

Suggestions for Alternative Restructuring Proposals from the Community

September 21 - October 21, 2020

Submitted by members of the U of A community through the [UAT Feedback Form](#) and [Interim Report Feedback Form](#). Some personally identifying information has been omitted.

I have read through the Interim report in detail. I recommend an alternative to Scenario A: The following faculties would remain as they are now:

1. FoMD (620)
2. Arts (310) + Education + relevant parts of ALES + Arts programs from CSJ and Augustana
3. Science (295) + relevant parts of ALES + Science programs offered at CSJ and Augustana
4. Engineering (219)
5. Health Sciences (174)
6. Business & Law
7. Native Studies

Programs at Campus St. Jean and Augustana would fall under the relevant Faculty above. For example, Biological Sciences at Campus St. Jean would be part of the Faculty of Science. It is not at all unusual for faculties (or indeed departments) to be located at more than one campus.

This proposal will reduce the number of Faculties from 18 to 7. This proposal will also have much less impact on the health and well-being of faculty and support staff, and students in most faculties at the University of Alberta. Supports can be directed to those faculties and departments that will be disrupted.

I've been saying for years that past budget cuts should have considered amalgamation of faculties. So, in principle I support this exercise. Clearly Option A is too little, but option B is too much. I actually think Option C seems not bad (Although I would go one step further and merge FoMD with the other Health Faculties). I note as well that Options B and C have similar levels of cost savings to Option B, particularly when considering that Option B would cause significant more disruption than Option C (that is, the cost/pain ratio is more attractive). This option also ties together Arts and Science, which is common in many places in North America. It would also solve the current weird split of Psychology between two faculties.

Some other things:

1. It seems that a lot of the proposed administrative savings will be at 'lower' levels (e.g., Associate Deans and Associate Chairs). There seems to be a lack of recognition this will lead to very modest savings. In Chemistry going from three to two Associate Chairs will save about \$50K/year (I think) from a small research stipend, a small salary bump and a semester of teaching release to two individuals. I was an Associate Chair several years ago for a few years and both these were sufficiently small that I forgot how much the research stipend and salary bump were. I suspect it the same in most other Departments. These kinds of reductions will, however, lead to several people being unwilling to take on these roles given that they would be effectively full-time administrative positions.

2. I wish administrators would stop talking about how putting people in the same building, or in the same administrative unit will promote 'collaboration'. I moved into CCIS in 2011 and doing so has led to exactly zero new collaborations with people in the Faculty. None of us who are doing what we should be doing have time to hang out in the hallways looking for new people to work with. Mutual interest, willingness, respect, trust, and frankly enjoying interacting with someone are much more powerful factors in establishing collaborations.

3. I wish there were more discussion in this document about getting rid of weak Departments. Clearly UofA cannot pay for all that it is doing. Let's do fewer things better. Focus on excellence, not the past, not tradition. Another point I've made for years is that these exercises where cuts are applied in a way that everyone get's whacked to the same degree sends this message: None of you are important to our mission. Cutting vertically would be better and would send the message that some things will be the priority for the future. For example, if, after a rigorous evaluation process the UofA decides Chemistry is not important to its mission, fine. Broadcast that. People can retire, move to other places, or be amalgamated into other Departments until they retire. It's cliché, but it's true: Budgets are about priorities. What are the UofA's? In the 17 years I've been here, that's never been clear.

4. The document is clearly pushing option B, but the examples for those are largely (if not all) from the UK or Australia. Despite being part of the commonwealth, I would argue that a North American model is better to follow.

The entire professoriate should be represented on the Executive Dean Council (or its equivalent) and that the representation should be somewhat linked to the relative sizes of professoriate

levels. This can and should have some consideration of EDI and optics, so it should not be a strict representation.

Any AR that creates a new level of administration should have specific limits on its growth and should have specific structures that reinforce collegial governance, as opposed to reduce it.

The Tri-council alignment aspect of Scenario B should be considered a non-starter as it would leave us locked into a system from the past.

The ARWG needs to come up with a scenario that does not consolidate large existing faculties that have achieved economies of scale and one that maintains representative membership on a reduced size Executive Dean Council (~8-10 members).

What is the expected administrative activity load on Faculties, especially those that are on the smaller side?

Why are Arts and Sciences being consolidated in Scenario C of the ARWG interim report given the current size and administrative efficiencies achieved in both Faculties?

How does the ARWG expect single Associate Deans will be able to be responsible for faculties bigger than Arts and Sciences are now, given that the current Associate Deans (at least in Science) have needed deputized ADs to meet the current workload.

According to the Interim Report of the ARWG, the Faculty of Science does 23% of all the teaching, holds 21% of all the research grants, but accounts for only 8% of the operations spending.

If the Faculty of Science is already very efficient, why does it have to turn into something different (scenario 2 favoured by the ARWG), adding new administrative layers and leadership by a (very likely) non-scientist Executive Dean, possibly losing the features that make it great?

If some faculties have already achieved efficiency at scale, I'd suggest concentrating on bringing those who are not in that position to the same level of efficiency by applying best practices from the Faculty of Science and possibly by re-organization via the Division or Faculty Merger model. Don't try to fix what's not broken, especially if you'd like to continue improving UofA's position in the worldwide rankings.

Science is a good model for a faculty - surely a scenario where FOMD stays intact (consolidated but intact) suggests Science could absorb parts of ALES for example and remain "Science". In the end it is all about cutting people - and I don't see that a complete revamp of what the University looks like will be the best way to make our devastating cuts palatable.

I think Science & Arts is appealing, but would just make it way, way too big. I would suggest breaking up ALES (which was, itself, created in a previous restructuring) and moving departments and research programs to where they are in a better home - Health, Science, or Arts. Engineering may well have to sit alone bc, as I understand it, accreditation is based on a specific governance model. So the model I'd suggest is: Science, Arts, Eng, Health Sciences, Medicine, and then the Shared Division for all the others that are too small to sit alone.

No to additional layers of Administration. Like many others, I really must protest the scenarios that add another layer of administration, in the belief that somehow this will reduce lower levels of administration and cost less money. This has been tried already since I arrived with ventures like IST, which has not exactly been a cost savings nor produced better service. It was during the time that IST was conceived that the University was big into "efficiencies", which instead led to serious growth of Central administrators. More is just more.

The argument that this umbrella administration will have specialists whereas depts have generalists seems factually untrue. Let's just take the example of expense claims in Biological Sciences, which have to be some of the most complex on campus (along with a select group that would include EAS, AFNS and RenR). We have personnel who can process a dizzying array of unusual types of expenses. Outside of those departments, even within FoS, administrators are flummoxed by these types of expenditures.

I can support reorganization on campus, but the natural alignments and reorganizations should be determined using a data driven approach, and used to form superunits. We've all seen those network diagrams with nodes and edges that show sharedness and connection. If we did some massive network diagram for all FoS faculty to ask which other faculty they collaborate with (as evidenced by grants, grant attempts, copublications, cosupervision, coteaching), these network diagrams would undoubtedly show the greatest degree of connection with select Depts in ALES, Engineering and FoMD. I'm pretty sure those data could be pulled from the FEC database by people smarter than I. The same could be done with courses that are taught in one unit that are required by programmes in another unit. The units that Science shares the greatest number of connections with are the units that Science should be grouped with as part of a Science superunit. Not the meat cleaver approach of this draft document.

Aligning Science with other Science Units to create a Science Superunit will be more acceptable to more people and will ultimately allow for more meaningful change. I see this as a more palatable variation of Scenario B.

Bring some FoMD units into a Science superunit. I would argue that FoMD may be big, but they are composed of a bajillion little departments with a ton of Administration. So they should not be untouchable, as the working document implies. Some of those Depts should be moved to a Science superunit, like Cell Biology and Biochemistry. And maybe Physiology. There might be more. Because all of those processes go on in other organisms, not just humans, so it makes little sense for them to be housed in FoMD. There is a great deal of alignment between these select Depts and some FoS faculty, and amazing opportunities for synergy.

Bring some ALES units into a Science superunit. There are clear overlaps with some ALES units like AFNS and RenR. The others should go to their natural homes, like REES to Economics. Why was it ever separate?

I would argue that Engineering needs to be standalone, or possibly only loosely associated with a Science superunit.

These units have greater degrees of administrative similarities than the other consolidations involving Science mentioned in the working document. This means that “efficiencies” might actually be found in combining forces, rather than dilution of talent.

There would be greatest opportunity to merge/combine/reimagine programs and courses to reduce redundancy. This is where money could be saved. The only way that these savings could be realized is if parts of ALES joined Science in a Science superunit. I would argue that the same thing is true for some of the FoMD programmes/courses. And maybe with Engineering?

There would be better opportunities to deal with facilities, instrumentation, infrastructure, core units and holdings) if Science were part of a Science superunit. Aquatics, land holdings, phytotrons, mass specs, the list goes on and on and on. We will have more critical mass to go after the funding that’s needed to maintain/expand/replace our essential infrastructure. And hopefully make the right choices when infrastructure is at the end of life.

Aligning Science with Arts (Scenario C) will hurt Science. Not that I don’t like my colleagues in Arts. But being put in a College of Arts and Science will hurt our ability to attract funding from some of the more applied sources. We just have to look at US Land Grant Universities to see many examples where Colleges of Arts and Science have excellent people who can get NSF grants (at a 5% success rate, they are often few and far between), but are left out of the running

for smaller, easier to get funding that gets funneled to their “Applied” Faculties.

We already have a problem with funding opportunities being funneled to ALES and Engineering. If we are in a College of Arts and Science, the perception will only grow that we don’t do useful science. Which clearly is not true. There is very little differentiation between BioSci, AFNS and RenR after 20 years of BioSci recruiting people who can attract extramural funding and AFNS and RenR recruiting people who will be assured of good Tricouncil funding.

See statement about administration above. Administrators who deal with Arts portfolios don’t deal with the complexities that Science does. But the complexities of our day to day operations blew her mind compared to Business. To think that we would share an umbrella administration that would see us as a homogenous population with homogeneous needs is very concerning.

There will be a lot of animosity with this merger. Which is hardly conducive to the multidisciplinary vision that the ARWG speaks of. Just because people are within one big massive unit doesn’t mean that they will suddenly seek collaborative opportunities. People only reach across divides to collaborate when there is money on the table.

There will be little opportunity for the real cost saving of program consolidation, course redundancy, elimination etc if we are aligned with Arts. We would just end up creating more committees, bodies and administration to try to build bridges.

We would still be dealing with infrastructure, instrumentation, holdings etc in a piecemeal fashion, and without any comprehension by Arts about the importance of these facilities and the issues that are posed.

Augustana and Campus St Jean may be unique, but they are expensive, and I would argue that the ROI for these units is not that great outside of the niche communities they serve. I acknowledge that the agreements that the U of A signed when they assumed responsibilities for these schools may be complex and restrictive, but really, the University should take a good, hard look at whether they need to continue as integral units. If they are asking us to have the guts to deal with a massive reorganization that will affect every single individual, we should ask them to have the guts to do a surgical excision of these two faculties to make significant budget savings.

I am excited about the possibility of change, mostly because I am currently unsatisfied with the solutions leveraged at the faculty level to date. Thank you for your work on this and for the three proposals. I think Scenario C has the most potential but would request some reconfigurations.

I agree that FOMD is large and can/should stand on its own and this is represented in A and C. I also agree that Augustana, CSJ, and Native Studies are unique entities and thus they should stand on their own. This is represented in A and B. Based on those two things, I should logically like "A" but I know that is not a viable solution and I also want to embrace a bigger shake-up that can allow new perspectives.

I think that Arts and Science make more sense together as in C than in B in part because there are already departments that cross those two Faculties and because they are educating generalists largely without any type of accrediting body. This is the main point that directs me to C because it is the only space where Arts and Science are combined. However, to choose this scenario I have change my opinion about the importance of Aug, CSJ, NS being independent. Why can't other principles argued in A and B carry through to C? The TBD dotted lines in C are highly problematic and don't make sense because of the argument that Augustana, CSJ, and Native Studies are unique - combining them with Education, Law, and Business does not make any sense to me.

I can imagine two revisions to C both of which allow the unique entities of Augustana, CSJ, and Native Studies to be retained

C-Revised 1

FOMD - 620

Arts & Science - 605

Applied Sciences - 331

Health Sciences - 174

Ed, Law, Business - 209

OR

C-Revised2

FOMD - 620

Arts & Science - 605

Applied Science - 331

Professional (combination of Ed, Business, Law, Health Sc - many of which have accrediting bodies) - 383

C-Revised2 does not actually change the "number" of Divisions proposed in C it just changes the organizations within and then Aug, CSJ, and NS can be in a dotted box or stand on their as they do in the preferred Scenario B. This C-Revised2 also results in similar numbers within divisions and only 1 more division than Scenario B, which is openly identified as the most desirable scenario.

I am a member of the Faculty of Education and when I think about trying to negotiate any type of leadership of the shared division as currently described in C I am at a total loss. Would the Executive Dean need to be bilingual - or even trilingual? How do I build collaborations with colleagues in Camrose? How do the identities of Ed, Business, and Law stand alongside the strong and (rightly) prioritized identities of the other three?

I don't agree that CSJ, Augustana and Native Studies should be left outside to be independent. I agree that they need to continue their community based interactions, but CSJ and Augustana both have programs that are already offered on Main Campus (ex: Arts, Music, Management, Commerce, Science, etc). Why not split those two faculties, CSJ and Augustana, amongst the bigger divisions (again going with Plan B model) for Arts/Humanities and Applied/Natural Sciences? This would allow us to not have duplicated programs, duplicated requirements, and duplicated services.

Native Studies could be combined with the Arts/Humanities division and still be able to have their community based interactions but now they have the backing of a bigger division so that they can have the potential to reach more bodies and have a bigger voice then if they are an individual faculty.

If we go with any model in which a faculty that doesn't typically follow the standard *3 credits class system and they are in a division with a majority of faculties that do follow the standard *3 credits class system, would that faculty consider changing their credit system to have a consistent credit system in the same division?

The Academic Requirements Report found in People Soft has been utilized by several faculties on campus and this has drastically reduced some of the transactional requests from students. If all faculties in the same division are able to utilize the Academic Requirements Report this would allow consistency within the division so if students go from one faculty to another within the same division then they have access to the same tools and resources.

For increasing efficiencies in services to students within each division/faculty the relationships between division/faculty and the Registrar's Office should be evaluated. Certain processes, for example - declaring a course extra to degree, could be reviewed to see if the division/faculty can take sole responsibility of administering this so that we can provide services to students faster. Currently there is a delay from when the faculty informs the student a course will be declared extra to degree and then waiting for the Registrar's Office to perform that administrative task.

Scenario D: 6 Faculties: FOMD, Arts, Science, Applied Sc (Eng & ALES), Health Sciences, Professional (Law, Education, Business); 3 Schools: Aug, NS, St. Jean;

This avoids the introduction of the whole new level of executive dean while solving the problem of a disproportionate size in our current structure. In this model, each of the 6 faculties has academic integrity and similar-esque size. How schools relate to Faculties is a question -- would they have "Principals" like the Peter Lougheed College rather than deans with a seat at the table?

While this keeps some larger faculties intact, certain admin structures within the faculty could be reconsidered. I don't think we need both Associate Deans, Research, in all faculties PLUS an Assoc. VP Research for the Tri-councils -- one or the other but not both. Streamlining could be done within Faculties.

My main question of any of the scenarios is: how will the budget model transfer into the new structure? This would be a central concern for me in considering which model to support.

I'm writing to follow up on a point raised at the Augustana Faculty's roundtable on Wed, Oct 14th re. Augustana's so-called community-based mission.

In the various scenarios for academic restructuring, the Augustana Faculty has been described alongside Faculté Saint-Jean and the Faculty of Native Studies as “community-oriented” and “community-based,” but it is not at all clear which community the Augustana Faculty is understood to serve. The Augustana Faculty certainly serves its surrounding rural communities by bringing economic, educational and cultural resources to central Alberta, and historically, Augustana has attracted students from surrounding rural communities. However, our academic mission is not centred on any one community or group of people. We bring in students from all over the world, and from both rural and urban areas.

The Augustana Faculty recently developed a new, unique and innovative curriculum that distinguishes us within the University of Alberta system. Our goal has been to develop distinct, interdisciplinary programs and an exciting core curriculum based in project-based learning as a means of diversifying the University’s offerings for undergraduate students. Through this work, we serve the wider University of Alberta community by acting, as described by Objective 9 of the University’s Strategic Plan, as a “living laboratory for teaching and learning innovation, to the benefit of the entire university.” It is this mission, outlined by the Strategic Plan, that guides our Faculty today, and I hope that the current University administration decides to follow through on the promise made in the 2016 Strategic Plan to “facilitate and deepen inter-campus connections, communication, and collaborations with Augustana Campus, and ensure that it is strengthened as a leading liberal arts college.”

In closing, I would like to highlight some of the features that distinguish the undergraduate experience offered by the Augustana Faculty:

- Interdisciplinary programs that bring together multiple disciplinary perspectives and methods. Some of these programs include Creativity and Culture, Ethics and Global Studies, and Law, Crime, and Justice Studies.
 - A core curriculum built around project-based learning, which emphasizes experiential learning and collaboration.
 - A unique First Year Experience: all first-year students participate in an intensive 3-week first-year seminar that sets students up for success by introducing key academic skills, orienting students to campus life, and establishing strong cohorts.
 - Undergraduate Research Opportunities: Our undergraduate students have plenty of opportunities to work closely with their professors as research assistants and collaborators. Many of our students have co-published with faculty members. Augustana students do not compete with graduate students for these opportunities.
 - Finally, students at Augustana benefit from the enriching experience of a small, residential campus in the City of Camrose that is very different from the environment of the U of A's North Campus.
-

While examining the three scenarios, and in particular Scenario B, I was concerned by the precarious position of the standalone 'community' campuses in Scenario B, as well as the poor fit between some of the other new faculties and divisions. The three tri-council divisions would make interdisciplinary work more difficult in some ways, not really address the overall number of faculties, and raises concerns about collegial governance. I propose an alternative Scenario. The faculties of Medicine and Dentistry (620 faculty), Arts (310), Science (295), and Engineering (219) would remain as faculties, with the expectation that they continue to restructure within each faculty to find efficiencies. Leaving them as faculties would assuage the fears of the majority of faculty members and staff at the U of A about the upcoming changes and put that change more firmly into their hands. These are all already large and diverse faculties allowing for economies of scale. There would be a new faculty of Health Sciences (174 members) as proposed in the Interim Report. Many of the remaining faculties would be incorporated into a new Faculty of Multidisciplinary Studies as departments (Augustana, CSJ, Native Studies, ALES, Education = total faculty 324), creating a faculty of comparable size to Arts and Science, allowing for efficiencies of scale, and creating a space for enhancing existing inter/multidisciplinary teaching and research. Finally, there would be two schools: Business and Law. Unlike the proposed standalone faculties in Scenario B, Law and Business have far greater resources and ability to succeed as independent schools. All faculties and schools would have a Dean (total of 8 vs 18), Dean of Research, and Dean of Teaching/Students. This model does not

require the creation of a new level of bureaucracy consisting of expensive executive deans, while still reducing Dean's Council to a more manageable size. It seems to me that this model would be more appealing to a larger proportion of faculty at the U of A and reduce some of the widespread resistance to the process of academic restructuring, while still meeting the criteria of reducing administrative costs and roles, creating more efficient larger units, and building on our strengths and reputation within the various faculties and programs at the U of A.

I was very intrigued by the possibility of 3 Faculties and so an option could look like:

1. Faculty of Human Health made up of:

FoMD

Nursing

Public Health

Rehab Med

Kinesiology

2. Faculty of Humanities & Social Improvement

Arts

Business

FSJ

Education

Graduate and Continuing Education (combine FGSR & Extension)

Law

Native Studies (Consider renaming - i.e. Indigenous Studies)

Sports & Rec.

St. Joseph's

St. Steven's

3. Faculty of Sciences & Innovation

Agricultural Life & Environmental Sciences

Science

Engineering

This may also be the time to discuss the always sacred topic in academic institutions of basically requiring academics to fill academic leadership roles that for the most part are essentially administrative in nature.

I like Scenario B but recommend that you consider a fourth Division of Transdisciplinary Science that could include Business, School of Public Health, Native Studies, CSJ, and other academic units that draw faculty from across the tri-council agencies and don't fit well within one of the three Scenario B divisions. They could share administrative functions (as appropriate) but be supported to continue to develop their unique reputations and identities outside of conventional disciplinary constraints.

I believe perhaps there could be something between A and B. Here are the combined faculties I would make if I, again, was forced to make the cuts:

- Business and Law
- CSJ
- Augustana
- Arts (+BARST from KSR, native studies, and education)
- Science, ALES, and Engineering
- Extension
- Grad studies
- Remaining health ones together (including Kinesiology)

I feel like KSR should be split in two. The Bachelor's of Arts in Rec, Sport, and Tourism program it has falls better under arts than Health Sciences, where Kinesiology fits better with Health Sciences.

I also like scenario C but I'm confused about how the shared division would work? What if instead of having a huge shared division they were split into 2 consolidated groups of professional (education, law, business) and community (CSJ, Augustana, Native Studies)?

However, based on the information currently available for U of A for Tomorrow (UAT), I have made some the following conclusions:

- While making budgetary savings is what has kicked off this campaign and is one of the main reasons for this restructuring, it is not the bottom line. In fact, the budgetary savings are a result of restructuring, but the restructuring is—largely—to benefit the institution's mission and the education it provides its students. Thus, in my suggestions I have balanced both cost savings and safeguarding programs and strategic aspects of the institution.
- Interdisciplinary study is key to the proposal and seen as a priority.
- A goal is to reduce the footprint of campus, use less buildings.

- Priority is to advance EDI
- Goal of creating academic and administrative structures similar to peer institutions
- The least interruption/interference to programs, the better (especially as these decisions need to be made quickly).

To achieve these goals, much of my feedback is centred around faculty restructuring. Based on the above priorities, my suggestions are:

1. If one of the end goals for UAT is to reduce the number of faculties, what immediately makes sense to me is to combine all health related faculties into a singular faculty (Faculty of Health Sciences, perhaps?). A large portion of faculties are health-related (FOMD, Nursing, Rehab Med, Kinesiology, Sport and Recreation, Pharmacy, Public Health). Combining all of these into one faculty would benefit the research work of the faculty, the education of students, plus would result in large savings with the least amount of disruptions to student's studies. This change would provide the opportunity for increased collaboration between health disciplines, resulting in research and programs that are interdisciplinary with the potential for new health-related discoveries. Plus, this would give us a reduction of administrative roles (and the cost associated with this) while still protecting programs in that none would have to be necessarily "cut".

2. In a similar vein, moving ALES' programs under the Faculty of Science, the Faculty of Arts, the School of Business, and the proposed Faculty of Health Sciences listed above, depending on the program, would provide large savings with little program interference. For example, it would make sense to move the Bachelor of Science in Agriculture, Environmental and Conservation Sciences, Forestry, and Human Ecology programs under the Faculty of Science; the Bachelor of Arts in Environmental Studies could be moved under the Faculty of Arts; Agricultural/Food Business Management, Fashion Business Management, Forest Business Management under the School of Business (the latter two programs are already jointly offered between ALES and the School of Business—you could move it under completely); the Bachelor of Science in Animal Health and Nutrition and Food Science could be moved under the Faculty of Health Studies.

3. Next, I wanted to comment on the Faculty of Extension. My thoughts are similar to the previous suggestion (moving all programs under different faculties), but for a different reason (Also, I did see that Extension's Masters programs were moved under different faculties already—which I agree with—so I won't comment on these). Currently, I don't think the way Extension is set up is intuitive for individuals wanting to continue their education. I personally know that Extension is where I would look for professional development, but I truly don't think this would be clear to most people outside the university. For example, if I am someone who is wanting to earn a certificate or diploma at the U of A (for arguments sake, let's say I've heard there's a course related to interior design) would I think to look at the Faculty of Arts or the Faculty of Extension? What is the most intuitive choice for someone? Moving Extension's

programs under faculties related to each program would benefit the University from both a cost savings standpoint (less administrative costs) while also benefitting potential students in that they can better identify programs of interest. Many faculties already differentiate between "Undergraduate" and "Graduate" programs. Why not add "Certificates and Diplomas"/"Continuing Education"/"Non-Degree Programs" to that list? Moving Extension would free up space at Enterprise Square—the U of A could then discontinue use of the building and reap savings.

4. For Graduate Studies and Research, my suggestion would be the same as the above. Truly, I'm not even sure why this is considered it's own separate faculty in the first place (to me, it looks like all graduate programs are held under other faculties anyways?). Perhaps it makes sense to transition this to a "Graduate Students and Research Office" in the same way there is an "International Students Office" rather than "cutting" it completely.

5. Now, here is my pitch for the importance of retaining Augustana Campus.

Augustana is simultaneously the U of A's door to rural communities, increased EDI initiatives, and the U of A's door to developing new, interdisciplinary programs and research.

My comment on rural communities has some background to it and is connected to a continuing issue I have with how the U of A markets itself. Very, very often, the U of A is talked about in terms of an "Edmonton" institution, and further to that, a "North Campus" institution (I cannot count the number of times North Campus has been referred to as the "Main Campus" when this is anything but the case). My issue is this: we are the University of Alberta, not the University of Edmonton. While I recognize that the University of Alberta began in Edmonton (and that it's important to impart a sense of "place" to prospective students and alumni), Alberta is not Edmonton. If we are wanting to increase the prestige of the U of A to even just Albertan students, we need to stop highlighting the U of A as "Edmonton" and "North Campus". We need to be the University of Alberta FOR Alberta; urban and rural Alberta; north, central, and south Alberta. Currently, there is a real divide between urban and rural Alberta. As someone from southern Alberta (Brooks, surrounded by many rural communities) who went to school in Edmonton, I am VERY aware of this. If we want to be the University of Alberta, we need to try and bridge this gap. In my high school graduating class of 140, how many people would you think went to the U of A? Whatever you thought or hope, it was only 3. As a top 5 university in Canada and the top university in Alberta, with only 3 graduates attending the U of A? To me, this spells that the current idea of the U of A isn't sufficient (at least, this was the case in 2012. I am also aware that this is anecdotal evidence, but I wanted to bring it up nonetheless). Augustana Campus is this best way to extend the idea that the U of A is for all Albertans, including those from rural areas. Our institution is meant to "Uplift the whole people" and to be "For the Public Good"; much of this work and what we do will always be influenced by

how we are viewed and who we welcome and make space for at our institution. So we have to ask ourselves: do we care about the public good and the whole people, or do we only care about the urban public good and the whole people who live in urban areas?

In terms of EDI, Augustana has the second highest population of Indigenous students at a U of A faculty (Native Studies being first). The U of A has demonstrated time and time again its commitment to reconciliation—sustaining Augustana only furthers this work.

In terms of interdisciplinary work, Augustana is way ahead of the game. In 2017, the campus introduced a new calendar which allows for the better incorporation of experiential learning and interdisciplinary study. In addition, new, interdisciplinary degree programs are being introduced and developed and are the only such programs of their kind at the U of A.

Augustana is already doing the work the UAT plan hopes to achieve, and is in a position to not only continue achieving these goals, but to benefit and transform the way the U of A is viewed.

6. Similarly, Campus Saint-Jean gives the U of A similar strategic advantages. The U of A is the only university of our peer institutions with an exclusive French campus, which immediately sets us apart. Just as Augustana is our opportunity to represent individuals living in rural communities or who want to live and work and learn in rural communities, Campus Saint-Jean is the U of A's connection to individuals who speak Canada's other official language. Campus Saint-Jean represents a vital aspect of Canada and its citizens.

7. It's a bit difficult to make suggestions in regards to St. Joseph's College and St. Stephen's College when I have no idea what these faculties do (even when I was a student I had no idea and was massively confused about them. I didn't even know about St. Stephen's until I started working at the U of A through my own research). Based on some quick research, it appears these faculties have similar mandates, so at the very least it makes sense to combine the two in some manner. My suggestion would be to move the degree programs under the Faculty of Arts, and transition the additional work of these faculties into a centre (similar to UAlberta North or the China Institute) or perhaps even a department under the Faculty of Arts (similar to Department of English & Film Studies). At the very least, the two should be combined into a single faculty (perhaps the ""College of St Joseph and St Stephen).

These are the faculties we would have after these suggestions (10—a reduction of almost 50%):

- Alberta School of Business
- Art
- Augustana Campus
- Campus Saint-Jean
- Education

- Engineering
- Health Sciences
- Law
- Native Studies
- Science

I feel that the committee has been too cautious--all three scenarios leave most Faculties in place, sometimes creating new bureaucratic layers. This is the wrong direction. We need to combine Faculties and Departments to achieve substantial savings in providing core services. In failing to suggest a clear path toward reducing the number of Faculties by over half, the committee is failing to achieve the savings goals that are needed. Suggesting significant combinations will provoke strong resistance, but we need bold leadership here.

My preference is for an alternative scenario, outlined below:

Scenario A is a baseline change, generating a new Health Faculty.

Engineering, Medicine/Dentistry, Science, and Arts should be left with their basic Faculty structure--they are large, and apart from Arts have good admin/FTE ratios.

For Arts, significant savings can be obtained from merging departments, which is appropriately in progress.

ALES should be dismembered; many departments can go into Science (where there is significant overlap), but some might be better housed in Arts and/or Health.

The remaining Faculties (Education, Law, Business, Augustana, CSJ, Native Studies) are small, and need to have better admin/FTE ratios (except Business) by combining them. For instance, group Business, Law, & Education into a Professional Faculty. Whether CSJ and Augustana should be restructured to place their departments into the relevant Faculties, or kept in a Community Faculty (with Native Studies, which otherwise goes into Arts) is not obvious to me.

This leaves us with 6-7 Faculties, each of adequate size to maintain administrative efficiency.

This plan is consistent with 4a (of the Initial Scenarios considered), with ALES shifted into Science (at least the majority of its departments) rather than Engineering. Or with 6a, with ALES in Science again, and with all Faculties, not Divisions.

I don't think the plan of removing associate chair positions from departments has been carefully considered. It's crucial that the associate chairs *know* their department well, so they can manage complicated situations (e.g. an AC managing a student-supervisor conflict; nominating

students for awards; managing admissions). Pushing these responsibilities to a higher level would be a *very serious mistake*, which would dramatically reduce support for undergraduate and graduate students.

To put this bluntly, the Faculty of Science (as well as Engineering, Business, & Medicine) are running a very lean ship, for their supported levels of students and faculties. The University should be looking to see how it can duplicate this level of service for cost throughout the University, not to dramatically change the current structure within these units.

I am very skeptical that creating a new administrative layer, of Divisions, would create the benefits sought. Though initially support staff would be centralized within Divisions, it would likely be quickly discovered that some of these staff are needed at lower levels again. For instance, Computing Science has discovered that IT support (pulled from departments), is inadequate . The additional layer of bureaucracy would add significant inertia to many of our missions (e.g. decisions about new research directions, as well as paperwork in general), and I think we would all regret the change.

Additional concerns:

Engineering has strong links to its professional programs, which make it hard for Engineering to be merged with other faculties. For instance, Engineering's dean must be an engineer; does this extend to the executive dean of the Division? Engineering should stay a separate Faculty. (I am not an engineer.)

The idea of combining Faculties into divisions by tri-agency council nature is, I believe, a mistake, as it will discourage interdisciplinary research which may get funding from multiple councils.

Keeping Native Studies, CSJ, and Augustana completely separate seems a poor choice as well, as they should be integrated more closely with the rest of the University. Especially Native Studies--these areas of study are not completely separate from the rest of the University, and isolating them seems a mistake; they could be logically housed within Arts.

I like components of Scenarios 4a and 6a in the report. What about Faculties of FOMD, Health Sci with appropriate parts of ALES, Nat. and Appl. Sci which would include Engg, Sci and appropriate parts of ALES, Fac. Prof. Studies (Educ., Business, Law), Arts and Native Studies, and Community Services which would include CSJ and Augustana. I think CSJ, Augustana, and

Native studies need to contribute more to admin. restructuring which could be achieved by being part of larger groups; in these tight fiscal times, it's difficult to support resource intensive operations without being able to quantify their substantial contributions to the institution as separate entities. Also, there'd be more opportunity for collaboration as part of a whole U of A culture, which I feel we are all divorced from if CSJ, Native Studies, Augustana, and the rest aren't more integrated; "us and them" persists to the detriment of collegiality and support for a whole institution.

Why were these particular groupings chosen for scenario B? Why not alternatives, such as a "Division of Professional (or Applied) Faculties", which would include all Faculties where graduates require further provincial or federal certification to work in their fields (including Law, Engineering, Nursing, Pharmacy, Rehab, SPH, KSR, Education, Business, and possibly FoMD) and a "Division of Academic Faculties" (including Science, Arts, ALES, CSJ, Augustana, and FNS)? Or any number of other possible scenarios? Has there been any evaluation of the likely ACADEMIC impact of combining these units? Or is it only bottom line focused?

I would like to suggest a Scenario D – Consolidation and Shared Division:

- SHARED DIVISION:

EDUCATION

BUSINESS

LAW

AUGUSTANA

CSJ

NATIVE ST

- HEALTH +MED SCI:

FoMD

REHAB

PHARMACY

SPH

NURSING

KSR

SCI+ENGG:

SCIENCE

ENGG
ALES

To Scenario B, consider having 7 Faculties instead of 6:

Health Sciences

Humanities

CSJ

Augustana

Native St

Separate Natural Sciences and Applied Sciences. The purpose is to be able to increase the potential in AI, technology and applied sciences research where natural sciences/environmental studies have a contrast opinion and the fields are different. Create areas of opportunity for all and foster open discussions for innovation, creativity and collaboration.

Looking at the plan announced recently, I actually like some of the " Preliminary Scenarios Considered by the ARWG" better than the 3 they have brought forward. Specifically I think 3a, 4a, and especially 6a are a more equitable distribution. In 6a, I wouldn't be against splitting the Community group into the 3 separate schools to maintain these specialized areas. I just hope there is ample room for flexibility as GFC discusses. All of these plans will have to have careful design as to how they will run internally, as right now it looks like they are adding Executive Deans without getting rid of other levels of leadership. If that is the plan we will end up even more top heavy than we already are. Getting rid of non-academic staff and reducing sessionals won't get the university the funding reductions it is needing. Only reduction at the top will be helpful.

The decision to leave CSJ and Augustana largely untouched is a lost opportunity to make a real structural change. Especially because of the enormous infrastructure costs associated with running these specialized institutes, they cannot be left to the status quo. In discussing with, for example, students who went through CSJ, they indeed loved it, for the reason it gave them opportunities not afforded to the majority of our students: "It was the only time in my life I had my own bathroom," (regarding the residences there); and "The class sizes are so much smaller" -- an opportunity we cannot afford to give our whole undergraduate population, it seems unfair that we give it to this small number of students. If they want that highly personalized experience, they should be going to small, liberal arts type institution, not the flagship public

university in our province. In a world of decreasing budgets, we cannot be both, and we need to decide who we are. We can offer community opportunities on main campus, but we can't pour all of our resources into these few while cutting the student experience of so many others -- many others who also belong to marginalized communities, who find their communities on main campus through vibrant student organizations.

Scenario D: Six super faculties consisting of Arts (A), Education (E), Engineering (Eng.), Extension (Ext.), Medicine/Dentistry (M/D), & Science (S). Schools within the super faculties would be as follows - [(A) Law]; [(E) Kinesiology/Sport/Recreation & Native Studies]; [(Eng.) as is]; [(Ext.) Augustana Campus, Campus Saint Jean, Graduate Studies & Research, & St. Joseph's + Stephen's Colleges]; [(M/D) Nursing, Pharmacy + Pharmaceutical Sciences, School of Public Health, & Rehabilitation Medicine.]; & [(S) Agricultural/Life/Environmental Sciences, & Alberta School of Business]. Benefits: Reduced administrative costs, building proximity, LRT/ETS/bus access, & professional designations possible for graduates of all six super faculties.

From a student's perspective, me and my colleagues agree that Scenario B or a modified Scenario C would be the best. Engineering and ALES doesn't share much in terms of research and focus, and they're both closer to different departments in the Faculty of Science. Scenario C with Engg and ALES with a Science block and a separate Arts block would be ideal. Would you consider grouping Business with Engineering and ALES instead of with Law and Arts? Given the UofA's emphasis on entrepreneurship and innovation I really believe that a Business and Engineering grouping would be more advantageous.

If education was to be merged with another faculty, I would like to see the Faculty of Native Studies merged with Education. Being taught about our responsibility as teachers to move forward with reconciliation, I feel that Native Studies have a stronger connection with Education than with Arts/Humanities/Social Sciences. It encourages us pre-service teachers to consider Indigenous Perspectives more and take it with us to the classroom. Education courses can include more topics regarding Indigenous communities, not just in EDU 211 but in other contexts/courses as well.

Although indeed KSR could be a part of the larger Health Sciences Faculty, I believe doing so will limit the research KSR is able to engage in. Much of the social science based research in the current Faculty of KSR actively works against the discourses/norms in what is typically deemed

a 'health sciences' field/faculty. Our programs and research foci go far beyond the scope of 'health'. There are indeed many researchers working on advancing health initiatives (e.g., exercise physiology, epidemiology); however, there are even more working towards dismantling the norms that have been placed on exercise and health by the medical field. The positivist research that is currently being done in the KSR faculty indeed fits with the proposed health science faculty... but what about the voices of the sociologists, psychologists, and pedagogues? We are actively trying to work away from a 'health' lens and towards a more inclusive understanding of physical activity and health. In a larger health sciences faculty, these voices will be lost. This would be very unfortunate. As a university, it will seem as though we are only allowing the voices of those who are able-bodied, white, and elite to be healthy because those will be the loudest voices in the proposed faculty. We do not aim to 'fix' a problem alike medical/health sciences. I challenge you to think of what you know about health, physical activity, recreation, and sport... why would we need to be linked to the medical field, unless we are fact working from a lens of 'this problem needs fixing'. Education may be better suited for many of the researchers working within the faculty of KSR, if KSR cannot remain its own faculty. We do not want to end up like other universities in Canada that only focus on elite sport. We want to remain a well-rounded university and such a simple change of not placing KSR into a health faculty, could do just that. Please be reminded that the KSR faculty has some of the most sought after undergraduate degrees (B.Sc in Kinesiology and B.Ed in physical education—linked closely to secondary ed). Will they be easily found/accessible if placed into a health sciences faculty? As well, if KSR is place with Health Sciences, where do the coaching students go?

Would you consider grouping Business with Engineering and ALES instead of with Law and Arts? Given the UofA's emphasis on entrepreneurship and innovation I really believe that a Business and Engineering grouping would be more advantageous.

Why not just make the three proposed Tri-Agency Divisions into actual Faculties (with Departments) and be done with the excess layering of bureaucracy?

I also like scenario C but I'm confused about how the shared division would work? What if instead of having a huge shared division they were split into 2 consolidated groups of professional (education, law, business) and community (CSJ, Augustana, Native Studies)?

Scenario A: The consolidation of the Health Science Faculties into one is great. I think you can go further to consolidate the other remaining 11 Faculties

Examples:

- Join Business and Law
- Create a Humanities Faculty and merge Arts and Native Studies under this faculty
- Rebrand FoMD to Medical Sciences

- Create Natural + Applied Science Faculty as in Scenario B and merge Science, ENGG and ALES together
- The faculty of Education can absorb Extension and Faculty of Graduate studies and Research

Scenario B: Feedback: Too much consolidation.

- Separate Health and Medical Sciences into their own faculties (have 2 faculties instead of 1). Health Sciences can be made up of REHAB, Pharmacy, SPH, Nursing, KSR.

Medical Sciences can remain FoMD

- Natural & Implied Science is great (1 Faculty with 3 main departments with each department having their own Major Topics to study)

- Separate Social Sciences and Humanities

Business and Law can be their own faculty.

Education can be its own faculty

Create a Humanities Faculty to encompass the Arts and Native Studies programs.

Although the Dietetics Specialization is currently in the Faculty of ALES it should be included in the Health Science or Health and Medical Science faculty as it is an accredited professional program that is regulated by a college.

FoMD has a number of independent and separate programs (Medicine/Dentistry/Dental Hygiene/Med Lab Sciences/Rad Therapy). Is there consideration in separating these 4 out of FoMD and having them have the same amount of visibility as Nursing, Rehab Med, Pharmacy, SPH, KSR?

I am in favour of Scenario B. I do like the idea of a super health sciences faculty with all the health sciences together. The intention of Dentistry leaving Dent/Pharm was that we would be more integrated with Nursing/Nutrition. This has absolutely not happened at all. I think encouraging all of us to be in the same Health Sciences Faculty will allow professors the opportunity to teach in other departments. There is concern that Dentistry / Dental Hygiene is lumped as a department. To be fair Med Lab Sciences and Rad Therapy are also part of FoMD.

I do feel that Dental Hygiene should be a school on it's own similar to Nursing and Rehab Med and not lumped in with Dentistry. The majority of dental hygiene programs in the country excepts those within Dental Schools are not with Dentistry. The Dental Hygiene Program at the U of A is considered one of the best programs in Canada / USA and we have the broadest scope of practice in Alberta compared to the rest of Canada / USA. Dental Hygiene should be considered separate from Dentistry. Dental Hygienists have their own college, their own standards of practice and their own Code of Ethics. Nursing is not a component of FoMD, Dental Hygiene should not be a component of Dentistry.

As a graduate, I believe that all studies should be reviewed as to subjects incorporated into the curriculum. Many are just "fillers" and have no use in future work environments or are never used in practice, also forgotten soon after they are finished. The program of study should be concise. It should only include all essential information. For instance, nursing should be restructured. There is too much of a "critical thinking" and too little of actual nursing. I went through the program without even getting a certificate for IV starts. I never had Pharmacology, as a separate subject. I spent too much time in libraries and in small student groups researching irrelevant to my practice topics, and too little time in clinical settings. I felt undereducated after I graduated. We only had one lab learning how to perform ECG and how to interpret it. All graduating nursing students should be ready to practice in ICU, Emergency, surgery, medicine, and so on. Divide four years into Medicine, Surgery, ICU, Emergency, Cardiology, Pharmacology, Anatomy and Physiology, Pathology, and Nursing Research. Require 80% or higher grade in each area to pass. Exams should be based on solid knowledge. In summary, all programs should be revised for their content and considered for elimination. This, in turn, will eliminate not needed teaching positions or open the new ones, more effective and more useful. There are ways for improvement in every department. I am convinced a lot of money would be saved.

I completely agree that the U of A needs profound change, it is long overdue.

Being a longtime member of this community, I can see that collaboration across disciplines is important, and must add that we have that among several faculties with our work interactions. Still, one can always see room for improvement, right?

Duplicate programs/activities include Augustana and CSJ. However, these, together with Native Studies, are faculties that have intrinsic philosophies and touch the delicate field of being ethically correct. Augustana is a fine example of a small campus experience, CSJ stands for the unique bilingual/cultural nature of Canada, and Native Studies covers important topics from the point of view of Native culture, that should never be ignored. Therefore, maybe good to be stand alone faculties.

The philosophical foundation of different disciplines is very important. The core of the thinking process defines how each discipline evolves. To inspire and educate mind and spirit, teaching has to be open, clear, creative and ethical as to keep intellectual integrity. All faculties must share that.

Right now we have to face a fiscal crisis, and at the same time the issue of possible decline of academia as a concept and practice because of excessive proliferation of administration. In addition, we have society and the planet in crisis.

All that being said, my suggestion is that an extra Scenario, that we can call D, would be best. Please bear with me:

FoMD is not to be separated from Health Sciences, when they all are (or should be) one and the same, based on the principle of health and wellness. On that note, Psychology could be part of this Health Sciences Faculty as well, rather than being part of Science.

Humanities and/or Social Sciences would be an appropriate name for a Faculty that joins Arts, Business, Education and Law. They all share how society functions and expresses itself in so many different ways.

Engineering and ALES are obviously important applied sciences/technologies providing education to find solutions and practices needed within many fields. They could be together as Applied Sciences Faculty.

Science and its philosophy of studying and pursuing the true nature of all things in an unbiased way makes this Faculty unique, therefore it should be a stand alone.

As said before, Augustana, CSJ and Native Studies have reasons to be alone as well.

Extension and Graduate Studies involve by their nature many disciplines and are to be alone as well. However, I am not certain that they should be faculties?

So, A is faulty and not sufficiently efficient for the fiscal part.

B is better than A, but faulty when joining Core Sciences with Applied Sciences. Believe me, I have heard good debates on this.

C is also better than A, except for two serious misconceptions there:

First, Arts with Science. Even if sometimes one can see art in something scientific, such as fractals, and science in something artistic such as Bach and his music, those two will not work well on an everyday basis.

Second, FoMD separated from the rest of Health Sciences, as explained above.

Scenario D brings our total number of 18 faculties to 9 and it makes sense philosophically speaking. It could be 7 if there were a way to redefine the status of Extension and Graduate Studies. Or it could be maybe 4 if reconsidering the stand alone status of Augustana, SCJ and

Native Studies, as done for Scenario C. However, these two reduced numbers could cost ethically speaking.

Good score as compared to A with 14, B with 8 and C with 7 and all of them failing one way or another on the philosophic foundation of the possible move-together.

I hope that this will be useful to you, bringing a fresh picture to feed your ideas. I am not able to make an objective evaluation of the preliminary saving costs, nor will I comment on advantages or disadvantages. My feeling is, after being part of this Campus for so long, that the outcome for Scenario D would be more into the positives than the negatives.

Thank you all for the opportunity to comment on this crucial changes, truly appreciated.

Here is an exciting new prospect for divisional regrouping. The Faculty of Kinesiology, Sport, and Recreation would fit best within a Division inclusive of Faculty of Arts that might also include Faculty of Science, Education, Law, Augustana, CSJ, and ALES. FKSR currently is made up of a large majority of SSHRC scholars, about 30+ in a total compliment of about 42 professors. Alignment across the Health spectrum is less attractive, and it definitely does not fit within a Faculty of Medicine do to many divergent dimensions of knowledge production in scholarship, teaching, and service.

Scenario C seems like the most reasonable so far, though I would suggest instead, moving ALES into Arts&Science (many people in ALES would fit into existing or re-worked departments in A&S, with the addition of an AGFOR dept), and putting ENG in with the other professionalized faculties (Ed, Bus, & Law) with an administrative hub. Augustana, CSJ, and NS could be a second administrative hub, maintaining their unique community connections.

Scenario C seems the closest to the logical outcome. Engineering should be kept separate because it is associated with a professional body, and is already at an excellent ratio of admins/FTE faculty so doesn't need amalgamation. I suggest altering scenario C by putting ALES (or most of it) into Science, and leaving Arts separate--improvement there can come from merging departments. This would leave 6 faculties; Engineering, FoMD, Arts, Science/ALES, Health (the Scenario A), and a faculty combining the (more autonomous) units of Law, Business, Education, Augustana, CSJ, and Native Studies.

Dear ARWG,

Having taken a look at the suggested scenarios, I cannot support any of the three.

First, given the evaluation matrix on page 44, I don't feel that the ARWG actually put forward more than 1 real scenario (B), with a potential weaker backup (C), despite technically presenting three scenarios. This makes the whole exercise of the ARWG seeking feedback feel exceptionally disingenuous.

I know everyone has their own criteria for a workable scenario, but mine focus on a relatively even distribution of faculty sizes, logical grouping, and an intangible feeling about what is best for my Faculty (Science). I realize that the latter will change from individual to individual, but I believe sharing these concerns might lead to an ability to abstract them out to more measurable and/or generally applicable ideas.

While I understand the history of some of our faculties and do not wish to diminish their productivity and importance to the University, the preservation of sub-100 (and especially sub-60) FTE professor faculties should not be considered a sacred cow because of the politics behind merging that Faculty. To be perfectly honest, I do not see why autonomy of a small faculty is viewed as a positive. The preservation of Campus St Jean, Augustana, and Native Studies as "Faculties" makes part of Scenarios A and B untenable in my opinion. Moreover, their lack of representation on an Executive Dean Council, suggest an autonomy without input model that I find to be political suicide. The least that would have made sense to me would be that a Division focusing on under-represented groups might have been made out of Campus St Jean, Augustana, and Native Studies, with lateral cross-appointments from several departments that are likely currently in Arts. Ensuring such a division have representation on an Executive Dean Council is critical.

Scenarios C does not do enough to even out the number of faculty. In fact it makes things worse by combining Arts and Sciences, when each of those existing Faculties already have more FTE professors than some of the new consolidated Faculties. I would argue that Scenario C should not consolidate Arts & Sciences. (More below)

Given that this exercise seems designed to pick Scenario B with Scenario C as a backup, I would like to concentrate on why I think either of these Scenarios is a net loss for Science.

In Scenario B, the tri-agency division alignment will, in my opinion, stifle cross-disciplinary work across agencies. It creates a false division given that we already have researchers in many departments that seek funding from multiple combinations of the tri-agencies. And finally, it assumes that the tri-agency division is set in stone.

In Scenario B, Engineering and ALES make up a division with Science. While this makes some logical sense, I have strongly afraid that this move will strongly negatively impact Science, and especially fundamental (sometimes called "basic") science within Science. The Engineering-heavy focus of this province, the "standards" that I have heard the Dean of Engineering applies to their faculty, and the political moves I have seen the Deans of Engineering pull in my time here all make me not want to share a division with Engineering (to the point where this scenario would seriously make me reconsider my continued employment within the University leading to the loss of a highly productive and visible research group). I think it would be inevitable that the University would push for someone with an Engineering background to become the Division leader (given Provincial priorities) and I do not want that Division leader deciding the Faculty budget for Science and setting major research initiatives. Moreover, I view the removal of an Associate Dean Research for Science as a non-starter. I think it is arguably the ADRs that are most difficult to combine across divisions.

While many American (and some Canadian) Universities traditionally link Arts & Sciences, I think this is a mistake to proactively choose that. In particular, our FEC structure means we would need to keep those separate. I think the current provincial government traditional seeks "cost-savings" from Arts and Sciences, and Scenario C would double down on that. And, as said above, , I view the removal of an Associate Dean Research for Science as a non-starter. I think it is arguably the ADRs that are most difficult to combine across divisions.

Scenario B and to some extent Scenario C add an extra layer of administration to this University. First, this seems antithetical to the ideas administration reductions, despite the claim that there would be a net reduction. What I see instead is the replacement of academic administrators with administration-only administrators and the addition of a new level of administration-only administrators, both being built largely by reducing replication in support staff. So I agree with many of my colleagues in identifying this as an attack on the model of collegial governance. Scenario C may be less an attack on collegial governance; it was unclear to me if Arts & Sciences; Health Sciences; and Applied Sciences are Divisions or Faculties). The former would mean the additional layer of administration, which I feel should be avoided at all costs, where possible.

Finally, both Scenarios B and C seem designed to decrease representation on the Executive Dean council to 3-5. I feel as if this has been one of the major goals of the Administration, and the one that is most likely to be attacked (for good reason) about trying to minimize a diversity of opinions. While I do not support 12 voices on an Executive Dean Council (Scenario A), I find that 3-5 is too few.

Given all of this, I could see myself supporting a variant of Scenario C that maintains the Art / Science split. This would mean that there would be 6 units (one division and 5 faculty) that all

are either around 300 FTE professors or are a historic Faculty (FoMD) that does not make to split up. The Executive Dean Council for such a reconfiguration should, include 2 FoMD representatives, 1 Arts, 1 Science, 1 Health Science, 1 Applied Science, and 1 representative from Professional Schools in the Shared Division, and 1 representative from Under-represented populations. The latter would allow the University to proudly point out something like keeping the Dean of the Faculty of Native Studies presence on the EDC. I would also understand if politically CSJ needed to have a representative on the EDC.

October 22 - November 5, 2020

Submitted by members of the U of A community through the [UAT Feedback Form](#) and [Alumni Feedback Form](#). Some personally identifying information has been omitted.

I would prefer some variant of Scenario C with the addition of a Division/Faculty of Arts and Sciences that includes faculties/schools of Education, Law, KSR, NStudies, CSJ, and Augustana brought together.

I prefer a scenario where the Business Faculty is part of the grouping with applied sciences because most of its focus is on enterprises and other organizations that apply or seek to apply the sciences. Such a new proximity could also produce synergies between ENGG, ALES and the Business Faculty. President Flanagan also mentioned hearing a similar view from faculty members and students in the Business Faculty.

Why not turn CSJ, Augustana, and FNS into one community-based faculty? This should help the U of A become more efficient, while acknowledging the importance and uniqueness of these three faculties.

As a member of KSR I was concerned about being placed in a Health Science faculty because I do not consider my research to be in health. I looked through the alternative scenarios and like the idea in A4 of the sport and recreation programs moving to humanities and social improvement. I don't care for the faculty name, however, and I think something more like ""Humanities and Social Science"" is better. Another thought I have about this - there are a group of researchers in ALES that I believe study similar topics to us (social science - environment, conservation, parks, recreation) and I think some of us would fit with them in some sort of scenario.

A final thought - why does KSR need to be with health? Would science + innovation in scenario A4 or multidisciplinary studies in A3 not fit us better? I just think there is a better fit for us somewhere that takes into account the wide variety of research from many disciplines that goes on in KSR.

Strongly suggest scenario B but would like to see FOMD separated and Dentistry restored to Faculty status. This provides a far more definitive autonomy to compete for the best caliber teaching staff , students , and resultant research and funding.

I agree that there is a need for consolidation of administrative services to improve efficiency and reduce costs. In the presentations, it was clearly implied that ""everything is on the table"". That being said, I find it difficult to understand why small entities like CSJ, Augustana & Native Studies are left intact. Students enrolled in courses in each of these, should all belong to existing faculties. Courses taught in French or any other language, should be options within existing faculties such as science or arts. For example, a physics or history course taught in another language should be academically under science and arts respectively. The question, from the financial side, is does U of A need the CSJ facility with the associate operating costs? Can the courses be conducted in French with existing resources at the main campus? With the adaptations required by the COVID pandemic, these questions need to be asked. Augustana, is another campus located in Camrose so will require administrative and logistical support in that community. On the academic side, the students should be enrolled in courses operated by the various faculties located at the main campus. It is important to define the role of Augustana within the existing structure. For example, is it Augustana's purpose to provide courses for students in their first couple of years with a plan to complete their senior years at the main campus? Will Augustana conduct specialized courses (e.g. Agriculture) which provide students with ""field experience"" that cannot be achieved at the main Edmonton campus? Regarding Native Studies, this would appear best situated as a Department within the Faculty of Arts. Students can earn a BA (Indigenous Studies) in the same manner as a student can earn a BSc (Chemistry). It would seem that the political issues are overriding the academic, administrative and logistical issues. I truly believe that our students can be better served by focusing on the latter.

Regarding the FOMD, I believe that Dentistry and Medicine have to be placed on equal footing. In Scenario A, it is planned to have a School of Dentistry and a School of Medicine under the FOMD. Similarly, Faculty of Health Sciences would have Schools of Rehab Medicine, Public Health, Nursing, Pharmacy and Kinesiology, Sports & Recreation. This same logic would apply under Scenario C. These would put all Health Care Provider education on an equivalent level. Under Scenario B, Dentistry and Medicine should each have separate Faculties to become equivalent with Rehab Medicine, Public Health Nursing, Pharmacy and Kinesiology, Sport & Recreation.

I believe that it is important to keep Arts and Science as separate Faculties. These represent the primary entry into university for the majority of students. They are very different academically so I cannot see any reason to combine them as proposed in Scenario C. I feel this would be a

step backward. Historically (a century ago) these Faculties were combined. They were separated due to the academic differences, the course structure (labs) and the student makeup having different needs and goals.

In closing, I would like to compliment the Working Groups for their comprehensive evaluation of the current circumstances and the presentation of logical solutions. Thanks for allowing me to provide feedback.

Modified B: Kinesiology, Sport, and Recreation would fit well in a Faculty of Arts and Sciences because most of its professors fall under SSHRC and its program focus supports discovery-based arts and sciences, and education. There is little fit with Medicine for a faculty that is highly committed to SSHRC research and preparation of graduate and undergraduate students plus Sport and Physical Culture (including dance), Tourism, and Recreation would all fall better in a large Faculty of Arts and Sciences -- to fully recognize its scope and excellent standing worldwide.