

From: Karen Hanson <karhan@umn.edu>
Date: Sunday, June 7, 2015 at 8:19 PM
To: Microsoft Office User <hexter@ucdavis.edu>
Cc: Mary McLaughlin <mbmclaughlin@ucdavis.edu>, "bstacey@uw.edu" <bstacey@uw.edu>
Subject: Re: UC Davis L&S

Ralph,

Thank you for your patience!

I read the report and thought I'd close the loop with a few reactions. I enjoyed talking with your workgroup-- though our technology was a bit of a problem-- and it was clear from that discussion and the report that they were a thoughtful collection of university citizens. (Perhaps because of tech challenges, though, I'm not sure they understood that I had been provost, not dean, at Indiana University-- which has a huge Arts and Sciences college-- and provost at the University of Minnesota, which has a large College of Liberal Arts, and three undergraduate-admitting science colleges--Science and Engineering, Biological Sciences, and Food, Agriculture, and Natural Resource Sciences. I tried to convey to the workgroup that I'd seen the "letters [or liberal arts] & sciences" model work and also seen work well the model where the humanities, arts, and social sciences are in one college and the sciences in another (or several other). Either arrangement can work, but the pinch points often connect with budgetary issues, and the particular budget processes of an institution can make a difference in the character of those pinch points.

I agree with Bob's worry that the report is silent on a crucial issue: whether the recommended divisional deans have budgetary autonomy or not. (The vehemence with which the workgroup rejected the idea of associate deans in favor of these more "empowered" divisional deans is a little puzzling, unless the divisional deans have full budgetary authority; but some of the benefits of the unified structure would, I think, be difficult to secure *unless* the L & S dean has primary authority for budgetary priorities and allocations.)

The idea that the divisional deans manage "downward" and the college dean "upward" also makes good sense, except that it looks as if the workgroup also suggests that the divisional deans will represent their divisions' interests to the provost and the chancellor, as well as to the college dean. I wonder if, on this model, the college dean would in fact simply be overseeing shared services and infrastructure, but not really the academic enterprise. If so, it would be hard for a person in that position to succeed in some of the "external-facing" functions-- development, legislative relations, etc.-- that usually require fairly close ties with and detailed understanding of the work of the divisions.

Given the strong sentiments of the workgroup, though, in favor of a structure of a college dean, along with divisional deans, I wonder if some of the desiderata of the group could be achieved by: 1) resting ultimate budgetary authority with the college dean, though the divisional deans would have autonomy in management of their budgets throughout each fiscal year; 2) keeping a couple of crucial academic offices at the the College dean level-- e.g., i) undergrad ed and ii) research and grad ed. Having associate deans with these portfolios might truly unify L & S, minimize the "zero sum game" jockeying that would be a temptation for the divisions, and provide an informed base for college-wide academic policies and initiatives.

I agree with the workgroup's assessment of the benefits of centralizing attention to advising, centralizing marketing and communications, and managing centrally the development staff, though, again, the development staff (and the communications people) would also need to work closely with the divisional deans.

Finally, I note the worries about underfunding of the college. I'm sure you've heard that before, and there is absolutely nothing I can think of to suggest on that point!

Good luck and best wishes,

Karen