

RESTRUCTURING TASK FORCE – PROGRAM GROUP IDENTIFICATION

Draft minutes of the meeting of March 5, 2004

Prepared by Lynn Rosenthal

1. The meeting was called to order at 2:30 in T115/713. Members present: Aletha Baumann, Eustace Esdaille, , Adam Parr, Lynn Rosenthal, Gwen Moolenar, Lorna Young-Wright, Denis Griffith, Joan Marsh, Debora Fontaine. (Solomon Kabuka had to be off island and Bob Stolz continues to have a conflicting commitment at this time.)

1. The minutes of February 27, 2004 were approved.

2. The meeting was largely devoted to review of program group proposals. In the course of discussing particular programs various issues were addressed with applicability beyond that single program. I report these here as generalities rather than confining these matters to a particular programmatic context.

- a) The effectiveness and efficiency of alternative structures are highly dependent on the specifics of the responsibilities of leaders at all levels – Deans, Heads, Coordinators. All groups were encouraged to bring forward any documentation of existing responsibilities in their areas and to include definitions of responsibilities for positions in proposals.
- b) The ramifications of the restructuring in operational terms are wide ranging. Care must be taken to insure that new policies are developed where necessary, that realistic implementation timeframes are established, that the details of new responsibilities and the implied workload for discharging those responsibilities are thoroughly examined and addressed.
- c) It was noted that there are alternatives to the ways we manage ourselves and the assumptions behind those approaches. Peer and team evaluation processes were described. The use of special interest teams as an alternative to formal roles of coordination was discussed. Members are encouraged to consider new approaches and to communicate new ideas to their colleagues.
- d) The implications of centralizing administrative support personnel were discussed, both with respect to possible efficiencies and to the fact that assistants are presently custodians of critical records and critical knowledge and skills needed to make UVI processes actually work. The issue is outside of the scope of the program group team but will require careful analysis.
- e) The importance of a dialog and collaboration among faculty on both campuses was noted, as well as problems in achieving such communications and cooperative development. All members were encouraged to continue to seek joint development of proposals.

Program group review:

- a) Proposals have been submitted in Mathematics and in Computing Sciences, but the Division of Science and Mathematics in general is still debating possible

- merger of basic groups. Discussions about the possibility that the chemists would fit well in a biology program group, that physics faculty interests might be compatible with those of mathematicians, and the effectiveness of smaller vs larger groups in general are ongoing. Faculty might end up favoring anywhere from two to four program groups. It was reported that the Divisional Chairs have been asked to facilitate timely resolution of these issues. The existing and possible proposals from programs in science and mathematics can be expected to remain within the planning framework of unification across the campuses with a single layer of management between the faculty and the Dean, with the exception of math skills coordination and lab management as previously noted.
- b) The proposal from Business Administration was welcomed as a well documented exposition of development directions in that discipline. The heavy management burden implied by large enrollments in the programs was recognized. Since creation of a separate School is beyond the present planning framework, Business Administration was asked to consider interim approaches through increased release for the Department Head and some coordination support for well defined and documented responsibilities.
 - c) The proposal from the Department of Education falls within the general planning framework of cross campus integration. The necessity for local supervision of some programmatic operations was recognized as not unreasonable. The (visiting) representative from Education acknowledged that in some areas such as the graduate programs additional release for the Department Head might be as effective as separate release for a coordinator.
 - d) The proposal from the Humanities which includes four program groups falls within the general planning framework of cross campus integration although not all programs are presently available on both campuses, and, with the exception of skills in the English group, with a single layer of leadership between the faculty and the Dean. It was suggested that faculty might also consider new approaches to management responsibilities as noted above.
 - e) A proposal in Social Science has not yet been received. Factors which have lead to confusion were identified and the team member from that discipline noted that she is not yet in a position to communicate and confirm a consensus proposal. Discussion and development will be ongoing.
 - f) The proposal from Nursing defines only one layer of management between the faculty and the Dean but has separate leadership for the A.S. and B.S. programs on the two campuses. The Nursing representative was asked to get feedback from the faculty on an approach with a single leadership position.

3. Identification of Schools

- a) Discussions revealed that some faculty concerns would be addressed if the name of a school included explicit identification of each of the disciplines, e.g. a "School of Business Administration, Education and Nursing"
- b) Asked for preliminary indication of where their disciplines might "feel comfortable" the Social Science representative indicated inclusion with science disciplines might fit and the Nursing representative indicated that inclusion with

business and education professions might fit, given identification of composition of the school to avoid loss of identify for the Nursing program.

4. Timelines

Progress with program group identification was recognized but it is important to complete the work soon so that other teams can progress and overall timelines be met. Allowing for Spring break the next meeting will be March 19, 2004.