

**Survey on Academic Affairs Restructure  
February 2013**

Note: Some responses addressed multiple themes; each theme was counted separately. There is judgment involved in deciding how to categorize the responses. Not all responses are represented in the tables, only those with the greatest frequency. Response categories are listed in descending order of frequency.

Total respondents for the survey: Faculty (F) = 97; Staff (S) = 28

**Question 1:** Please list up to three positive results that have come from the restructure of Academic Affairs since Fall 2011.

Respondents for this question: Faculty = 89; Staff = 23

No positive outcomes	(F) 29 (S) 3
COAS too large; Redistributed into 2+ colleges	(F) 18 (S) 3
New leaders	(F) 14 (S) 0
Opportunities with new colleagues/collaboration	(F) 10 (S) 3
New identity/vision/governance	(F) 9 (S) 2
Left blank	(F) 3 (S) 3
Better use of resources, clearer budget	(F) 5 (S) 0

**Summary**

The most common responses to the request for positives were “None,” “Can’t think of any,” etc. Across colleges, there was some agreement that COAS was too big and needed some sort of division. New structures for sharing interests and vision were also appreciated. Some CHABSS and CSM responses noted benefits resulting from a more focused college, and some CEHHS responses noted the potential for collaboration with new colleagues across disciplinary lines. However, many responses were quite negative, even though the question asked for positives. When compared to the responses for “Negative Results” and “Process,” the responses were relatively short in length.

**Question 2:** Please list up to three problems that have come from the restructure of Academic Affairs since Fall 2011. If you have suggestions for remedies, please include these in your response.

Respondents for this question: Faculty = 83; Staff = 26

	Total
Increases in cost of administration with little or no tangible benefits seen by faculty and staff; No benefit seen for students	(F) 33 (S) 3
Lack of or Poor Leadership in some colleges; No sense of shared governance; No effort to build collegiality/ synergy; No attention to administrative needs while micromanaging departmental decisions at the same time	(F) 29 (S) 3
CEHHS is not a cohesive college; Departments do not share similarities as in other colleges; Groups within the college or from the colleges are being pitted against one another	(F) 20 (S) 0
Separation between colleges has grown and collaboration is now difficult	(F) 17 (S) 0
Blame or perception that problems are a result of behavior of colleagues or resources being given to other programs/colleges	(F) 15 (S) 1
None; I don't know; Unsure; N/A	(F) 6 (S) 8
Workloads have increased or are now distributed in any uneven manner as a result of the restructure; Need desk audits for staff	(F) 8 (S) 3
Faculty are demoralized, retiring, disengaging, and even getting sick or leaving due to problems from the restructure	(F) 9 (S) 2
Left blank	(F) 8 (S) 1

### Summary

The most common responses to the request for negatives were that significantly more money is being spent on administration while no tangible benefits and many tangible negatives are seen. There was a sense that even the benefits that should have resulted are not being seen because of new leadership in some of the colleges. Faculty from across all colleges felt that the grouping of programs in CEHHS was not cohesive. It was a common comment that collaboration is more difficult as a result of the restructure. Other negatives that were not as common, but with responses across colleges, were that both faculty and staff workloads have increased as a direct result of the restructure and that faculty are demoralized. It is interesting that the Library and COBA faculty did not notice many negative impacts on them directly, but they did note that faculty from other colleges were more demoralized than they had seen them before.

**Question 3:** Please comment on the process used to design the restructuring during AY 2010/11, including positives, negatives, and suggestions for improvement. (Your feedback on the process can help guide a possible renewed attempt by the Academic Senate to develop policy/procedures for Academic Affairs restructuring.)

Respondents for this question: Faculty = 69; Staff = 10

	Totals
Process was top down, a done deal, and forced on the campus	(F) 35 (S) 2
Feedback was sought and then ignored; There was no real interest in the feedback given	(F) 26 (S) 1
Left blank	(F) 17 (S) 7
Lack of shared governance for the process	(F) 15 (S) 0
Don't know; N/A; No opinion; No comment	(F) 4 (S) 9
Faculty voice needed more voice and weight	(F) 8 (S) 2
There was no campus policy for conducting a restructure	(F) 8 (S) 1
Lack of transparency	(F) 4 (S) 0
Process was fine	(F) 2 (S) 1

### Summary

Overwhelmingly, faculty respondents felt disenfranchised by the process used in AY 10-11 to restructure Academic Affairs. A large majority of respondents think the process was top down, bypassed shared governance, and ignored feedback. Several respondents (mostly outside of the most-affected colleges) responded that they had no opinion or did not know enough about the process to comment. Two faculty members and one staff member thought that the process worked well.