticism that implementing these changes will result in cost savings.</li> <li>3. A better path to achieving AAU membership is to identify the highly acclaimed programs/resources unique to FSU, not to attempt to remake FSU in the image of universities that have already achieved membership.</li> <li>4. Faculty morale and problems with retention should be a restraint on reorganization.</li> </ol> |

**Faculty Senate Steering Committee**  
**Summary Response to the Report of the Committee to**  
**Study the Administrative Organization of Academic Affairs**

| <b>College</b>                                       | <b>Report Recommendation</b>  | <b>Summary of Input</b>   |
|--|---|---|
| <b>Communication</b>                                 |   |   |
| Communication  | Merge Colleges of Communication and Information                         | Strong consensus in support of this move IF reorganization does take place on campus  |
| Communication Disorders                              | Move Communication Disorders To Health and Hum Services                 | Faculty regard the proposal with caution since they do not know what financial support, administrative structure or geographic location would occur. Such concerns override the assumptions about benefits of the move. |
|  | Move Communication Disorders with Communication to Information Services | Open to either move that meets their specific concerns for visibility, funding, and improved facilities.  |
| <b>Criminology</b>                                   | Merge Criminology with Social Sciences                                  | The majority of the faculty are opposed to merging Criminology with Social Science.   |
| <b>Education</b>                                     | Entire Report   | No clear sentiment on any recommendation since none directly affects them   |
| <b>Engineering</b>                                   | Move Computer Science to Engineering                                    |   |
| <b>Human Sciences</b>                                | Merge Human Sciences with Nursing, Communication Disorders, Social Work | Generally, faculty saw more advantages than disadvantages in the merger and somewhat with the reorganization report.  |
| <b>Information</b>                                   | Merge Colleges of Communication and Information                         | Faculty support the merger.   |
| <b>Law</b>   | Entire Report   | No input; not directly affected.  |
| <b>Medicine</b>                                      | Entire Report   | No input; not directly affected.  |
| <b>Motion Picture, Television and Recording Arts</b> | Combine Film with Visual Arts, Theatre and Dance                        | Faculty are UNANIMOUSLY OPPOSED   |
| <b>Music</b>   | Combine Music with Visual Arts, Theatre and Dance                       | Faculty are UNANIMOUSLY OPPOSED   |

**Faculty Senate Steering Committee**  
**Summary Response to the Report of the Committee to**  
**Study the Administrative Organization of Academic Affairs**

| <b>College</b>                        | <b>Report Recommendation</b>                              | <b>Summary of Input</b>  |
|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| <b>Nursing</b>                        | Merge Nursing into College of Health & Human Sciences     | Nursing faculty are UNANIMOUSLY OPPOSED to merging Nursing into the College of Health & Human Sciences   |
| <b>Social Science</b>                 | Move Criminology into Social Science                      | No strong opinions expressed. Extreme skepticism about potential cost savings.   |
| <b>Social Work</b>                    | Merge Social Work into College of Health & Human Sciences | The college values its autonomy, feels there would be no advantages, only disadvantages, to such a move, and feels the name of the new college does not reflect its mission. College faculty request opportunity for involvement in planning any reorganization.   |
| <b>Visual Arts, Theatre and Dance</b> | Merge Music and Film with Visual Arts, Theatre and Dance  | The general consensus is that the concept of reorganization seems reasonable. But, there are many questions about how it would work, so many faculty have reserved judgment on the issue. Interior design supports reorganization. Theatre is guardedly optimistic about reorganization. Dance has many concerns/questions, and Art History is generally concerned about reorganization. |