

Program Change Proposal:

Provided to Faculty in the following affected units:

- Department of Counseling, Quantitative Methods & Special Education
- Department of Curriculum & Instruction
- Department of Educational Administration and Higher Education
- Department of Workforce Education and Development

This program change proposal is provided in keeping with the provisions of Article 9 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) between the Board of Trustees and the SIUC Faculty Association IEA/NEA. Specifically, this proposal addresses the requirements of Section 9.03 of the CBA.

Overview

A preliminary draft of a campus-wide reorganization plan that included multiple mergers of departments into schools was presented to the campus community by the Chancellor on October 19, 2017. Beginning roughly in mid-October, 2017, Faculty were provided the opportunity, via an online portal that remains open as of November 9, 2017, to participate in the development of merger proposals by providing feedback, input, alternate ideas, etc. in response to the preliminary draft proposal that had been presented. More than 550 responses were submitted through the portal or directly to the office of Provost or Chancellor, with many responses reflecting input from multiple individuals. Although it is not possible to report the exact number of Faculty who participated (many responses were anonymous), it was clear that a significant number of Faculty members provided input via the portal. Additionally, discussions of the draft proposal occurred at meetings of the Faculty Senate and Graduate Council, individual meetings with Chancellor and/or Associate Provosts were held with a number of Faculty members at their request, and several departments met with the Chancellor and Associate Provosts at the request of the department.

In response to the comments received through the portal, as well as comments, feedback, and alternate suggestions for reorganization that were communicated via email and through face-to-face meetings between October 19, 2017 and November 9, 2017, the draft proposal presented by the Chancellor on October 19, 2017 was substantially modified. The revised draft of the overall re-organization proposal will be presented to the campus community on **Friday, November 17**. The individual program change proposal provided here pursuant to Article 9 was prepared based on the revised draft reorganization proposal.

A. Description of Proposed Change:

The proposal would create a School of Education (headed by a Dean) by merging the Department of Counseling, Quantitative Methods & Special Education, the Department of Curriculum & Instruction, the Department of Educational Administration and Higher

Education, and the Department of Workforce Education and Development into a School. Please note that the Teacher Education Programs will also be housed in the School of Education. **All degree programs associated with each of the existing departments, including undergraduate and graduate degree programs, concentrations and specializations associated with the degree programs, minor programs, and certificate programs will be transferred to the School of Education.** The names and academic requirements of the degree programs will not change.

Organizational Structure of School of Education:

The School will be led by a Dean who will serve at the pleasure of the Provost.

Each of the (former) academic units that comprise the School of Education will have the status of **Division** within the School. Each Division will be led by a faculty member who serves in the functional role of Division Coordinator. The duties of the Division Coordinator may vary based on the complexity and needs of the Division. Division Coordinator duties will reflect a service assignment in the faculty member's annual workload assignment. It is anticipated that this service assignment will correspond to a "release" from one-to-two 3-credit hour courses per year, depending on the Division's complexity (i.e., a 12.5% or 25% FTE service assignment). The service assignment will be determined by the School Director in consultation with the Division Coordinator and the Dean and in compliance with the collective bargaining agreement. Depending on the complexity of the Division's programs and needs, Division Coordinators may also receive summer appointments in support of the division and its programs. Service duties of the Division Coordinator may include, but may not be limited to: consulting with the School Director and/or support staff regarding course staffing needs; providing input to the School Director to inform the Director's assignment of workload to faculty; assisting with student concerns; coordinating accreditation-related activities if appropriate; assisting the School Director with program assessment.

B. Rationale

SIU's academic programs and structure have remained largely unchanged in a changing higher education marketplace. To revitalize our programs in order to attract students, we need to better align programs that relate to each other in order to create opportunities for greater collaboration among students and faculty. We should also add new programs in high demand areas, reinforce essential and strong programs, and end programs that are weaker and attracting fewer students¹.

With respect to this specific proposal, the Department of Counseling, Quantitative Methods & Special Education, the Department of Curriculum & Instruction, the

¹ Adapted from Vision 2025 FAQ

Department of Educational Administration and Higher Education, and the Department of Workforce Education and Development into a School. The Teacher Education Programs will also be housed in the School of Education. Determinations regarding the structure of the proposed School were based on analysis of factors such as current degree and course offerings in each of the component academic units, descriptions in the catalog and in the public descriptions of academic programs by the component academic units (e.g., websites). In addition to reducing barriers to innovative programming, curricula and research in these core educational disciplines, we wish to elevate the status of the units that serve one of our historic core missions of training educators by housing the units in a school headed by a Dean. Additionally, the proposed reorganization of administrative structure will contribute to more equitable distribution of service-related tasks across Faculty, freeing faculty from some of the service obligations that can be cumbersome in small academic departments. By spreading these responsibilities out in larger schools, individual faculty members will be able to increase their teaching and research capacity. Additionally, we anticipate that implementation of the overall reorganization plan will result in approximately \$2.3 million in permanent (projected) administrative cost savings. These savings, which will accrue from elimination of administrative positions (e.g., fewer dean positions, elimination of department chair positions) will allow us to invest in our people and programs ²

C. Impact on Faculty Lines and Faculty Workload

This proposal has no effect on Faculty lines. There will be no eliminations of faculty positions under this proposal. Consistent with current practice in other Academic Schools at SIU Carbondale, Faculty workload will be assigned by the Dean in her/his capacity as the chief academic and administrative officer of the School. The Dean will assign workload in consultation Division Coordinators. Faculty workload assignment is governed by the terms of the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) and all Faculty workload assignments will continue to be made in accordance with the procedures established and required by the collective bargaining agreement and the School's Operating paper.

Overall, the return of department chairs to faculty status will increase the time available for faculty research and teaching capacity in each division. Additionally, the nature of the School structure is such that required committee assignments will be more efficiently managed than was possible in the former departments that will comprise the school. This should result in an overall decrease in service load requirements for Faculty. Finally, to the extent that the current administrative structure may contribute to

² Adapted from 2017 State of the University Address (9/26/2017)

curricular overlap and duplication (by way of highly similar courses being offered in multiple programs), we anticipate that as a result of the integration and synergy that is central to the reorganization plan there will be decreased pressure to staff required courses.

General Considerations for Tenured Faculty. Current examples of the approach proposed here for “locating” a Faculty member’s tenure home exist in the School of Allied Health, School of Art and Design, School of Architecture and School of Music. These schools house multiple academic degree programs, with faculty tenure residing in the school. The proposed reorganization will **not result in any loss of tenure** for any Faculty member in the affected academic units. Specific to this proposal, Faculty members who hold tenure in the Department of Counseling, Quantitative Methods & Special Education, the Department of Curriculum & Instruction, the Department of Educational Administration and Higher Education, and the Department of Workforce Education and Development will have their tenure transferred to the School of Education.

Promotion Considerations for Tenured Faculty. Under the terms of the current Collective Bargaining Agreement, the promotion guidelines and procedures included in the operating papers in force at the time of the tenured faculty member’s most recent promotion will apply to a promotion review case that occurs after the proposed merger and establishment of the School of Education. Note, however, that the tenured faculty member may elect to apply the promotion guidelines and procedures of the operating papers of his or her new school to the promotion / tenure review case. Similarly, the promotion standards and procedures articulated in the 2016 SIUC Employees Handbook apply to promotion review. Under the provisions of the current Collective Bargaining Agreement, to the extent that the Promotion Policies and Procedures set forth in the 2016 SIUC Employees Handbook are modified in the future, the procedures in effect under the 2016 SIUC Employees Handbook shall be used, unless otherwise mutually agreed between the Board and the Faculty member being considered for promotion and/or tenure.

Tenure and Promotion Considerations for Tenure Track Faculty. Under the terms of the current Collective Bargaining Agreement, the tenure and promotion guidelines and procedures in the operating papers in force at the time the faculty member was hired into the tenure-track position will apply to a tenure / promotion review case that occurs after the proposed merger and creation of the School of Education. Note, however, that a tenure-track faculty member may elect to apply the tenure/promotion standards of the operating papers of his or her new school to the promotion / tenure review case. Similarly, the promotion and tenure standards and procedures articulated in the 2016 SIUC Employees Handbook apply to promotion and tenure review. Under the provisions

of the current Collective Bargaining Agreement, to the extent that the Promotion and Tenure Policies and Procedures set forth in the 2016 SIUC Employees Handbook are modified, the procedures in effect under the 2016 SIUC Employees Handbook shall be used, unless otherwise mutually agreed between the Board and the Faculty member being considered for promotion and/or tenure.

When creating the Operating Paper for the School of Education, attention will be need to be given to the tenure and promotion processes associated with a School that is headed by a Dean. SIU Carbondale's Library Affairs unit and the School of Law may provide models to advance such discussion.

D. Impact on Students and Ability to Maintain Curricula

There will be no negative impact on students. To the contrary, we anticipate significant benefits to students in the integrated school model. They will have exposure to a wider range of faculty and will have opportunities to engage in cross disciplinary research, curriculum, and co-curricular activities.

The catalog under which a student enrolled as a major will continue to govern that student's curricular requirements. That is, an existing student whose major will be housed by a School rather than a department will have identical requirements to those in place when s/he entered the major. S/he will be able to continue their current programs through graduation based on the requirements specified in the Undergraduate or Graduate Catalog as of the date they enrolled in the program. We will ensure that we deliver on our commitments to students enrolled in every program. Future changes to curriculum will be the responsibility of the faculty, and such changes would follow established campus procedures (e.g., the NUI or RME process).

Given no reduction in faculty as part of the reorganization plan, there are no implications for ability to maintaining the curricula³. Again, the degree programs currently housed by the component academic units will simply be housed in the broader administrative structure of the School.

E. Estimated Financial Costs or Savings, Including Source(s)

Cost savings associated with this proposal will come from elimination of administrative positions including a reduction in the number of Dean positions (in the overall campus-wide proposal) and the elimination of 4 Department chair positions. Specifically, for

³ With exception of any proposal to eliminate a degree program. Any such proposals will be separate and apart from this program change proposal.

each former department chair, the differential between Faculty salary and Chair salary, plus summer salary will be saved. Across the University, we anticipate permanent (projected) administrative cost savings of \$2.3 million. In addition, additional savings may be generated following the reorganization by reducing duplicative courses through better coordination in the Schools. There will be no layoffs of employees in civil service positions, although it is possible that there will be re-assignment of some civil service positions, allowing us to allocate positions to the areas of greatest need. We anticipate that civil service positions might be re-assigned to support complex Divisions (e.g., to assist the School Director with scheduling, personnel tasks, etc).

The Executive Director for Finance and Administration, Associate Provost for Academic Administration, and office of the Chancellor arrived at this *estimated* savings. Data used to provide the estimate included the average Dean salary across the University, average salary of chairs versus faculty of the same rank, and the typical level of summer appointment for department chairs. Note that additional expected cost efficiencies realized by reducing the number of overlapping courses, reducing the service obligations of Faculty by spreading the assignments across a greater number of individuals within the school thereby allowing faculty more research and teaching time, and other administrative efficiencies were **not** included or calculated as part of this estimated savings.

F. Comparison of similar programs at Peer Institutions (if applicable)

Considering IBHE peer institutions, there are no universities that have adopted a comprehensive, campus wide College / School model such as the one that has been proposed. However, a number of universities among the **IBHE peers** have Schools that are administratively housed within Colleges (e.g., Mississippi State University, University of North Dakota, Kent State University, Oklahoma State University, West Virginia University). Another IBHE peer, Texas Tech University, has academic units that are named as Departments, but that are similar in structure to those proposed here (e.g., there is a Department of Sociology, Anthropology and Social Work). Schools of Education headed by a Dean occur with regularity among comprehensive research universities.

The existence at a peer university of an overall College / School model that parallels that proposed here is not a necessary pre-condition for this program change. To the contrary, insisting on precedent precludes innovation and guarantees that the University would follow and not lead. The University is facing longstanding challenges that threaten our ability to maintain our Carnegie R2 / Higher Research Activity University, much less progress toward our goal of becoming a Carnegie R1 / Highest Research Activity University, and call into question our ability to serve the students who

are at the core of our mission. The University wide reorganization proposal within which this specific proposal is subsumed is designed to reinvent SIU to foster curricular innovation and synergy in research and creative activity, and to provide world-class opportunities to our students inside and outside of the classroom.

With respect to precedent, the most important fact to note is that the School model (with multiple degree programs housed in the School) is already functioning effectively at SIU in the School of Allied Health, the School of Information Systems and Applied Technology, the School of Art and Design, the School of Music and the School of Architecture. In most of these programs, faculty members who serve as division, area, or program coordinators / directors provide effective support and consultation to the School Director as part of their service assignments. School Directors at SIU have demonstrated their ability to understand, support, and represent the disparate academic disciplines represented in their schools; to advocate for wide-ranging academic programs; and to support, mentor, and evaluate fairly and equitably the faculty who teach and engage in scholarship in varied disciplines. School Directors at SIU have also demonstrated their success at supporting undergraduate and graduate students from multiple academic disciplines. In short, we need look no further than our own campus to see examples of the “School Model” working.

G. Possible Consequences of the Proposed Change on the University’s Carnegie Status

The proposed change will have no direct / explicit impact on the University’s Carnegie Status. However, one of the goals of the campus-wide re-organization plan (see point B) is to invigorate, enhance and expand Faculty research and creative activity by increasing synergy and collaboration. This includes the goal of expanding extramural grant / contract activity and increasing Ph.D. production. The reorganization plan will contribute to the broader institutional goal of increasing the University’s Carnegie Status to R1 (Highest Research Activity).

[END of Program Change Proposal]

Independent of and apart from the Program Change Proposal provided above to Faculty under Section 9.03 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement, the following information is provided for informational purposes:

Neither establishment, modification, elimination, nor renaming of Colleges by the University is subject to the requirements of Article 9. Establishment of Colleges and assignment of Departments / Schools to Colleges **is** subject to established campus shared governance processes. Accordingly, future plans to establish, eliminate, or rename Colleges, and proposals for assigning Academic Schools to Colleges will follow established procedures (e.g. review of RME by Faculty Senate and/or Graduate Council), with opportunity for feedback by faculty, staff and students.