

Committee Charge

- Develop recommendations to reduce the number of stand-alone schools and colleges
- Identify potential program synergies that could guide realignment options
 - Not charged with conducting an in-depth program array review

1

Members

- Kristian O'Connor
- Dietmar Wolfram
- Gillian Rodger
- Wilkistar Otieno
- Paul Roebber
- Greg Ahrenhoerster
- Marie Sandy
- Amy Harley
- Kevin Hartman
- Val Klump
- Mo Zell
- Drew Knab
- Tim Behrens
- Cassandra Broeren (student)
- Michael Kirsanov (student)
- Daniel Dyer (student)
- Jared Parker
- Jonathan Hanes

2

Progress to date

- Reviewed current campus structure and budget model
- Developed overall guiding principles
- Initial discussions of potential synergies in three subgroups based on metamajors
 - Art, Design, & Innovation / Humanities & Communication
 - Business, Industry, & Applied Technology / Social & Behavioral Sciences
 - Health / Natural Sciences
- Co-leads meeting with individual college administrators and chairs to gather initial input

3

Guiding Principles

- Prioritize Students' perspective
- Group "Like with like" or "like with complementary"
 - Common academic programs?
 - Common strategic vision/underlying philosophy?
 - Common workload models?
 - The committee also discussed opportunities to investigate non-traditional pairings that may be complementary
- Reduce operational cost
- Better operational efficiency
- Remove unnecessary barriers (typically driven by budget decisions)

4

Additional Considerations

- Fundraising
- Accreditation
- Identity
- Autonomy
- Nimbleness
- Student Experience
- Differences in workload expectations

5

Next Steps

- Develop lists of potential alignment options with pros and cons
- Develop recommendations for changes to P&P to facilitate the ability of Schools to reside within Colleges
- Final report due late January

6