



**Committee on Planning & Budget**

January 23, 2015

To: Jose Wudka  
Chair, Riverside Division Academic Senate

Fr: Kenneth Barish   
Chair, Committee on Planning and Budget

**Re: College Realignment Proposal**

The Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) submits a vote of +10-1-0 to continue discussion and potentially formal review of a proposal to realign and merge the College of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences with the College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences. The discussion within CPB was spirited and the support for the rough draft submitted by PEVC D'Anieri was limited. The vote, therefore, is in no way an endorsement of this specific proposal. However, the committee supports continued discussions of a college merger, and this is the context in which the vote should be interpreted. While there were varied opinions and objections, it was evident that there may be support for a proposal that would grant budgetary authority and autonomy to Deans of the Division in a combined CNAS/CHASS College. It was not evident that a plan without this change could garner a majority of support. Below is a summary of the major discussion items:

**Undergraduate Education.** There was overall agreement that a combined CNAS/CHASS college could be an overall benefit to undergraduate students. In particular, the current structure can lead to unnecessary complications for students, students who wish to transfer between colleges can fall through the cracks, and undergraduate advising is non-uniform. These issues would likely be improved in a merged college. While there was strong agreement in this regard, it was also noted that there are alternate solutions to these problems.

**Graduate Education.** It was not felt there would be a significant effect on graduate education. There are few current cross-college programs which a merge would potentially benefit, and perhaps additional programs between colleges would be facilitated.

**CNAS.** There was sentiment that there are currently issues with the structure of CNAS. In particular, it was recognized that there is a cultural divide between IR and OR departments. It was noted that Option A, the formation of a School of Agriculture, would

largely address this issue. However, there was also some objection as there is a wide range of research being conducted in OR departments. In addition, there are other issues within CNAS that would be addressed.

**CHASS.** It was noted that there are no evident advantages to CHASS faculty mentioned in the proposal. It was discussed that there are structural issues within CHASS, however, these issues would not be addressed in a college merger.

**Dean and Associate Deans.** There was recognition that pushing decisions down to a Dean's level and allowing faculty to have more direct access to associate deans could be a benefit. However, there is also discomfort with creating an all-powerful Dean. There is also concern that the appointment of this Dean would lead to divisiveness within the College.

CPB supports taking stock of the current structure and exploring if it could be improved. This is even more important when we consider our aspirational growth goals. We note that the current structure was established when we were at a fraction of our current size and there have been complaints from some quarters that the current structure has been constraining.

CPB discussed an alternate system similar to UCLA, where they have Deans of the Division who have autonomy and budget authority. In UCLA's structure, one of the Divisional Deans serves as overall Dean. This would address many of the concerns raised above, while retaining the advance to undergraduate students. If the conversation is to continue, CPB strongly recommends that this structure be considered.

If a formal review were to be undertaken, the Committee expects there to be significant faculty input into the proposal submitted for Systemwide and Divisional endorsement as well as a cogent rationale for embarking on the effort. The proposal should also address the many differences between CHASS and CNAS which will need to be resolved should a merger move forward.

The dissenting voter felt that there is no reason to justify a merge and doing so would likely be at the detriment of both CHASS and CNAS.