

Report of the Letters & Science Workgroup on Possible Changes in the Administrative Organization of the College of Letters and Science

FINAL - 13 May 2015

WORKGROUP MEMBERS

Professor and Chair Alan M. Taylor, Social Sciences, Economics (Chair)

Professor and Chair Andreas Albrecht, Mathematical & Physical Sciences, Physics

Professor Leopoldo Bernucci, Humanities, Arts & Cultural Studies, Spanish and Portuguese

Associate Professor Christina Cogdell, Humanities, Arts & Cultural Studies, Design

Director Beth Floyd, L&S Undergraduate Education & Advising

Professor Carol Hess, Humanities, Arts & Cultural Studies, Music

Associate Professor and Chair Carlos Jackson, Humanities, Arts & Cultural Studies, Chicana and
Chicano Studies

Lecturer Andy Jones, Humanities, Arts & Cultural Studies, University Writing Program

Professor Bruno Nachtergaele, Mathematical & Physical Sciences, Mathematics

Assistant Dean Steve Roth, Social Sciences

Ms. Katarina Schmidt, Undergraduate Student, International Relations

Professor and Chair John T. Scott, Social Sciences, Political Science

Associate Professor Jared Shaw, Mathematical & Physical Sciences, Chemistry

Associate Librarian Adam Siegel, Research Support Services, Library

Professor and Chair Victoria Smith, Social Sciences, Sociology [until 3/31/2015]

Professor Sarah Stewart, Mathematical and Physical Sciences, Earth & Planetary Sciences

Professor and Chair Li Zhang, Social Sciences, Anthropology

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

For all their efforts in support of the Workgroup, we would like to thank Rose Cabral, Mary McLaughlin, and Robert Loessberg-Zahl.

Background and Functioning of the Workgroup

The Letters & Science Workgroup (or L&S Workgroup, or Workgroup) of 18 members was convened by Provost Hexter on January 15, 2015. It was charged specifically to examine the possibility and advisability of different administrative arrangements for the College of Letters and Science (henceforth *College*, or *L&S*), including the status quo, a unified College, or a College divided into 2 or 3 Colleges.

Our charge was to include, but was not limited to, consideration of the responsibilities and powers attached to the role of a Dean and/or Divisional Deans, other Deans or associate and assistant Deans and the best arrangements of portfolios, and reporting lines in any structure.

Within this remit, the Workgroup was asked to consider what structure would best promote the intellectual project that the college embodies, addressing the needs and aspirations of faculty, graduate and undergraduate students, and staff.¹

The Workgroup convened for its meetings a total of 19 times from January through May 2015. The group held several meetings where we questioned UC Davis senior administrators and staff to gather information on various matters affecting the College: the future vision of UC Davis and the place of the College within that; the functioning of Divisional Deans both individually and collectively; the budget situation and prospects; and development operations and future growth. Our meetings also included fact-finding interviews at which we questioned five senior administrators from other leading public research universities (as described in an Appendix to this document).

A Vision for the College is a Basis for Investment

The Workgroup believes that this report should be framed by two key points on which there was complete agreement.

The first key point is that the College is currently structurally underfunded, both relative

¹ The possibility of alterations to the university's structure outside the bounds of the College as it stands, though neither irrelevant nor uninteresting, was not to be the subject of this report by the Workgroup.

to its own history and in comparison with peer institutions. Resource problems show up across the board and throughout the College, and this issue unifies the faculty. It shows up in different departments and divisions in different forms (examples: class sizes growing beyond appropriate levels; salaries and startups that lag the market, decrepit laboratories and other physical spaces). For these issues to be remedied, a substantial investment in the College is necessary. Without such resources being injected on a large scale, neither the status quo nor any new plan can deliver meaningful change, whatever structure is chosen.

The second key point is that that such an investment response will only materialize if the College, meaning its faculty and leadership, can deliver a credible and co-operative vision for what a future successful College can and should look like. If the Provost and Chancellor have confidence in such a vision, believe investments will be used wisely, and see the concrete steps needed to make it reality, then the necessary investment is very likely to happen. If there is no viable vision, and little sign of co-operation, or if a course is chosen which seems to make the delivery of the vision unlikely, then the necessary investment is very unlikely to happen.

The Workgroup broadly understands this as a fair description of the current position, and perhaps a reasonable basis for judging what the College should do next. For reasons discussed below, the Workgroup also broadly agrees that the status quo does not meet the criteria for what a future successful College can and should look like. Hence, we judge that inaction is not a sensible option.

Rather, to effectively promote a vision of the College, the Workgroup believes that the L&S faculty have to be unified around a common purpose. They need to present a larger vision of our place on this campus and our relationship to the rest of the world. This point needs to be emphasized, since, without such a starting point, the project will be less likely to bear fruit and attract the much-needed investment.

Articulating the Vision: What is a College of Letters and Science?

We now briefly elaborate on some of the key elements of the vision of the College that the Workgroup believes should serve, with the help of further refinement by the faculty, as a basis or guide for creating a stronger College at UC Davis.

As a public research university, UC Davis has the responsibility to prepare students to be both educated citizens and discoverers of new knowledge. On the first point, it is widely acknowledged that students can best benefit society and themselves when they are educated broadly enough to give them scope for good decision-making on personal and political levels, as well as deeply enough to equip them to pursue a livelihood.

This educational vision has long been the foundation of liberal arts education in general, and of our College, but it means even more in today's globally competitive job market. From medical schools recruiting social science majors to engineering firms looking for engineers with more artistic training, from graduate schools to the job market, cross-disciplinary learners trained in this cross-disciplinary setting have flourished, and will continue to do so.

Moreover, a strong and collaborative College provides students with adequate background and opportunity to discover new knowledge, fulfilling the research aspect of our university's mission. When disciplines coordinate and communicate, the resulting integration of bodies of knowledge can trigger game-changing insights and inventions.

A rejuvenated College would not only foster internal collaboration, but serve as an anchor and example to the University, leading the way in guiding students to learn exemplary complex-problem solving skills and refining their ability to view issues through a plurality of disciplinary viewpoints. While society may be looking to field specialists for expert advice on everything from local issues to global developments, we need cross-disciplinary teams and leaders who are equipped to listen, understand, and integrate this plethora of information and discern wise and informed courses of action.

If UC Davis wants to continue to produce not only excellent students and researchers, but exemplary team players and future leaders, then we need to take cross-disciplinary education and research seriously—and demonstrate that through investing in an organizational structure that attracts visionary leadership, catalyzes external and internal funding, nurtures faculty collaborations, and facilitates cooperative, world-changing research.

Evolution of the Thinking at the Workgroup

In a series of meetings, the Workgroup learned about the current leadership and administrative structure of the College, about its finances in general, and about specific long-standing issues that the College seems unable to address. Concrete issues include problems related to budget, admissions, advising and student services, course and curriculum development, infrastructure, fund raising, and communications. There are also issues of trust and co-operation, and a lack of vision. The Workgroup interviewed five senior administrators from other universities (see Appendix) and learned from them that another leadership structure might be better able to lead the College to solutions of its problems.

Members of the Workgroup also invested in conversations with faculty colleagues, sometimes in formal department meetings, to collect a broad range of perspectives. It became clear that most of us knew initially very little about the way the College functions and the problems with which it is faced. Our own perspectives changed as we learned more. Similarly, most of our colleagues focus on one or a few aspects with which they are familiar, and their viewpoint is determined by their experiences within their own daily spheres. No doubt, many of our colleagues would come to a more nuanced viewpoint if they had a chance to become more familiar with all of the issues throughout the rest of the College.

The Workgroup came to understand that while many of the issues are not specifically caused by the current “headless” divisional structure of the College, the fact that the College has such great difficulty finding and implementing solutions is most definitely related to its lack of unified leadership. Since no single person is in charge of the whole, the Divisions are too often led to zero-sum thinking. The new opportunities and challenges stemming from the 2020 initiative, in combination with the new budget model, exacerbate the negative consequences of this lack of unified, strategic thinking.

What is Broken? Weakness in the Current Design Will Require Essential Changes through a New Structure

The Workgroup began skeptically by asking two fundamental questions that any organization must answer before engaging in a major reorganization. First, *what isn't working* and needs fixing as part of the changes? Second, *what is working* and should

be left well alone lest changes unintentionally mess things up? The former question is perhaps more obvious and tempting to focus on, especially for those functions of the College obviously burdened by the underperforming aspects of the present design; but the latter question is equally important, so that unnecessary or adverse changes are avoided and fears of damage to existing functions or undue costs can be allayed.

We start with the first question, which required the Workgroup to identify where the true problems in L&S actually reside, based on both internal absolute levels of dissatisfaction and on external comparative benchmarking to peer institutions, with the latter informed especially by our opportunity to interview and question our external contributors.

The Workgroup identified what it saw as the most glaring and significant shortcomings, which must be addressed in any future organization of the College, as follows:

- **Underfunding in Aggregate** The College has been and currently is structurally underfunded, as we noted above. This is so despite L&S being a very significant generator of both tuition and other revenue streams for the University. This is a major financial imbalance at UC Davis. As a large impediment to L&S success, this issue needs to be addressed. In particular, in the budget model the current parameters of the Provost Allocation (i.e., the “tax” and “subsidy” flows) are set in such a way as to direct significant net revenue streams away from L&S for use elsewhere.²
- **Underfunding by Division** While all parts of L&S suffer from the aggregate underfunding, this problem impacts different divisions in different ways. And whilst it is tempting for each division or department to fight its own war for funding, this is an incoherent strategy that fails to take into account the common problem and its common cause. Hard sciences have problems maintaining and investing in adequate lab facilities and offering adequate startup packages; humanities and arts departments have a hard time maintaining the critical class sizes for proper language, writing, art, or music

² For example, L&S receives a Provost Allocation of about \$62M out of a total base budget of \$155M (40%). In other instructional units, the Provost Allocation is \$163M out of \$310M (53%), i.e., about one third larger in percentage terms. See the 2014–15 base budget table including the Provost’s Allocation at page 4, top panel, in this document: <http://provost.ucdavis.edu/messages-and-announcements/CODVC%20re%202014-15%20Final%20Budget%20Allocations%209.10.14.pdf> .

instruction, and the presence of many small units stretches the divisional administration very thin; social sciences often have extraordinarily large classes and teaching pressure, but faced with a large “net tax” they struggle to get FTE to staff their programs and to make competitive market-based offers in recruitment and retention.

- **Problem of Zero-Sum Behavior** The current L&S divisional system has led to internal competition among the Divisional Deans, which is another way of saying that the response to the above challenges has not been a fully cooperative approach to enhance the position of L&S on campus, but all too often has been a non-cooperative or zero-sum game among the three divisions. At its extreme this has resulted in deep distrust, epitomized by conflicts over trivial sums of resources. Successful peer institutions have demonstrated better efficiency and morale by pursuing a degree of coordination and extending trust across their L&S units that is sadly absent here and now. Our Workgroup believes this as an area in which our College can do better than we do at present. We must make the conscious choice to foster an organization which permits the rational budget planning and smoothing necessary to confront routine fluctuations in resources and needs within L&S as a whole, as well as to allow for a focus on strategic cooperation between L&S, the Provost, and the Chancellor to address large-scale projects as part of a University-wide vision.
- **Lack of Coordination on Shared Functions** Partly as a result of both lack of resources and poor coordination, many joint functions are run in suboptimal or, in some cases, grossly deficient ways as judged by peer institution norms. Lack of resources, poor structural arrangements of the organization, plus a degree of false-economy thinking, have led to certain key functions being lumped, essentially arbitrarily, under one Divisional Dean and yet having to serve all parts of L&S. Two stand out: advising and development. The Workgroup judges that neither of these functions is adequately supported or managed at present. The average number of students per advisor is now several hundred, and the average number of donors per development officer is in the thousands. Both ratios are far too high. Both advising and development must both be reorganized to have: supervision and management on a college-wide basis with centralized reporting, and a large increase in

resources and staff to achieve reasonable and desirable goals.

- **Need Stronger Advising Functions** The inadequacy of the advising support is critical because one of the major strengths of UC Davis is its reputation as an excellent undergraduate learning environment. To preserve that reputation, the Workgroup judges that our undergraduate students deserve a quality of support that meets or exceeds that at U.S. peer universities. This is especially needed as we look to a future where our campus enrolls more students from out-of-state or overseas and relies increasingly on that tuition stream for revenue as direct state support dwindles. Failure will mean that students, or at least the better students, may start to look elsewhere, and UC Davis's well-earned reputation will then suffer.
- **Need Stronger Development Functions** The same revenue pressures will also make success in development critical, and here the Workgroup judges that we surely and significantly lag leading public universities (and are even further behind private universities). Other public universities are on their 3rd or 4th campaign, while we have only completed our 1st. Many have 3 or 4 times as many development staff as we have and are the beneficiaries of more philanthropic giving. UC Davis surely has greater potential for gifts, and while the development function is moving forward, this could be pushed further and faster. We think its current effectiveness is diluted by divisional silos which obstruct efficient performance in reaching prospects and in matching givers with opportunities that often cross divisional and even college boundaries.
- **Need More Than a Shell Structure** There is a disjunction between the perception or image of the L&S College and its reality, especially when one compares faculty and student experience. Undergraduate students and some shared functions (for example, Undergraduate Education & Advising; or Marketing & Communications) do identify with the College and not with the divisions; for the faculty and decanal functions, the perception is sometimes almost the opposite. Some faculty feel L&S is almost best described by the word "shell" or would even say that "there is no there *there*." The Workgroup sees this as an unfortunate and potentially troubling state of affairs. Whilst faculty in their research may retreat into a very narrow zone, an effective liberal arts education for our students in a well-functioning College has to embrace in a much wider perspective. Our peer institutions, their degree

programs, their advising, their development, and other key structural features recognize that their Colleges are more than the sum of their parts. The current L&S model at UC Davis to a large extent has ignored these issues, which is likely to the detriment of our long-term success as an institution competing against better-organized peers. A well-functioning, world-class College of L&S is critical to our university's mission and its future success.

The Workgroup did not try to tabulate an exhaustive list of all the problems in L&S that needed to be addressed, so this is only an attempt to focus on the most serious issues, the ones that have come up repeatedly in our discussions.

The Workgroup reached a strong consensus that the current model (i.e., the status quo) is inadequate for the task of addressing these problems not only because it is the system in which these problems have appeared and persisted, but also because the key participants seem to lack the will, the incentives, and even the structures to address these problems. By the same token an even more devolved system of breaking the College up into even more parts struck the Workgroup as doing little or nothing to address the key problems identified above, whilst potentially making many problems even worse.

The Workgroup reached a consensus, and with a large majority sentiment, that all of these challenges would be best met by “delegating upwards” some of the crucial responsibilities we have identified to a single *Dean of the College of Letters and Science* (henceforth *College Dean*) who would sit in an executive position, above and in addition to a group of Divisional Deans, at the head of L&S. Most important among these centralized College responsibilities are the reporting lines, overall budgets, and oversight of key shared activities like advising and development. In addition, the College Dean can help alleviate the problem of zero-sum non-cooperation that plagues the current interactions among the Divisional Deans, and which severely limits the stature and unity of the College's representation both in internal issues on campus and when interacting externally with alumni, donors, and other stakeholders. Those limits threaten to undercut the ability of L&S, and therefore UC Davis, to reach their full potential and excel when placed head-to-head with our peer institutions.

What is Working? Shaping the New Structure to Preserve Strength Where Divisions Now Work Well

However, on that last point, a complete Workgroup consensus was inhibited largely by what we see as legitimate anxieties (for us, but also for the faculty as a whole) about what a College Dean model should not put at risk, and it is to these issues we turn next. Whilst the degree of concern on these issues varied across Workgroup members, everyone agreed that these are important caveats that any reorganization must address.

- **College Dean plus Divisional Deans** A reorganization should maintain a structure of Divisional Deans. The Workgroup shares the widely held faculty concern that a College Dean would be too distant from the divisions and departments, and would thus be unable to understand the needs of such a wide range of academic disciplines in terms of budgets, appointments, merits and promotions, and so forth. It would be better to have Divisional Deans (with the title “Divisional Dean” not “Associate Dean”). As now, we envision that these Divisional Deans would give all departments a figure with decision-making power and authority over the bulk of each division’s day-to-day *inward-facing* operations. We envision that the College Dean will stay focused instead on key shared functions at a central level (e.g. advising and development) and will be charged with taking the lead on all *outward-facing* operations (representing the College to the campus and its leadership and to the outside world, including, most importantly, alumni and donors). We also recognize that some of these functions will require the Departments, the Divisions, and the College to work closely together.
- **Divisional Deans Bridge Disciplinary Expertise and L&S vision** One of the features of the current arrangement that many feel is working well is that a Divisional Dean can capture a bold idea or serious problem that needs to be understood in an expert way and bring it straight to the top campus leadership. We know of many examples where that combination of understanding and access has accomplished a great deal. The College Dean model must continue to promote and enhance this high level of achievement and intellectual entrepreneurship, without damping it out due to an extra layer of administration. The Dean, the Divisional Deans, and the Chancellor and Provost would all need to all be responsible for maintaining appropriate

collaborative relationships amongst themselves to successfully meet this challenge.

- **Executive Council: Deans** The question then arises how these Divisional Deans function with, and report to, a College Dean, without adverse consequences for the positive aspects of the current divisional structure. The Workgroup concludes that a model of an Executive Council of the L&S College should be used. In this group the Dean consults with the Divisional Deans, and this team should develop the consensus and cooperation needed to address top-level administrative, budget, and other College-wide issues. Beyond that, as much administrative and decision-making power as possible should be devolved to the Divisional Deans, especially on matters such as the academic personnel process and the curriculum. This will prevent the over-centralization of power, and its concomitant inefficiency, and take advantage of the specific skills of the Divisional Deans who can make heard the needs of a diverse range of departments.
- **Executive Council: Other** The Executive Council could be expanded beyond these individuals, and perhaps should be, to include a few key L&S decanal positions. It could usefully include a sub-Dean for Finance (responsible for budget issues) and a sub-Dean for Development (responsible for advancement/fundraising). It might possibly also include two other sub-Deans responsible for educational programs and infrastructure, respectively, all of these being college-wide positions that should have a direct reporting line to the College Dean.³ Furthermore, this structure is intentionally flexible: should the form of the College mutate, and the number of divisions change, then such developments can easily be incorporated, e.g., by adding a corresponding new Divisional Dean for any new divisions that happen to materialize.
- **Staffing to Reflect Structure** To support the above structures, the main reporting lines and staff needs at the College Dean level should focus on strengthening the central shared functions, principally advising and development, and leading college-wide initiatives. At the overall College level, the finance team and the advising team should report directly to the College

³ Here, “sub-Dean” means an Associate Dean or Assistant Dean title, as appropriate. The suggested structure resembles that at the University of Washington: see Appendix.

Dean, and it would be useful to have their leaders as part of the Executive Council. The reporting lines and staff responsibilities at the Divisional Dean level should be devolved and flexible, and focus squarely on the needs of the division and the departments therein.

- **The Issue of “Bloat”** There are two forms of administrative "bloat" about which the committee is concerned, and which should be avoided under a single L&S Dean with Divisional Deans: first, a simple increase in the number of administrators and staff beyond what is necessary or desirable; second, the addition of another “layer” of administration that either duplicates positions or functions or creates a less responsive and more cumbersome administrative system. As for the first, going back for years, faculty have been rightly sensitive to the issue of increases in administrative positions. It is a problem not unique to UC, but we have seen our management/staff-faculty ratio approximately double in the last 20 or so years. Faculty worry that many of these expensive, new positions have had few benefits for the core missions of the university. As for the second, one concern with adding a College Dean, while retaining a divisional structure with Divisional Deans and their staff, is that we would create an extra, perhaps redundant layer of administration without any benefit and even with a number of drawbacks. The Workgroup emphatically stresses that any new positions that we envisage in the new structure do not, or should not, create administrative bloat in either sense. We envisage a new allocation of functions, administration, and staff that largely reconfigures existing positions in L&S, rather than adding a large raft of new personnel. For example, some of the functions, and especially the shared functions currently operating or overseen at the level of the Divisional Deans (e.g., advising and development), would be moved under the College Dean structure, while other functions at the divisional level (e.g., academic personnel) would remain at that level under the Divisional Dean. If additional administrators or staff are deemed necessary it should be for tasks that are currently not adequately supported. For example, at present, College academic personnel functions are often slow and unresponsive; there is no College finance team at all; development staffing lags behind our rivals' teams that are 3 to 4 times larger; and a ratio of several hundred students per advisor may meet pathetic national norms, but it leaves our students ill served.

Caveats Concerning the Proposals of the Workgroup

In evaluating the recommendations of this report, stakeholders might ask:

- Isn't the recommendation effectively a return to the College Dean model that the College moved away from nearly 20 years ago?
- If the College is to be reorganized, why not split it up into three separate colleges?

In response to the first question, the Workgroup sees fundamental and pivotal differences between the old College Dean model that the College used until approximately 20 years ago and the new model that we now recommend. In the old model, the College Dean had only Associate Deans for support. The divisions lacked identity and representation, and the Associate Deans handled functional areas of the college as a whole, while academic personnel authority rested with the College Dean.

In the new model, we propose having three Divisional Deans serve as the primary contact between the departments, programs, and centers of each division and the Dean's office as a whole. The Divisional Deans will (and should) in all likelihood be drawn from the faculty of their respective divisions and we would expect them to be the lead actors on academic personnel matters, including signature authority over normal merits. The Divisional Deans will also be key contact points for major promotions, recruitments, appointments, and retentions, and will liaise with the College Dean, the Executive Council, and the upper administration as needed on each case. Thus, in the new model we propose, the divisions will continue to have a strong identity and will be led by Divisional Deans connected to their disciplines and empowered to act on behalf of their divisions as much as possible.

In response to the second question, the workgroup believes that splitting up into three separate colleges would entail significant additional administrative costs and redundancies as each college takes administrative and academic matters into its own hands. At a minimum there would likely need to be separate offices in each college for undergraduate education, development (philanthropy), and marketing & communications. Also, there would be limited ability to leverage creative collective approaches to staff responsibilities across three separate colleges. Ultimately, this would

diminish the amount of resources that would be available to invest in the core academic positions and activities of each college.

Further concerns arise. One is that separate colleges would impair the ability to evolve structurally over time, whereas a College Dean in a single college structure leaves greater flexibility to realign and develop divisions to best address changing needs over time. Another concern is that splitting up would exacerbate, rather than diminish, the zero-sum conflicts that already impair the functioning of the College at present.

Workgroup Recommendation and the Path Forward

To summarize, the Workgroup recommends that a College Dean, a single dean for the entire L&S College, must take on essential tasks that are neglected or ignored in the present model: top leadership internally and externally, and the shared functions that ought to reside at a central, college level. These tasks, which are poorly done and/or inappropriate at the divisional level, should be “delegated upwards” to a college Dean.

At the same time, the Workgroup stresses that all the structures and operations that can, or potentially could, function well at the divisional level, and those for which proximity to the faculty is crucial, should be “delegated downwards” to Divisional Deans. This should leave the Divisional Deans empowered to use their disciplinary focus, expertise, and vision to provide the best direct oversight and management of their divisions and departments, and remain the best advocates for their divisions’ interests to the other divisions, the College Dean, the Provost and the Chancellor, as well as to internal and external stakeholders.

The Workgroup does not favor the return to a College Dean without a supporting Divisional Dean structure (the “old model”). That is, we favor a “1+3” structure, not the “1+0” structure of days past. L&S has grown significantly since the last time it was led by a College Dean. The Workgroup believes that a Dean plus Divisional Deans structure of L&S is necessary to allocate appropriate workload for the administration, to effectively manage the diversity of the college, and to cope with the varying nature of disciplinary needs.

If this Dean plus Divisional Deans structure is chosen, the L&S college Dean should be seen as much as an unter-provost as an über-Dean. The principle should be followed of delegating up only what is best centralized for efficiency and cooperation reasons, leaving the college Dean to focus on upward and external-facing matters. Divisional Deans can then focus on inward-facing functions and the smoother running of their respective divisions, departments, and programs.

The Workgroup recognizes that a transition to a new Dean structure generates valid concerns related to increasing the administrative distance between the faculty and the Provost. Thus, any transition requires a period of increased attention and investment from the Provost and Chancellor to manage and ameliorate these concerns, as well as the active engagement of the faculty in the entire transition process.

The Workgroup suggests that a clear commitment of resources from the Provost and Chancellor and a shared vision of L&S renewal and excellence are both required for a successful transition. The current level of anxiety within the faculty reflects an extended period of underinvestment in L&S. Raising the confidence of the faculty to achieve positive change will require clear communication of the details of plans and implementation of change from the administration with opportunities for faculty feedback and response.

The Workgroup believes that if L&S can have strong leadership from a high-caliber team composed of a College Dean and Divisional Deans, if this is backed by significant increased investment from the Provost and Chancellor, and if the faculty and staff can work in a dedicated partnership with the administration, then we can move forward and successfully pursue a shared vision of excellence for the College.

Appendix

Summaries of Workgroup Meetings with Five External Administrators

1. Robert Stacey, Executive Dean, Letters and Sciences, University of Washington (23 February 2015)

Dean Stacey provided an overview of the structure of the College of Letters and Sciences at the University of Washington.

The College consists of four divisions: arts, humanities (languages and literatures); all social sciences except for social work; all natural sciences except for earth/space/atmospheric science. The administrative structure consists of the Executive Dean and the four Divisional Deans. In addition, there are College-wide Deans for development, research/infrastructure, and educational programs, as well as a Director of finance and administration.

As the dominant college for undergraduate education, the College has a single budget that is relatively large. Stacey said this allows the College to move quickly when threats emerge, or when opportunities arise. In terms of administrative matters, Stacey discussed the role played by Divisional Deans as facilitators/advocates for retention and recruitment within the departments. Recruitments are under the purview of the responsible Divisional Dean and the Executive Dean.

Stacey was very supportive of a transition from a structure like the current UC Davis L&S structure to an executive College Dean model, underscoring that the campus administration (i.e., the Provost) would have to help the College see immediate gains.

2. Mark Richards, Dean, Mathematics and Physical Sciences, UC Berkeley (former Executive Dean) (3 March 2015)

Dean Richards described the administrative structure at the College of Letters and Sciences at Berkeley, noting that the four Divisional Deans are complemented by an Undergraduate Dean. The Berkeley Council of Deans is large, and some Deans run entire schools which are smaller than some MPS departments.

Berkeley's Executive Dean oversees the fundraising mission. Problems in the college typically stem from money issues and resource management. The mandate is to "fundraise, fundraise, fundraise." There are 20 to 25 people in Berkeley's L&S development office, which is not enough—it's half of what UCLA has. He thinks there should be at least 35 doing development for the College.

Berkeley's L&S is effectively the College for all undergraduates except engineering and chemistry, and dominates Berkeley in terms of FTE and students. Its divisional structure is efficient: it works well because of staff support across the divisions.

Richards closed by saying he thought the best way to ensure parity with other schools and colleges would be with a College Dean, and that the best model for the liberal arts college is an Executive Dean plus Divisional Deans.

3. Paul Koch, Dean of the Division of Physical & Biological Sciences in the Institute of Marine Sciences at UC Santa Cruz (4 March 2015)

Dean Koch provided an overview of his division: 4000 undergraduates, 400 graduate students, and hundreds of ladder-rank faculty. The Dean is responsible for administration: physical plant and academic and resource planning for the sciences.

As a Divisional Dean, he is expected to spend around 25% of his time fundraising. Dean Koch's division is somewhat larger administratively than some of the other divisions, and the division raises half the external funds for the campus.

Some of the issues facing the College are unique to the campus. In terms of scale he recognized that UCSC is much smaller than UCD, so there are differences between our universities. Most of UC Santa Cruz's programs are small, relative to other research universities, and the campus was built with a focus on undergraduate education at a time when the UC system favored graduate studies.

4. Ruth Watkins, Provost, University of Utah (previously Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences at the University of Illinois) (11 March 2015)

Provost Watkins provided an overview of Big 10 reorganizations. Ohio State in the recent past divided the College of Letters and Sciences into five small colleges, which was a failure. They have returned to the old model.

Provost Watkins emphasized that a successful reorganization stresses culture, place, and purpose, and begins with an intellectual discussion addressing what is to be accomplished and how it can be helped and not hindered.

As the College Dean at Illinois she wanted to empower Associate Deans to have a clear role, vis-à-vis department heads, in day-to-day operations. As Dean, she was the “up and out” person — i.e., spending more of her time on the road, raising money. She was the public person for major gifts. The College had a development office of 25. In an era of declining state support, funding major gifts development is a very worthwhile investment. She endorsed the importance of talking about the value of the liberal arts education to everyone who invests in the institution: politicians, legislators, donors, parents, alumni. Not only the social or societal value, but the practical value (graduation rates, employment).

Despite this role, and the size of the College, she still played an active role in academic personnel issues, particularly retentions and hires. She said that she knew all the faculty.

She emphasized the need for healthy collaboration, rather than competition, for research. Competition, she stated, is good, but only up to a point. All have to be advocates for the College, as Letters and Sciences is the heart and soul of the campus, and “a larger college structure gives you a better chance to mentor, retain, promote faculty.”

5. Karen Hanson, Vice President, Academic Affairs, University of Minnesota (previously dean at Indiana University) (18 March 2015)

Vice President Hanson discussed budget models at her two institutions: both UMN and IU use responsibility-centered management (RCM). In the College, administration and faculty are responsible for curriculum, funding, and promotion and tenure.

With the “big college” model, there are bottlenecks, which can be circumvented by re-delegating authority at the divisional level. Resources at UMN’s College of Liberal Arts are an issue, particularly for language instruction, literature, and culture. Hanson acknowledged that responsibilities could be handled more effectively: she said that the College came up with plans for administrative consolidation and made plans to heighten the impact of the college, but the plans stalled.

Much of what Hanson described at UMN was rather different from other externals, and UC experience.