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Consolidation Model

In Favour

The Consolidation Model Proposal will best serve the UofA long term because a) it creates Faculties that most faculty members and students can identify with, b) it strikes the right balance in terms of administrative structure and staffing, and c) it provides an academic structure that is intuitive to members of the public and that will make sense to members of the public.

At the beginning of this process, I was very much in favour of the Division/College model. But, as I have continued to see things play out in real time (from within the trenches), I believe strongly now that the Consolidation model is the only approach that can truly achieve both the required cost savings and the future increased collaboration between units that is intended.

Although well intended for historical and cultural reasons, maintaining both Deans and Executive Deans will not create synergies or provide savings. Current leadership is already focused on trying to maintain the status quo versus truly opening themselves up to the spirit of what we need to achieve. Tighter structures will lead to real collaboration. Looser structures (like the Colleges) will leave too many opportunities on the table.

Having worked in different health sciences Faculties, I am acutely aware of the concerns about power imbalances, particularly with Medicine. However, that cannot be a reason not to pursue consolidation. These disciplines must find a way to work together as professionals in the healthcare system. I actually find it insulting to think that with decent Faculty governance, we somehow could not find a way to harmonize and co-exist within the same Faculty.
I know that consolidation marks the most significant change. However, it is much better that we go all-in now versus dabbling with the College or Hybrid models before finding out that they cannot achieve the intended objectives.

This is ideal for myself and many other students because it allows the two faculties I am apart of (Native Studies- minor, Campus Saint-Jean- major) to remain autonomous. As autonomy and sovereignty has been stripped from the French, but far more from Indigenous peoples, I recommend allowing these two faculties to continue to exist as autonomous and independent campuses. By taking away an autonomous french campus, you are effectively removing the ability for students to have a francophone education. This removal of a safe, french space targets a large Black student, faculty and administrative diaspora. It also removes the ability for all students to access francophone higher education in Western Canada. The next place one could attend a francophone institution is in Manitoba. Removing this faculty as autonomous will be detrimental to french language education in Western Canada. In addition, by removing the autonomy of the Native Studies faculty, UAlberta would effectively be participating in the removal of Indigenous autonomy in Canada, therefore present as an active participant in fascial and political racism in Canada. Budgets can be reduced in ways that DO NOT impact Black, Indigenous and POC students, faculty members and administrative staff. I recommend that UAlberta makes a smart decision in restructuring the university that does not disproportionality impact Black, Indigenous and POC peoples, as well as the french language.

The consolidation model. It groups faculties most naturally with regard to the types of research, teaching, and learning that go on in each of the current faculties and with regard to the types of degrees they offer. For example, Arts and Science have faculty members and students who are primarily dedicated to pure research and to teaching and learning that give students broad-based foundations for future study and work via bachelors and graduate degrees. These types of teaching, research, and learning are generally quite different from those in the faculties that have strong ties to industry and various professions and that are primarily oriented toward training students for direct entry into specific, more technically oriented careers (including ones in education and law). Faculty and students in Arts and Science tend to have career trajectories that have much in common but differ substantially from those of faculty and students in the professional schools. The consolidation model also appears to be closest to the organizational models of the majority of institutions with public missions similar to ours against which we should be measuring ourselves and competing for students, i.e. the best of the public, land-grant universities in the United States. Adopting such a recognized and more standard administrative structure should better position us to recruit faculty, stay competitive in relation to international trends, and benefit from future research on how to improve administrative structures, as more research is likely to be done on the prevailing model.
Looking at the budget estimates, there’s no difference in the savings between the College of Health + Medical Sciences and a consolidated Faculty of Health + Medical Sciences. This suggests that there's no real difference between consolidation into colleges or faculties, other than in name.

So to me, looking at the proposals, the real question is whether to put:

a) Arts together with Science, or
b) Science in with ALES and Engineering, and Arts in with Business, Education and Law.

From a student perspective, I think that a consolidated Faculty of Arts and Science makes sense. I think many students would benefit from enhanced access to learning across the liberal arts and foundational sciences.

From a research perspective, though, it seems like the Faculty of Arts has many more existing connections to Education, Business and Law, than with Science. And ALES and Engineering seem like a lean faculty without Science in the mix. So from a research perspective, the college model seems more robust.

I personally would put student learning first and go with the Consolidated Faculties model, but I can see the benefits of the College too.

Consolidation model, but I don't believe that CSJ, AUG & Native Studies' identities are any more, or less, important than other faculty identities. As such they should be consolidated into one faculty, or absorbed into one of the others as Schools or Campuses.

Concerns

Restructure the health and medicine faculties and force them to get on the regression curve. If these 6 faculties were fitted to the curve it would be: $y = 0.1888*(32,730^{0.6137}) = 111$ FTEs. If you followed your own model, these six faculties need to cut 499 staff. Since this number is greater than the total cuts required, fixing this one set of faculties would solve all the problems. Instead you are allowing them to be overstaffed by 423 positions (they should have total staff of 111 FTEs vs scenarios which show 534 FTEs).

Augustana may be better served if it became a member of a larger Faculty on the North Campus. The reasons are two-fold:
1) Academic benefits  
2) Cost savings  

As it stands, Augustana is unable to fully benefit from the resources, collaborations and infrastructure that the University of Alberta potentially offers. This holds true for all departments at Augustana, i.e. Social Science, Science, and Fine Arts & Humanities. Our resources are extremely stretched due to the scale of our operation and the distance from Edmonton. Only coordinated partnerships with all parts of the UofA can address the issues we face in Camrose.

At the same time, it is very difficult to imagine how Augustana could balance its budget over the next 2-5 years without drastically impacting the academic operation, if we remain a Faculty. The administrative costs are simply too large.

In contrast, running Augustana with two departments (Arts and Science) would not only be feasible, it would make us more nimble. The two department chairs could report directly to the North Campus, while a figurehead, such as a Rector or Principal, could ensure that we maintain Augustana's distinct position within the Camrose region. At the same time, Augustana could maintain its suite of redesigned degree programs that we are currently launching (Fall 2020 and Fall 2021). This does not require an independent Faculty. Most members of the community do not know, or care, that Augustana is a Faculty but they do care about Augustana being its own campus, and this would not change.

If there is now a push towards a Faculty of Arts & Science, why would the UofA's liberal arts & science campus, i.e. Augustana, not fall under this Faculty? It would generate an abundance of new academic opportunities for both parties that does not exist currently. It could also place Augustana finally on a sustainable financial footing.

This is a decision that will have lasting implications for Augustana on a 20-30 year time horizon, and the UofA needs to get this right.

(1) Move School of Education into its own Faculty. The historical significance of a Faculty of Education is important since this evolved from Normal schools or schools of teaching/education to be more curriculum and theoretical groundings in the foundations of education. (2) Maintain the name "Faculty of Native Studies" the renaming to this as a "School of Native Studies" is not clear - if it is separate from all the other faculties, shouldn't it be a faculty?

Faculty evaluation should take place at the school level. Putting this at a Faculty level with such diverse faculty members could disadvantage many. For example, those from the School of Education (particularly elementary and secondary education) would have an unfair advantage.
when it comes to teaching reviews and community involvement but their research production tends to be less than those in some areas of the school of business. How do you propose to have a consistent evaluation with these differences?

The Dietetics Specialization belongs in the Health Sciences faculty. As the practice of dietetics encompasses a well-rounded clinical education complete with a year round practicum in which clinical placement is a key component, it is no question that dietetics is a health science. Registered Dietitian's are part of the interdisciplinary health care team, and work in-conjunction with physicians, nurses, pharmacists and beyond to perform optimal patient care on a day to day basis. Clinical Dietitians work in hospital and long term care settings to provide vital components of care such as physical assessments, drug therapy, and tube feeding therapy to patients in need. All of this work is done as part of a health care team that includes all other health care professionals found within the Health Sciences faculty.

Interdisciplinary communication and teamwork are 2 values that are highly stressed within the Dietetics Specialization, but how can these values be implemented if the dietetic practice is segmented away from the Health Science faculty?

Overall, placing the Dietetics Specialization within the Health Sciences faculty will only allow health care professionals of the future to prosper as part of a team.

Science works as a faculty - you cannot seriously consider merging it (and killing it in the process) with Arts.

I think Dietetics should be part of the Faculty of Health Sciences. Dietitians mainly work in healthcare settings in Alberta and collaborate very closely with all of the other professions that are being proposed as part of this new faculty.

Moving all health sciences together and in unity with each other. ie. Dietetics program is not in the Health and Medical Sciences division when it should be but in there. If you are to move Faculty of KSR into Health and Medical Sciences then why cannot the Dietetics program be moved in conjunction as well to the Health and Medical Sciences? If you are consolidating similar fields then why not put Dietetics into the Health and Medical Sciences? If this is the time to correctly place some programs in the correct spot then the time is now, so when you consolidate all health and medical sciences together but exclude one program, the dietetics program, then how is this fair to the program that is clearly in the health and medical field to not
be with all the other health and medical professions in the Health and Medical Sciences division?

In any scenario, I feel that Dentistry deserves to become its own Faculty or School again. I understand why Medicine and Dentistry wound up in the same Faculty in the first place. But, Dentistry deserves its own voice going forward within a larger Health Sciences unit. No less or no more than Nursing, or Pharmacy, or Medicine, etc.

The Medicine / Dentistry model does provide some valuable lessons, though. There is a tremendous amount of collaboration between those two programs from being part of the same Faculty. This is proof that working within a consolidated Faculty does meet the objective of greater alignment.

Also, it would make sense to move Dietetics into a School that is part of a consolidated Health Sciences Faculty. This is long overdue and would be more difficult/impossible to achieve in the College model.

Stop trying to force arts and science faculties together, this is completely short sighted and based purely off the perceived financial benefits. This is so incredibly stupid, and makes absolutely no sense. This will be a disservice to the students of both faculties, and honestly feels like you are trying to remove the Faculty of Arts (coming from a Science student). This will ruin how U of A science programs are viewed in a public and international scope.

As an uninformed outsider, it seems more sensible to have a School of Education under the Faculty of Arts and Science, than to put education under Professional Studies.

The Consolidation model downgrades existing Faculties to Schools and would have significant negative repercussions to the reputation of these Faculties and their departments across Canada, alongside significant disruption to existing Faculty and departmental governance (FEC, Councils and Committees, etc.) I believe it would be a significant negative step towards the U of A and its constituent parts further losing its existing strengths and reputation, and am surprised the ARWG even made this proposal given feedback from the previous town halls and roundtables.
The College and Hybrid models appear to avoid the most significant negative repercussions and disruptions, at least, and allow Faculties to maintain greater control over their academics. As a social science researcher and educator I personally prefer the “College” groupings under the College model (aligning with the Tri-Council) to those under the “Hybrid” model, but both would work OK. The use of the term “College” could be confusing to some externally given its use in the US as equivalent to a Canadian Faculty, but I appreciate there was dislike of the “division” label used in the prior scenarios (and don’t find either term objectionable myself). I also understand there is dislike of the “executive deans” by some, and while the idea and term isn’t exactly a positive for me, I appreciate and understand the need for this sort of structure to help reduce costs, and would certainly prefer this to the downgrading of Faculties to Schools under the Consolidation model.

The revised models do not seem to have taken into significant account feedback provided at my Faculty’s roundtable, however, nor do I feel the ThoughExchange is sufficient to capture further feedback from the university community in such a short time span, especially with a closing time 23 hours before the “town hall” itself and only a couple of weekdays since the revised models were released, during what is for most a very busy time of the fall term.
I agree that nutrition should go under health sciences. I do like the College approach to the professions. As for other suggestions, they are difficult to make without being completely immersed in the process and/or digesting the document completely.

As a student in a health science faculty, the college or hybrid model is best. Allowing faculties to retain their status will ensure that programs such as pharmacy and nursing can continue to have enough autonomy to meet accreditation requirements. Grouping the other faculties is more difficult but I believe either the college or hybrid model could work. The combination of the faculties of arts and science can work well as demonstrated by other universities that use this combination such as the University of Saskatchewan. However, grouping the rest of the faculties into the "College of Professional and Applied Sciences" seems like somewhat of an odd combination.

Plan B as it allows for cost savings without taking away too much autonomy. Professional programs deserve faculty status as decisions need to be based by someone who knows the field. We are training professionals who will have lives in their hands. We cannot lower the quality of education which would happen if you take away decision making power of a faculty.

I favour the 'college' model as it seems to provide the most intuitive and logical groupings of faculties. For example, the grouping of science, engineering and ALES seems to me a better alignment than arts and science. Besides, the consolidation model which puts engineering and ALES together might suffer from the long standing rivalry between engineers and aggies. It is mostly a fun rivalry but I wonder if the history would still cause some divisiveness. The college model also seems to preserve much of what faculty members likely treasure; the separateness of faculties within a college grouping. Since things like FEC don't need to change, it likely has the best chance of success as the university navigates a way forward.
Thank you for providing these detailed scenarios. I am strongly supportive of the College model. I have major issues with the amalgamation of Arts and Science in the other two models for many reasons, not limited to the loss of culture and identity in the Faculty of Science (and likely in Arts but I cannot speak for them), the challenges associated with equitable distribution of the budget, and the substantial issues that will arise with a combined FEC. The fact that Arts FEC is already challenged to evaluate such disparate programs as Music and Economics is not a logical rationale for saying a combined Arts and Science FEC will function properly and fairly for all parties. There is a profound culture difference in both teaching and research activities between these two faculties and amalgamating them would be detrimental to both. Having come from the UofT, I have seen first-hand the substantial negative impact that having a combined Arts and Science faculty brings. Faculty members feel isolated, powerless, and unable to innovate. Personally, I strongly identify with Science and not with Arts. I am also very cognizant of perceptions of a combined Arts and Science faculty to other researchers across Canada who will be evaluating my applications for funding. There is a perception that I will not have access to the resources and support I need to perform translational research (using human samples as well as animal models) if I am part of a combined Arts and Science faculty. That amalgamation would have a negative impact on my ability to obtain grant funding, which would be a disaster for my research program. I like the College model for reasons outside of maintaining a Science faculty (though that is clearly at the forefront of my mind). The movement of administrative functions into a College, while allowing Faculties to retain budgetary and program autonomy makes a good deal of sense. The closer association between the Natural and Applied Sciences is an attractive one as much of the work being done in FoS could be considered both Natural and Applied so we are a good fit with Engineering and ALES. Indeed, this closer association between FoS, Engineering and ALES is far more likely to produce innovations in teaching and research than an amalgamation with Arts.

Of the 3 proposed models, the "College Model" makes the most sense. It does not make sense to merge FoS and Arts for a number of reasons.

1) None of the other models keep FoS and Arts as separate 'schools'. Which suggests in these scenarios, that there would be a redistribution of wealth, FEC evaluations, TAships and the like. Similar disputes regarding GTAs came up at Queen's University in the early 2000's; a smaller institution whose research landscape is not what it is here at UofA. This makes it a likely scenario here.
2) FEC evaluations and metrics for success between FoS and Art's are completely different. One could envision a weakening of incentives for success in these models.

3) Science teaching is inherently more laborious and requires more time, money (e.g. GTAs) and resources (e.g. lab funding). Merging Arts and Science will result in this last point likely being a major point of contention and could foreseeably result in a reduction of research excellence at UofA.

College Model- Arts and Science should NEVER be combined. There are vastly different leadership and support needs, and I do not believe the university will find a dean that is adept at managing both science and art disciplines. This will NEGATIVELY effect how the U of A is viewed internationally, as Arts and Science degrees do not carry the same clout as strictly science or art degrees. Forcing science and arts faculties together will destroy the prestige of getting a degree here. I would NOT attend the U of A for a science degree if you combine these faculties, and would consider transferring to another institution so my degree did not have 'Arts and Science' on it.

None are particularly great, but the College and Hybrid models are much better than the Consolidation model, with a slight preference for the College model (aligning with the Tri-Council).

Concerns

We should have a 4 college model. College of Health and Medical Sciences (FoMD and others already present); College of Applied Science (Engineering - revised Faculty to become a college), College of Fundamental and Natural Sciences (FoS and ALES) and College of Art's and Education (Arts, Education, business, law, etc). This makes more sense than the two options with FoS and Arts merged together without either even maintaining 'school' status (unlike all other faculties in all other merger models)

I do not get the idea of several Executive Deans - why would you want to select one person to represent each services/graduate/EDI/research of the whole college? Not only you will pay/spend more money on these specific positions but they will not even "get work done". It will take a lot of time to understand how all the faculties function and what's best for their interests, especially those research intensive and external funded. Except that you will offer an Exec
Dean for the college you will still plan to keep the Associate Deans in the faculty, except that of AD Research in some faculties - why is that? This brings more losses for you UofA. Just invest more money where it is needed. You do not need to have a specific ED for EDI and one for Intl and one for Graduate, you can combine two of them together, EDI and Intl for example.

I like the College model but the additional level of management for 4 colleges seems a waste. Since it appears to be a way to handle administrative functions and high level strategic direction surely you could have a single central team that falls into the SET structure under the Provost. You could have ""College Operations Managers"" that each earn half the salary.

I've also seen a lot of feedback regarding splitting of Dentistry and Medicine, but that doesn't appear to have been acknowledged anywhere.
Hybrid Model

In Favour

Hybrid Model. This seems to make the most sense from an academic point of view and provides the most in savings. I do not like the Executive Dean model because it appears to be another level of bureaucracy, so my concerns about a merger between Arts & Science are lessened since these will not have such a position.

B and C from my perspective would work best with the philanthropic community as it maintains identity with faculty and the passions of donor interest.

I believe Scenario C will best serve the long-term, well-being of the UofA. This would avoid each Faculty only focusing on their own concerns which will enhance communications between all services for the "big picture" approach.

Hybrid model. Most faculties remain as they are and offer more possibility for collaboration with programs that have the same scope of study. Also, looks like it offers the best option for savings.

Concerns

These combinations are extremely problematic - particularly the college of professional and applied sciences. The culture surrounding teaching, research, and service is so vastly different in engineering, ALES, Business, Law, and Education, I struggle to see how ONE administrator could be knowledgeable enough in ALL of these areas to effectively lead this college.

I am concerned that now with two models combining Arts and FoS and only one that is not, that the decision is made. Although I know there is a need amongst the leadership to move this forward, the models put forth are not as well constructed as they could be.
The constant drive to combine arts and science is a severely flawed outlook in my opinion. The science faculty would totally swamp out multiple arts options in weight, and lead to arts seeing ever diminishing returns. The college model preserves existing cultural linkages between faculties, ensures that faculties aren't stuck with far larger or far smaller faculties, and seems more grounded.
None of the Models

None of the plans should be implemented. They primarily punish the high performing faculties and primarily reward the worst performing faculties. Specifically, of the 16 faculties, 9 do not fit the regression line. The worst performing faculty is FOMD and it is required to make $0 in cuts. Meanwhile the two best performing faculties (A&S) are expected to reach a level of performance no other faculties on campus will reach.

At the end of the restructuring, the H&M faculties will have average costs per course registration of $1,503. The three University Schools (CSJ, Augusta, NS) will have average costs per course registration of $540 per course. The remaining 7 faculties will have average costs per course registration ranging from $198 (Hybrid) to $225 (Consolidated). There is simply no justification for this differential treatment. If the cost per course registration is the key metric, all faculties should be required to reach the same target.

All the plans as presented punish the 7 faculties responsible for 210,000 out of the 260,000 university registrations while allowing 4 faculties to make $0 in cuts (FoMD, CSJ, NS, Augustana) and 5 health faculties are somewhere in the middle. The plan is entirely misguided. You are taking the best performing parts of the university and killing them and you are taking the worst performing parts of the university and subsidizing them.

None. They all seem to inflate the senior bureaucracy to unbearable proportions, adding extra layers of executives and managers and "Dean-like leaders". Some actually anticipate a potential INCREASE in costs, which is quite an unbelievable failure of imagination and goal achievement. Actually reduce the bureaucracy and number of executive managers in each faculty and area.

I believe there should still be consideration in keeping the faculties as is. Currently it allows for better more specified allotment of money and ensures the needs of the University of Alberta students are met.

NONE, they completely ignore the fact that Registered Dietitians are health professionals. Moe the Dietetics Specialization (and other nutrition programs) into the health sciences faculty.
General Questions and Comments

Why are you not following the budget approved by the BOG? Why are you not following the new budget model? If you would simply follow the approved budget model all the cuts to the Campus Alberta grant would flow through to the faculties and the faculties could deal with them as they saw fit. It seems to me that you are clearly circumventing the approved governance processes.

According to the 2020-2021 budget which was approved by the Board of Governors, you are supposed to do the following:

"The base reductions from 2019-20 are being addressed in the 2020-21 budget. In addition, the budget for the 2020-21 fiscal year reflects that the university’s Campus Alberta Grant has been cut by a further 10.7% ($65.9M). There were two components to the 10.7% reduction: the Campus Alberta Grant was cut by 8.9% ($53.3M); in addition, the Government eliminated the funding for Targeted Enrolment Expansion ($12.6M) while maintaining the university’s requirement to keep those enrolments. This brings the total ongoing cut to the Campus Alberta Grant to $110.3M ($44.4M + $65.9M) to be addressed in the 2020-21 budget. The approach is as follows:

- $65.6M is applied differentially to the faculties (based upon the new budget model results) offset by additional tuition revenues of $21.1M that now flow directly to faculties. This brings the net reduction to the faculties to $44.5M or 8.3%
- The academic support unit budgets are being cut on a differential basis by a total of $34.2M, or 12.8%.
- The remaining $10.5M will be addressed by an adjustment to investment income supporting the operating budget (discussed in the Investment Income section 2.1.1.4) and the use of other internal one-time sources."

You are not following any of the processes stipulated by the budget. In my understanding you lack the authority to contravene the approved budget in this way.

In all of the scenarios, how does the university intend to ensure that leadership of massive colleges or faculties will avoid bias to certain programs? For example, if a dean of professional studies comes from Law, how can we be sure they understand the unique challenges faced by the schools of Business AND education as well? This is particularly problematic given the lack of professionalization of teachers for years. While one could argue this brings ""professional"" status to teaching, it may also see what is referred to as ""The school of education"" becoming the
neglected school in this faculty. (A similar argument could be made for KSR in health & medical sciences).

In all of the scenarios, How does the committee intend to deal with differences in the cultures of each of the schools? For example: pay; Professors in Business and Law tend to be much higher paid than those in Education, similar to ALES and Engineering. Other examples include teaching loads, graduate student expectations, etc. This is particularly problematic when combining Faculties of incredibly different cultures such as has been done in Scenario C.

The proposal that creates the most opportunities for interdisciplinary studies will be the most effective, since interdisciplinary thinking and research is the way of the future in education in a knowledge-technology society for collective creativity, economic reformation, inclusion (EDI). Interdisciplinarity allows for an agile modular-based program of learning along with microcredentials to support essential lifelong learning in a new economy. Also, an interdisciplinary approach aligns most closely with the UA’s mission statement.

As a student and student advocate, I do wonder how each plan might impact student experience, engagement, and academic and career success (career development and transition to work), and how experiential learning opportunities might improve under each scenario ie. collaboration with the community, industry, etc., and how community-based research will be enhanced under each scenario.

I will comment briefly on a crucial component that has so far been missed in all the restructuring discussions: In addition to teaching and research the university must play a far greater role in the translation of research to commerce. This will enrich society and pay the university’s bills.

I was recruited as an icore chair and principal research officer at NINT with a very focused goal: to transform the highest of tech - atom scale manufacturing - into real tangible commerce. We have adhered remarkably well to the plan I submitted at the outset and have several products emerging at this time - as predicted. We truly lead the world in this enormously important area.

Even with the many extraordinary advantages i have been granted it has been a long and hard battle to maintain my course. For every supporter there have been 10 who would stop me. But my work speaks for itself, I am very stubborn, and I have managed to prevail.
We need to explicitly build in a capacity to enable lucrative science to commerce developments. Otherwise we are missing the only real opportunity to generate revenue. The UAT plan says that in just a few years we must transition from 60% public funded to just 40%. Wow. How are we planning to do that if not by supporting, then being supported in turn by new business?

There needs to be a small number of "moonshot" grade developments underway. These won't be substantially funded by the university. We only need to house and nurture. There is a very innovative natural way to blend such positions into the larger university fabric such that both students and regular professors greatly benefit from new research opportunities. I have more to say about that.

We don't want to retrofit these essential functions later on when all the other issues are sorted. No, this needs to be a integral part of being self sustaining. We have to plan for it, not just hope for it as ever before.

Bring School of Native Studies and CJS into a faculty so they can have the benefits of collaboration and partnership. This also further reduces duplicate and redundant administrative functions that they would each have to carry on independently.

Nothing specific, but it will be important to consider the student experience as we go forward. I'm thinking of things like student services and facilities and research support that should remain in the faculties. Faculties such as science, eng, and ALES have very specialized facilities that need support expertise, and the student service teams are much more consultive than transactional in nature.

On that note, and perhaps more specific to the SET initiative, it will make sense to have a common set of tools and functions available to students and administrators, especially those that are grouped together in the college or consolidated model. For this reason, it becomes even more important to support enterprise solutions and platforms such as Academic Advisement and EDRMS. There has been little central support for such initiatives, and this has hindered the adoption of technologies that have proven to make a positive difference.

I have a question about the projected savings due to cuts in Ops Staff. On page 18 and 25 of the latest report, there is a projected reduction of ops staff from 257 to 133, and from 387 to 228 for the consolidation model and the college model respectively. Where do you anticipate these
cuts to occur? I assume that ops staff covers broad areas such as HR, IT, accounting, student services and research support.

As noted above, specialized support for students and instructors is needed in many faculties, and student services is an important function that requires detailed discipline specific knowledge. I think it would be a mistake to assume that savings/reductions can be made in those areas (as opposed to HR, IT and accounting/procurement where likely there is duplication of effort).

I have had the pleasure of being a student or staff/faculty member of 4 different Faculties on campus. I am very familiar with the strengths and drawbacks of larger Faculties versus smaller Faculties, general studies versus professional programs, undergraduate versus graduate, etc. So, I do not make the case for consolidation lightly. I am very proud and committed to the tradition and identity that different units have built up over our joint histories. However, we are obviously at a critical juncture. One in which I don't think we can afford to not go big. Because, of course, no one wants to go home!

I believe it is important that the faculty of Dentistry and Dental Hygiene be separated out from the current FOMD. We are both professional programs that have been pointed out in previous letters from faculty and staff in our programs. To lump Dentistry and Dental Hygiene with Medicine is doing everyone a dis service by creating FOMD as much larger than all the other health departments under each of the larger umbrella faculties. You were concerned with the size of FOMD in your original scenarios when putting it in with the other health sciences. Separating Dentistry and Dental Hygiene out from FOMD will help solve a problem that you had noted and benefit all the faculties involved.

Do better. Have faculties propose budget cuts within the faculty and departments rather than trying to force faculties with different pedagogies together.

This process should have been made way more transparent for students, staff, and faculty on the ground. It feels as though the proposals were made behind closed doors, and now individuals who have no intimate knowledge of the proposals are being asked to rate and review the proposals. Many will not feel knowledgeable enough to voice opinions on the proposals
because the proposals are not easily understood to people who did not participate in constructing them.

What will happen to independent departments? The proposal is very high-level and it is unclear how the different scenarios will affect department-level affairs.

Treat Dentistry the same as all other health disciplines regardless of the proposal chosen now. It makes no sense to leave it embedded with Medicine when they have separate and different accreditation requirements. Why isn't Dentistry being treated equitably with other health disciplines within either the larger Health Science Faculty or College?

I worry that the small faculties/units are going to be at a disadvantage with the creation of new, larger groupings of faculties. Attention needs to be paid to ensure these small faculties/units remain relevant and appealing for students, faculty, and staff to be a part of.