January 11, 2010

TO:   Kathleen Montgomery, Vice Chair, AGSM  
      Dan Ozer, Secretary Parliamentarian, Psychology  
      Richard Arnott, Economics  
      Steve Axelrod, English  
      Jay Farrell, Electrical Engineering  
      Christine Gailey, Women's studies  
      John Ganim, English  
      George Haggerty, English  
      Dan Hare, Entomology  
      David Herzberger, Hispanic Studies  
      Carol Lovatt, Botany and Plant Sciences  
      Manuela Martins-Green, Cell Biology and Neuroscience  
      Doug Mitchell, GSOE  
      Len Mueller, Chemistry  
      Vivian-Lee Nyitray, Religious studies  
      Erik Rolland, AGSM  
      John Trumble, Entomology  
      Ameae Walker, Biomedical Sciences  
      Albert Wang, Electrical Engineering  
      Alan Williams, Earth Sciences  
      Jose Wudka, Physics  
      Marylynn Yates, Environmental Sciences

FR:   Tony Norman, Chair  
      Riverside Division

RE:    Executive Council Agenda, January 11, 2010

This is to confirm the meeting of the Executive Council on Monday, January 11, 2010 at 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m. in Room 145 University Office Building.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Enclosures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action/Information</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong> pp. 1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:10 – 1:15</td>
<td>I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approval of the January 10, 2010 Agenda and December 14, 2009 Meeting Notes.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong> pp. 6-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:15 – 1:45</td>
<td>II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Photo Roster for Students</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion and Action item- VPUE Fairris and Tom Payne will appraise the EC on the idea and seek approval for implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:45 – 2:00</td>
<td>III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposal to Divide Finance and Management Science into 2 Departments</strong> – Action item – see attached responses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 – 2:10</td>
<td>IV.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Update on Resolutions -</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Ozer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:10 – 2:40</td>
<td>V.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exit Survey</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results and next step – Martin Johnson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:40 – 3:00</td>
<td>VI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Any Other Business</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXECUTIVE COUNCIL MEETING
MINUTES
DECEMBER 14, 2009

PRESENT:
Anthony Norman, Chair
Mary Gauvain, Ag. Vice Chair, Psychology
Kathleen Montgomery, AGSM (Vice Chair)
Dan Ozer, Secretary Parliamentarian, Psychology
Jay Farrell, Electrical Engineering, BSOE Executive Committee
John Ganim, English, Preparatory Education
Dan Hare, Entomology, Faculty Welfare
Carol Lovatt, Botany and Plant Sciences, Planning and Budget
Manuela Martins-Green, Cell Biology and Neuroscience, Sr. Rep to the Assembly
Ameae Walker, Biomedical Sciences Executive Committee
Jose Wudka, Physics, Educational Policy
Marylynn Yates, Environmental Sciences, CNAS Executive Committee

ABSENT:
Richard Arnott, Economics, Research
Steven Axelrod, English (Preparatory Education)
Christine Gailey, Women's studies, Committees
George Haggerty, English, Gen Ed Advisory Committee
David Herzberger, Hispanic Studies, CHASS Executive Committee
Vivian Nyitray, Religious studies, Undergraduate Admissions
Doug Mitchell, GSOE Executive Committee
Len Mueller, Chemistry, Academic Computing
Erik Rolland, AGSM Executive Committee
John Trumble, Entomology, CAP
Albert Wang, Electrical Engineering, Junior Rep to the Assembly
Alan Williams, Earth Sciences, Graduate Council

GUESTS:
Christian Shelton, BCOE
Theda Shapiro, Chair, Courses

Chair Norman opened the meeting by thanking Prof. Mary Gauvain for accepting to be the
Vice Chair for Fall quarter while Prof. Montgomery was in Australia.

CONSENT CALENDAR:
The agenda and the minutes were accepted as written.

PHOTO ROSTER FOR STUDENTS:
Due to illness, VPUE Dave Fairris was unable to attend the meeting. This issue was tabled
until the next meeting.
SUSTAINABILITY PLAN FOR LEARNING OUTCOMES AT UCR

The main issue for discussion was how to deal with learning outcomes and to figure out both short and long term processes. In principal, responsibility would fall under the umbrella of Educational Policy (CEP) but members of CEP were concerned with workload issues. VPUE Dave Fairris proposed creating a Faculty Advisory Committee on Learning Outcomes Assessment to be chaired by Dean Steve Bossert. The Committee would include faculty members from each of the disciplinary areas of the campus, as well as members from CEP. Chair Norman indicated that he thought it would work out better if it was a joint administrative/Academic Senate committee and that it was not a very good idea to have this be an administrative committee.

Prof. Jose Wudka, Chair of CEP indicated that he had originally talked to Chair Norman about putting together a committee like what is currently being discussed to deal with learning outcomes, but then found out that Dave Fairris had gone ahead and set up this other committee and thanks to Chair Norman, CEP was added to the committee. He indicated that there are several steps to this processes and part of it is teaching departments how to do this. There is also the actual collecting of data and the assimilation of the data, and one of the things that have to be done is using the results to improve our programs. The 2/3 departments that have established learning outcomes are under pressure because of the ongoing obligations to the WASC process. In Dr. Wudka’s opinion, there were too many learning outcomes and which will require enormous effort to try and measure them all. One of the roles of the committee is to tell departments whether they are on the right road. What is even more complicated is being able to determine whether the departments chose correct learning outcomes. CEP does not have the expertise to do this and they did not want to be seen as learning outcomes ‘policemen’. The only way that CEP felt they could do this was through the undergraduate review process where one of the external members would be asked to review the learning outcomes. However, this happens only every seven years and right now that would not be appropriate.

A member of EC wondered if the Committee should not include nominees from each of the College Executive Committees. There were concerns that it will be difficult to get people to serve on it. Chair Norman reminded the EC that the WASC review process will not go away. We need to have in place a structured way of implementing learning outcomes. We need to document the feedback loop and record the data and actions based on that data recorded. EC members felt that Senate representation should draw on the expertise that already exists. However, there was a need for the committee to have strong administrative support. In the end, it was agreed that Chair Norman and Prof. Wudka would continue to interact for the next couple of meetings with the Faculty Advisory Committee on Learning Outcomes Assessment and also talk with Dave Fairris and report to the EC from time to time.

COURSE ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT – NEW FUNCTIONALITY FOR POPULATION RESTRICTION:

Chair Norman indicated that UCR had a crisis in the past 10 days due to the fact that a significant number of our undergraduates could not find enough classes to enroll for in the winter quarter. At the same time, the Registrar had written to the Senate requesting that the Senate review and determine the required oversight process/policy for enrollment.
restriction to be placed on courses. Of importance was that this was a problem that sooner or later will affect all departments.

Many members felt that there was really no good solution to the problem. Graduate Council felt that a steering committee should be formed whose charge would include among others, looking for unintended consequences of implementing restrictions to enrollments. EC also agreed on the following:

1. Appoint a Senate Administrative Enrollment Management Committee to examine these problems that are emerging in an attempt to stop them before they happen
2. The Committee on Courses should also review their courses and see which other department would be impacted and rule on these courses.
3. Executive Committees need to talk to each other to deal with the lower division course issues.

In the end, the EC members agreed that the joint Senate/Administrative Committee could be viewed as a postmortem committee that would work with Dave Fairris’ office to get ready for the next enrollment crises. Chair Norman also thought that as part of the Enrollment Committee, he would initiate a meeting of all the Chairs of the Executive Committees.

PROPOSAL TO DIVIDE FINANCE AND MANAGEMENT INTO TWO DEPTS:
After a lengthy discussion, the EC tabled this proposal in order to give the AGSM representative an opportunity to respond to issues that were raised.

ANY OTHER BUSINESS:
Chair Norman gave an update on the Climate Survey and indicated that as of approximately December 12, 2009, 45% of the faculty had responded. The current agreement is that the Survey Center will provide a summary of the climate survey to the Senate by end of January.

Regarding the five resolutions that were introduced at the December 1 meeting, Chair Norman indicated that he was seeking the advice of the Executive Council on how to proceed. He inquired if the EC felt that he should convene a special meeting or whether they should let the resolutions be dealt with via ballot process. Most EC members felt that there was no need for a special meeting and that the ballot process would suffice.

Meeting adjourned at 2:50 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Sellyna Ehlers
Executive Director
Academic Senate
November 6, 2009

Professor Anthony Norman
Chair, UCR Academic Senate

Re: Proposal to Split Department of Finance and Management Science

Dear Tony:

As you are aware based upon recent correspondence from Professor Eric Rolland, Dean Stewart and Chair Smith favor creation of a new Department of Operations and Supply Chain Management that would be split-off from the existing Department of Finance and Management. The AGSM/SoBA Executive Committee also supports this proposal.

Consistent with University policy, I am forwarding this proposal to the Academic Senate for a recommendation. Supporting documentation from the Dean, department chair and executive committee are enclosed. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Dallas Rabenstein
Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost

cc: Dean Stewart
Chair Smith
Professor Rolland
Executive Director Ehlers
MEMORANDUM

DATE: October 30, 2009

TO: Dallas Rabenstein, EVC and Provost

FROM: David W. Stewart, Dean

SUBJECT: Division of Department of Finance and Management Science Into Department of Finance and Department of Operations and Supply Chain Management

The Faculty of the Department of Finance and Management Science have requested that the department be divided into two departments, the Department of Finance and the Department of Operations and Supply Chain Management. I believe this a reasonable request that is consistent with the way in which most other business schools are organized and with the strategic plan of the School of Business Administration.

The current department structure is highly unusual and appears to have represented an organization of convenience at the time of its creation. The current department structure appears to reflect needs to manage personalities among faculty members at the time the department was created rather than programmatic or strategic objectives. There are few synergies between discipline of finance and the disciplines of operations and supply chain management. Indeed, the disciplines of operations and supply chain management have more in common with other business disciplines such as accounting and marketing than with finance.

This division of the department will produce two departments that are not only very similar to departments found in other departmentalized schools of business but that are also more closely aligned with the strategic plan of the School. In late 2008 the Faculty of the School of Business Administration unanimously approved a strategic plan that identified five specific “spires of excellence.” Two of these spires are empirical finance and supply chain management. The Faculty would like to align our administrative and organizational structure with these spires. This reorganization also has advantages in dealing with external constituencies such as employers, potential donors and corporate partners because it cleanly separates two business disciplines that have very different constituencies, even within the same business organization.

This reorganization will result in a Department of Finance with seven ladder faculty members plus a research active emeritus faculty member. The School also has a fully endowed chair in finance that we plan to fill with a distinguished senior faculty member. The Department of Operations and Supply Chain Management would initially be composed of four faculty members, including three
full professors. However, this is also an area where the School has lost faculty members in recent years and that we anticipate building over time. We also anticipate that some other members of the current faculty, notably those in information systems, may wish to migrate to this department. The School currently has 15.58 unfilled faculty FTE, so once the current budget crisis ends there is ample opportunity to add to the faculty of both departments.

The cost of this division is minimal. The School of Business Administration currently uses a central business unit model for supporting departments and faculty members. This means that no staff members are assigned to individual departments.

The chair of the current department is in finance and would remain in the role of chair of the new Department of Finance. We have also identified a senior member of the operations and supply chain management faculty who is willing to take on the role of chair of the new Operations and Supply Chain Management Department.

There is agreement among the faculty within the School, including departments that are unaffected by this change, that this division of departments is in the best interests of the School and is consistent with our recently adopted strategic plan. The Executive Committee of the School has unanimously endorsed this proposal. As Dean of the School I see this change in departmental structure as critical to our continuing efforts to create a school of business administration of the highest quality.

Please let me know if you have questions or need further information. I would appreciate an expeditious decision.

David W. Stewart, Ph.D.
Dean, School of Business Administration and
The A. Gary Anderson Graduate School of Management
Anderson Hall 122
University of California, Riverside
Riverside, CA 92521

gsmdean@ucr.edu
http://agsm.ucr.edu/
Date: November 16, 2009

TO: David Stewart
    Dean, School of Business Administration

FROM: Erik Rolland
    Chair, Executive Committee
    School of Business Administration

RE: Recommendation for the creation of a new department

During the 2008-2009 academic year a group of faculty within the School of Business Administration (SoBA) met to discuss the possible formation of a department focused around the academic field of Operations Management. With several new hires, both at the senior and junior levels, the faculty felt that the group was sufficiently large to warrant its own department. Further, this group is currently in a department joint with Finance, which in itself is an unusual constellation. In most business schools, Operations Management is its own department, possibly joint with information systems. Thus, the (single) information systems faculty was included in the proposed SoBA department as well. The formation of such a department is in line with the school’s strategic plans, as one of the focus areas of the School of Business Administration is Supply Chain Management -- one of the main components of Operations Management.

After submitting the proposal for the new department to the dean, the proposal was discussed within the three current departments. In the Finance department, one faculty member opposed the proposal on grounds of lack of critical mass of faculty and students. In the Accounting & Information Systems (AIS) department, the proposal was supported, albeit the department wanted to retain the information systems group (1 faculty member) within AIS. This modification of the new department proposal was grounded in the development of both new academic programs, as well as joint research programs, where information systems was for the time being better aligned with the AIS department. Finally, the Department of Marketing and Management supported the formation of a new department as well.

After the above faculty consultation, the proposal was submitted to the Executive Committee. During its October 27 meeting of the Fall Quarter 2009, the Executive Committee of the School of Business Administration voted all in favor of creating a new Department of Operations & Supply Chain Management. The committee expressed that the creation of this department further strengthens the school with respect to its spires of excellence.
Date: October 27, 2009

TO: Tony Norman
    Chair, Riverside Division

FROM: Erik Rolland
    Chair, Executive Committee
    AGSM/SoBA

RE: Division of the Department of Finance and Management Science

During its October 27 meeting of the Fall Quarter 2009, the Executive Committee of the A. Gary Anderson Graduate School of Management/School of Business Administration voted all in favor of creating a new Department of Operations & Supply Chain Management within AGSM/SoBA. The creation of this department further strengthens the school with respect to its spires of excellence.
May 22, 2009

To:         David Stewart, Dean  
            Anderson Graduate School of Management

From:       Richard Smith, Chair  
            Department of Finance and Management Science

Bifurcation of Department

You recently indicated that members of the management science faculty within the Department had indicated to you their interest in forming a separate department. I have raised this issue with the finance members of the Department and have found that with one exception the finance faculty are in agreement that bifurcation would result in a more effective structure (one junior member has indicated no preference). The majority are clearly in favor of bifurcation.

An over-riding consideration for me and others is that there are few if any synergies between the two parts of the Department. When I joined UCR, I thought there might be an opportunity to create departmental synergy around a curriculum designed to meet the needs of students interested in financial engineering. While I tried to encourage some collaboration around this opportunity, in my experience, the success of such efforts depends on there being champions for the initiative from both disciplines. Unfortunately, there is no such champion among the MS faculty, and, if anything the strategic focus of the school on supply chain management, tends to discourage collaboration around financial engineering.

Department member from MS, in general, have been good citizens in the finance recruiting efforts this year, as they often attended the candidate seminars and were available to meet with candidates. However, I believe the new collaborative effort across all AGSM departments which is to include within-school outside members on search committees will be a more effective way of ensuring that school-wide concerns are appropriately weighted in department-level hiring recommendations.

Moreover, in some important respects, the two groups in the department have not worked well together. Illustrative of the problems and reflective of the view held by several finance faculty members, one member of the faculty indicated:

I am strongly in favor of the split.

As you have observed, there is no synergy in research and teaching between the SCM/MS faculty and the finance faculty. [During my tenure at UCR], I have not seen a single collaborative research or teaching effort between [the longer term management science faculty] and the finance faculty.
Also, we do not quite understand the expected productivity, research outlets, and market condition of each other. Yet, there have been several occasions where the MS faculty basically decided (or attempted to decide) hiring and merit/promotions of finance faculty. Note that some of MS faculty cast votes even without meeting the job candidates or attending their seminars.

Splitting the department would solve this problem...

The faculty member who is not in favor of bifurcation sees no benefits and indicates that:

1. The intellectual balance that currently exists in the department will be destroyed
2. The decency balance in the department will also be destroyed

This view is in sharp conflict with the views of those who favor bifurcation.

My own view, as chair, is that even on simple matters the MS group seeks to act with almost complete autonomy. For example, on the simple matter of preparing a paragraph of text that could be placed on the Department website to help steer users into a set of pages related to MS, which paragraph needed to parallel a similar paragraph on finance, the MS group met a couple of times and after two or three weeks returned a multi-page discussion that was not usable. It took several more meetings and two or three more iterations before they finally produced a draft that could be used. This difficulty in working with them on the website has essentially stalled our efforts to develop the site.

Problems related to course staffing in the Department are exacerbated because two members of the MS faculty are program deans and see a diminished role of the Department in setting the curriculum and staffing the courses. I largely agree with them that they need to take the lead in this effort, as they know better than I what needs to be offered in the SCM/MS area, but under the current structure this has resulted in a number of miscommunications and convoluted communications with staff. Bifurcation would solve this problem.

There are other issues related to how the Department has functioned. Some of them are symptomatic of the personalities involved. I have tried not to focus on those issues, and instead to concentrated here on problems that are more of a structural nature that would likely exist no matter who the individuals might be.
November 6, 2009

November 9, 2009,

TO: JOSE WUDKA, CHAIR EDUCATIONAL POLICY
CAROL LOVATT, CHAIR, PLANNING AND BUDGET
ALAN WILLIAMS, CHAIR GRADUATE COUNCIL
JOHN TRUMBLE CHAIR COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL
VIVIAN-LEE NYITRAY, CHAIR, UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS
DAN HARE, CHAIR, FACULTY WELFARE
RICHARD ARNOTT, CHAIR, RESEARCH
JOHN BAEZ, CHAIR, LIBRARY

FM: ANTHONY W. NORMAN, CHAIR
RIVERSIDE DIVISION

RE: PROPOSAL TO DIVIDE FINANCE AND MANAGEMENT SCIENCE INTO TWO DEPARTMENTS.

Attached, please find a proposal to divide the Department of Finance and Management into two departments.

I would appreciate receiving your response by November 30, 2009.

Attachments
ESTABLISHMENT OF A NEW DEPARTMENT

III.A. Departments
Actions involving departments are carried out on the nine established campuses. That is, creating a new department, changing the name of an existing department, and consolidating, transferring, or disestablishing an existing department are campus decisions for which there is no systemwide review. If favorably reviewed by the relevant divisional Academic Senate committee(s) and approved by the campus administration, a proposed action involving a department is implemented. Any proposed coordinated actions involving undergraduate or graduate degree programs associated with affected department(s) should be handled according to the procedures described for the proposed action for either undergraduate or graduate degree programs.

All final campus actions involving departments should be reported to systemwide offices in a month report to the Coordinator - Program Review, copied to the Director Academic Planning and Program Review and to the Records Manager, Information Resources and Communications. E-mail use is encouraged.

PROCEDURES FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF NEW ADMINISTRATIVE UNITS SUCH AS DEPARTMENTS

1. A group of faculty submits a proposal for the establishment of a new administrative unit (i.e. department) to the Dean.

2. The Dean seeks advice/recommendations of the executive Committee of the college or school, (and where appropriate, departments or other unit chairs). Chairs would consult with faculty in their departments.

3. The Dean forwards the proposal to the Executive Vice Chancellor with a recommendation and supporting documentation along with the advice of the Executive Committee (and departments).

4. The EVCP submits the proposal to the Academic Senate for a recommendation.

5. The Senate seeks the advice of standing committees: Planning and Budget, Educational Policy, Graduate Council, Academic Personnel, Undergraduate Council, Faculty Welfare, Research, Library, etc where appropriate. Recommendations of the appropriate Senate committees go to the Advisory Committee and are then submitted by the Advisory Committee to the Division for a formal recommendation by vote.

6. The Campus decision is forwarded to the Office of the President.
At its November 17, 2009 meeting, the Research Committee discussed the Proposal to Divide Finance and Management Science into Two Departments. The Committee on Research found no significant research implications and therefore had no basis for objection to the proposal.
November 18, 2009

To: Anthony W. Norman  
Chair, Riverside Division Academic Senate

Fr: John Trumble  
Chair, Committee on Academic Personnel

Re: Proposal to Divide Finance and Management Science into two Departments

CAP has no objects to the proposal to divide the Department of Finance and Management Science and form a new Department of Operations and Supply Chain Management (+9-0-0-0).
TO: ANTHONY W. NORMAN, CHAIR
RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FM: DANIEL HARE, CHAIR
FACULTY WELFARE COMMITTEE

RE: PROPOSAL TO DIVIDE FINANCE AND MANAGEMENT SCIENCE INTO TWO DEPARTMENTS

Procedures for the establishment of a new department call for the recommendation of a number of committees of the Academic Senate, including a recommendation from the Committee on Faculty Welfare. The Committee received the proposal to split the AGSM Department of Finance and Management Science into two departments on November 7, 2009 and discussed it by e-mail over the next two weeks. Whereas the proposal is formally complete, the justification lacked detail, and a substantial number of committee members were skeptical that the proposed action was driven by programmatic interests.

Others on the committee were concerned with the size of the new departments and their effectiveness in the merit and promotion process. Personal issues should play no role in evaluating a candidate’s file, but such issues often creep into the review of files in small departments where candidates can easily infer how their colleagues may have voted. The Committee perceives this as being a serious concern for the smaller department that will have only three full professors to vote on each other’s files. Although AGSM hopes to rectify this with future hires, it is unlikely that additional faculty positions can be allocated in the foreseeable future.

On balance, the Committee found the justification for the proposed action to be unconvincing and questioned the impact of the proposed action on the welfare of faculty participating in the merit and promotion process in the new departments.
At its meeting of Thursday, November 12, 2009, the Graduate Council considered your request dated November 9, 2009 to divide the Department of Finance and Management into the departments of Finance and Operations and Supply Chain Management. The Council feels that this is a reasonable step for Management to make at this time and therefore is in favor of the division of the departments.

Alan E. Williams, Chair
Graduate Council

AEW/vb
TO: ANTHONY NORMAN, CHAIR
RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FR: JOSE WUDKA, CHAIR
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

RE: SCHOOL OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION PROPOSAL TO SPLIT TWO DEPARTMENTS

On November 20, the Committee on Educational Policy reviewed the proposal to split off the Department of Finance and Management and create the Department of Operations and Supply Chain Management. Several members expressed concern that the new department would be small, below the critical mass needed to attract majors and faculty, but this was balanced by the expectation that this will be remedied as the financial crisis eases. The Committee voted in favor of the proposal (4 Yes votes, 0 No votes, 2 Abstention votes).
November 30, 2009

TO: Anthony Norman  
Chair, Riverside Division

FROM: Carol J. Lovatt  
Chair, UCR Academic Senate Planning and Budget

RE: Proposal from AGSM/SoBA to divide the Department of Finance and Management Science into two departments

On November 20, 2009, the members of the Planning and Budget Committee reviewed the request of David Stewart, Dean of the A. Gary Anderson Graduate School of Management/School of Business Administration (AGSM/SoBA), submitted through Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost Dallas Rabenstein, to create a new Department of Operations and Supply Chain Management and rename the Department of Finance and Management Science the Department of Finance. Eligible voting members of the Planning and Budget Committee were unanimous in approving the request. Our positive vote was based on the following.

1. The proposed change is consistent with the School of Business Administration’s newly adopted strategic plan and will purportedly foster collaboration between the operations and supply chain management faculty and faculty in the Department of Accounting and Information Systems, whereas none exists with the finance faculty in the current department structure.

2. The proposed change was endorsed by all faculty who would be impacted by the change, except one who saw no benefit, the Executive Council of the School of Business Administration and by the Dean of AGSM/SoBA.

3. There is no financial impact of the requested change to the campus. The only associated expense is a stipend for the chair of the new department, which is borne by the Dean of AGSM/SoBA.

4. With regard to the small size of the two resulting departments, which is not atypical for the SoBA, the School holds 15.58 unfilled faculty
FTE that can be used to strengthen both departments once the current budget crisis ends.
December 3, 2009

TO: A. W. NORMAN, CHAIR
   RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FR: J. BAEZ, CHAIR
    COMMITTEE ON LIBRARY AND SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATION

RE: PROPOSAL TO DIVIDE FINANCE AND MANAGEMENT SCIENCE INTO TWO DEPARTMENTS

The proposal for the newly proposed Finance Department is based solidly on the current Finance faculty. However, it seems that the newly proposed Department of Operations & Supply Chain Management will engage in significant hiring when the budget situation improves. The Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication has concluded that this will put more pressure on the library. Due to budget cuts, the library has had to cut its monograph (book) budget from its previous annual expenditure of $1.2 million by more than 50% for FY2009 and FY2010. It has also had to cancel many serials and impose other cost-cutting measures.

Thus, in order to develop both departments as "spires of excellence", as indicated in the cover letter from Dean Stewart, additional library funding will be required.
TO: ANTHONY W. NORMAN, CHAIR
RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FM: VIVIAN NYITRAY, CHAIR
UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS COMMITTEE

RE: PROPOSAL TO DIVIDE FINANCE AND MANAGEMENT SCIENCE INTO TWO DEPARTMENTS

The Committee on Undergraduate Admissions does not have any substantive comment on this proposal.