

SPGIA FACULTY MEETING MINUTES
Research 163
January 29, 2015

Dean Rozell opened the meeting at 10 a.m. His opening remarks focused on the importance of the decision about SPGIA's organizational structure and the need for a result with the greatest possible legitimacy that arises from an open participatory process. Whatever the outcome, it will be important that the faculty comes together after the decision is made.

Divisional Structures Committee co-chair Peter Mandaville described the committee's charge and process for developing its recommendations. The purpose of the decision on the recommendations is to guide the bylaws committee. He thanked the members of the committee, who represent a wide diversity of views. He described the recommendations as a workable middle ground.

Prof. Mandaville then focused on each component recommendation. Divisions would coordinate programs but not "own" them; the programs belong to the School. The committee has proposed one possible assignment of programs to divisions, but recommends that no decision should be made without consulting the program directors. He argued that the three proposed divisions reflect the name of the school and provide a clear and flexible structure that is forward-looking. Faculty members would be able under the recommendation to affiliate with up to two divisions, but only one for promotion and tenure voting. The structure would be up for review in two years. Any stove-piping caused by the divisions would be counterbalanced by management structure that crosses divisional boundaries, such as the proposed curriculum and governance committees.

The ensuing discussion focused on a number of themes:

- The current functioning of the divisions and how well similar structures have worked at other schools like SPGIA
- The growth potential of the proposed International Affairs Division
- The intellectual coherence of the proposed International Affairs Division
- The possible tensions between the proposed divisions and multidisciplinary
- The challenge of creating operational values that would allow the School to work well regardless of its formal structure
- Whether the subunits should be called divisions, or something else, such as faculties
- The names of the proposed divisions
- The role of disciplines, such as economics, within the proposed divisions
- The structure of first and second level reviews for promotion and tenure
- New faculty hiring
- How individual faculty members can create identities for themselves that do not necessarily rely on divisional identities
- Any financial costs of establishing and running divisions
- The potential for collaboration and conflict resulting from divisions
- Whether the proposed structure would be efficient
- Whether the proposed structure would make the dean's job easier
- The appropriate balance between faculty governance and the dean's authority

- The potential for divisions to enhance or inhibit enrollment growth
- Whether faculty members could choose not to affiliate with a division.
- Whether the proposed divisions would provide adequate visibility to key activities in the School

The meeting concluded with a discussion of next steps, including a faculty vote with ballots distributed early the following week.