Update regarding Report on the Provost’s Reorganization Plan

Previously the Executive Committee requested status reports from the various committees involved in evaluating the Provost’s proposal. Responses received to date included:

1. A response from the (A&S) Graduate Committee.
3. A response from the (AS&E) Budget and Priorities Committee.
4. A response from the (AS&E) Athletics committee expressing concerns about ambiguities.
5. A question from the (AS&E) Faculty Advisory Board about the sources of budgetary information.

Since we are unaware at this time of the status of FAB, the consensus is that Joe Auner be allowed to describe what FAB is doing in whatever way seems best.

The report from B&P shows how money flows now and highlights the uncertainties of how the proposal will change money flow. In the opinion of the report, there is insufficient information available from which to assess the Provost’s reorganization plan.

In the UAFAC report, the issue of whether ex-officio members of the Admissions and Financial Aid committee now have the vote should be investigated. In the opinion of UAFAC, there should be solid line reports from the Director of Admissions to the Deans of A&S and Engineering. This might not be considered practical, though, because a solid line is a line of authority.

There was also significant discussion of the impact of moving admissions decisions. It would make financial sense to admit more students in the Humanities, and less in the sciences and engineering, because the tuition is the same and the cost is less. This would – however – result in an unbalanced student body. This is an argument that the deans should decide this instead of the Provost.

There was general discussion of the overwhelmingly negative opinion of the faculty about the plan, and that the situation is now heading toward universal rejection of the plan. But there are changes being proposed, and perhaps it is more productive to propose the changes we have, and to see if the faculty agree with us on the proposals we have.

One way this could work is that there are clear messages in these reports that should be addressed, and that could be addressed by changes in the Provost’s plan early next semester.

Scheduling of the athletics decision is a problem. As soon as the Athletics committee has a recommendation, we can put it to a faculty vote.

UAFAC’s conclusion is that there should be no change. The basic question is how the briefing notes should look for the Dec. 3 meeting.

It was decided to mail all the chairs that night, and tell them what we intend to do, and see which chairs can comply.