

BRIDGEWATER STATE COLLEGE

COMMITTEE ON NEW SCHOOLS

PRELIMINARY STUDY

May 2007

In 2007 President Dana Mohler-Faria charged the Committee on New Schools to conduct a campus-wide discussion about possible structures for academic schools at Bridgewater State College. To begin this discussion, the committee gathered information from full-time faculty members using the Zoomerang web survey hosting site. The instrument consisted of three open-ended questions. The committee used email messages to invite the 292 full-time faculty members to participate. The three open-ended questions were posed in such a way that respondents could reasonably be expected to respond to one, two, or all three of the questions. There were 46 responses to the first question, 46 responses to the second question, and 28 responses to the third question. Responses were analyzed using emergent theme coding, with each comment being coded into as many themes as the statements warranted. Because this was a qualitative study, the purpose of this analysis was to understand the responses deeply and to depict them in a faithful way, rather than to develop generalizable data about the broader faculty population. This document presents the results of that analysis. Following this summary is a full transcript of responses to all questions.

Readers should be aware that persons who respond to online surveys tend to use conventions that are common and appropriate for email and text messaging (e.g., no capitals) and to make uncorrected typographical errors. For ease of reading, those have generally been corrected in the text of this report. The unedited version appears in the transcript of comments at the end of the report.

Advantages of New Schools

Question 1 asked was this: “From your perspective, what would be the advantages of the formation of new schools at Bridgewater? (You may write as much as you wish in the text box below.)” Forty-six of the participants responded to this question. Their answers fell into four main categories.

Collaboration and Cohesion

There were 24 comments that focused on the idea that the internal functioning of new schools would be better than the present model. These comments mentioned collaboration, shared resources, and discipline-specific focus or shared vision, among other advantages. These are comments that fell into this category:

Opportunities for cross-disciplinary specialization for both students and faculty

Easier communication among departments with some similar interests

Separate school based graduation ceremonies would allow the students to stand in the spotlight a little longer and still allow the graduation to be a reasonable time. There could still be a single main ceremony with a speaker, but a more intimate affair where the students walk and in the future if we offer Ph.Ds where those students are hooded.

Interdisciplinary collaboration

New schools can increase cohesion among faculty and students, while giving students a deeper appreciation for the major sub-areas of a liberal education, such as the humanities, the natural sciences, and the social sciences. School-wide colloquia and school-wide policies of various kinds can be facilitated much more readily than they can in the large A&S school we have now.

Would help develop more interdisciplinary teaching and research...Would afford students and faculty more inter-departmental interactions.

More identity to each content area; perhaps more interaction among departments within more focused schools

Combining programs that have an applied orientation - counseling, criminal justice, social work, speech pathology, etc. would allow for the development of consistent policies re internships, inter-program ... collaboration, and innovative course development including learning communities. The composition of each school will in some ways determine its viability and value; for example, if some applied programs opt out, the value of the whole would thereby be diminished.

A school also may encourage closer relationships among faculty and among students that can reinforce learning and the values of the related disciplines in a way that informal relationships among departments cannot. I note that students not in workforce-targeted disciplines often have difficulty standing up to pressures pushing obviously job-targeted learning, but they may find more support in the bolder commitment of a school dedicated to the larger interests of their chosen field (for example, a school for the arts). The contemporary emphasis on interdisciplinary work may receive more support in that a school can emphasize and support affinities between disciplines and departments where they may be found. Finally, faculty work tends to be more similar in subgroups of disciplines, and better understood among a group of related disciplines, resulting in finer support, evaluation, and collaboration. All of these advantages have been borne out clearly in the schools of business and education.

More streamlined communication with departments. ... More opportunities to do faculty/program collaboration

The most pressing need in these various Colleges is not reorganizing under "this or that" model. It is in improving information flow, reducing redundant procedures, increasing internal flexibility, and creating an environment less encumbered by purely Mertonian ritualistic process oriented behaviors. That would be the major advantage, although such things could conceivably be done without formal academic reorganization, it is also possible that formal reorganization will change none of what I have cited above.

Stream-lined education due to specificity of a school

Most areas of academic study have discipline-specific perspectives, philosophies, methodological approaches and just plain 'ways of doing things.' One size doesn't fit all in a liberal arts environment. It is time to acknowledge these differences by letting certain academic areas have their own schools that can specifically address questions relevant to that area.

There could be a common vision within a school.

I believe the benefit of forming academic schools within the Bridgewater State University would be a strengthening of ties within the "schools," with opportunities for collaboration in areas of common interest.

I'm not sure what the new schools would mean, but it would be nice not to be so separated.

It would allow grouping of similar programs/majors under a school with a common mission. Program development as well as program collaboration would be facilitated, leading to multi-trans-inter-disciplinary programming and studies. Space issues for "clinical" programs might be more easily resolved.

Focuses training, benefit to students graduating with more specific major, opportunities for continued study

It would also gather the like-minded faculty who are now spread across the campus. It would be easier for collaborations and joint activities if we were gathered together under one umbrella.

More focus on recruitment to specific disciplines

More interaction between the various Arts areas

Formation of new schools could serve to strengthen identity. The School of Education and Allied Studies' mission is applicable for education related programs. The majority of majors in MAPLES and more than 50% of the graduate students in Counselor Education are being prepared to work in health related professions. A School of Professional Studies, for instance, would allow for the development of a mission that would delineate a vision, purpose, short and long term goals to guide student programs, outcome assessment, and needs. Such a school would enable faculty to clarify beliefs and a philosophy consistent with the health professions instead of being a tag along to education majors. ... Collaboration between and amongst faculty and students with respect to program offerings (e.g., electives), continuing education opportunities, scholarship activities, etc.

The advantages would be that disciplines that share similar interests, content & research areas could share information and work together.

The possible greater strength in combined use of resources, such as space and technology. Departments may be able to serve student needs more effectively by transforming some of our individual resources into shared assets.

Administrative Advantages

Seventeen responses included comments about the administrative advantages of establishing new schools. These included the workload for deans, the ability to acquire college resources, and the voice for the new schools' disciplines within the administration. The following comments reflected these concerns:

Programs will get the appropriate content support if located in the appropriate school.

I agree with the argument that Deans of smaller schools can be more sensitive and responsive to their faculty. From this, other good things could flow -- conducive workspace, competitive salaries, ... etc.

The current structure does not provide a strong voice and advocate for the Humanities on the administrative level. A School of Humanities or Arts would help remedy that situation.

Increased focus on the concerns of various specialties, administrators who are experienced and informed in specialized disciplines.

More local control over direction . . . individual departments may have the "ear" of their local dean a little more.

Uniting various departments under one administration

No one Dean would have too many departments to try to manage.

Schools have the administrative capacity to focus on the specific needs of a related group of disciplines and departments, and to promote the interests of those units. Even-handedness and pressures for perceived even-handedness among units with differing philosophies, missions and needs is mitigated as an issue, freeing the executive to recruit, promote, and advance the interests of his/her unit without regard to perceptions of balance or imbalance of attention to dissimilar disciplines. Fewer subunits also allows the executive the time to do that, where too much of the load now falls exclusively to the department chairs who can't do it all and don't have the resources.

Better organizational structure, greater awareness on campus ..., shared resources

We could also have an administrator who is knowledgeable of our disciplines and unique needs speaking specifically for us and our requirements. It is my assumption that funding would be better, having even a smaller financial pie split only among the arts instead of the arts competing for funding with the sciences and humanities. We would have greater access to the top administration for needs in the arts with a sympathetic dean being our advocate. It is my assumption that better facilities would follow a push for a school of the Arts and that having a school justifies the expense better than having separate disciplines who need facilities.

Decrease the number of departments under one dean

Better advocacy for the Arts programs. Better funding opportunities for the Arts programs. Dedicated focus on the Arts. A Dean with a focus on the Arts

Streamline professional/clinical departments and offer more recognition and support

A new school of professional studies would have the advantage of grouping all the directly pre-professional programs under one umbrella. Since such programs are distinct from traditional arts and sciences curricula, it might make sense to separate them administratively.

With University status, presumably there will be some generation of new programs and degrees and clustering these as appropriately as possible may require the formation of new schools.

The possible greater strength in combined use of resources, such as space and technology. Departments may be able to serve student needs more effectively by transforming some of our individual resources into shared assets.

Would provide more focused leadership.

External Advantages

There were nine comments that identified advantages beyond the College itself. These focused primarily on reputation, service, and ability to acquire external funding. The following responses were in this category:

Perhaps an increase in outreach into the region

Program-community collaboration

If BSC is hoping to make a splash in the arts community (in other words, to create one), then Performing Arts makes sense. Having a school of science might facilitate grants.

Better visibility for "like" programs for both students and the public ... Better chance for collaborative grants

An increase in recognition locally and nationally

One huge advantage for a School for the Arts would be a visible affirmation that the Arts are important and valued by our institution to the point where they have their own school. I don't think you can underestimate the importance of this message.

It may be an advantage for groups of departments to cooperate to secure funding for projects.

With regards to health care and physical education, both fields are ever evolving. Expanding schools to accommodate such changes will increase BSC reputation in the academic community as center of excellence in education.

Additionally, our region is in dire need of continuing education opportunities for health care providers. It would greatly benefit a School of Professional Studies to have a national leader in health care as a Dean; to develop a vision for the future, attract faculty, and serve the region.

None

Nine respondents indicated, either directly or indirectly, that they see no advantage to the formation of new academic schools. Two respondents wrote simply "none." In addition to these, the following comments fell into this category:

The question above assumes that there are advantages to establishing new schools. What is the impetus for this discussion? It appears to be another "top-

down" determination that is not based on academic principles, and rather on economic ones. We need to first determine if the current system is inadequate. As I see it, there would be no advantage in separating Arts and Sciences, for example.

None. I think this would cause fragmentation to the College, dilute the meaning of a liberal arts education, and create more paperwork and bureaucracy for the campus.

From my perspective, very little will be gained and much will be lost. As a member of A&S, I have benefited from the synergy of having many disparate disciplines come together.

From my perspective, I do not see any advantages to the formation of these new schools.

It is not clear to me that there would be any advantages.

Pays another administrator?

Non-Coded Response

In addition to the responses recorded above, the following response was not coded:

(NOTE: In support of a manageable survey, I am keeping my remarks brief.) While I subscribe to the desirability of the benefits that are anticipated for the new School of Science (and others), I believe that we need to explore alternative routes (see section 3.) to these benefits, in order to avoid the risks I note in section 2.

Disadvantages of New Schools

Question 2 asked, "From your perspective, what would be the disadvantages of the formation of new schools at Bridgewater? (You may write as much as you wish in the text box below.)" Forty-six participants responded. The themes that emerged from these responses were in general the reverse of the themes cited above. For each advantage there was a corresponding disadvantage. For example, on Question 1, some respondents saw an advantage in collaboration within a new school; on Question 2 other respondents expressed concern that there would be a loss of collaboration between departments that are no longer administratively linked.

In addition to the themes that were related to previously cited advantages, two new themes emerged in response to this question. One new theme related to the effects of new structures on the Core Curriculum. The second new theme expressed concern about how new academic divisions might logically be drawn.

Loss of Collaboration and Cohesion

The most common theme in these responses concerned the potential loss of collaboration and cohesion that would come from separating departments that are currently housed together administratively. Several respondents referred to this as “Balkanization.” The following 21 comments fell into this category:

I think there we can lose a lot if we separate the fields of English and Biology, for example. The kinds of intrinsic connections that can be made would be harder to make, among faculty, if the schools were separated.

Fragmentation of the College, greater competition for resources, less collaboration between departments and faculty ...

More difficulty in providing an interdisciplinary education

Balkanization of learning. The interplay between the Arts and Sciences, for instance, is of great value. Separating them reinforces students' (incorrect) opinion that they are unrelated.

Loss of cohesion within arts and sciences

More fragmentation

If too many schools are formed with too-narrow distinctions among them, there may be a risk of Balkanizing the institution. The principle disadvantage of schools in general is a potential reduction of the ground for institution-wide collective interest. Because we will know our close colleagues more, we will know our colleagues from unrelated disciplines less. The creation of schools should not reduce the capacity of students to cross disciplines more than current practice.

Possible isolation from related disciplines

These very differences may cause further 'splits' in the academic fabric as we become even more engaged within our disciplines, and unable to see outside them.

The main problem, as with academe in general, is Balkanization of disciplines and fields of study. This is not always a bad thing, but frequently can be, especially if faculty find it increasingly difficult to "find" each other, and if turf and the protection thereof becomes more of a concern than the quality of what is produced and of forward thinking about knowledge and research.

There may well be less of a collaboration in disparate disciplines (e.g., chemistry and political science).

It would be a shame to become isolated from the general faculty and the varied perspectives of their background and knowledge and discipline-based points of view.

Lose some connections between humanities/art/science

At a time when campuses across the country are being encouraged to engage in more interdisciplinarity, the move to disengage parts of the Arts and Sciences from the rest seems out of place. While clustering departments might encourage interdisciplinarity between them, both for faculty and students, it would very likely actively discourage such efforts between schools.... As well, some departments might find themselves isolated from their most natural collegial relationships. If the number of faculty in a school is below a threshold (yet to be determined), efficiency of operation may in fact be hampered, as for example in the School of Management. The workload issue could be handled in a number of other ways short of creating new schools, such as appointing assistant deans (which might need to be done in any case, whether or not new schools are created). Finally, dividing Arts and Sciences into fiefdoms might dilute the ability of the Arts and Sciences faculty to stand together on issues of common concern, such as the proposal for a Liberal Studies Major or the reinstatement of a language requirement.

Some departments/programs may be "naturally" linked, but in so doing, they may lose very important parts of themselves - so for example, a social science program -- such as social work, may end up linked in program with more professional areas, but lose the emphasis upon sociology - just one example.

Not sure that there would be disadvantages for professional programs. There is a concern about undergraduate education liberal arts majors if Arts and Sciences were to separate.

Splitting up the central school of arts and sciences would be a very bad idea, which would foster parochialism among the students, exacerbate territoriality and resentment among the faculty ... It's hardly "best practices" to split up the central arts and sciences disciplines -- this is the "soul" of a university.... Students will come to think of their own fields as self-contained. Resources will be allocated unequally.

More fundamentally, it puts us more in line with the "normal school" mentality, where knowledge is broken up into separate categories. It aligns us with the less prestigious "public colleges" and separates us from the more prestigious private colleges. Most fundamentally, it fails to see that "the humanities" is best seen as including the sciences, for the humanities aim to provide us (humans) with a

comprehensive and critical and growing understanding of what is. To separate the humanities from the sciences would be to implicitly teach our students that knowledge is bifurcated, after the fear of C.P. Snow's Two Cultures. Instead of challenging this bifurcation, we would be contributing to it. There's enough division as it is.

Educational Disadvantages: a weakening of true Liberal Arts education for our students. Liberal Arts needs to be nurtured and seen as the best professional education for a rapidly changing career and life environment (no need to expatiate here!). The creation of separate schools runs a measurable risk of increasing, rather than decreasing, the compartmentalization of curricula across departments. Research Disadvantages: a weakening of perceived rewards and incentives for creative faculty work that cross School boundaries. (The role of School-level Deans runs a risk of inward-focused rewards.)

The disadvantage maybe the skirmishes that may result precisely because of the advantage I have sited. Territorial competition.

Ever narrower schools would probably also isolate faculty members in different fields from each other and lessen the unanticipated interactions that can lead to serendipitous cross-fertilization of ideas. I think these changes would also contribute to faculty cynicism about the goals and priorities of the administration.

Expanded Administration

Thirteen responses mentioned disadvantages associated with the expanded administrative structure that would be needed to support new academic schools. The following comments fall into this category:

Too much complex administration. For a college of this size, 4-5 schools seems about right. Adding too many school deans will create additional difficulty in actually accomplishing anything. Also too many schools will give the appearance of haphazardness. "We have a school of frying and a school of boiling because everyone wanted their own school."

Divides resources too much. Have seen this on other small campuses. Basically a tacky set-up. Makes deans more like chairs.

More levels of administration.

The number of administrators appears to have increased far faster than any other group on campus.

I am concerned about the expansion of administration in the school, with both financial and human resources diverted from much needed growth in faculty lines. I think that this may be especially true if we attain university status - any

reductions in teaching loads to offset increasing research roles would require even more faculty lines than are currently proposed. Also, physical space is an issue - we don't really have adequate space for current classroom and faculty office needs... where would new admin offices be? (And one would not want them located away from the departments they serve, which compounds the problem.)

Making another layer of administration to deal with.... More administration offices created and staffed (more of the budget earmarked for administration, not for teaching or research)

More administrative work

New schools would require increased in staffing and facilities. My concern is that the expense will be passed onto the students.

It pays another administrator, taking away a position that could be better put in teaching and research.

Institutional Disadvantages: a weakening of the capacity of the Dean of Arts and Sciences to provide balanced oversight of the whole of College-level Liberal Arts

Subdivisions would lead to smaller operating budgets and a less powerful voice on campus.

More bureaucracy

The formation of these new schools would add administrative layers and positions to BSC. It is not clear to me that this would be an advantage.

Core Curriculum Concerns

Seven responses expressed concern for the effects of new administrative structures on the Core Curriculum. The following comments fell into this category:

As far as the CORE curriculum is concerned, I see a real concern for breakdown of the CORE, given that a "School of Science" might want to have students NOT complete certain requirements (e.g. global culture, multiculturalism) due to pressures from their own majors, some busting at 44 credits hours presently.

Core curriculum is currently being handled well within Arts & Sciences. Any new school configuration would spread those courses among several schools, which might complicate things. Creating a position of dean of general studies might avoid this problem.

Segmenting the programs and the students into schools might diminish the cross-fertilization that enriches a liberal arts education, although the goal of the CORE is to prevent premature fragmentation.

Disadvantages: the CORE curriculum would be distributed over a set of Schools, complicating its administration

Schools might become isolated from one another and might attempt to pursue their own agendas with regard to such matters as Core Curriculum. This could result in students becoming overspecialized and not emerging from the College with a well-rounded Liberal Arts education.

Watering down of the Core Curriculum

Weaken the core liberal arts education we claim to offer.... Faculty will come to see "their" students' needs as distinctly different, and thus seek to eliminate core requirements which are inconvenient or thought to be "irrelevant."

Difficulty in Dividing Disciplines Further

Eight responses were concerned with the difficulty of determining or explaining the selection of academic disciplines that would go into a new academic school. The following comments fell into this category:

There are many real disadvantages, especially with respect to separating Arts and Sciences. For example, Anthropology is a discipline that encompasses both a "hard-science" component as well as a purely "Humanities" component. Where do we put a professor like Ingmanson after the schools are separated?

Pedagogically it doesn't make sense to pull science from liberal arts except to have a building that the President's name can go on.

Placing the applied programs or the arts into one grouping might enhance the perception of some that they are less than fully academic or intellectually rigorous -generally "less than."

The internal buzz has been that this is a naked power move by Movement Arts. More specifically, WHERE IS THE VISION???? Other than allowing a few programs more authority within the institution, what is the GOAL? What values are addressed by these changes? How does this increase the QUALITY of scholarship and teaching? How does this help students? How does this enhance teaching? How does this respond to regional, national, and global structural change? The answers to these questions have to be real, and not just a vocabulary of motive. The previous document of justification that was circulated via email was clearly and transparently a vocabulary of motive, a rationalization that did not embody a genuine vision, other than a justification for a naked power grab,

IMHO. And, by the way, the substantive questions around a reorganization have not even been addressed, to the best of my knowledge. So, from where I currently sit, it's just an internal political move, and will be seen by the majority, in the absence of a real and viable plan, as such.

Irrational distribution of disciplines among not-very-reasonable segments. (For example, how is mathematics more suitable for a "science" school than any other? Mathematicians need to know how to write and read; psychologists and business managers need to understand a number of mathematical concepts to do their jobs.)

There are a lot of assumptions about liberal arts and how different it is from, for instance, education. It seems very fragmented now, and it might be possible that this would make good collegial clusters. However, it also might unfairly privilege those who are already privileged (liberal arts, perhaps).

We currently have three schools for undergraduates: education, business, and arts and sciences. Aside from other professional programs, these are standard in most university organizations. The creation of schools specifically for Fine Arts is also fairly common. However a school or college of science? This would leave multiple departments in the current school without a school of its kind. What would you do with the 'soft sciences, such as anthropology or political science? Ok let's image it. A school for the Humanities: we currently have a humanities office that consists of English, philosophy and FL. What about history? What school would include political science, criminal justice, philosophy, history and anthropology?

If schools are created that combine disparate disciplines then there is no benefit and it may actually be detrimental.

None

Eight respondents stated directly or indirectly that there would be no disadvantages to the establishment of new academic schools. Two responded specifically "none." The following responses also fell into this category:

As long as the college does not create every school that is requested for, I don't foresee any disadvantages.

I don't see any disadvantages.

Minimal if any!!

There are no disadvantages that I can determine. Hopefully, if a program "joins" a new school, all ties to the current school would not be severed.

NO DISADVANTAGES!

Non-Coded Responses

In addition to the categorized responses above, the following comments were not coded:

It's not worth a lot of fuss and discussion just to put new labels on the same old thing. A change in school organization at BSC has to be accompanied by a change in our ways of thinking and how we do business in order to be beneficial.

People would need to be open to change... May feel threatened

The issue of what comes first--the schools or the resources? Right now, we have no space as it is and insufficient faculty.

Continued traffic problems with more students and faculty in the area

The one logical school considered a few years ago--the School of Fine and Performing Arts--is conspicuous by its absence from this iteration of a call for more Schools. And yet Art, Music, Dance, and Theater are all desperately in need of adequate and appropriate space for their endeavors--as well as needing a dean who would understand their very specific needs.

May be overwhelming for the prospective student, but guidance can be provided.

Additional Comments

Question 3 invited participants to provide any additional comments they wished. Twenty-nine participants chose to respond. Some of the comments affirmed the idea of new structures of one kind or another. Some rejected new structures. A third group expressed concerns about process issues in making the decision for or against new schools. The fourth group of comments expressed concern that Bridgewater State be in line with long-standing traditions in higher education or with aspirational peers.

Affirmation of New Structures

Ten comments either affirmed the suggestion of some new schools, or made specific suggestions about future structures. The following comments were in this category:

If we must subdivide Arts and Sciences, then in fairness to them, we should give the Fine and Performing Arts their own School (and space actually designed for the arts).

Bottom line: tentative "yes" to a new school of professional studies, resounding "no" to splitting up Arts and Sciences.

I was skeptical at first, but I really do think it is time to do this.

How schools are created is important. There needs to be a reasonable affinity among the programs, and there needs to be a collective interest among them that will be served better by the exclusive attention of an executive. In general, however, it will be a win-win.

We need to move the non teacher education programs out of the School of Education where they will get better visibility.

A school of allied health, health, or health-related, especially to incorporate programs that have both undergraduate and graduate degrees.

I am in favor of separate schools, especially in the sciences. I think we will have to work hard to keep the camaraderie of this campus going as we get bigger and more specialized but it can be done if people want it.

As the college grows into a university it seems like a good idea to create sub-structures which support the departments, and the schools will reduce or coordinate overlapping agendas.

Let's move forward!

By way of promoting a discussion of alternatives to the new schools, I would offer one alternative:

- MAINTENANCE OF UNIFIED SCHOOL of ARTS and SCIENCES within BSC/BSU structure via creation of several faculty-led Divisions
- GRADUATE and CONTINUING EDUCATION
- SCHOOL of BUSINESS
- SCHOOL of EDUCATION and ALLIED STUDIES
- SCHOOL of ARTS AND SCIENCES
 - Division of Sciences and Mathematics
 - Division of Arts and Humanities
 - Division of Political, Social, and Behavioral Sciences

Each division would be headed by a Director appointed from the constituent faculty, for a 3-year term. For the sake of continuity, the third year of the outgoing Director would be concurrent with the first year of the incoming Director (who would then begin as assistant to the Director). I believe the Directors of the divisions would be able to provide the sought-for focus on external promotion, without weakening the intellectual coherence at the core of our institution.

Rejection of New Structures

Five comments rejected new academic structures. The following comments fell into this category:

I see no advantages to this at all.

I understand we are growing but I think we need to retain the same structure -- add associate deans or assistant deans within arts & sciences if the numbers are so high but dismantling the structure into schools would be a mistake. Most excellent higher education institutions have managed to retain the structure we now have.

Is this just an excuse to hire more Deans?

I oppose this.

If it ain't broke, don't fix it!

Process Issues

Nine comments mentioned concerns about the process for making a decision on new schools. These are comments that fell into this category:

I hope there will be room for open discussion when a list of proposed schools and the rationale for such schools have been generated

I have more comments, which I would like to make at a later date, if possible.

I appreciate your seeking my input and sharing your thoughts on higher level organizational issues ...

It almost seems as if we have too much going on at once--new schools, university status, space issues, adjustments and comfort with the new core curriculum, etc. Maybe we need to direct our energies to one "new thing" at a time.

Has the rationale for the proposal been disseminated campus-wide?

I suggest much broader participation in the committees or task forces that come up with these kinds of suggestions. I am referring here also to the suggestion for restructuring CART. Forming new schools and adding new administrative positions are predictable, but not especially creative ideas as we move towards university status.

A division of 'science and math' from the rest of the institution is a ridiculous way to solve a problem. And clearly, there is a problem, otherwise this wouldn't even be coming up. So, please be clear with us what the problem is. Then, we might be able, as a community, to solve it.

Thanks for considering faculty and librarian input.

The Department of Counselor Ed. has never discussed or had any information on the idea of a new school shared with the department. If we are being considered as part of a new school then the members of the department would like to be privy to the discussions and have our voice heard in the process.

Higher Education Traditions and Aspirational Peers

Five comments stressed the value of being in line with the traditional core of higher education or with aspirational peers. The following comments were in this category:

I think the above capture my thoughts. I believe we should examine the current schools as this process moves forward to review as clearly and objectively as possible whether some contraction might accompany some expansion of schools. The major issue is to have them mirror generally understood and accepted standards and understandings from the outside (i.e.. a school of education clearly means something), but also to be as creative as possible, e.g. now on the rebound the School of Management at Yale and its historical commitment to both profit and non-profit--maybe even greater emphasis on the latter--sector leadership and organizational behavior.

Most universities I have researched--and most colleges--have a School of Arts and Sciences. I appreciate that at Bridgewater this means that one dean (Howard London) must administer a greater number of departments than the other deans. But this can be addressed with the hiring of another Associate Dean.

A college of arts and science, or letters and science is the core, the heart, the foundation of a liberal arts education.

While the proliferation of pre-professional programs might point towards the merits of some reorganizational models, no compelling case has been made for separating fine arts and natural science into separate schools. "Arts and Sciences" is a time-honored central core for a reason -- part of which is the interrelatedness of the humanities and the sciences, especially for the production of well-rounded

undergraduate education. Another point: splitting up the core arts and sciences disciplines enlarges already-arbitrary distinctions. Why is art history grouped with studio art rather than with intellectual history, or with literature? Why would we group drama with sculpture rather than with literature? Why would we group mathematics with lab sciences -- but relegate economics to the business school?

If we really take seriously that we seek to be an elite college/university, where we see our competition coming from the Williams and Wheaton and Mount Holyoke contingent rather than the Big State lineup, then we will not go this route. Just imagine this being discussed at an Amherst College! Try it. It's laughable to think it. And this is not elitism. Rather, it's a cool look at how academia properly understands the division of labor. There are the vocational schools, the Big States, and then there are the colleges and universities where knowledge really is understood and respected, where the deep understanding of the profound interconnectedness of ideas is seen thoroughly and completely, from the top down, so that as knowledge is divided, or not, is an essential teaching tool. The School of Sciences and the School of Liberal Arts, or however they would be named, is a way of saying, "We don't know or care about the kind of enlightenment that drove Newton to Einstein and on to be moved by a critical reflection of not just the mathematics of their disciplines but what the mathematics signified, to be moved by the need for poetry and philosophy as much as by the need for theories that predict and control,

Uncoded Comments

The following comments were not coded because the ideas they contained did not appear frequently enough in this section of the survey to justify coding. Some of these ideas appeared at least tangentially in previous sections.

I wonder if you're pursuing flashy, easy changes because the nitty-gritty, hard changes are too controversial or too hard.

I wonder also whether the interaction among "unfamiliar" faculties would get lost. I value the colleagues from other fields.

I would like the administration to address issues like salary inversion and crowding that directly impact educational quality right now.

A new department needs a new building not encroachment on others.

Transcript of Comments

This section contains a verbatim transcript of all responses. Unlike the previous section, here there has been no editing for typographical errors and online messaging conventions.

Question 1: From your perspective, what would be the advantages of the formation of new schools at Bridgewater? (You may write as much as you wish in the text box below.)
Programs will get the appropriate content support in located in the appropriate school.
The question above assumes that there are advantages to establishing new schools. What is the impetus for this discussion? It appears to be another "top-down" determination that are not based on academic principles, and rather on economic ones. We need to first determine if the current system is inadequate. As I see it, there would not no advantage in separating Arts and Sciences, for examples.
None. I think this would cause fragmentation to the College, dilute the meaning of a liberal arts education, and create more paperwork and beaurocracy for the campus.
None
Separate school based graduation ceremonies would allow the students to stand in the spotlight a little longer and still allow the graduation to be a reasonable time. There could still be a single main ceremony with a speaker, but a more intimate affair where the students walk and in the future if we offer Ph.Ds where those students are hooded.
Opportunities for cross-disciplinary specialization for both students and faculty.
Easier communication among departments with some similar interests.
I agree with the argument that Deans of smaller schools can be more sensitive and responsive to their faculty. From this, other good things could flow -- conducive workspace, competitive salaries, interdisciplinary collaboration, etc.
New schools can increase cohesion among faculty and students, while giving students a deeper appreciation for the major sub-areas of a liberal education, such as the humanities, the natural sciences, and the social sciences. School-wide colloquia and school-wide policies of various kinds can be facilitated much more readily than they can in the large A&S school we have now.
The current structure does not provide a strong voice and advocate for the Humanities on the administrative level. A School of Humanities or Arts would help remedy that situation.
Would help develop more interdisciplinary teaching and research...Would afford students and faculty more inter-departmental interactions.Would provide more focused leadership..
None.

<p>Increased focus on the concerns of various specialties, administrators who are experienced and informed in specialized disciplines.</p>
<p>More local control over direction . . . individual departments may have the "ear" of their local dean a little more.</p>
<p>Uniting various departments under one administration.</p>
<p>More identity to each content area; perhaps more interaction among departments within more focused schools; again, with more identifiable programs, perhaps an increase in outreach into the region.</p>
<p>Combining programs that have an applied orientation - counseling, criminal justice, social work, speech pathology, etc. would allow for the development of consistent policies re internships, inter-program and program-community collaboration, and innovative course development including learning communities. The composition of each school will in some ways determine its viability and value; for example, if some applied programs opt out, the value of the whole would thereby be diminished.</p>
<p>No one Dean would have too many departments to try to manage</p>
<p>Schools have the administrative capacity to focus on the specific needs of a related group of disciplines and departments, and to promote the interests of those units. Even-handedness and pressures for perceived even-handedness among units with differing philosophies, missions and needs is mitigated as an issue, freeing the executive to recruit, promote, and advance the interests of his/her unit without regard to perceptions of balance or imbalance of attention to dissimilar disciplines. Fewer subunits also allows the executive the time to do that, where too much of the load now falls exclusively to the department chairs who can't do it all and don't have the resources. A school also may encourage closer relationships among faculty and among students that can reinforce learning and the values of the related disciplines in a way that informal relationships among departments cannot. I note that students not in workforce-targeted disciplines often have difficulty standing up to pressures pushing obviously job-targeted learning, but they may find more support in the bolder commitment of a school dedicated to the larger interests of their chosen field (for example, a school for the arts). The contemporary emphasis on interdisciplinary work may receive more support in that a school can emphasize and support affinities between disciplines and departments where they may be found. Finally, faculty work tends to be more similar in subgroups of disciplines, and better understood among a group of related disciplines, resulting in finer support, evaluation, and collaboration. All of these advantages have been borne out clearly in the schools of business and education.</p>
<p>Better organizational structure, greater awareness on campus and beyond, shared resources,</p>
<p>If BSC is hoping to make a splash in the arts community (in other words, to create one), then Performing Arts makes sense. Having a school of science might facilitate grants.</p>

<p>More streamlined communication with departments.</p> <p>Better visibility for "like" programs for both students and the public</p> <p>More opportunities to do faculty/program collaboration</p> <p>Better chance for collaborative grants</p>
<p>The most pressing need in these various Colleges is not reorganizing under "this or that" model. It is in improving information flow, reducing redundant procedures, increasing internal flexibility, and creating an environment less encumbered by purely Mertonian ritualistic process oriented behaviors. That would be the major advantage, although such things could conceivably be done without formal academic reorganization, it is also possible that formal reorganization will change none of what I have cited above.</p>
<p>An increase in accomplished professors, an increase in recognition locally and nationally, streamlined education due to specificity of a school</p>
<p>Most areas of academic study have discipline-specific perspectives, philosophies, methodological approaches and just plain 'ways of doing things'. One size doesn't fit all in a liberal arts environment. It is time to acknowledge these differences by letting certain academic areas have their own schools that can specifically address questions relevant to that area</p>
<p>There could be a common vision within a school.</p>
<p>With University status, presumably there will be some generation of new programs and degrees and clustering these as appropriately as possible may require the formation of new schools</p>
<p>I believe the benefit of forming academic schools within the Bridgewater state univeristy would be a strengthening of ties within the "schools", which opportunities for collaboration in areas of common interest.</p>
<p>From my perspective, very little will be gained and much will be lost. As a member of A&S, I have benefitted from the synergy of having many disparate disciplines come together.</p>
<p>From my perspective, I do not see any advantages to the formation of these new schools.</p>
<p>I'm not sure what the new schools would mean, but it would be nice not to be so separated.</p>
<p>It would allow grouping of similar programs/majors under a school with a common mission. Program development as well as program collaboration would be facilitated, leading to muliti-trans-inter-disciplinary programming and studies. Space issues for "clinical" programs might be more easily resolved.</p>
<p>Focuses training,benefit to students graduating with more specific major,opportunities for continued study.</p>

One huge advantage for a School for the Arts would be a visible affirmation that the Arts are important and valued by our institution to the point where they have their own school. I don't think you can underestimate the importance of this message. It would also gather the like-minded faculty who are now spread across the campus. It would be easier for collaborations and joint activities if we were gathered together under one umbrella. We could also have an administrator who is knowledgeable of our disciplines and unique needs speaking specifically for us and our requirements. It is my assumption that funding would be better, having even a smaller financial pie split only among the arts instead of the arts competing for funding with the sciences and humanities. We would have greater access to the top administration for needs in the arts with a sympathetic dean being our advocate. It is my assumption that better facilities would follow a push for a school of the Arts and that having a school justifies the expense better than having separate disciplines who need facilities.

Increased collaboration

Decrease the number of departments under one dean

More focus on recruitment to specific disciplines

More focus on outside money for specific disciplines

It may be an advantage for groups of departments to cooperate to secure funding for projects. Also, it could alleviate the workload of the Dean of Arts and Sciences.

With regards to health care and physical education, both fields are ever evolving. Expanding schools to accommodate such changes will increase BSC reputation in the academic community as center of excellence in education.

It is not clear to me that there would be any advantages.

1. Better advocacy for the Arts programs
2. Better funding opportunities for the Arts programs
3. Dedicated focus on the Arts
4. A Dean with a focus on the Arts
5. More interaction between the various Arts areas

Formation of new schools could serve to strengthen identity. The School of Education and Allied Studies' mission is applicable for education related programs. The majority of majors in MAPLES and more than 50% of the graduate students in Counselor Education are being prepared to work in health related professions. A School of Professional Studies, for instance, would allow for the development of a mission that would delineate a vision, purpose, short and long term goals to guide student programs, outcome assessment, and needs. Such a school would enable faculty to clarify beliefs and a philosophy consistent with the health professions instead of being a tag along to education majors.

Additionally, our region is in dire need of continuing education opportunities for health care providers. It would greatly benefit a School of Professional Studies to have a national leader in health care as a Dean; to develop a vision for the future, attract faculty, and serve the region.

Collaboration between and amongst faculty and students with respect to program offerings (e.g. electives), continuing education opportunities, scholarship activities, etc,

A new school of professional studies would have the advantage of grouping all the directly pre-professional programs under one umbrella. Since such programs are distinct from traditional arts and sciences curricula, it might make sense to separate them administratively.

Streamline professional/clinical departments and offer more recognition and support

Pays another administrator?

The advantages would be that disciplines that share similar interests, content & research areas could share information and work together.

(NOTE: In support of a manageable survey, I am keeping my remarks brief.)

While I subscribe to the desirability of the benefits that are anticipated for the new School of Science (and others) , I believe that we need to explore alternative routes (see section 3.) to these benefits, in order to avoid the risks I note in section 2.

The possible greater strength in combined use of resources, such as space and technology. Departments may be able to serve student needs more effectively by transforming some of our individual resources into shared assets.

Question 2: From your perspective, what would be the disadvantages of the formation of new schools at Bridgewater? (You may write as much as you wish in the text box below.)
As long as the college does not create every school that is requested for, I don't foresee any disadvantages.
There are many real disadvantages, especially with respect to separating Arts and Sciences. For example, Anthropology is a discipline that encompasses both a "hard-science" component as well as a purely "Humanities" component. Where do we put a professor like Ingmanson after the schools are separated? Also, I think there we can lose a lot if we separate the fields of English and Biology, for example. The kinds of intrinsic connections that can be made would be harder to make, among faculty, if the schools were separated. In addition, as far as the CORE curriculum is concerned, I see a real concern for breakdown of the CORE, given that a "School of Science" might want to have students NOT complete certain requirements (e.g. global culture, multiculturalism) due to pressures from their own majors, some busting at 44 credits hours presently.
Fragmentation of the College, greater competition for resources, less collaboration between departments and faculty, more administrative work, watering down of the Core Curriculum.
More bureaucracy; more difficulty in providing an interdisciplinary education
Too much complex administration. For a college of this size, 4-5 schools seems about right. Adding too many school deans will create additional difficulty in actually accomplishing anything. Also too many schools will give the appearance of haphazardness. "We have a school of frying and a school of boiling because everyone wanted their own school"
I don't see any disadvantages.
Balkanization of learning. The interplay between the Arts and Sciences, for instance, is of great value. Separating them reinforces students' (incorrect) opinion that they are unrelated.
It's not worth a lot of fuss and discussion just to put new labels on the same old thing. A change in school organization at BSC has to be accompanied by a change in our ways of thinking and how we do business in order to be beneficial.
Core curriculum is currently being handled well within Arts & Sciences. Any new school configuration would spread those courses among several schools, which might complicate things. Creating a position of dean of general studies might avoid this problem.
None
people would need to be open to change..My feel threatened
Divides resources too much. Have seen this on other small campuses. Basically a tacky set-up. Makes deans more like chairs.
None.

<p>More levels of administration.</p> <p>Loss of cohesion within arts and sciences</p>
<p>The number of administrators appears to have increased far faster than any other group on campus.</p>
<p>More fragmentation; the issue of what comes first--the schools or the resources? right now, we have no space as it is and insufficient faculty;</p>
<p>Segmenting the programs and the students into schools might diminish the cross-fertilization that enriches a liberal arts education, although the goal of the CORE is to prevent premature fragmentation. Placing the applied programs or the arts into one grouping might enhance the perception of some that they are less than fully academic or intellectually rigorous -generally "less than." Such a grouping into schools might also require a revisiting of expectations for tenure, promotion, etc. since the requirements of various fields sometimes diverge. Programs working closely with communities, for example, may be fulfilling the mandates of their professions but encountering difficulty in meeting traditional academic standards re publications and presentations.</p>
<p>I am concerned about the expansion of administration in the school, with both financial and human resources diverted from much needed growth in faculty lines. I think that this may be especially true if we attain university status - any reductions in teaching loads to offset increasing research roles would require even more faculty lines than are currently proposed. Also, physical space is an issue - we don't really have adequate space for current classroom and faculty office needs... where would new admin offices be? (And one would not want them located away from the departments they serve, which compounds the problem.)</p>
<p>If too many schools are formed with too-narrow distinctions among them, there may be a risk of balkanizing the institution. The principle disadvantage of schools in general is a potential reduction of the ground for institution-wide collective interest. Because we will know our close colleagues more, we will know our colleagues from unrelated disciplines less. The creation of schools should not reduce the capacity of students to cross disciplines more than current practice.</p>
<p>Possible isolation from related disciplines.</p>
<p>Pedagogically it doesn't makes sense to pull science from liberal arts except to have a building that the President's name can go on.</p>
<p>Minimal if any!!</p>

The internal buzz has been that this is a naked power move by Movement Arts. More specifically, WHERE IS THE VISION???? Other than allowing a few programs more authority within the institution, what is the GOAL? What values are addressed by these changes? How does this increase the QUALITY of scholarship and teaching? How does this help students? How does this enhance teaching? How does this respond to regional, national, and global structural change?

The answers to these questions have to be real, and not just a vocabulary of motive. The previous document of justification that was circulated via email was clearly and transparently a vocabulary of motive, a rationalization that did not embody a genuine vision, other than a justification for a naked power grab, IMHO.

And, by the way, the substantive questions around a reorganization have not even been addressed, to the best of my knowledge. So, from where I currently sit, it's just an internal political move, and will be seen by the majority, in the absence of a real and viable plan, as such.

Continued traffic problems with more students and faculty in the area

These very differences may cause further 'splits' in the academic fabric as we become even more engaged within our disciplines, and unable to see outside them

The main problem, as with academe in general, is balkanization of disciplines and fields of study. This is not always a bad thing, but frequently can be, especially if faculty find it increasingly difficult to "find" each other, and if turf and the protection thereof becomes more of a concern than the quality of what is produced and of forward thinking about knowledge and research.

There may well be less of a collaboration in disparate disciplines (eg chemistry and political science).

Disadvantages: the CORE curriculum would be distributed over a set of Schools, complicating its administration and making another layer of administration to deal with;

more administration offices created and staffed (more of the budget earmarked for administration, not for teaching or research);

irrational distribution of disciplines among not-very-reasonable segments (For example, how is mathematics more suitable for a "science" school than any other? Mathematicians need to know how to write and read; psychologists and business managers need to understand a number of mathematical concepts to do their jobs.);

the one logical school considered a few years ago--the School of Fine and Performing Arts--is conspicuous by its absence from this iteration of a call for more Schools. And yet Art, Music, Dance, and Theater are all desperately in need of adequate and appropriate space for their endeavors--as well as needing a dean who would understand their very specific needs.

The formation of these new schools would add administrative layers and positions to BSC. It is not clear to me that this would be an advantage. Ever narrower schools would probably also isolate faculty members in different fields from each other and lessen the unanticipated interactions that can lead to serendipitous cross-fertilization of ideas. I think these changes would also contribute to faculty cynicism about the goals and priorities of the administration.

<p>There are a lot of assumptions about liberal arts and how different it is from, for instance, education. It seems very fragmented now, and it might be possible that this would make good colleageal clusters. However, it also might unfairly privilege those who are already privileged (liberal arts, perhaps).</p>
<p>There are no disadvantages that I can determine. Hopefully, if a program "joins" a new school, all ties to the current school would not be severed.</p>
<p>May be overwhelming for the prospective student, but guidance can be provided.</p>
<p>It would be a shame to become isolated from the general faculty and the varried perspectives of their background and knowledge and discipline-based points of view.</p>
<p>Lose some connections between humanities/art/science</p>
<p>At a time when campuses across the country are being encouraged to engage in more interdisciplinarity, the move to disengage parts of the Arts and Sciences from the rest seems out of place. While clustering departments might encourage interdisciplinarity between them, both for faculty and students, it would very likely actively discourage such efforts between schools. Schools might become isolated from one another and might attempt to pursue their own agendas with regard to such matters as Core Curriculum. This could result in students becoming overspecialized and not emerging from the College with a well-rounded Liberal Arts education. As well, some departments might find themselves isolated from their most natural collegial relationships. If the number of faculty in a school is below a threshold (yet to be determined), efficiency of operation may in fact be hampered, as for example in the School of Management. The workload issue could be handled in a number of other ways short of creating new schools, such as appointing assistant deans (which might need to be done in any case, whether or not new schools are created). Finally, dividing Arts and Sciences into fiefdoms might dilute the ability of the Arts and Sciences faculty to stand together on issues of common concern, such as the proposal for a Liberal Studies Major or the reinstitution of a language requirement.</p>
<p>New schools would require increased in staffing and facilities. My concern is that the expense will be passed onto the students.</p>
<p>some departments/programs may be "naturally" linked, but in so doing, they may lose very important parts of themselves - so for example, a social science program -- such as social work, may end up linked in program with more professional areas, but lose the emphasis upon sociology - just one example</p>
<p>We currently have three schools for undergraduates: education, business, and arts and sciences. Aside from other professional programs, these are standard in most university organizations. The creation of schools specifically for Fine Arts is also fairly common. However a school or college of science? This would leave multiple departments in the current school without a school of its kind. What would you do with the 'soft sciences, such as anthropology or political science? Ok lets image it. A school for the Humanities: we currently have a humanities office that consists of english, philosophy and FL. What about history? What school would include political science, criminal justice, philosophy, history and anthropology?</p>
<p>NO DISADVANTAGES!</p>
<p>Not sure that there would be disadvantages for professional progrms. There is a concern about undergraduate education liberal arts majors if Arts ans Sciences were to separate.</p>

Splitting up the central school of arts and sciences would be a very bad idea, which would foster parochialism among the students, exacerbate territoriality and resentment among the faculty, and weaken the core liberal arts education we claim to offer. It's hardly "best practices" to split up the central arts and sciences disciplines -- this is the "soul" of a university. Faculty will come to see "their" students' needs as distinctly different, and thus seek to eliminate core requirements which are inconvenient or thought to be "irrelevant." Students will come to think of their own fields as self-contained. Resources will be allocated unequally.

I don't see any

It pays another administrator, taking away a position that could be better put in teaching and research.

More fundamentally, it puts us more in line with the "normal school" mentality, where knowledge is broken up into separate categories.

It aligns us with the less prestigious "public colleges" and separates us from the more prestigious private colleges.

Most fundamentally, it fails to see that "the humanities" is best seen as including the sciences, for the humanities aim to provide us (humans) with a comprehensive and critical and growing understanding of what is. To separate the humanities from the sciences would be to implicitly teach our students that knowledge is bifurcated, after the fear of C.P. Snow's Two Cultures. Instead of challenging this bifurcation, we would be contributing to it. There's enough division as it is.

Subdivisions would lead to smaller operating budgets and a less powerful voice on campus. If schools are created that combine disparate disciplines then there is no benefit and it may actually be detrimental.

The department of counselor Ed. has never discussed or been given any information regarding the potential marriage with other departments into a new school. I believe that being part of the process or at least having our voices heard would be beneficial to having everyone committed to the formation if in fact it comes to fruition.

a) Institutional Disadvantages: a weakening of the capacity of the Dean of Arts and Sciences to provide balanced oversight of the whole of College-level Liberal Arts

b) Educational Disadvantages: a weakening of true Liberal Arts education for our students.

Liberal Arts needs to be nurtured and seen as the best ?professional? education for a rapidly changing career and life environment (no need to expatiate here !). The creation of separate schools runs a measurable risk of increasing, rather than decreasing, the compartmentalization of curricula across departments.

c) Research Disadvantages: a weakening of perceived rewards and incentives for creative faculty work that cross School boundaries. (The role of School-level Deans runs a risk of inward-focused rewards.)

The disadvantage maybe the skirmishes that may result precisely because of the advantage I have sited. Territorial competition.

Question 3: Any additional comments:
I hope there will be room for open discussion when a list of proposed schools and the rationale for such schools have been generated.
I have more comments, which I would like to make at a later date, if possible.
I see no advantages to this at all.
I understand we are growing but I think we need to retain the same structure -- add associate deans or assistant deans within arts & sciences if the numbers are so high but dismantling the structure into schools would be a mistake. Most excellent higher education institutions have managed to retain the structure we now have.
Is this just an excuse to hire more Deans?
I would like the administration to address issues like salary inversion and crowding that directly impact educational quality right now. I appreciate your seeking my input and sharing your thoughts on higher level organizational issues, but I wonder if you're pursuing flashy, easy changes because the nitty-gritty, hard changes are too controversial or too hard.
I was skeptical at first, but I really do think it is time to do this.
I oppose this.
A new department needs a new building not encroachment on others.
It almost seems as if we have too much going on at once--new schools, university status, space issues, adjustments and comfort with the new core curriculum, etc. Maybe we need to direct our energies to one "new thing" at a time.

How schools are created is important. There needs to be a reasonable affinity among the programs, and there needs to be a collective interest among them that will be served better by the exclusive attention of an executive. In general, however, it will be a win-win.

We need to move the none teacher education programs out of the School of Education where they will get better visibility

A school of allied health, health, or health-related, especially to incorporate programs that have both undergraduate and graduate degrees.

has the rationale for the proposal been disseminated campus-wide?

I am in favor of separate schools, especially in the sciences. I think we will have to work hard to keep the camaraderie of this campus going as we get bigger and more specialized but it can be done if people want it.

I think the above capture my thoughts. I believe we should examine the current schools as this process moves forward to review as clearly and objectively as possible whether some contraction might accompany some expansion of schools. The major issue is to have them mirror generally understood and accepted standards and understandings from the outside(i.e. a school of education clearly means something), but also to be as creative as possible, e.g. now on the rebound the School of Management at Yale and its historical commitment to both profit and non-profit--maybe even greater emphasis on the latter--sector leadership and organizational behavior.

As the college grows into a university it seems like a good idea to create sub-structures which support the departments, and the schools will reduce or coordinate overlapping agendas.

Most universities I have researched--and most colleges--have a School of Arts and Sciences. I appreciate that at Bridgewater this means that one dean (Howard London) must administer a greater number of departments than the other deans. But this can be addressed with the hiring of another Associate Dean. If we must subdivide Arts and Sciences, then in fairness to them, we should give the Fine and Performing Arts their own School (and to space actually designed for the arts).

I suggest much broader participation in the committees or task forces that come up with these kinds of suggestions. I am referring her also to the suggestion for restructuring CART. Forming new schools and adding new administrative positions are predictable, but not especially creative ideas as we move towards university status.

I wonder also whether the interaction among "unfamiliar" faculties would get lost. I value the colleagues from other fields.

Let's move forward!

If it ain't broke, don't fix it!

A college of arts and science, or letters and science is the core, the heart, the foundation of a liberal arts education. A division of 'science and math' from the rest of the institution is a ridiculous way to solve a problem. And clearly, there is a problem, otherwise this wouldn't even be coming up. So, please be clear with us what the problem is. Then, we might be able, as a community, to solve it.

Thanks for considering faculty and librarian input.

While the proliferation of pre-professional programs might point towards the merits of some reorganizational models, no compelling case has been made for separating fine arts and natural science into separate schools. "Arts and Sciences" is a time-honored central core for a reason -- part of which is the interrelatedness of the humanities and the sciences, especially for the production of well-rounded undergraduate education. Another point: splitting up the core arts and sciences disciplines enlarges already-arbitrary distinctions. Why is art history grouped with studio art rather than with intellectual history, or with literature? Why would we group drama with sculpture rather than with literature? Why would we group mathematics with lab sciences -- but relegate economics to the business school? Bottom line: tentative "yes" to a new school of professional studies, resounding "no" to splitting up Arts and Sciences.

If we really take seriously that we seek to be an elite college/university, where we see our competition coming from the Williams and Wheaton and Mount Holyoke contingent rather than the Big State lineup, then we will not go this route. Just imagine this being discussed at an Amherst College! Try it. It's laughable to think it. And this is not elitism. Rather, it's a cool look at how academia properly understands the division of labor. There are the vocational schools, the Big States, and then there are the colleges and universities where knowledge really is understood and respected, where the deep understanding of the profound interconnectedness of ideas is seen thoroughly and completely, from the top down, so that as knowledge is divided, or not, is an essential teaching tool. The School of Sciences and the School of Liberal Arts, or however they would be named, is a way of saying, "We don't know or care about the kind of enlightenment that drove Newton to Einstein and on to be moved by a critical reflection of not just the mathematics of their disciplines but what the mathematics signified, to be moved by the need for poetry and philosophy as much as by the need for theories that predict and control,

The Department of Counselor Ed. has never discussed or had any information on the idea of a new school shared with the department. If we are being considered as part of a new school then the members of the department would like to be privy to the discussions and have our voice heard in the process.

By way of promoting a discussion of alternatives to the new schools, I would offer one alternative:

MAINTENANCE OF UNIFIED SCHOOL of ARTS and SCIENCES within BSC?BSU structure via creation of several faculty-led Divisions

o GRADUATE and CONTINUING EDUCATION

o SCHOOL of BUSINESS

o SCHOOL of EDUCATION and ALLIED STUDIES

o SCHOOL of ARTS AND SCIENCES

? Division of Sciences and Mathematics

? Division of Arts and Humanities

? Division of Political, Social, and Behavioral Sciences

Each division would be headed by a Director appointed from the constituent faculty, for a 3-year term. For the sake of continuity, the third year of the outgoing Director would be concurrent with the first year of the incoming Director (who would then begin as assistant to the Director).

I believe the Directors of the divisions would be able to provide the sought-for focus on external promotion, without weakening the intellectual coherence at the core of our institution.