

University of Alberta for Tomorrow Feedback

October 22 - November 12, 2020

Below are comments shared by members of the U of A community in response to updates about [University of Alberta for Tomorrow](#). All feedback shared through the UAT website ([UAT Feedback Form](#)) is, and will continue to be, shared with the Academic Restructuring Working Group (ARWG) and Service Excellence Transformation (SET) Committee. A list of all University of Alberta for Tomorrow (UAT) consultations is available on the [UAT website](#).

Responses to frequently asked questions and comments can be found on the [UAT FAQ website](#), and in regular [UAT Updates](#) from President Flanagan, Provost Dew, and SET Executive Lead Rob Munro.

General Questions and Comments

There should also be a rethink about structures within current faculties. Students need equal access through a fair process to scholarships and grants, not subject to arbitrary decision-making by a few. Some departments exemplify the former, while others practice the latter.

Here's my thought: to help reduce the impact of lost government funding, why not charge tuition based on income, just like taxes? Wealthy families sending their kids to school pay a lot more, while students putting themselves through school can pay as much as they pay now or less. This is already being done with international students, who are typically wealthier. It might work out to more than the university is getting through tuition now, and would be less controversial than the recent blanket increases in tuition.

What impact will this have on essential, health professional programs? There are many factors, such as alumni and donor relationships which would be negatively impacted if some of the programs lose autonomy.

Having the timelines for when you are planning on enacting everything would be helpful. There is a lot of angst/anxiety all around. With everything else going on, this compounds and magnifies things, and it is not a healthy situation for anyone to be in.

Communicate better with those of us on the ground. Sometimes during the townhalls, as much as you think you are communicating, some of the answers given are non-answers, which leaves many of us coming out feeling even more confused and anxious than before.

Academic Restructuring

It is becoming more and more clear that Option B is the preferred choice. I think that this option is good for smaller faculties, but I do not think it will work for bigger faculties (like Engineering or Science). For these faculties, the ratios of faculty members to administrators are already very higher (much higher than many smaller faculties), further consolidation would not create much cost savings. In fact, it will be very problematic with all the centralization. We should not be forcing everybody to go through restructuring because that is the "fair" thing to do. In fact, we should acknowledge the highly efficient systems that are already in place for some of these larger faculties and not negatively impact their abilities to serve students.

My second concern is that Option B will create even more work for faculty members in these bigger faculties. For example, in Engineering, the average workload for a faculty member is much higher than our peers in some other faculties. This is based on the number of students taught, the number of graduate students supervised, the number of scholarly outputs (e.g., papers, books, patents), research funding. The disruption caused by Option B will no doubt cause much stress and extra workload for us.

In the end, I strongly urge the committee to please listen to our concerns and engage us in coming up with alternative options (e.g., consolidating smaller faculties, but allowing bigger faculties - Engineering, Science, and Medicine to remain as separate faculties).

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.

Forced to choose, I think Scenario 1 would be the best for education. If we had to compromise, I would suggest an alternative scenario wherein Education was lumped with Science and Arts, Applied Science (ENG and ALES) would be separate and (Business and Law would be separate). So similar to Scenario B, but with one more added group. Education has so little in common with law and business and majors would benefit with a closer working relationship with arts and science.

Go with the model that benefits your students the most. The majority of us could care less about the department structures and levels of organization that exist above the classroom and what we are paying for- which is ultimately the information and education we receive from our professors.

If there is “fat to be trimmed” by reducing redundant department heads through consolidation then I’m all for it as we face increasing difficulty regarding funding and operational costs. I think the first option should always be the one with the student in mind. If option B provides this but requires the greatest changes then so be it. We have been forced to drastically change how we complete our school and I don’t see why other areas of the university operations shouldn’t follow suit to meet changing needs or demands to best serve its students.

The Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry is the largest most complex faculty within U of A. As such, keeping it as a stand alone faculty to continue its mandate for teaching, research, and delivery of clinical care (and related training programs) makes the most sense. Amalgamating into a larger health sciences faculty would not be of benefit to the larger U of A.

I believe Scenario B is the best choice for the U of A at this time. It provides the best cost efficiency with benefits for students. Although it is highly invasive, I believe that is a small negative in the shadow of the multiple positives that come with this scenario. Scenario A and C seem to be the least effective for the purpose of cost efficiency and do not appear to offer as many benefits as Scenario B does for students.

For restructuring to be effective the faculty of education must remain independent. The faculty does not "fit" with any other because the secondary stream of the bachelors of education program includes majors and minors from both the faculty of arts and sciences. To place it with one faculty would leave half of all secondary education students in a faculty that does not represent their fields of study. The faculty of education is the most diverse faculty on campus, which means our needs are like no other. If one considers the diversity in the faculty of arts and the faculty of science, the faculty of education has the level of diversity among both combined. Our programs are also far different from other faculties. We have two practicums of different lengths, we have condensed courses, and even within our own program we have two streams, elementary and secondary, and secondary requires a major and minor that requires study in other faculties. Recent budget cuts to the faculty of education and the loss of the library this year has tarnished the faculty of education beyond repair, I fear that if it also loses its name and identity it will eventually be erased entirely, or at least it will fall so low in ranking that people will simply stop applying.

I love how well done the interim report was, I especially like the Tri-agency alignment because of the great benefits it could provide. I believe that's the best choice.

Scenario B is preferred. This may help create interdisciplinary connections and may create better understandings for students on the tri-council funding. This may also enhance collaboration in teaching and mentoring students.

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.

I am in the FoMD and I favor Option B - FoMD needs major upheaval to get rid of the entrenched corruption in our midst and provide opportunity and advancement for all. We have redundancy in our structure with an unhealthy duplication of services that are available in and better delivered by the main University offices. The FoMD leadership is corrupt and does not know or adhere to policy and procedure, in addition the duplicated offices in FoMD do not follow policies and procedures of the University because of the perception that we are special and this is leading to human rights and equity concerns putting the entire University and Faculty at risk. PLEASE do not treat FoMD as "special". What makes us special is not good.

The cost savings in reducing Academic admin positions is not being calculated correctly, in that many of the smaller units require only a small percentage of time for the Academic leader to fulfill their admin role, far, far less than the 50% estimate. In FoMD, we have ~15 grad coordinators+ 4 Associate Chair (grads). The vast majority spend less than 10% on this admin function. It is a 500% error to assume this offers 50% savings. My estimate is eliminating all 19 might lead to savings between 1 or 2 positions max. I am an example: Associate Chair (grad) in charge of a 30 grad student program. I receive no extra stipend and the position is 5% of my time. The problem seems to be there are no "boots-on-the-ground" on the restructuring panel. Unfortunately there is a vast overestimation of the savings for many of the smaller dept Academic admin. The math is fairly straightforward: a grad program of about 30 students is

about 5% time, 300 = 50%. It does our Provost a great disservice to suggest there is a 50% savings in each of these positions. When the reality is about 10 times less for small programs in regard to grad coordinators/assoc chair (grad). We need a higher level of understanding that may not be possible from the top-end administrators on the panel. I am not sure who came up with the 50% time estimation, but this is not based on the reality of our situation at UAlberta in small depts. The numbers are deeply flawed for small depts and will lead to a lot more pain in the future since the numbers are falsely overinflated. Let's start with the real situation and build from there!

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.

My comments will focus on the position of the Department of Dentistry within the overall University structure.

Currently Dentistry functions technically as a department within the Faculty of Medicine. It is listed in the title of the Faculty (FoM&D) and allowed to use the title of "School"

Under the proposals listed in the University for tomorrow documents in scenario "B" I would advocate for Dentistry to be recognized as similar status as Medicine, Pharmacy, Nursing, Rehabilitation Medicine, Public Health and Kinesiology Sport and Recreation.

Accreditation requirements for Dentistry require significant autonomy to control curriculum Commission on Dental Accreditation of Canada (CDAC) accreditation Requirement 1.1 states: The CDAC requires that dentistry must exist as a distinct faculty/college/school, of a recognized university. The administrative status of the program must ensure that the autonomy of dentistry is respected and the unique needs of dental education are recognized and supported at the highest levels of administrative authority. The faculty/college/school should have the same responsibilities and privileges of the other academic units within the Institution.

The majority of Canadian dental programs are structured as "Faculties" and all USA dental programs are structured as "Schools of Dentistry" or "Colleges of Dentistry" with the autonomy equivalent to faculty status.

Having the University of Alberta, dentistry unit named School, College or Faculty of Dentistry provides an identity which is well understood and respected outside of the University. This

would help facilitate recruitment of highly qualified academic staff, post-doctoral fellows and graduate students.

Academic dentistry has a 103-year history at the University of Alberta and provides an important and distinct contribution to the University and to the community. Accreditation requires a high level of functional autonomy. The academic restructuring being planned for the University provides opportunity to provide an appropriate governance structure that meets the needs of dentistry while achieving the goals outlined in the ARWG Interim Report.

As a Dentistry Alumnus , class '68, I would be most supportive of an academic restructuring that would return Dentistry to it's original "Faculty" status equal to that enjoyed by Medicine, Nursing, Pharmacy and others within that Division. Dentistry at the U of A has a long history of excellence and it was only due to a financial crunch a number of years ago that it was merged with Medicine to ensure its survival at this University. Over the past number of years the Dentistry program has progressed and excelled, research has been expanded and various outreach community programs have been implemented. This would be a great opportunity to reinstate more independent "Faculty" status to Dentistry.

I have reviewed the many different scenarios of what the faculty organizational structure could look like. From a bigger picture view, what is the benefit of combining faculties in various forms and what is the main objective? It seems a driving factor is to reduce costs, but with so many different options being considered what is the main objective behind it? Streamline? Reduce cost? It is not clear to me what the advantages/disadvantages would be of the different potential combinations.

Accreditation Standards and Requirements

It is important for Dentistry to be granted a high level of academic ownership and autonomy, with academic leadership from within the profession to effectively meet our Commission on Dental Accreditation of Canada (CDAC) accreditation requirements/status.

Commission on Dental Accreditation of Canada (CDAC) accreditation Requirement 1.1 states: The CDAC requires that dentistry must exist as a distinct faculty/college/school, of a recognized university. The administrative status of the program must ensure that the autonomy of dentistry is respected and the unique needs of dental education are recognized and supported at the highest levels of administrative authority. The faculty/college/school should have the same responsibilities and privileges of the other academic units within the Institution.

Local, National and International Reputation/Branding

There are nine dental programs in Canada and 61 dental programs in the USA. The University of Alberta dental program is uniquely structured as a department within a faculty. The majority of Canadian dental programs are structured as “Faculties” and all USA dental programs are structured as “Schools of Dentistry” or “Colleges of Dentistry” with the autonomy equivalent to faculty status.

Having the University of Alberta, dentistry unit named School, College or Faculty of Dentistry provides an identity which is well understood and respected outside of the University. The academic lead for dentistry requires level of leadership (and associated title) that creates equality when communicating directly with other dental schools and professional organizations (including regulatory and examining bodies) at the provincial, national and international levels.

The appropriate visual identity for the University of Alberta dentistry program would:

- Enhance the local, national and international reputation of the University of Alberta
- Facilitate recruitment of highly qualified academic staff, post-doctoral fellows and graduate students.
- Facilitate the development of international collaborations.

Alumni & Donor Relations

Dentistry and dental hygiene alumni identify themselves with dentistry as a distinct academic unit. Alumni engagement and credibility with potential donors from the dental community will be enhanced by establishing faculty status.

Unique Regional External Relationships

Dentistry has unique regional external relationships that support our educational mission. These include partnerships with:

- The Glenrose Rehabilitation Hospital
- The Boyle McCauley Health Centre
- The Metis Nation of Alberta
- Various long-term care facilities

I feel that it would be advantageous to have Dentistry as a distinct faculty/school to ensure that we do not risk losing our accreditation standards.

Option and A and B make the most sense. Option C seems like it could lead to a huge decrease in the quality of an education from the u of a. Please ensure that the quality of education increases and does not decrease.

Scenario B makes the most sense because faculties are grouped in a way that makes sense. Scenario C doesn't seem like it will go well to just jumble a bunch of faculties together.

option c: economic majors like myself take most of their courses in the science faculty, especially with computing science being a popular minor, and the only "art" is the classification of economics. By merging arts and science we would be able to let a lot of students from either arts or science (as a lot of people would benefit as students don't always associate themselves as one of the two faculties. For instance biology major psychology minor is very popular as well.

for the love of god don't put science and art together. The two faculties encompass most of campus and getting advising is hard enough without even more topics being covered by less people, it is unfair.

I believe it is VERY important to ensure that the Faculty of Native Studies doesn't get absorbed into another. If I'm not mistaken the U of A is the only university with a Faculty of Native Studies.

As a student, I'm most impressed by scenario B. I like the opportunity for interdisciplinary collaboration as well as the retainment of faculty identity and status. This university is a part of my identity and I feel proud to be associated with it; belonging to a certain faculty is also something each student is proud of. Keeping the identities and status' of faculties intact during this process is so important because the focus of our education is a central characteristic of who we are as individuals. It was also mentioned that this scenario offers the best potential savings and academic opportunities; those outcomes seem like a win-win to me.

I personally think that Scenario B is the best! I also think the thing that most students are interested in at the moment is more academic opportunities, especially with covid happening. It's a win-win!

After looking over the three options for the academic restructuring, I personally think option A looks the best, but option C for me is following closely behind. I don't particularly feel option B is a good option.

Option B appears best to me. I think it would be helpful to group medicine with health sciences: I don't really understand why med and dentistry is separated from, say, rehab medicine anyway, aside from prestige which, in itself, is a problematic and divisive concept. Same with grouping law with arts and business and engineering with science. Also, interdisciplinary work matters a lot to me, and I think this is the best way forward to foster collaboration rather than silos.

As a student, I want my education to be least disrupted. Option A makes most sense to me and it offers the interdisciplinary interaction.

First of all, as a Secondary Education student at the U of A, I prefer scenario A more than scenario B, and it would be such a shame if scenario C ever becomes our reality.

1. Education faculty has not been one of the most supported faculties in the University of Alberta, yet this is the faculty that is directly involved in building a future. While we already lost our library space this year, Education faculty should not be deprived more.
2. Education faculty sends out many students to complete practicums. While doing unpaid practicums is already difficult and overwhelming, many students need to quit their part-time jobs to make time for their practicums. However, if education faculty were combined with other faculties, who would be there to ensure student teachers can receive timely support and feedback or the students are protected. If scenario B and C were to take place, who can guarantee that education students would still receive the same amount of the support? Hence, it is not fair for education students to lose out on their own income to complete their degree, while paying increasing tuition just to get lower quality of training and support from the U of A.

I feel option B is best and best represents the university

I think that scenario B is the most fair as the whole school is affected similarly and we get to maintain our faculty status.

I think that scenario B is the most fair as the whole school is affected similarly and we get to maintain our faculty status.

B seems the most logical structure however Dentistry needs to be a distinct faculty in this process. For accreditation purposes and because it is equal to all of the other faculties

recognized. We make a research contribution and are internationally recognized. I understand there is no cost to this change but a huge impact on my profession in terms of being able to attract students to our school who end up being professionals in this community.

Scenario B is the one that stands out to me as being the best option. One of my complaints over the years has been around what the ARWG states is the ""to promote collaboration across disciplines"". Working in the French-second-language education field, it has frustrated me to no end that Faculté Saint-Jean, the Department of Modern Languages and Culture and the Department of Linguistics do not work together. Not only do they not work together, they are usually not even familiar with their colleagues in this area nor do they know about the research that they have/are undertaking. Modern Languages focuses on French-as-a-second language teaching while FSJ on French immersion and French first language. Heaven forbid that they should impinge on each other's domains!

Aside from this, maintaining FSL and Augustana as separate faculties/campuses is a must. Not only does geography play into it, but culture does as well. I am most familiar with CSJ. FSJ is the only French language university west of Winnipeg. We also cannot forget the Centre Collegiale de l'Alberta which is also housed at CSJ. This institution offers college/diploma level programs for the French-speaking community.

By merging or relocating the campus, we will lose the ""immersive"" environment that is necessary for the students to be successful. We will be relying, hoping and praying that the administration of the day is supporter of the model and programming. This stress would negatively impact the 100 years of work that CSJ has done. The administrative team, instructional staff and students at CSJ should not have to worry about having funds diverted away from their program, promotions going to individuals that know nothing about CSJ or changes to their programs by someone who is more worried about saving money or efficiencies than they are about the quality and uniqueness of the programs.

The other major issue is that CSJ is the single largest educator of French-speaking teachers in Western Canada. There is a national shortage of French-speaking teachers which causes jurisdictions to beg, borrow and steal from others. French immersion in Western Canada is big! BC has the 2nd largest population of French immersion students in the country while Alberta is number 3. How do we continue to offer this valuable program to our K-12 students if we do not have a safe and secure source of graduates.

Prefer Option A - This is a logical amalgamation of faculties. Other schools have different program "faculties" all under a health science faculty and it seems to work very well. For example University of Guelph Human Health and Nutritional Sciences.

I like academic restructuring option C the best but also like option B. I am in the faculty of ALES which is a smaller faculty and I worry about ALES being overwhelmed by other faculties. Right now academic advising is very accessible which i am grateful for but I worry about this restructuring reducing this capacity.

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.

Having reviewed the various proposals on academic restructuring, I would like to submit unequivocal support for KSR's inclusion within a larger Faculty of Health Science. I do not believe that KSR would fit anywhere else but within a Health Science Faculty. KSR is exceptionally diverse, however through our own deliberations, only 2 years ago, regarding our name change (from Phys Ed and Rec to KSR) we explored major themes of research and teaching within the faculty. Overwhelmingly feedback indicated that we aligned with health or wellness, whether from a physiological (spanning clinical, applied or performance), mental or sociocultural perspective. Further, student groups heavily supported the name Kinesiology as it aligns with practitioners across a number of health and wellness disciplines.

I believe that documentation on the intensive consultation process that was undertaken during our Faculty name change would be critical for informing the realignment of our Faculty.

There seems to be a major gap in coordinating offices that provide services to both staff and students, since these functions are being split apart. Numerous offices have functions that rely on being centralized locations for all university community members and this does not seem to be reflected in the new VP organizational structure or SET plans.

I have been reading with dismay the proposal to move KSR to Social Sciences and Humanities, or Education. Over the last 5 years we have undergone significant consultation with our students (and Faculty) as we changed our name from Physical Education and Recreation to KSR. The students OVERWHELMINGLY indicated that they wanted to drop physical education and replace it with Kinesiology. As a Faculty member who is funded by SSHRC, I do not believe our Faculty aligns with either social sciences, humanities or education. Nearly every other

Kinesiology program in Canada (and the world) is based in Science or Health Sciences. I strongly suggest reviewing the comments of the students regarding their desire to be in Kinesiology prior to further considering a move away from Health Sciences.

I am not sure that I have a preference for a particular option (including all the additional alternative scenarios), but I **really** like these elements that I have seen: (1) a Community division – housing the Faculties of CSJ, Augustana, and Native Studies; (2) a Professional division – housing the Faculties of Business, Law, and Education; (3) a Medical and Health Sciences division – housing the Faculties of FoMD, Nursing, KSR, SPH, Rehab Med, and Pharmacy.

I am not entirely sure what to do with the remaining four Faculties: Arts, Science, ALES, and Engineering.

Perhaps a Natural and Applied Sciences division, housing the Faculties of Science, ALES, and Engineering. With the Faculty of Arts remaining as is.

Maybe an Arts and Science division, housing the Faculties of Arts, Science, and ALES (would that fit there?). With Engineering being housed under the Professional division.

Or maybe an Arts and Science division, housing the Faculties of Arts and Science, and an Applied Sciences division, housing the Faculties of Engineering and ALES. To me, these four faculties feel like they have less of a natural fit.

Scenario 13: Augustana enrolls well over 80% of its students in sciences, physical education, psychology and business/management. Therefore, it would be problematic to house Augustana under Humanities & Social Science. In fact, it would likely have a serious impact on the viability of the Augustana campus.

Scenario B works the best. It puts alike faculties together in a smart way and protects CSJ and Native Studies. I feel like it will also break up the toxic culture that's growing in the divisions between faculties. (Strong bias AGAINST C)

Don't put arts and science together. Their cultures just won't mesh well. Sure, you'll get there eventually but the turmoil created in the 5ish years in between will be detrimental to the student experience.

Consolidating the Health Sciences together feels smart.

And grouping engineering with ALES feels like an excellent choice in whatever model. Similar to arts and sciences there will be some tension but I think those faculties have somewhat complimentary cultures and could work together to really improve the campus' image locally and globally.

Congratulations on moving quickly in a complicated environment. That is essential.

Plan B gives the best opportunity for Dentistry to return to full faculty status. This is important for new accreditation requirements, historical value and aligning Dentistry with nearly all other dental schools in Canada and the USA.

U of A Faculty of Dentistry was one of the top schools in Canada when I graduated in 1968, and it has the capacity to regain that level of excellence as an independent faculty within the Health Sciences Division rather than a spinoff of the Faculty of Medicine.

I prefer Scenario B as it provides the opportunity for Dentistry to return to its original status as a 'Faculty' within the new Health Sciences Division. Dentistry has a strong academic profile on campus and returning to 'Faculty' status would return it to its former 'Faculty' status, enhance its ability to meet new accreditation standards and affirm its position as a leader among Canada's dental Faculties.

Scenario B makes the most sense and could potentially increase inter-department cooperative research. However, I believe the inclusion of Native studies should be considered within the Humanities and social sciences.

B is preferable. I repeat: This scenario accomplishes the objective of dentistry's re-assuming its historical status as a 'Faculty' and this indeed could be realised within the new Health Sciences Division. University of Alberta dentistry is well respected at the various levels of organised dentistry within Canada and globally and within the University itself both on and off-campus. Nobody had ever expected that University of Alberta dentistry would be interred within an administratively combined medicine and dentistry division when that event sadly happened. A renewed 'Faculty' status would bring back its former luster and well-being. In addition it would further its need to meet accreditation standards and affirm its position as a leader among Canada's dental Faculties.

I prefer Scenario B. Dentistry has lost status as a Professional Faculty when it was incorporated into a much larger and powerful Faculty. When our class graduated the Faculty of Dentistry was one of the top Faculties in Canada. It has lost its luster in the past years. Now would be a time to bring it back to a status as an individual Faculty so that it can again reach it's potential as a leader among Canada's Dental Faculties.

I have been a part of the academic restructuring at another institution. I was on the Provostorial committee tasked to propose the restructuring options. So, I can say a few things with some experience. Our objectives at my previous institution were driven by a clear three-fold purpose (within the institutional context): 1. Simplify and facilitate accreditation of Programs such as Engineering; 2. Consolidate health-related disciplines; 3. Create new Faculty shells as the University was thinking of bringing in new programs in Law and Medicine. Here at the U of A, I believe that the entire exercise is driven by one and only objective - how to save costs. However, once created, the scenarios are being justified using interdisciplinarity, size, identity and so on, which were not considered at the outset of developing the options. So, to me who is looking at it from a distance, the whole exercise seems a bit lopsided in terms of its purpose, objectives, and options. Perhaps we should develop the academic restructuring options based on clear objectives, derived from the U of A strategic plan and then do the costing.

Plan B offers foresight and enhances the future benefit for students and for society in general. As a student of Dentistry, when it was a stand alone Faculty, our class enjoyed beneficial size and the resultant comraderie. Our stand alone Faculty was recognized Canada wide as a leader.

Plan "B" provides the best scenario with the potential to allow the Dep't of Dentistry to return to its original status as a " Faculty "within the new Health Sciences Division which it deserves in that it is an integral and vital part of health services . This would greatly enhance its ability to satisfy and meet accreditation standards.

The need for autonomy with programs such as Medicine, Dentistry, Nursing and Pharmacy are critical. Not only is autonomy required for accreditation purposes, it is imperative to help maintain key external relationships. The needs between health professional programs are unique compared to other undergraduate science/arts programs. We also need to ensure that these programs are maintained as they serve an underserved population in our community. The School of Dentistry for example serves thousands of patients that would not otherwise be able to see a dentist, which builds in other societal costs if the School was negatively impacted.

Maintaining FoMD as is, without grouping it in with other health professions is critical for the ongoing success of this large program. If FoMD is grouped in with other programs, further damage to the medical and auxiliary health professional programs will likely occur. Do not let cuts from the UCP to the U of A compound the damage that is currently being done to our healthcare system.

Even if some administrative duties are spread between health care professional programs, a certain degree of autonomy needs to be maintained.

SET

Really well done, although the diagrams were abit confusing. I do agree with what was proposed here and I'm interested to see how this all looks when implemented.

The student experience at the University of Alberta stands to suffer greatly if student supports are not considered during the administrative restructuring process. Students need timely and personal attention to manage issues throughout their years on campus. Health (physical and mental), financial, accommodation and educational are a few of the supports that are required. Many of these need to be accessed in a timely fashion and in a location close to where the students are participating in learning activities. There are some activities that can likely be centralized however this cannot be the only way students can get the support required.

In order to streamline and thereby cut costs, the creation of Divisions as per the plan would seem like a good idea and certainly should be examined closely.

I like that model, but have a couple of concerns. The first one is around timeliness of services. Centralizing services does not necessarily streamline things. Should you have to turn something around in a timely fashion, but rely on centralized services, your turn around time is usually longer. Your request gets prioritized according to the criteria of the service provider not on the need of the requester.

Secondly, centralized services do not usually understand or appreciate the perspective of what is going on on the ground with the department or faculty. Staff who are centralized usually follow policy, protocol and procedures that are set-up at their level to streamline what they are doing. There are many things that can be managed this way, but a system needs to be put in place to support those that cannot.

An excellent example of all of this is how Alberta Health Services (AHS) centralized all of their human resources. They contracted a private company out of BC to deliver many of their services. When an employee has an issue, they have to go online to either send an email or fill out a form for assistance. This gets submitted and the employee then waits to receive a response. This wait can be a week or more in length. The contractor then makes a determination whether they can handle it or whether it needs to be forwarded to AHS Human Resources. This determination is made based on agreed upon conditions and criteria. If appropriate, the referral is then forwarded back to the HR office in Edmonton who would then reach out to the employee if applicable. Quite often responses are received from a generic email address which does not accept responses or replies. The cycle then continues. This does not necessarily mean a savings

of money as the more inquiries for service that are received the more the contractor or department can demand for payment.

Instead of centralizing all of the services, why not train staff, place them within each faculty or department, but have them work for the centralized service department. This type of model is used by both Campus Saint-Jean and Augustana in regards to admissions.

I agree that there are many duplications of service across the university that can be cut or addressed. The key point is that all departments and faculties must be REALLY involved in determining the final decision. There is always the exception to the rule and those exceptions must be addressed.

Thank you for sharing today how the administrative restructuring will affect the structure of the portfolios. I have several questions (in no particular order):

(1) If the AVP (IST) now reports to the VP (USF), does this mean the whole unit of IST will be transferred to the University Services & Finance portfolio? (This was not explicitly mentioned, though it would fit there being a university service). Or does the unit continue to reside within VP Academic, just the direct report of the VP (IST) changes?

(2) What is happening with FGSR – will it become a unit under VP Academic (on par with the Office of the Registrar)?

(3) I am really confused with the comma placement in ""Performance, Analytics and Institutional Research"" – what does ""performance"" mean in this context? Or do you mean ""performance analytics"" (which would make much more sense), and therefore should be ""Performance Analytics and Institutional Research"" (i.e. with NO comma).

(4) If the U of A Botanical Gardens is moving out of ALES and into VPFO, is something similar happening with the sporting facility services and KRS?

(5) If HR and Finance services will be largely conducted at the central level, with supports placed at the divisional or faculty level, what does this mean for the departments? Do professors no longer have a say in who gets hired for a research project? Are they able to hire (graduate) students for a short-term or casual placement or will it always have to be a GA-ship? Will departments no longer have an operating budget? I feel like more clarity needs to be made with regard to how these changes will affect these services at the department-level.

I am concerned that in all of the process of discussing options for cost savings that the salaries of the highest paid members of our community have never been a part of the conversation. There has never been discussion of putting a cap on how much any particular employees can make, restricting how much a faculty member can make after leaving an administrative position (such as a professor who previously was on an increased salary during their work as a dean), or even

disclosing how much anyone at University of Alberta makes. There have been charts laying out how many positions are planned to be eliminated, but never a discussion of how much each of those positions currently make. I suspect that many people who hold our faculties together will lose their jobs, the student experience compromised, and professors who were once the dean of a faculty will continue bringing in large salaries. This is not a happy prospect and morale has been low as a result. Faculty members have had higher work loads with lay offs happening and yet they feel less and less secure in their jobs, while graduate students are picking up more and more small contracts (I, a PhD student, am currently working 4 small RA/TA contracts), and students who are not academically employed are facing the degradation of services as a result of instructor burnout and this will only get worse with fewer administrative supports.

I would like to see greater transparency around how contracts are negotiated for administrative positions and some justification for the number of positions that will be cut. I cannot currently see how changing the academic structure of the University of Alberta will realistically save our institution money when there is no discussion of controlling salary of those who are highest paid at our institution. Sure, having fewer deans would mean fewer dean-sized salaries, but will there be controls in place to ensure that those who step down from acting as dean will not continue to make that much?

Suggestions for Alternative Academic Restructuring Scenarios

Please review the [Alternative Restructuring Proposals from the Community report](#).