Committee Reports on AS&E Reorganization Proposal
On September 2nd, 2014, the Provost presented to the Tufts Faculty his proposals for a reorganization of the current structure of A&S and Engineering. Realizing that the proposed modifications may have significant consequences for the students and faculty of Arts, Sciences and Engineering, the Executive Committee of GSAS held a series of special meetings to discuss the existing structure of GSAS and possible ways to improve it.

At a special meeting held September 19th the GSAS EC decided to invite the past Deans of A&S and GSAS to seek their opinions and input.

On September 24th, we met with Lynne Pepall, Robin Kanarek and Susan Ernst. It was extremely useful and instructive to hear different concerns and points of view expressed by the past Tufts administrators, who were also Tufts faculty, and who all value graduate education and would like to see its importance more highly recognized on this campus and the University. The discussion at the September 24th meeting was in the context of just the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences. However, given the number of significant overlaps, shared problems and common goals between A&S and the School of Engineering, we felt it would be important to have a joint meeting with representatives from both schools.

The joint meeting was held on October 1st, 2014. Karen Panetta, Associate Dean of the Engineering Graduate School, Tufts University, and Mark Ranalli, Associate Dean and Executive Director of Tufts Gordon Institute, joined us from the School of Engineering. It was another useful and very informative meeting. We decided that our deliberations might benefit from finding out more from the current Deans of both schools. We agreed to invite Linda Abriola and Jim Glaser, the current Deans of A&S and of Engineering, to another joint meeting of GSAS EC and the Engineering Graduate Studies Committee.

The meeting with the current Deans of AS&E took place on October 8th. It was a very informative, in-depth and revealing meeting, and resulted in our taking more steps to gather even more information about the financial structure of both schools and, even more importantly, about the financial structure of GSAS within A&S.

Based on the information we were able to collect, we discussed several possible options and suggestions in response to the Provost’s proposal, and specifically to the one which would affect the GSAS. We considered: i) keeping the existing structure as is; ii) creating a position of an independent Dean of GSAS, reporting to the Provost; iii) creating a position of an independent, joint Dean of Graduate Studies within A&S and the School of Engineering; iv) adopting the Provost’s proposal; v) keeping elements of the existing structure with modifications that we felt were essential to improve it.

After another meeting on October 15th, we reached an agreement on October 24th, and prepared a summary of our discussions and recommendations, to be presented to the Tufts Faculty. Enclosed please find the document. We also decided to invite David Harris and Kevin Dunn to another special meeting of GSAS EC to discuss our recommendation with them, even before showing the document to the Tufts Faculty.

We met on November 5th, 2014. I think everyone agrees that we had a very productive and
constructive conversation. The Provost did agree that the Dean of GSAS should attend many more of the important meetings than in the past, including meetings between the Provost and the Dean of A&S (at least once a month), as well as other meetings concerning Advancement, Development, and the Capital Campaign. We were promised that the final details will be agreed upon in a joint meeting between the Provost, the Vice Provost, the Dean of A&S and the Dean of GSAS. We were pleased to hear from the Provost that "there's no reason we need to wait to start implementing these ideas." We also had a useful discussion of the Provost's proposal to create a position of associate or vice-provost for graduate studies. We expressed strongly our position that implementing our recommendations will serve the needs of GSAS better. We think that the proposed new administrator will be unlikely to match the experience and dedication of the Dean of GSAS. We also think that creating a de facto intermediary between the faculty and Tufts Administration would also necessarily, although perhaps unintentionally, diminish the role of the Dean of GSAS, and dilute her/his voice. This is precisely what we think should be avoided.

The GSAS Executive Committee has met several times to consider the Provost's proposals for the Strategic Plan 2014 and administrative restructuring. First, we welcome the new language and emphasis on graduate programs in the Strategic Plan 2014 Working Document. We find it encouraging that both the Administration and Faculty understand and appreciate how crucial graduate programs are for Tufts. We also welcome the Provost's pledge to hiring an A&S Dean with a deep commitment to graduate education.

During the meetings and discussions, which were part of T10 planning, the most consistent message heard from the A&SE faculty and staff was that support for graduate studies and graduate students falls short of what is required. Also, it was pointed out repeatedly that graduate studies need representation in the higher administration and that the present structure submerges the interests of graduate students in the undergraduate mission.

In our meetings we consulted with a number of past and present Deans of Arts and Sciences and the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, as well as the Dean of the School of Engineering and the Associate Dean of the School of Engineering, Graduate Studies. We tried to evaluate the current model, as well as several alternatives, including proposals in which a Dean of the GSAS or the GSAS&E would report directly to the Provost.

We believe that the future of the Graduate School requires long-term, strong support from the entire Administration. Without this, a change of the financial structure between A&S and the GSAS may not by itself lead to a desired increase of support for the GSAS. However, we feel that it is very important to modify the currently inadequate level of representation of the GSAS in the higher administration, and to ensure an ongoing independent voice for the Dean of the GSAS. We would support an equivalent representation for the Deans of School of Engineering, should they so desire. Therefore we recommend:

The GSAS Executive Committee recommends keeping the current financial structure of the GSAS within the School of A&S intact. At the same time, we request that the Dean of GSAS, together with other Deans, be present at any and all meetings at which financial issues and matters of policy priorities are discussed and decided. We believe that this "seat at the table" will ensure that graduate programs are well-represented and that the graduate and undergraduate programs will continue to be mutually supportive and integral to the overall goals of our University.
To: AS&E Executive Committee  
From: David Garman, Chair of the Undergraduate Admissions and Financial Aid Committee (UAFAC)  
Date: November 24, 2014  

Re: UAFAC Review of Reorganization Proposals for AS&E Admissions from Provost Harris

The UAFAC held four meetings in September and October to consider the implications of the Provost’s reorganization proposals for AS&E admissions. The discussions were wide-ranging but the primary issues were: the administration of admissions and financial aid budgets, where primary policy-making responsibilities should reside, and the role of the administrative position currently identified as the AS&E Dean of Admissions and Enrollment Management.

The committee benefited from the participation of many administrators with intimate knowledge of the relevant issues. Vice Provost Kevin Dunn participated in the first two meetings as an invited guest. Dean James Glaser and Dean Linda Abriola each attended a meeting as invited guests. Dean Bruce Reitman attended several meetings as an invited guest. Dean John Barker, Dean Lee Coffin, Dean Carmen Lowe, Director of Financial Aid Patricia Reilly, and Associate Provost Dawn Terkla are all ex officio members of UAFAC and actively participated in the discussions. The student members of the committee were not appointed by the TCU Senate until after this set of four meetings and their views were not solicited for this report. The faculty members on the committee thank each of the administrators above for their willingness to give forthright and thoughtful answers to our questions about the strengths and weaknesses of the current organization.

During the AS&E committee bylaw revisions of two years ago, the Executive Committee changed the status of the ex officio members from nonvoting members to voting members. This was a surprise to all current members of UAFAC since it had not been requested by the committee chair of that year. The ex officio members generally felt that it would be inappropriate for them to vote on any resolutions related to their administrative or supervisory roles and behaved accordingly.

At the end of the committee’s information collection and discussion, committee members were polled on the primary issues. This allowed members to respond privately and to elaborate in a way that would not have been possible on up or down votes on formal resolutions. The questions and a brief summary of the responses follow.

1. Should the AS&E Dean of Admissions be responsible for “coordinating” or “improving” admissions practices in schools other than A&S and E?

All respondents were opposed to expanding the role of the AS&E Dean of Admissions to cover any aspects of admissions practices at the other schools. It was thought AS&E admissions, especially undergraduate admissions, is too important to Tufts and too large a responsibility to take the risk of disrupting an organization and process that is currently working so well. One respondent suggested that one of the current vice provosts could be assigned to work on coordinating or improving graduate and profession school admissions (as one part of his or her overall responsibilities.)

2. Should the budgets for AS&E admissions and financial aid be set and controlled by the Provost’s Office or by the Deans of A&S and E?

All but two of the respondents felt the budgets should be set and controlled by an equal collaboration of the Dean of A&S and the Dean of E. It was deemed important to keep the decision making in the hands of the two deans directly responsible for A&S and E, and to allow those deans to have the budget authority to make spending trade-offs or to use the saving from improved efficiency. One respondent felt that budgets should be decided by an equal collaboration of the Dean of A&S, the Dean of E, and the Provost – with the qualification that the authority should remain within AS&E “if equal voting power is not enforceable.” One respondent felt that central budget control in the Provost’s Office would be better if the new process had: transparency and accountability to the two schools, some “rules or law” on how the budget would be allocated, and an enforceable prohibition on diverting the savings from any reduced expenditures to cover the needs of other schools.
3. Should the AS&E Dean of Admissions report to the Deans of A&S and E (solid lines to both deans and dotted “informational” line to the Provost’s Office) or to the Provost’s Office (solid line to the Provost’s Office and dotted “informational” lines to both deans)?

All respondents felt that the AS&E Dean of Admission should have a solid line reporting relationship to both the Dean of A&S and the Dean of E. All felt that adding a dotted line representing “informational” reporting to the Provost’s Office would be acceptable if it improved the flow of information without adding unnecessary complications or added interference in AS&E policy making. Several respondents noted that Dean Coffin has always acted “as if” he had solid line reporting relationships to the Deans of A&E and E and that this system has worked very well. One respondent suggested that major policy changes should be carried out in joint consultation among the Dean of A&S, the Dean of E, and the Provost’s Office.

4. What other points should be covered in the report to the Executive Committee?

Only three members of the committee responded to this question. Two members asked that future proposals from the Provost’s Office be vetted by the relevant school administrators and the Executive Committee in advance of being sprung on the AS&E faculty-at-large. This would allow concerns to be raised and proposals to be modified in a way that might avoid the rush and frenzy of this semester. One member admonished the committee to see through strategic considerations and to focus on the best interests of the university.
To: AS&E Executive Committee  
From: FAB, Joseph Auner (chair), Juliet Fuhrman, Kyongbum Lee, Margaret McMillan, Albert Robbat  
Re: Report on the Proposed Reorganization of Dowling  
Date: Dec 4, 2014

This report reflects a series of meetings with the following senior administrators and many of the key players in the proposed reorganization:

Dean Linda Abriola  
John Barker, Dean of Undergraduate and Graduate Students  
Michelle Bowdler, Sr. Dir. of Health and Wellness  
Associate Provost Kevin Dunn  
Dean James Glaser  
Provost David Harris  
Kim Knox, Dean of Students, SOE  
Carmen Lowe, Dean of Academic Advising and Undergraduate Study  
Mary Pat McMahon, Dean of Student Affairs  
Bruce Reitman, Dean of Student Life and Leadership  
Paul Stanton, Dean of Student Services  
Prof. Vickie Sullivan, co-chair A&S Strategic Plan Committee

All meetings except for the meeting with Harris and Dunn were individual.

FAB is grateful to everyone who met with us; we were consistently impressed with their openness and their dedication to Tufts. In no case did we feel that anyone was resistant to change simply because it would represent new ways of doing things; nor did we feel that anyone was proposing change just for the sake of change. We are also grateful to the Budget and Priorities Committee for sharing some of their preliminary findings. Our special thanks go to Jillian Dubman and Maxine Bisazza for outstanding logistical support.

What follows are the main areas of concern expressed by the individuals we interviewed about the reorganization proposal and its possible unintended consequences. With the exception of the Provost, we did not hear from anyone who was strongly in favor of the reorganization as currently articulated. While challenges were identified in the operations associated with Dowling Hall, people did not identify the current split reporting structure between the two Deans as the most important challenge they faced. On the contrary, several administrators in Dowling noted that, were their operation to be moved to the Provost’s office, they would still be required to triangulate between the two Deans.

We regard these findings as provisional, because crucial aspects of the proposed reorganization have not been not fully spelled out. These include:

a) the justifications for and specific benefits of the proposed changes beyond an
appeal to “best practices” at other schools.

b) which specific sectors of Dowling would move and which would stay under the Deans.

c) how the roles of Provost as Chief Academic Officer or the Associate Provosts who are academics would be operationalized in the reporting structure for Dowling.

d) the impact on the role of the Deans. Everyone agrees that putting large parts of Dowling under the Provost would impact the budgets and budget flexibility of the two Deans, though the Provost argued that the Schools would lose both revenue and expense. The budgetary matter is the central concern of the B+P committee, which will issue its own report. Along this vein, it is not clear how the new reporting structure would reduce the structural tensions between the Deans, since they would still be in competition for funds, albeit from a significantly smaller overall budget.

e) the impact on AS&E faculty committees which, according to bylaws, may interact with or exert oversight for parts of the Dowling operation. Would that relationship change if those sectors of student services/affairs moved out of the schools and into central administration?

The following sections contain our interpretation of the key issues surrounding the reorganization as articulated by those interviewed for this report.

1) DOWLING

These interviews made clear that what is referred to as “Dowling” represents a large and complex operation, including seven branches (Student Affairs, Student Services, Student Life, Academic Advising, Orientation and Transitions, Study Abroad, Health and Wellness). Each of these branches operates with various degrees of autonomy and faces different challenges, but they all also interact in complex and productive ways with each other, the schools, central administration, and the broader university. A strength of the current structure is that the physical and administrative proximity of the offices makes it easy to help students with issues that cross these categories (as, for example, in the case of a student issue involving accessibility services, study abroad, ARC, and the health and wellness office). We were impressed by the commitment of everyone to a model of integrated academic, co-curricular, and residential student life supported by student services, student affairs, and the other segments of the Dowling operation.

In what follows the word “Dowling” should be understood as referring to this overall complex operation currently reporting to the Dean of Undergraduate and Graduate Students.

2) THE VOICE OF STUDENT AFFAIRS/SERVICES

The biggest problem that was articulated is the challenge of giving Dowling a stronger voice at the level of senior administration in terms of communication of important everyday issues and problems, as well as short and long range budget planning and decisions related to facilities, building (e.g. dormitory) construction, enrollment etc. that
have major impacts on student life. There is a clear consensus that lack of adequate attention to the student experience can have a detrimental impact on the “core business” of the school in delivering the highest quality academic and campus-based residential experience. Yet, we also heard that there were aspects of the current structure in which important issues could be readily addressed (such as OEO matters). Some also noted that it currently seems easier to be heard at the presidential than at the provostial levels.

We heard of the need for a better mechanism to provide appropriate support for graduate students. One suggestion was for a graduate student alpha dean to help with the complex issues facing graduate students (such as medical leaves, problems with advisors who are acting inappropriately, etc.)

3) ACADEMIC OVERSIGHT AND ACADEMIC INTEGRATION
There is a fear that centralizing components of Student Services and Student Affairs and moving these operations away from the two Deans would weaken the integration of Dowling with academic planning and oversight by faculty, and would instead allow business/finance concerns to drive planning (as with the recent discussion of potentially expanding first year enrollments). A major strength of current operations is the way in which faculty are engaged as part of an integrated model of academic, co-curricular, and residential student life supported by student services and student affairs. Conversely, there are concerns that there are already tendencies toward marginalizing faculty input, as for example with the creation of the transitional advisor program and the ways in which those positions were defined.

There are concerns that splitting off components of the Dowling operation would decrease efficiency and further interfere with communication among the various parts, thus complicating the experience for students dealing with problems that involve multiple offices (as we learned is often the case).

Many argued that it is problematic to draw clear distinctions between “academic”/“non-academic,” “grad”/“undergrad,” and “A&S and SOE” in connection with any of the seven branches. Even those parts of Dowling that serve the whole university and, thus, could conceivably benefit from a move to central, such as Accessibility Services and Health and Wellness services, would still require mechanisms to preserve close cooperation with the rest of Dowling.

4) STRUCTURAL PROBLEMS VS COMMUNICATION PROBLEMS
Based on our interviews, current challenges relating to Dowling seem to result less from the current split reporting structures and more from problems with communication and oversight of the schools. Since Dowling operates as a shared service center between the schools, cooperation between school Deans is essential. When the school Deans cooperate as they did in the past and do again now, tension between the schools can be minimal. Some offices have been very responsive to both Deans. Problems have arisen when others have been less responsive in honoring the dotted line to SOE. In some cases SOE has developed parallel structures to those already existing in Dowling, such as advising and career service.
Most of the people we spoke with indicate that the challenges stem less from the administrative structure than from problems in communication. Similarly, any positive impact of structural changes would be minimal without improvements in communication. There is a clear need for:

- more open and ongoing communication, in particular more efficient ways of getting information up through the Deans to the Provost and President,
- new mechanisms to get more people from the various sectors at the table at the provostial and presidential levels more regularly, and
- more time in the Provost’s schedule for the school Deans to discuss student affairs.

Several of those interviewed suggested that there were other mechanisms besides the large scale restructuring for achieving this goal. For example, regular meetings to address concerns regarding communication could put more people around the table. It was suggested that the two school Deans, the EAD(s) for those schools, the Dean of Undergraduate and Graduate Education, the Dean for Undergraduate and Graduate Admissions, the Vice Presidents for Finance and Operations, the Executive Vice President, the Provost, and the President could meet regularly to discuss issues such as resource allocation, student expectations, financial aid, enrollment, housing, and dining.

Success stories we heard, such as the ability for Accessibility Services to hire a new person dealing with the skyrocketing expenses of accommodations and the growing numbers of students needing them, demonstrated the benefits of facilitating communication between Dowling, the Deans, the EAD(s), and central finance.

5) BUDGETARY CONCERNS
We heard of significant concerns about accountability and checks and balances on the budgets for Dowling operations if they were removed from reporting structures responsible for the academic mission of the schools. Comparisons were made with what happened when TTS moved to central administration, with a growth in budget and staff and corresponding new charges to the schools.

There is widespread dissatisfaction with the budgetary process at every level. While this does not relate only to the reorganization proposal, it was a consistent theme among all those interviewed. People spoke of the lack of flexibility for revenue-neutral changes with their own budgets, the lack of any regular budget process that would allow mid- and long-range planning, and a lack of transparency about budgets with central administration.

6) SHORTCOMINGS OF THE “BEST PRACTICES” MODEL
Several commented on problems of applying “best practices” when evaluating the academic placement of Dowling in comparison to other universities. While our administrative structure for student affairs and students services at Tufts is atypical, so is our unusual combination of schools, the way in which we integrate student-centered schools with a strong teaching mission within a research university, and the history of
limited central coordination. Unlike peer schools with strong central operations who need to coordinate undergraduate programs in multiple schools and professional programs, Tufts only has undergraduates in the two schools, and prides itself on the absence of barriers between the two schools for the students. Several pointed out that Dowling operations (with the exception of accessibility and health and wellness) are generally not set up to serve students in other schools either on the Medford campus or at the Grafton and Boston campuses.

In conclusion, it is impossible to predict the consequences of the proposed reorganization as key details are missing. Some individuals were not strongly opposed. However, the interviews do not give strong support for the proposed move of oversight of Dowling activities from the two schools to central administration.
To: AS&E Executive Committee  
From: Fiorenzo Omenetto – Chair, Budget and Priorities Committee  
Re: B&P Review of Reorganization Proposals for AS&E Admissions from Provost  

Over the past few months the Budgets and Priorities Committee has met 4 times on October 17, October 31, November 6, and November 20, 2014. During these meetings, the committee has heard reports on the present structure and expenditures of the AS&E budget. Key representatives of the administration joined the B&P committee meetings - namely Scott Sahagian (10/17, 10/31, 11/6, 11/20), Jonathan Dudley (10/31, 11/20), and Kevin Dunn (11/6).

An overview of the budget for AS&E has been also redacted.

As a consequence of these meetings, a series of questions were redacted, presented to Kevin Dunn on 11/6, and addressed to Provost Harris. The questions are included in the appendix of this document. The questions address different themes that pertain to the budgetary implications and the financial planning associated with the reorganization proposed.

Responses to these questions will be addressed by the Administration beyond the November 21st deadline since it is the Administration’s opinion that these budgetary issues need to be addressed thoughtfully.

It is the opinion of this committee that the Administration is working earnestly to define a Budgetary Plan for the reorganization, and that, to date, such plan has not been defined.

It is also the opinion of the committee that it is impossible to assess or predict the possible consequences on the operational budget of the schools without having more details on what the future Budgetary/Financial Plan or Budgetary Evaluation/Projection will be.
Budget and Priorities Meeting, November 6, 2014

Compiled and redacted questions

With the change in management structure, decisions on the use of funds that are currently generated primarily by AS&E undergraduate tuition and applied to AS&E operations from the “shared” budget (such as academic costs, student services, athletics, admissions, etc) will now be made in the Provost’s office rather than at the level of the academic Deans.

In the new structure:

1. What budget will the two Deans have control over? How does it compare to the budget over which they have control in the current administrative structure?

2. How do the proposed changes impact the discretion of the A&S and SOE deans to allocate funds?

3. In the new organizational structure, what formal roles, if any, will the new Deans have in contributing to decisions about the use of shared resources, managed at the Provost’s office level, for their respective Schools? Will they only have the chance of asking the Provost for additional or re-directed use of money for their Schools, or will they actually sit at the table where budget decisions that impact their Schools are made?

4. How will the new structure guarantee that these funds will continue to be applied to benefit the AS&E students, and not (partially) diverted to other Schools?

5. In the new organizational structure, what opportunities will the two Deans have to attract funds to their School over which they will have full control? Will there be about the same, more, or less opportunities with respect to the current administrative situation? In what way will there be more, less, or about the same opportunities for the two Deans to identify proactive approaches to generate funding for their School over which they will have full control?

6. Are there any identified financial inefficiencies of the current system and how is the new plan going to mitigate them? How is this new plan going to benefit the schools financially? Are there *specific* budgetary issues that have arisen in the recent past which motivate the proposed reorganization effort?

A large fraction of the budget for the two individual schools (A&S and E) comes from the 80/20 split on the funds remaining in the shared budget after all costs have been met. Under the new management structure, with all shared funds under higher administrative control, the two academic Deans will need these funds “up front”; that is, as a revenue stream in their budget from the beginning removing some of the “fluidity: and “adaptability” of the process.

7. What changes (if any) will be made to the budget structure to place additional funds from undergraduate tuition directly into the budget streams for the two schools, rather than splitting remaining funds at the end of the process?
8. How will the new organizational structure change the balance between the central administration and the School-level administration with respect to costs (maintenance, upgrades, expansions, new opportunities, etc.) associated with buildings, infrastructures, lab/classroom/administrative space, etc. within each School? What role, if any, will the Dean play in decisions that will involve funds managed at the central administration level that will directly impact the facilities and infrastructures in their respective schools?

---

Elected student representatives attend the BnP committee meetings – they submitted the following questions

**Questions from the student representatives attending the BnP committee.**

How will the reorganization of the budget affect the balance of power between the provost and the dean of a&s, and will the process of petitioning for money by the deans become increasingly arduous as a result?

How will the power of the Deans be affected by the proposed reorganization?

With all control of resources allocation lying with the provost, will deans have any impact on the budgetary decisions being made?

If competing entities are vying for resources, who will mediate the decision?

What control over resource allocation will the dean of a&s have after the reorganization?

Will there be any check on the power of the provost to allocate resources were he or she to hypothetically feel it necessary to prioritize the budget to another campus?
High Level Budgetary Model for AS&E
Current situation based on FY2014 Profit & Loss Statement
Only major (>1M) revenues and expenses are captured.

The AS&E “shared budget” is currently managed jointly by the Deans of the two schools. The individual school budgets are managed (individually) by the two Deans.

MAIN QUESTIONS

QUESTION 1 - Institutional support of $51M goes out of the shared AS&E budget to central admin. How will this cost change and be managed?

QUESTION 2 - Academic support & student services (Tisch library, athletics, admissions, registrar, advising, etc) costs $36M annually. Many of these services under the new plan will report directly to the Provost rather than the academic Deans. How will this budget change and be managed? (See next page)

QUESTION 3 - The schools rely on the 80/20 split of shared surplus to balance their individual school budgets. How will the surplus change and how will the split be managed?
**AS&E Shared Budget (Both Deans)**

**Revenue:** $258M

- Instruction: $76M
- Spons Programs: $23M
- Academic/Student Services: $3M
- Clinical Act: $3M
- O&M of Plant: $1M

**Expenses:** $181M

- Instruction: $241M (Balance to Eng budget: $15M)
- Spons Programs: $20M
- Academic/Student Services: $23M
- Clinical Act: $3M
- O&M of Plant: $27M
- Debt Service: $2M

**Surplus:** $77M

- 80.5% of surplus goes to balance A&S budget: $62M
- 19.5% of surplus goes to balance Eng budget: $15M

**Questions**

**Question 1**

- Instruction: $76M
- Spons Programs: $23M
- Academic/Student Services: $3M
- Clinical Act: $3M
- O&M of Plant: $1M

**Question 2**

- Instruction: $24M
- Spons Programs: $18M
- Academic/Student Services: $2M
- O&M of Plant: $1M

**Question 3**

- Instruction: $24M
- Spons Programs: $18M
- Academic/Student Services: $2M
- O&M of Plant: $1M

**SoE Direct Budget (Dean of Eng)**

**Revenue:** $31M

- Instruction: $24M
- Spons Programs: $18M
- Academic/Student Services: $2M
- O&M of Plant: $1M

**Expenses:** $45M

- Instruction: $12M
- Spons Programs: $7M
- Academic/Student Services: $3M
- O&M of Plant: $5M

**Deficit:** $14M

**A&S Direct Budget (Dean of A&S)**

**Revenue:** $43M

- Grad Tuition: $27M
- Financial Aid: ($19M)
- Net Tuition: $8M
- Grants & Contracts: $31M
- Return on Investors: $4M

**Expenses:** $106M

- Instruction: $16M
- Spons Programs: $4M
- Tuition Remiss: $2M
- Debt Service: $2M

**Deficit:** $63M

**Institutional Support:** $51M

**Academic Support Student Services:** $31M

**B&P committee 21 Nov 2014**

CONFIDENTIAL
In support of answering question #2, “Academic support & student services (Tisch library, athletics, admissions, registrar, advising, etc) costs $36M annually. Many of these services under the new plan will report directly to the Provost rather than the academic Deans. How will this budget change and be managed?”

Consider the organization chart below. Currently the Academic Support and Student Services budget of $36M ($31M from the shared budget, $5M from the school budgets) is managed in this manner, with the entities reporting to the Dean of Arts and Sciences with a dotted line to the Dean of Engineering. Under the new plan, many of these entities will report directly to the Provost’s office. How will this part of the budget change and how will it be managed under the new plan?