

**Final Report of the Committee to Review the College and Divisional
Structure**

February 2017

Report of the Committee to Review the College and Divisional Structure
Delivered to the President and Provost on February 28, 2017

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary

I. Introduction: Context, Aims, and Principles

1. Narrative: process and focusing of report
 1. Charge to committee
 2. Consultation: the process
 3. Consultation: key issues raised
 4. Deliberations: focusing of report
2. Definitions and context
 1. The Divisions and the College: Historical perspective and institutional roles
 2. Role of the Provost
 3. Comparative distinctiveness of Divisional and College structure
3. Coherence and continued centrality of the Divisions and the College
4. Values grounding the Divisions and the College

II. Evaluation of Current Divisional and College Structure: Strengths and Challenges

A. Strengths

1. Divisions
2. College

B. Challenges

1. College-Divisional coordination
2. Proliferation of extra-Divisional programs and weakening of Divisions
3. Interdivisional planning, fundraising and advocacy
4. Alignment of responsibilities and authority/resources
5. Faculty participation and administrative transparency

III. Recommendation: Strengthened Divisions and the Decanal Council of the Divisions and the College

A. Overview

1. Evaluation of potential reforms and reorganization
2. Summary of recommendation

B. Recommendation I: Strengthened Divisions

1. Enhanced budgetary resources and authority
2. Divisional fostering of interdisciplinary/disciplinary innovation
3. Reimagining the Divisional role in undergraduate curriculum
4. Faculty consultation and participation

C. Recommendation II: Decanal Council of the Divisions and the College

1. Definition of the Decanal Council's charge

2. Functioning of the Decanal Council and role of Provost
3. Purview of the Decanal Council
 - a. College-Divisional coordination
 - b. Cross-Divisional graduate education and life
 - c. Interdivisional centers and initiatives
 - d. Interdivisional strategic planning, fundraising coordination, and advocacy
4. Faculty participation in the Decanal Council's deliberations

D. Next steps

Appendices

1. Four models for governing structures
2. Summary of consultations and deliberations
3. Charge to the Committee to Review the College and Divisional Structure
4. Deans' memorandum on the College and Divisions
5. Response to Deans' memorandum
6. Roster of committee members

Executive Summary

The Committee to Review the College and Divisional Structure was appointed by the President and Provost on May 19, 2016, in response to a memorandum written by the Deans of the College and three of the four Divisions of the University (Humanities, Physical Sciences, and Social Sciences). The Deans identified the current “budgetary allocation structures” and the institutional capacity for forward-looking interdivisional planning as especially urgent challenges facing the Divisions and the College. The Deans called for a review of the current structure and the consideration of future reforms assuring “greater budgetary, administrative, and strategic coordination among the Divisions and the College as a group.”

In response to the Deans’ request, the President charged this committee with assessing the strengths and weaknesses of the current organization of the Divisions and the College, and outlining alternative structures that might address the existing set of challenges. An assessment of the Biological Sciences Division (BSD) and its place within any future organizational reform is to be considered by a subsequent committee.

Following extensive consultation with the University’s academic leadership, Deans, departmental Chairs, faculty members, and other academic appointees (OAAs) in the relevant units, the committee identified several key concerns regarding the existing structure of the Divisions and the College. These included:

- the College-Divisional relationship;
- the weakening of the Divisions, due in part to the proliferation of extra-Divisional programs and initiatives;
- the misalignment of responsibility, authority, and resources within and between the Divisions and the College, and vis-à-vis the Provost; and
- a lack of administrative transparency and faculty participation in governance.

The committee also heard broad support from these constituencies for the retention of the Divisional structure, as well as strong resistance to any reforms that would sap its vitality, particularly in the form of a centralized Arts and Sciences model. The faculty expressed concerns about assuring continued responsiveness to the University’s core academic mission, and warned of the dangers of adding administrative layers that might distance them from key decision-makers. In addition, the committee’s consultations revealed a widespread belief in the need to strengthen advocacy on behalf of the Divisions and the College. Finally, there was strong sentiment in favor of maintaining the Provost’s traditional role as the leader of the University’s academic mission, and as a champion of the values of the arts and sciences.

A number of key values grounding the Divisions and the College were also highlighted throughout the consultation process. These include the primacy of research and inquiry to the University’s central mission, the culture of faculty-initiated and faculty-driven scholarship, the prominence of graduate education, the distinctive undergraduate experience fostered by the Core and the broader liberal arts curriculum, and a tradition of interdisciplinarity, diversity, and faculty administrative leadership that is integrated into the academic life of the institution.

As part of its efforts to determine how best to preserve and strengthen the University's academic distinctiveness in the context of substantial and evolving challenges, the committee tested a variety of options, and created four hypothetical governing models for the Divisions and the College. The features of these models, along with a summary of their potential strengths and weaknesses, were presented for discussion with all of the Chairs within the three relevant Divisions, as well as at open town hall faculty/OAA forums and in consultations with academic leadership.

As a result of these deliberations, the report presents the following two-part recommendation:

- **To strengthen the Divisions** through the delegation of enhanced budgetary resources and authority, Divisional fostering of interdisciplinary innovation, reframing of the Divisional role in the undergraduate curriculum, and the reinforcement of faculty governance mechanisms.
- **To establish a Decanal Council of the Divisions and the College** designed to facilitate coordination and planning across the relevant units. The Decanal Council would address issues involving more than one Division or the College, and deliberate over matters that affect their common interests, including interdivisional initiatives. The Decanal Council would be chaired by the Provost. It would respect the autonomy of the Divisions in matters under their established purview, and not interfere with their oversight of academic appointments and promotions. The Decanal Council would be empowered to appoint, and to call for the election of, standing or ad hoc committees that span the Divisions and the College, as appropriate to the task at hand. Its purview would encompass College/Divisional coordination, including matters pertaining to the allocation of College tuition revenues, College enrollment, and academic and curricular planning. It could also oversee certain interdisciplinary centers that currently report to the Provost and coordinate areas of cross-Divisional graduate education and life. Finally, it would be responsible for interdivisional strategic planning, fundraising coordination, and advocacy, and its deliberations would be informed by clear mechanisms of faculty input, including regular quarterly meetings and an annual report to the faculty.

The committee believes these recommendations build on the historically distinctive architecture of academic leadership at the University, while creating a new foundation for concerted strategic planning, interdisciplinary dynamism, and interdivisional faculty consultation. Looking forward, it would also serve as a forum of deliberation that would guide the imaginative advancement of the research and teaching missions of the arts and sciences, including the future evolution of their governing forms and organization.

In order to ensure the successful implementation of this structured coordination model, the committee strongly recommends that the Decanal Council of the Divisions and the College be officially adopted as part of the University Statutes. It is the committee's hope that the publication of this report will encourage robust discussions regarding the fundamental centrality of the Divisions and the College, whose faculty share a special responsibility in ensuring the University's core mission of advancing liberal education, the training of future scholars, the production of new forms of knowledge, and a relentless and fearless practice of inquiry.

I. Context, Aims, and Principles

I. A. Narrative: process and focusing of report

1. Charge to the Committee

On May 19, 2016, the Committee to Review the College and Divisional Structure received from President Robert J. Zimmer its formal charge. In his statement [see Appendix 3], the President outlined the context of his decision to constitute the committee following receipt of a collective memorandum from the Deans of the College and three of the four Divisions of the University [Humanities, Physical Sciences, and Social Sciences]. The memorandum from the Deans underlined two especially significant challenges facing the current organization of the Divisions and the College, the first relating to the current “budgetary allocation structures” and the second concerning “the institutional capacity to encourage and sustain cross-cutting innovation in both research and teaching.” Given this assessment, the four signatory Deans called for a review of the current structure as well as the consideration of future reforms that might permit “greater budgetary, administrative, and strategic coordination among the Divisions and the College as a group” and enable them “to develop more rational and transparent planning vis-à-vis the revenues generated by the College and to encourage new forms of educational and scholarly collaboration.”

In response to the Deans’ request, the President charged the committee with exploring the current organization of the Divisions and the College, including the roles of and interactions among departmental Chairs, the Deans and the Provost; assessing the strengths and weaknesses of the current organization, particularly regarding the aforementioned concerns about the system of resource allocation and the capacity for interdivisional innovation; and outlining alternative organizational structures that might address these concerns and “any other challenges discovered by the committee in its work.” Finally, the committee was informed that assessment of the Biological Sciences Division (BSD) and its place within any future organizational reform was to be considered by a separate committee that would be charged after the rendering of the current committee’s report. A BSD faculty member was named to serve on the current committee, in order to better connect these two phases of the review.

Consultation: the process

After a round of June 2016 meetings with individual Deans and other key administrators, the committee started the 2016-17 academic year with an extensive range of consultations with the faculty. This process was initiated through email communications with the full faculty and other academic appointees (OAAs) of the relevant Divisions, to provide background, solicit feedback through the use of a dedicated email address, and invite all recipients to reach out to members of the committee for personal conversations. Over 65 consultations with faculty, OAAs, and academic administrative leadership took place during the course of the committee’s work. A summary of the full range of consultative activity, including discussions with faculty, Divisional leadership, and other academic and administrative leaders within the University, can be found in Appendix 2.

At the heart of this faculty consultation was our sustained and iterative work with the Chairs of all departments in the three relevant faculty-appointing Divisions. There were three separate rounds of in-depth discussions with each group of Chairs: a first round of meetings during early Autumn Quarter, to introduce the key issues and listen to their perspectives and concerns; a second round at the end of the Autumn Quarter, which followed up on the individual Chairs' own intervening conversations with their departmental faculties; and a final round in mid-January, during which the committee presented its preliminary findings and the outlines of four hypothetical models of organizational reform/restructuring.

The committee's guiding principles in these consultations were twofold. First, *to listen*. That is to say, to carefully attend to the stated core values of faculty concerning the organization of academic affairs and University governance; to register their assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the current Divisional and College structure; and to gather their ideas for appropriate reforms or reorganization, as well as concerns about such changes. Second, *to help inform*. We aimed to broaden and deepen the discussions in part by sharing the perspectives of faculty and Divisional leaders from corners of the University other than their own. We also drew attention to the larger University context, and relayed what we had learned of key academic, budgetary and organizational challenges facing the central administration.

Regarding this last point, to say that there often exists a "disconnect" among faculty hailing from different divisions, and, even more saliently, between the faculty and the central administration, would perhaps not come as a surprise. We nevertheless believe that this divide should not simply be discounted as an inevitable fact of academic life, to be met with resignation. It is instead a problem that, far from being an immobile constant, is subject to evolving institutional factors. It can be eased or aggravated, diminished or perpetuated, by certain organizational practices and structures. This belief significantly informs the assessment and proposals that follow in this report.

Consultation: key issues raised

Among the chief concerns regarding the *existing structure* of the Divisions and the College, the committee heard the following:

- *College-Divisional relationship*. Faculty consistently expressed concern about the shrinking role of graduate studies as a central element of the University's culture, and in particular in relation to an expanding College. Faculty also expressed dismay about the lack of coordinated planning for College enrollment growth, and its powerful effect on departmental and Divisional resources, academic programming, and curricular design. Furthermore, as the committee began its consultation process, the Provost's Office undertook work with the Divisions and the College in creating and implementing a new tuition allocation model that impacts the structures that this committee was charged with evaluating. In this regard, we heard widespread alarm about the potential effects that such a monetization of teaching might have on the distinctive intellectual vitality of our undergraduate programs and their historical attachment to faculty scholarship. At the time of our consultations, these concerns were undercutting faith in the University's distinctive academic mission, and corroding faculty morale.

- *Diminished status of the Divisions.* There was broad acknowledgment of the opportunities and resources provided by the University's vast expansion outside of Divisional control, in the form of interdisciplinary programs and institutes reporting directly to the Provost, international centers, and professional school initiatives. There was however also considerable disquiet about the concomitant weakening role of the Divisions in an increasingly large and complex University. Faculty often feel that they are no longer setting the academic agenda (or at least not doing so through the collective work of their home departments and Divisions), and that the longstanding centrality of research within the University, along with its graduate mission, is threatened.
- *Faculty participation and transparency.* As mentioned above, the sense of disconnection between leadership structures and the faculty was expressed through the articulation of an urgent desire to not only reinvigorate longstanding mechanisms of faculty governance and consultation, but also to consider adopting new processes and practices that would assure transparency regarding academic and budgetary decisions. Concerns regarding more robust coordination and the flow of information were registered on a number of levels: between departments and their respective Divisions and the College; among the various Divisions and the College; and finally, between the Divisions and the Office of the Provost.

In discussing the key criteria to be considered in moving forward toward any *future structural reforms*, several concerns were particularly salient in faculty consultations:

- *Sustaining Chicago's distinctive academic culture.* In this regard, the committee heard broad support for the Divisional structure (see below under "Strengths"), and strong resistance to any reforms that would substantially sap its vitality, particularly in the form of a centralized Arts and Sciences model.
- *Assuring continued responsiveness to core academic mission.* Faculty repeatedly emphasized the traditional strengths of the University of Chicago in nimbly responding to faculty initiatives, and warned of the danger of added "administrative layers" that might distance faculty from key decision-makers and direct access to resources. More specifically, faculty often expressed deep attachment to the traditionally strong role of the Provost as leader of the academic mission of the University, working closely with the Divisions and the College. While the committee fully registered this resistance to bureaucratic strata, it also underscored to the faculty the current complexity of Provost's portfolio in an expanding University, as well as the general need for effective administrative support in order to advance the research and teaching mission of the University.
- *Strengthening advocacy for the Divisions and the College.* Faculty frequently stressed their belief that the scholarship and teaching carried out on a daily basis by members of the academic Divisions lie at the heart of the University's success as a whole. Many of the much-touted aspects of the University's expansion — such as its robust international presence and dynamic interdisciplinary initiatives, even though housed outside the

Divisions — largely draw upon and adroitly leverage the research renown of these faculties. The tremendous success of the College likewise hinges on its unique reputation for offering an intellectually exhilarating experience rooted in these faculties’ teaching. Our consultation revealed a widespread belief that the centrality of the Divisions’ work needs to be better represented in the future.

Committee deliberations and focusing of report

In our final round of deliberations and consultations, we wrestled with the fundamental problem of how to preserve and strengthen the University’s academic distinctiveness, partially grounded as it is in certain institutional structures, while appropriately reforming those structures in order to vigorously address the very real and evolving challenges they face today and in the years to come. This required the committee to test a variety of options, and led to the creation of four hypothetical governing models for the Divisions and the College, each successively adding and reinforcing structures for coordination and centralization. These ranged from a “strengthened Divisional model” to a robust (but still federal) “Arts and Sciences” model. The first model did not simply maintain the Divisional and College status quo, nor did the final one entail the absolute elimination of its constituent units. We then presented these models, with a summary outline of their potential strengths and weaknesses, for full discussion with all of the Chairs of the three affected Divisions, as well as in open forum town hall meetings and private consultations with academic leaders in the Divisions, the College, the Provost’s Office and beyond.

I. B. Definitions and Context

The Divisions and the College: Historical perspective and institutional roles

The current structure of the four academic Divisions and the College, constituted individually as autonomous Faculty Ruling Bodies, was instituted by President Robert Maynard Hutchins in the broad institutional reforms of 1930. While the four Divisions originally maintained control over the advanced, post-Core work of undergraduate education, by the 1940s a clear division of labor had been established, which has remained relatively unchanged to this day. Each of the Divisional Faculties maintains general control over graduate education in their areas, while the Faculty of the College retains control of the undergraduate curriculum and work leading to the Bachelor of Arts degree.ⁱ While in the early decades of this arrangement the College had the power to appoint a separate and distinct Faculty dedicated to undergraduate education, this arrangement was gradually eliminated by the end of the 20th century. Today the tenured and tenure-track faculty in the College are nearly coterminous with the Faculties of the Divisions, and maintain appointments in both a Division (or occasionally multiple Divisions or Schools) and the College. It is important to note in this regard that the Faculty of the College as a Ruling Body constitutes, in point of practice, the governing institutional arrangement that most closely conjoins the autonomous faculties of the Divisions (aside from their shared reporting structure to the Provost and the President).ⁱⁱ

In terms of governance, each of the Divisions and the College is administered by a Dean. According to Section 7.1 of the University Statutes, these Deans are “empowered to act as the executive officer and representative of their Faculty, and with regard to educational policy, to take the initiative in proposing plans to the Faculty, and to carry into effect plans adopted by the Faculty.” We might say, then, that Deans act as both executive officers as well as representatives of their faculties, which themselves are invested with the power to inform, develop, and approve academic planning.

Role of the Provost

The Divisional and College Deans report to the Provost, who recommends their appointment to the President following a consultation process undertaken through an elected Faculty committee. The role of the Provost in the current structure is particularly crucial since, as noted above, the Divisions and the College independently operate without any formal or statutory mechanisms of lateral coordination; they depend entirely for such coordination on their vertical relationship to the Office of the Provost.

Hence the Provost plays a uniquely critical role in the academic life of the University. Beyond simple authority over academic budgets, the Provost is more broadly granted, by the Statutes, general responsibility for the academic affairs of the University, powers to be exercised in consultation with faculty and academic leaders: “In furtherance of this responsibility, the Provost shall take the initiative in proposing plans and action in academic matters, in reviewing and implementing educational programs and policies, and in meeting and consulting with Deans, Chairs of Departments, Directors, and members of faculties [Section 6.2 of the Statutes].”

While the evolving size and complexity of the University demands continual creative adaptation in overseeing this increasingly vast portfolio, the enduring vision of the Provost as the leader of our academic mission was most recently reaffirmed in President Zimmer’s March 2016 message to the University faculty. In outlining the qualities essential for the effective exercise of the Provost’s duties, the statement notably calls for “a distinguished faculty member who can represent and forcefully articulate the distinctive values of the University” and “provide collaborative academic leadership, working with the deans and faculty to continue building our academic programs with great ambition.”

Distinctiveness of Divisional and College Structure

The University of Chicago’s Divisional and College structure might be characterized as an “arts and sciences without the Arts and Sciences.” The relative idiosyncrasy of our system can be judged, to cite one revealing example, by a chart of comparative structures presented in a recent Yale University report on decanal organization. When one glances at a schematic grid illustrating decanal roles at peer institutions, a single empty box strikingly stands out: where other universities have some form of a Dean of Arts and Sciences, we have none.ⁱⁱⁱ

This reflects a deliberate choice. By incorporating the duties of a Dean of Arts and Sciences within the much broader role of the Provost, Chicago’s Divisional and College structure has arguably enhanced the development of research and teaching at the University and powerfully

contributed to its special strengths.^{iv} Our Divisional structure with its institutional clustering of departments, flexibly joined by broadly conceived methodological affinities, has allowed for the incubation of strong interdisciplinary collaboration beyond departmental boundaries.

Furthermore, while a vast arts and sciences umbrella structure tends to place local power within discipline-specific departments (with more of that power located in larger departments), the University's supra-departmental structure is able to nourish small departments or subfields that may not fare as well in the larger competitive pool of an Arts and Sciences organization. Finally, it has placed academic decision-making in the hands of Deans who are most closely situated to these areas of expertise.

Turning to the College as an independent faculty Ruling Body, its role in overseeing the undergraduate curriculum outside of departmental control has allowed for the development of one of the University of Chicago's hallmark achievements, a distinctive general education core that is dedicated to the students' intellectual development in broadly conceived arenas of human knowledge and investigation.

The distinctiveness of this system is however not without costs, and even its fiercest proponents admit that it faces ever new challenges, as will be outlined below. It should be noted, however, that on both intellectual and administrative levels, it provides a degree of local, confederated control that has proved appealing to many peer institutions, a number of which have moved in recent years to devolve a certain, if limited, degree of decision-making to such divisions or subdivisions within their traditional arts and sciences governing models. (It is telling that Stanford, Yale, and Columbia Universities, for example, have recently evolved in this direction.) Yet the fact that these newly created divisions directly report to long established and imposing deans of arts and sciences (or their equivalent) has meant that their establishment elsewhere tends not to create the kind of robust, "close to areas of expertise" control that has distinguished Chicago's academic culture.

I. C. Coherence and continued centrality of the Divisions and the College

Considered as a group, the four Divisions and the College largely constitute, as earlier noted, what is referred to outside of the University as the "arts and sciences." However, to respect the institutional nature of this committee's charge and the University's tradition, in this report we will, in matters pertaining to organizational structures, use the term "Divisions and the College" rather than the "arts and sciences."

The Divisions and the College can be viewed in many respects as a coherent ensemble. Their missions share a common dedication to promoting inquiry and knowledge in their own right. They are also equally committed, on both the undergraduate and Ph.D. levels, to degree programs that admit students in a need-blind fashion, on the basis of pure merit. As indicated earlier, their Faculties are, through common appointments in the College, largely incorporated — at least regarding certain of their functions — within one Faculty Ruling Body.

While they undeniably form the long-established center of the University, their work also ramifies far and wide across the full panoply of the institution's research, teaching, public engagement, and dissemination activities. The centrifugal force of the Divisions and the College

is expressed everywhere, and its faculty play key roles in major initiatives that stretch beyond their traditional confines, ranging from Molecular Engineering to the Urban Labs, from the Chicago Arts Incubator to the University's Centers in Paris, Beijing, Delhi, and Hong Kong.

In short, the influence of the Divisions and the College is ubiquitous. Their organizational borders are thus in good part an administrative illusion. This is admittedly a necessary illusion, since effective operations require the clear delimitation of structural perimeters. Yet the actual work of their faculty and students —not only in terms of intellectual value but also of international prestige and philanthropic appeal — is ultimately impossible to isolate. They remain the greatest generative force for the University as a whole, even while the immediate impact of their work may sometimes be felt most strongly in its manifestation outside of their Divisional homes.

Finally, our understanding of any organizational grouping of the Divisions and the College necessarily requires some form of inclusion, to be determined during the next phase of this process, of the biological sciences.^v The Biological Sciences Division comprises faculty that would easily be considered to be part of any arts and sciences academic unit, and it shares a common history with other Divisions, established coequally with them in 1930. BSD has, of course, some important distinctive characteristics: it is affiliated with a medical school (the Pritzker School of Medicine) and a medical center (The University of Chicago Medicine), and it does not receive financial support from the University. However, many of its faculty teach in the College and participate in University centers and institutes outside of BSD. Cross-Divisional appointments are also common with BSD. Thus, numerous formal and informal connections exist between BSD faculty, the College, and the other three Divisions. Regarding the College, it should be noted that undergraduate education in biology is organized through the Biological Sciences Collegiate Division (BSCD), overseen, as in the other Divisions, by a Master who reports jointly to the Deans of BSD and the College.^{vi} We thus believe that BSD should have an opportunity to actively participate, in a manner to be assessed by the subsequent committee, in any processes of coordination with the other Divisions; develop a system that recognizes and incentivizes its faculty to teach undergraduates; and have input into decisions regarding enrollment and curriculum in the College.

I. D. Values Grounding the Divisions and the College

In the early rounds of its consultation, the committee asked faculty and OAAs to reflect upon the core values that should help determine our criteria for assessing the strengths and weaknesses of the current Divisional and College organization and any future modifications made to that structure. The values described below reflect both longstanding features of the University, all of which are evolving and some of which face significant challenges, and qualities that, while firmly grounded in aspects of our history, remain in part aspirational.

- *Primacy of research and inquiry to our central mission.* More than a simple motto, the search for scholarly excellence fundamentally shapes all aspects of academic life, including teaching, faculty appointments and promotions, and disciplinary organization.
- *Faculty-initiated and -driven research agendas.* The preeminence of the University’s culture of inquiry is grounded in the unrelenting creativity, curiosity, and rigor of the faculty, whether working individually or in self-formed collective teams. It is primarily bottom-up rather than top-down.
- *Fundamental value of inquiry and new knowledge.* Investigation, discovery, and curiosity are ends in themselves; their impact on society — through teaching, public dissemination, application, and civic engagement — is vast and invaluable, but also often intangible in the immediate term.
- *Prominence of graduate education.* While the balance between graduate and undergraduate education has significantly evolved over the past two decades, the University must be vigilant in maintaining its unique reputation as a trainer of scholars and “teacher of teachers.” Furthermore, the eminence of graduate education, closely coupled with our research mission, provides the University with an invaluable competitive edge in the recruitment and retention of faculty.
- *Distinguished undergraduate liberal arts education and the Core.* The unique intellectual vibrancy and intensity of the College student experience depends on its integration in the University’s boundary-breaking culture of inquiry. This is manifested in a broadly conceived Core curriculum, as well as in students’ participation in the research mission of the Divisions through a range of opportunities including graduate courses, laboratory research, and advanced scholarly activities.
- *Interdisciplinarity.* Chicago has an illustrious tradition of research and teaching that is grounded in the exploration of ideas and problems, rather than an adherence to narrow departmental borders. The future of this mission will also require continued rigorous training in highly focused areas of knowledge that are often endangered by market forces. Meaningful interdisciplinarity depends on the bold and ever-probing practice of disciplinary investigation and education.
- *Diversity.* Diversity is central to the University’s singular commitment to rigorous inquiry and an empowering education. The success of this mission requires embracing a wide range

of ideas, supporting diversity in disciplines and curriculum, and providing an environment in which people with differing backgrounds and perspectives thrive.

- *Faculty leadership.* The University has a long history of administrative leadership that is fully integrated into its academic life. It has in particular relied on faculty circulation in and out of key academic administrative positions, which helps assure the promotion of the values noted above. While a more expansive and complex University may require adaptation in this regard, maintaining the administration's proximity to the academic mission is key to the continuation of our distinctive scholarly reputation.

II. Evaluation of the Current Divisional and College Structure: Strengths and Challenges

II. A. Strengths

The following summary of the historically grounded strengths of the Divisional and College structure is derived from our discussions with faculty, as well as with present and former University leaders. These qualities face continual challenges, and their realization in practice has evolved with time.

1. The Divisions

- *Proximity.* Key decisions relating to faculty appointments and promotions, graduate degree programs, and academic priorities are made close to areas of disciplinary expertise.
- *Size.* The relatively small and nimble structure of the Divisions allows responsiveness to faculty-driven initiatives, with relatively few intermediaries.
- *Priority given to scholarly excellence.* Historically, the concentrated scope of decanal responsibilities (as opposed to a sweeping “arts and science model”) has allowed primary focus to be given to the advancement of faculty research and graduate education.
- *Cross- and extra-departmental initiative.* The intimate grouping of departments by broadly conceived intellectual agendas and methodological approaches (e.g, humanities, physical sciences) promotes strong interdisciplinary collaboration in these areas; via coordination with the College, it also encourages boldly expansive undergraduate core sequences.
- *Graduate/undergraduate coordination:* The Divisional focus on scholarship and graduate education has historically promoted, through the teaching of the faculty, a distinct research-oriented undergraduate experience.
- *Multiplication of decanal advocacy.* The individual voice granted to each Division assures representation to the central administration of diversified methodological perspectives and interests.

2. The College

- *Integrative liberal arts approach.* The independence of the College helps support a Core curriculum — and more generally, an undergraduate education transcending departmental boundaries — that promotes a distinctively dynamic academic experience.

- *Protection of undergraduate education.* The College has historically provided an institutional counterpoint to the graduate emphasis of the Divisions (although this balance has fundamentally shifted in the past few decades).
- *A potentially powerful advocate.* Through its amalgamation of the various faculties of the Divisions in their crucial role in undergraduate education, the College has the capacity to act as a powerful representative for the arts and sciences.
- *Division of Labor.* By assuming responsibility for undergraduate education, the College helps departments and Divisions maintain a focus on their graduate and research mission.

II. B. Challenges

1. College-Divisional relationship

This committee's charge was motivated in good measure by the lack of any ongoing and sustained coordination between the College and the Divisions. The committee in particular views as critical the following:

- *Budgetary allocation and facilities/capital planning.* The current structure lacks any regular mechanisms for coordinated decision-making among the concerned parties, particularly regarding College enrollment sizes (now in the hands of the Vice President for Enrollment) and the budgetary, capital, and administrative resources required for undergraduate teaching (including classroom and laboratory capacities, operating expenses, and construction/facilities costs, which require further coordination with the Provost's Office). The recently announced tuition allocation model for budgetary allotment presents its own very significant challenges. It will at a minimum require regular coordinated and collective review and modification, in order to avoid undermining our academic mission through the monetization of student enrollments and through counterproductive rivalries among Divisions and departments aimed at capturing a finite number of students.
- *Academic and curricular alignment.* As a consequence of the growth of the College since the 1990s and the decreasing size (notably in the humanities and social sciences) of graduate enrollments, Divisions and departments have been required to manage a shifting balance between undergraduate and graduate teaching demands. Many faculty must now systematically redesign their teaching portfolios, and they often find themselves under competing and sometimes conflicting sets of incentives and constraints. Departmentally imposed teaching obligations in the majors on one hand, and, on the other, College incentives for teaching in the Core or in Study Abroad, pull faculty in opposite directions. New or enhanced coordination is needed in order to harmonize a coherent undergraduate curriculum that systematically integrates the aims and methods of both general education and advanced disciplinary training.
- *College staffing and graduate student teachers.* The shifting composition of our student body has produced new tensions in staffing. Not only are there more undergraduates to

teach, but in many departments there are also fewer graduate students available to help teach them. Furthermore, the disparate administrative mechanisms attending to the learning needs of undergraduates on the one hand, and the teaching opportunities of graduate students on the other, are not systematically aligned. Departments in the Humanities and Social Sciences Divisions are responsible for ensuring that their graduate students receive the requisite pedagogical training and experience under the Graduate Aid Initiative (GAI). While the College strives to take this into consideration in staffing the Core and managing teaching support in the majors, where the great bulk of graduate students' teaching opportunities lie, it must first prioritize the quality, continuity, and curricular coherence of the undergraduate program.

2. Proliferation of extra-Divisional programs and weakening of Divisions

The work of the faculty in the Divisions has outgrown the Divisional structure in which they are appointed. Most notably in relation (but not limited) to the Humanities and Social Sciences Divisions, the propagation of extra-Divisional centers, institutes, and initiatives has created an unbalanced system. The Divisions serve the primary institutional role of faculty-appointing and degree-granting bodies, yet they often no longer act as the base for some of the most interesting scholarly activities of the very faculty whose salaries they pay, nor do they control a significant degree of the budgetary and administrative resources necessary to advance that vital work. Two aspects of this situation are particularly challenging:

- *Administrative misalignments and complexity.* The exploding number of extra-Divisional centers creates an unwieldy number of reports to the Provost's Office. In addition to the resulting administrative tangle, this reporting structure insufficiently promotes sustained coordination with the academic interests and strategic planning of the Divisional home of the faculty involved.
- *Disciplinary tensions.* The Divisions play a crucial role in sustaining disciplines whose rigorous specialization and unrelenting focus on inquiry and knowledge as ends in and of themselves are often endangered by market forces, such as undergraduate enrollments, priorities of funding agencies, and philanthropic interests. This nourishing and protective mission can fruitfully co-exist with the Division's commitment to newly emerging fields and innovative cross-disciplinary research. Yet the tension between the two can be real, and has been one of the factors in the propagation of extra-Divisional units.

3. Interdivisional planning, fundraising and advocacy

As has been noted earlier, there now exists no mechanism for the structured coordination of the Divisions and the College. This has led to unproductive rivalries in fundraising, where concerted broad-based efforts would likely enjoy a greater chance of success. It has also reduced opportunities for effective forward-looking and collaborative planning for important cross-Divisional initiatives, ranging from the GAI to new interdisciplinary degree programs. In addition, there is an absence of unified advocacy for the academic values and mission of the arts and sciences at the University.

4. Alignment of responsibilities and authority/resources

The current Divisional model places enormous institutional responsibilities on the Deans — whether in high-stakes faculty appointment and retention offers or in developing new research programs — without the concomitant budgetary authority and resources to enable them to effectively advance their missions. While increasing the budgetary power and autonomy of the Divisions will be required to renew their central place in the life of the University, this renewal will necessitate the expansion of proper administrative bandwidth to handle increased authority. It will also require attention to maintaining the scholarly focus of Divisional leadership as it takes on new authorities befitting its expanded responsibilities.

5. Faculty participation and administrative transparency

As noted above, our discussions with faculty revealed intense concern about a lack of robust forms of consultation between faculty and their leaders. The Divisions themselves have inconsistent processes and practices designed to enable faculty participation in crucial decision-making. For example, within the different Divisions, the role of the departmental Chairs as a collective body for effective deliberation and for dissemination to the faculty of key information, including budgetary overview, is often ambiguous. The existence and functions of elected deliberative faculty bodies also vary across the Divisions. While great care must be taken not to overload faculty with excessive committee work nor to constrain faculty initiatives through cumbersome approval mechanisms, any revisions to the Divisional and College structure must address this need for effective faculty participation in the setting of key academic priorities.

III. Recommendation: Strengthening of the Divisions, and Creation of a Decanal Council of the Divisions and the College

III. A. Overview

1. Evaluation of potential reforms and reorganization

Our assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the current Divisional and College structure led the committee to weigh potential reforms and reorganization that would accomplish three key goals: 1) maintain or enhance the advantages of the current system; 2) provide solutions to the five key challenges they face; and 3) design any such reforms with an eye towards the current feasibility of implementation, as well as future ability to adapt to an evolving University. As noted above, this required the committee to test a variety of options for reaching these goals. Because we determined that maintaining strictly unchanged the current governing structures could not accomplish this, we created four hypothetical models for the Divisions and the College that introduced various levels of modification to the present structures. These four models were presented to departmental Chairs and academic leaders, and discussed at town hall meetings, for the purpose of obtaining feedback from faculty and OAAs in the three Divisions and the College.

A more detailed outline of these four models, including the benefits and costs they potentially entail, is presented in Appendix 1. It should be noted that each of these models includes the College as a fundamental component, as well as the Divisions. The committee found that the exclusion of the College from any reorganization would simply exacerbate current problems regarding the effective coordination of our undergraduate and graduate/research missions.

Each of the four models successively adds mechanisms and structures of coordination and centralization. The first two models reform the current organization while not adding a new decanal function that would unite the Divisions and the College. Model 1 strengthens the current Divisions, while providing no new coordinating mechanisms. Model 2 provides structured coordination through a newly constituted “Decanal Council of the Divisions and the College,” which would be charged with overseeing interdivisional planning and the concerted action of our undergraduate and graduate/research missions. Models 3 and 4 add to our current structure different versions of a Dean of the Arts and Sciences position that would oversee interdivisional affairs. Model 3 attempts to maintain a maximally federal structure that includes autonomous Divisions, with the Divisional and College Deans continuing to report directly to the Provost and not to the newly created Dean of Arts and Sciences. Model 4 envisions a more centralizing function, by placing the Divisional and College Deans under the leadership of a “strong” Dean of the Arts and Sciences.

Model 3, while occupying an attractive “middle ground” between a Decanal Council structure reporting to the Provost and a more consolidating Dean of the Arts and Sciences position, ultimately failed to convince due to its unstable occupation of that conciliatory ground. When tested with the various challenges confronting such an ambiguously empowered Dean of the Arts and Sciences (to whom the other Deans would not directly report), we found it likely that ultimate controlling power would collapse in one direction or another. It would either revert back to the Provost, who would have to closely oversee a weak arbiter or “referee” Dean (and

hence back to a version of Model 2), or to an increasingly empowered Dean of the Arts and Sciences, who would, in the interests of an efficient executive function, gradually absorb the powers of the subordinate Deans.

This last scenario would in effect constitute a version of Model 4. A “strong” Dean of Arts and Sciences, as envisioned in that model, would certainly bring added benefits: greater potential for effective cross-Divisional strategic planning and coordinated fundraising, enhanced advocacy for the arts and sciences within the University, and a streamlined reporting structure. Yet the committee judged the potential downsides to be very costly. In terms of political feasibility, there was extremely little support among the faculty for a new “Arts and Sciences” decanal structure. We also judged its potential weakening of the independent Divisions and the College to be too menacing to the distinctive academic culture of the University. Furthermore, in order to be effective, such an “Arts and Sciences” model would require a vast transfer of budgetary resources and administrative authority capable of handling the most challenging appointment and retention costs and implementing ambitious interdivisional initiatives; otherwise it would potentially constitute little more than another administrative layer distancing the Divisions and the College from the Provost’s Office.

2. Summary of recommendation

The committee thus proposes a series of reforms, outlined below, to 1) strengthen the Divisions so that they may better chart their own destinies and provide more imaginative and expansive leadership within the University, and 2) establish a Decanal Council of the Divisions and the College, to oversee, under the Provost’s direction, matters of interdivisional coordination and planning.

We believe that the advantages of these proposals can be summarized as follows: ***The reinvigoration of the Divisions, and the establishment of a robust structure for their own collaboration as well as coordination with the College, would build on the historically distinctive architecture of academic leadership at the University, while creating a new foundation for concerted strategic planning, interdisciplinary dynamism, and interdivisional faculty consultation. Looking forward, it would also serve as a forum of deliberation that would guide the imaginative advancement of the research and teaching missions of the arts and sciences, including the future evolution of their governing forms and organization.***

Finally, each of the two sets of recommendations below includes proposals for enhanced faculty consultation and administrative transparency. These proposals could take on various forms, such as strengthened functions for executive committees of departmental Chairs representing their faculty, or elected bodies for faculty deliberation. We are keenly aware that such mechanisms may cause unintended consequences through the creation of potentially cumbersome administrative layers and barriers to faculty innovation. Our aim is to maintain a balance that would promote proper faculty participation without undue committee workload, and allow for a robust discussion of the academic value of new programs without stifling individual faculty initiatives through unwieldy approval processes.

III. B. Recommendation I: Strengthening the Divisions

In order to address the relative weakening of the Divisions and reaffirm their centrality within an expanded University, the committee proposes that the Divisions enlarge their institutional bandwidth and academic scope — and be given the resources to do so.

1. *Enhanced budgetary resources and authority*

Increasing the capacity of the Divisions to purposively and imaginatively chart their academic futures — and to effectively implement their designs — will require the infusion of substantial additional resources. This empowerment is particularly crucial in order for the Divisions to execute thoughtfully planned faculty appointments, strategic advancement of their graduate programs, and creative incubation of programmatic initiatives. It is crucial that the Divisions be granted, from the Provost, the budgetary resources and administrative authority concomitant to these added responsibilities.

The invigoration of the Divisions will also require increased fundraising capacities. True progress in this regard will depend in part on the Divisions' own elaboration of an inspiring vision and the strategic priorities to allow for its realization; but it will equally depend on the University's commitment to make available to the Divisions significant philanthropic opportunities, and to grant them significant leeway to take the initiative in framing such opportunities to suit their research agendas. It must also be understood that certain disciplines and departments are of greater interest to funding agencies and donors, while others are not typically viewed as being traditional targets for philanthropic investment.

Furthermore, as outlined at the beginning of this report (“Context, Aims, and Principles”), the Divisions and the College have always been at the center of the University, and thus have never been separable as financially independent units. Therefore, any proposed budgetary arrangements or administrative restructuring designed to increase the autonomy of the Divisions and the College must not distort or endanger their fundamental academic mission.

It is thus important to attend to the potential academic costs of revitalizing the Divisions by strengthening the budgetary, administrative, and fundraising levers at their control. In particular, this expansion of scope may risk undermining the Divisions' traditional emphasis on assuring excellence in scholarship, faculty hiring and promotion, departmental undergraduate programs, and graduate education. To allow the Deans to maintain a keen focus on these priorities will require effective administrative support (some of which could potentially be redistributed from the Provost's Office) and robust academic leadership teams within the Divisions, in the form of deputized roles for certain appointed faculty members.

2. *Divisional fostering of interdisciplinary/disciplinary innovation*

The University of Chicago has been a leader in the development of interdisciplinary workshops, centers and institutes. Possibly, no other university has placed such importance on, and resources into, fostering the intellectual benefits that come from collaboration across departments and Divisions. However, over the last decade this has translated into the proliferation of

interdisciplinary units, many of which are situated outside of the Divisional structure. These units make tremendous contributions to the intellectual life of the University, but they simultaneously appropriate resources needed in the Divisions. In some cases, the establishment of such centers and institutes came about as a result of faculty collaborations across different units. In others, these centers and institutes were created outside of the Divisional structure because of concerns that the Divisions might not be sufficiently supportive of such intellectual innovations, or that they would not be the most appropriate entity to guide the unit's development. And in other cases, new interdisciplinary units outside of the Divisions were the result of the implementation of top-down initiatives guided largely by the central administration.

While we understand that there are reasons why some centers and institutes are better situated outside of the Divisional structure and thus need to report to either the Decanal Council (see below) or the Provost, we also believe that wherever possible, centers and institutes should be placed under the direction of the appropriate Divisions, in order to provide for the best fit between the unit's mission and faculty expertise. Thus, in an effort to strengthen the Divisions and to ensure that their faculties have a role in guiding the direction and development of interdisciplinary units, we recommend a review (undertaken by or in coordination with the Decanal Council) of the reporting structure of all programs, centers and institutes currently operating outside of the Divisions, to determine whether any of these entities might be reassigned to a Divisional Dean. Of course, the current budget for the unit would also be transferred to its new Divisional home. The Physical Sciences Division offers an excellent example, in which interdisciplinary centers and institutes related to the physical sciences currently report to a Deputy Dean within that Division.

We recognize that there are potential risks and challenges associated with adding new interdisciplinary reports to the Divisional Deans. For example, if a Dean does not believe that the mission of an interdisciplinary center is central to the work of the Division, might this jeopardize the center's needed resources and endanger its success? Just such a scenario is why we do not believe that every interdisciplinary center and institute should be reassigned from the Provost to a Division. Rather, we would suggest reassigning only those whose work and faculty fall squarely within one of the Divisions. As noted above, we are also concerned that such reassignment might add to the already heavy workload of Divisional Deans. To address this concern we would encourage Deans to utilize Divisional executive councils or elected committees (as recommended below) that might help nourish, guide and incubate interdisciplinary and emerging field initiatives, and protect them from more narrow departmental interests.

3. *Reimagining the Divisional role in undergraduate curriculum*

Throughout the University's history, the departments have played a custodial role with regard to the majors, which has constituted their main contribution to the undergraduate curriculum, replicating in miniature the disciplinary stewardship that the departments have advanced in their graduate programs. Oversight of the majors has thus evolved as a kind of unfunded mandate, because of the departments' status as organs of *graduate* Divisions, and not of the College. While departmental faculty have played a central role in designing much of the Core curriculum

over the last half-century, they have done so as College faculty in service to Core sequences that have often, by design, existed in some tension with the disciplinary training provided within the majors. While this arrangement has proven in many ways salutary, particularly as it has fostered analytical rigor and interdisciplinary insight, it has also generated abundant organizational difficulties for the College and the departments.

In light of the mounting centrality of the undergraduate curriculum to the life of the University in recent times, it has become necessary to reimagine the Divisional role so as to enable effective pedagogical leadership in coordination with the College. Not only must the majors and the Core be constantly sustained and revitalized through active curation and initiative by the faculty, but the broader conceptual and pedagogical interdependence of these two pillars of the undergraduate curriculum must be coordinated and developed in a more comprehensive fashion than has been possible under the existing Divisional-College structure.

4. *Faculty consultation and participation*

While the Deans must help drive new initiatives forward and oversee planning for their Divisions, such initiatives and planning require meaningful faculty input in order to ensure successful implementation, as well as the support of their constituencies. Regarding the individual Divisions, we particularly recommend robust processes of faculty participation in planning for new initiatives and fundraising goals; in establishing budgetary priorities in existing programs; and in the collective evaluation and creative advancement of graduate training. We believe that increased consultation and transparency, far from undermining the executive leadership of the Deans, will, through the active engagement of an informed and invested faculty, enhance their capacity to take bold action.

We thus recommend that the Divisions consider the following mechanisms of faculty participation. Each of these currently exists in some form in at least one of the Divisions. However, as a whole they are inconsistently implemented across the Divisions, and are sometimes seriously atrophied. The goal here is less to add new committees or faculty bodies, than it is to invigorate and empower those that already exist.

- Executive committees of the departmental Chairs and other academic leadership (Deputy Deans, center Directors, etc.). Such groups should meet regularly and engage in meaningful policy discussions regarding agenda items initiated by the Chairs themselves, and in information sharing, such as pertinent budgetary overviews. This group may also form subcommittees to address specific arenas of planning, such as graduate education or interdisciplinary initiatives.
- An elected body of faculty members. Such a body would complement the executive committees by diversifying faculty representation beyond those leaders attached to specific departmental functions. Its purview may include the review of tenure and promotion cases (as is currently the case within the Humanities and Biological Sciences Divisions) and the elaboration of key programmatic priorities.

- Regular meetings of the full faculty of each Division. In addition, the Dean should provide the faculty with an annual report, including a budgetary overview.

III. C. Recommendation II: Decanal Council of the Divisions and the College

The strengthening of Divisions, while crucial, does not in itself address a number of the challenges facing the current structure. For example, many of the interdisciplinary centers will not, as noted above, easily fit into an individual Divisional portfolio. More importantly, strengthening the Divisions does not address the key problems concerning the effective coordination of the Divisions and the College.

These challenges require the establishment an organized form of structured coordination. The stakes involved are too great to be left simply to the good intentions of the involved parties and their desire to improve their working relationships. We therefore propose that a Decanal Council of the Divisions and the College, composed of the member Deans, be statutorily established.

1. Definition of the Decanal Council's charge

We propose that the Decanal Council should have jurisdiction over matters affecting more than one Division or the College, and deliberate over matters that affect their common interests. As outlined below, particularly important to this charge is the coordination of the College and the Divisions, and the oversight of interdivisional initiatives and programs. The Decanal Council would be chaired by the Provost.

It is important to underscore that the Decanal Council would be designed to respect the autonomy of the Divisions in matters under their established purview. In particular, it would not interfere with their oversight over academic appointments and promotions (which would continue to proceed directly from the relevant Divisional Deans to the Provost), degree programs, or the strictly intra-Divisional aspects of their respective budgets.

2. Functioning of the Decanal Council, and the role of the Provost

We are proposing that the Decanal Council meet on a regular basis, at a minimum of three times quarterly, with the Provost serving as chair. The Deans would be expected to identify agenda items, share information on budgetary and academic planning, deliberate on interdivisional matters, and conduct votes to advise the Provost on matters as determined by the Decanal Council, according to principles of budgetary transparency and orderly academic planning. Minutes of these meetings would be prepared and distributed, in accordance with rules of procedure that would be established in conjunction with the formation of the Decanal Council.

The Provost could choose to delegate certain of the functions outlined above concerning the role of chair of the Decanal Council to a deputy or Vice Provost. Such a deputy would presumably serve as a proxy of the Provost in this committee and retain some degree of authority to represent the Provost's Office in all Decanal Council deliberations. At the same time, we would expect that the deputy would also act as a conduit and advocate for the Decanal Council in representations to the Provost.

While there are reasons why the Provost might find it necessary to create this intermediary position, the committee has heard a number of concerns from the faculty that bear on this matter. First, there is a persistent worry that such a position could actually exacerbate the existing distance between the academic responsibilities of the Deans and the Provost. We have repeatedly heard from faculty that one of the primary functions of the Provost is to serve as the chief academic officer of the University, and overseeing the healthy operation of the Divisions and the College should be one of the highest priorities of this office. The committee therefore strongly recommends that any intermediary position, if deemed truly necessary, not weaken the investment and involvement of the Provost in this regard. In other words, any representative of the Provost in the Decanal Council should be one who helps to strengthen, not weaken, communication and effective collaboration between the Provost's Office and the Decanal Council. Finally, the faculty urges that the selection of any such deputy involve substantial faculty consultation.

3. Purview of the council:

a. *College-Divisional Coordination*

i. Allocation of undergraduate tuition revenues. While the final determination of the total amount of undergraduate revenues to be allotted among the Divisions would rest under the Provost's control, the Decanal Council should have oversight in defining the principles and values that regulate the apportioning of those funds to the Divisions and the College. This oversight would include the design of, and relative budgetary weight granted to, any tuition allocation mechanisms that may, or may not, play a role in shaping this budgetary allotment.

ii. College enrollment. Advance planning with regard to the size of College entering classes (and their targeted composition concerning students' academic interests) should be conducted in conjunction with the Decanal Council. We urge that the Vice President for Enrollment act in this regard with the advice and consent of the Decanal Council.

iii. Academic and curricular planning

To address the problems outlined earlier in the "Challenges" section, the Decanal Council must provide lateral coordination mechanisms to facilitate closer cooperation between the Divisions and the College in their joint management of the undergraduate curriculum. This would entail a regular strategic review of the state of the undergraduate curriculum in its relationship to the Divisions. This review would include a comprehensive evaluation of budgetary responsibility for staffing the undergraduate curriculum; the principles governing financial incentives to promote teaching at different levels (Core, majors, graduate); faculty responsibilities and priorities in meeting teaching obligations at each level; and provisions for and governance of curricular innovation within the current purview of the College Curriculum Committee. (This last point would require statutory changes if the Decanal Council is to in any way review or set the Curriculum Committee's agenda.)

b. Cross-Divisional graduate education and life

The landscape for recruiting, training and supporting graduate students has changed substantially in recent years. For example, most universities now provide stipends and teaching opportunities/requirements to every graduate student they accept into their doctoral programs. Thus, competing for the top graduate candidates necessitates that across the Divisions, we offer competitive stipends, substantively meaningful teaching opportunities, and effective support for students entering the job placement phase of their graduate careers. No single Division or student services program can provide all of the resources necessary for success in this new environment of graduate education. Our continued role as a leader in graduate education will depend on greater coordination between the Divisions, student service programs such as UChicagoGrad, and, more broadly, the central administration. We believe that the Decanal Council should serve as the coordinating entity for far-reaching and strategic decisions about graduate education at the University, along with new and existing interdivisional degree programs. Through the Decanal Council, the level of Graduate Aid Initiative stipends and summer research support can be determined to minimize variation across departments and Divisions. The Council on Advanced Studies, which serves as a training ground for graduate students across Divisions, could potentially report to the Decanal Council. However, in all such cases, the Decanal Council would continue to respect the specificities of the Divisions. It would *not*, for example, participate in Division-controlled decisions involving graduate education, such as the number of offers any one department might make or the size of a divisionally-based Master's program.

c. Interdivisional Centers and Initiatives

The Decanal Council could potentially take under its oversight or coordinating function a number of interdisciplinary centers, institutes and initiatives that currently report to the Provost, and which are primarily based in the work of the faculty of the Divisions and the College, but which do not easily fit into a single Division's portfolio, as discussed above. The Decanal Council would also act as a deliberative body for the creation and approval of new initiatives grounded in the work of its faculties. The committee believes that this oversight would help ensure the concerted action of such extra-Divisional programs with the academic priorities of the Faculty Ruling Bodies.

We are aware of the potential risks that such a shift might entail, including with regard to programs that might not enjoy the advocacy and support of the Deans (see "Divisional fostering of interdisciplinary/disciplinary innovation"). In order to assure the vitality of such programs, several arrangements might be considered for the Decanal Council's role in this area. For example, such centers/initiatives may continue to report to the Provost, working in direct consultation with the Decanal Council concerning programmatic coordination with the academic mission of the Divisions. Under this arrangement, the Council would also help vet new extra-Divisional initiatives. Alternatively, a Dean of interdivisional initiatives and planning could be appointed to oversee these centers and initiatives (and might also be charged with facilitating interdivisional planning and innovation). This Dean, who would be a member of the Decanal

Council, would be appointed by the Provost through the regular process of faculty consultation, involving all of the Divisions represented on the Decanal Council.

d. Interdivisional Strategic Planning, Fundraising Coordination, and Advocacy

Invested with an oversight and/or coordinating role in the three areas outlined above, the Council would necessarily also serve a crucial role in the collaborative planning of philanthropic priorities. It would work closely with Alumni Relations and Development in creating and pursuing concerted fundraising goals.

It would also serve as a collective voice representing the common academic mission of the Divisions and the College, as well as a powerful advocate, within the University and beyond, for the advancement of the arts and sciences.

4. Faculty Participation in the Decanal Council's Deliberations

The Decanal Council's deliberations should be informed by broad faculty input. Part of this faculty participation would be conducted through the Divisional procedures and practices outlined above, which will help advise the individual Deans serving on the Decanal Council. However, as noted above, there currently exists no mechanism designed specifically to allow the faculties of the Divisions and the College to collectively participate in discussions and decision-making concerning cross-Divisional matters.

We therefore recommend that the Decanal Council be empowered to appoint (and to call for the election of) standing or ad hoc committees that span the member Divisions and the College, as appropriate to the task at hand. It should also be sanctioned to convoke collective meetings of the faculties of these units.

In this regard, we recommend that the Decanal Council consider appointing an Advisory Committee charged with deliberating on crucial matters of interdivisional initiatives and planning, fundraising priorities, and College-Divisional coordination.^{vii} We also recommend that the Decanal Council hold an annual meeting of the departmental Chairs and their equivalents (center Directors, etc.) in all of the Divisions. Budgetary overviews of key aspects within the Decanal Council's purview, including the allotment of College revenues, should be shared with the group.

III. D. Next Steps

In order to ensure the successful operation of the structured coordination outlined above, we strongly recommend that the Decanal Council of the Divisions and the College be officially adopted as part of the University Statutes. The implementation of this structured coordination will thus require further discussions involving the faculty, Divisional leaders, the Provost's Office, and the Council of the University Senate.

Furthermore, we hope that the publication of this report will encourage robust discussions regarding the fundamental centrality of the Divisions and the College, whose faculty share a

special responsibility in ensuring the University's core mission of advancing liberal education, the training of future scholars, the production of new forms of knowledge, and a relentless and fearless practice of inquiry.

ⁱ The Faculty of the College determine the general education requirements for the Bachelor of Science degree, and jointly, with a Division, recommends candidates for that degree.

ⁱⁱ The College Council brings together the various faculties of the Divisions (as well as certain faculty from the professional Schools and the Collegiate Assistant Professors), but only to consider intra-College affairs. In addition, the University Senate includes most of the faculties of the Divisions, Schools, and the Institute for Molecular Engineering, but it does so in the framework of the entire institutional landscape well beyond the focus on the Divisional and College arenas.

ⁱⁱⁱ “Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Decanal Structures,” Yale University, 24 January 2014, p. 20

^{iv} For a history of President Hutchins’ intentions in this regard, see John W. Boyer’s *The Organization of the College and Divisions in the 1920s and 1930s* (Chicago: Occasional Papers on Higher Education, n.d., pp. 59-71).

^v While the Biological Sciences Division presents a uniquely strong case for inclusion in any future structural reforms, we note that the interface of at least three other entities significantly linked to the missions of the Divisions and the College should also be examined in future discussions: the Institute for Molecular Engineering, the Oriental Institute, and the Divinity School. In our consultations with them, the current leaders of each of these three units, who were informed of our preliminary findings, expressed interest in exploring a connective role with any future coordinating structure established pursuant to the recommendations of this report, pending further conversations with their faculty.

^{vi} There were almost 6,000 BSCD course registrations in AY15-16 and 438 declared biology majors in the spring of 2016. In AY15-16, 74 BSCD basic science faculty (46%) and 40 BSCD clinical faculty (25%) taught in the College.

^{vii} For example, such an Advisory Committee might be composed of a rotating group of two departmental Chairs (or their equivalents) from each of the member Divisions and the College (in the latter case, a Collegiate Master, Director of Undergraduate Studies from a Divisional department, or representative of the Collegiate Assistant Professors might be appropriate). In addition, one or two faculty Directors of interdivisional centers or institutes may also be appointed on a rotating basis, to ensure a robust diversity of representation.

Appendix 1: Four Models for Governing Structures

To provide a framework for its consultations and deliberations regarding possible governing structures for the Divisions and the College at the University of Chicago, the committee constructed four hypothetical models, characterized by successively increasing levels of coordination and centralization.

Model 1 – Strengthened Divisional Structure

In this model, the Divisions would be fortified through the devolution of increased budgetary authority from the Provost's Office, as well as the placement of relevant interdisciplinary Centers under individual Divisional control, where deemed appropriate. This model would intensify the autonomy of the Divisions and the College, with coordination and oversight functions remaining in the Provost's Office.

Potential Benefits

By placing certain initiatives and Centers under Divisional control, this model would streamline the Provost's reporting structure, and strengthen individual Divisions' powers and influence. Strengthening Divisional resources and authority would help rebalance the relationship with the College, potentially bringing the undergraduate curriculum closer to the Divisions, and facilitating more effective advance planning in teaching matters. Decision-making would remain within individual Divisions, which would retain their expertise and knowledge with respect to research, graduate mission and departmental concerns.

Potential Costs

Under this model, interdivisional innovation would be placed under greater Divisional control. This could raise concerns about the existence of disincentives towards interdisciplinary initiatives and collaborations. Furthermore, given the existing complexity that characterizes the oversight of Divisional matters, it is unclear whether this structure could realistically provide the needed administrative oversight for the Centers. It is also unlikely that this model would provide a comprehensive solution towards reducing the number of direct reports to the Provost. The leadership of some Centers may prefer not to be placed under Divisional control, and would rather maintain a direct reporting line to the Provost. In addition, even when strengthened along these lines, it is unlikely that the Divisions would become entirely self-sufficient, and hence central support would still be needed. Not only does this model fail to address interdivisional coordination problems and rivalries, its Division-centric nature may even exacerbate these issues. In the face of more powerful Divisions, the College and the Core could be weakened under this model. Finally, there would not be a single advocate for the disciplines within the arts and sciences, and there could also be a loss of power of and advocacy for undergraduate programs.

Model 2 – Structured Coordination: Decanal Council of the Divisions and the College

This model presupposes a modulated version of Model 1, with the Deans of the Divisions and the College reporting directly to the Provost with respect to divisional matters, but with an additional collective superstructure, the Decanal Council, to coordinate and address interdivisional matters, and to which certain interdisciplinary Centers may report. This model features shared coordinating structures, which may include committees and/or councils comprised of Masters/Chairs/faculty. The Decanal Council would report to the Provost.

Potential Benefits

Like Model 1, this model would streamline the Provost’s reporting structure. In addition, decision-making would remain closely aligned with research, the graduate mission, and departmental concerns. It would, at the very least, maintain if not strengthen the power and influence of individual Divisions. It would bring the undergraduate curriculum closer to Divisions, and allow for more effective and coordinated planning by the Divisions in cooperation with the College. The Decanal Council would provide a viable mechanism for connecting the work of interdisciplinary initiatives and Centers to the Divisions and their faculties.

Potential Costs

As is the case for Model 1, the inability to bring all Centers under this “structured coordination” model, the reliance on central support, and the lack of a single powerful advocate for the arts and sciences remain unresolved issues in this model. Furthermore, the executive function for extra- and inter-Divisional matters could potentially be complex, and may call into question the effectiveness of the Decanal Council.

Model 3 – Arts and Sciences “Executive” Dean

This is designed as a maximally “federal” model for a collective but not unitary “arts and science” structure. The autonomy of individual Divisions and the College would be assured through their continued direct reporting to the Provost with respect to intra-divisional matters. In order to insure more robust coordinated planning, an “Executive” Dean, appointed through faculty consultation and reporting to the Provost, would assume the role of Chair of the Decanal Council (as in model 2) , and be vested with its oversight and the implementation of its interdivisional planning.

Potential Benefits

As in the first two models, this model features added efficiency, in that it would streamline reporting to the Provost, and decision-making would remain relatively aligned with the Divisions’ research and graduate missions as well as departmental concerns. Like Model 2, it would also provide a viable mechanism to bring together interdisciplinary initiatives and Centers in the arts and sciences and situate them more closely to the faculty and Divisions. Model 3 would generally maintain individual Divisions’ power and influence. With the “Executive” Dean as the Chair of the Decanal Council , this model would provide a (carefully circumscribed) executive function. It would bring the undergraduate curriculum closer to the Divisions, and

allow for more effective coordinated planning between them and also with the College. In that regard, the “Executive” Dean could serve as a balance wheel between the Divisions and the College. This model would give the Divisions, the College, and the arts and sciences a single, unified voice within the University.

Potential Costs

This model creates an executive level of authority and responsibility that would be more distant from areas of expertise. The lack of proximity, and the addition of another layer of authority and responsibility, raise concerns about the potential effectiveness and efficiency of this model. The executive function of an administrative layer without clear status and proper authority could also be problematic. While there would be a single, albeit relatively weak, advocate in the form of the “Executive” Dean, this position could create a roadblock between the Provost and the Divisions and the College. This model could also threaten the autonomy and distinctiveness of the Divisions and the College. Finally, the diversity of academic priorities could be hampered under this model, and the need for central support would remain.

Model 4 – Arts and Sciences “Strong” Dean

This model strengthens the function and powers of the Dean of Arts and Sciences posited in Model 3. Instead of reporting to the Provost, Divisional and College Deans would report directly to the Dean of Arts and Sciences. There is a strong possibility of more shared administration (for example, the creation of an office of Dean of Graduate Studies) among the Divisions and College under this model.

Potential Benefits

As with the others, this model would feature added efficiency, and streamline reporting relationships to the Provost. Like Models 2 and 3, it would also provide a viable mechanism for bringing interdisciplinary initiatives and Centers under an arts and sciences framework, in closer association with the faculty and Divisions. It would centralize the Divisions’ powers and influence under a clear executive function, and promote interdivisional planning, innovation, and fundraising coordination. The model would in effect unify the College and the Divisions, and in doing so, it would bring the undergraduate curriculum closer to the Divisions, and allow undergraduate teaching to be more closely coordinated with the graduate education and research missions of the University. Finally, this model would give the Divisions and the College a strong, single, unified voice for arts and sciences in the University.

Potential Costs

This model would create an executive level that would be distant from local areas of scholarly and pedagogic expertise. This lack of proximity, and the addition of another layer of authority, responsibility and administration, raise concerns about its impact on the distinctive academic values of the University. An additional administrative layer coupled with a centralized governing structure could result in a potential lack of accountability to the faculty. The centralized structure would further diminish the power of the Divisional Deans, potentially reducing them to the status of “Deputy Deans” (as is largely the case at peer institutions in which a version of this model is in place). Furthermore, the unification of the College and the Divisions could threaten their

autonomy and distinctiveness. While this model would allow for the creation of a powerful advocate in the form of a strong Dean for the arts and sciences, this position could potentially become a roadblock between the Provost and the Divisions and the College. In addition, the diversity of academic priorities could be hampered under this model, with the risk of endangering smaller programs as a result of an emphasis on larger ones that generate more revenue.

¹In keeping with the charge of this committee, we do not here fully evaluate the place of the Biological Sciences Division in the hypothetical models.

Appendix 2 – Chronology of Consultations and Deliberations

During the course of its work, the committee held over 75 meetings with faculty, OAAs, and administrative leadership within the University. As part of its process of consultation, the committee met three times with the departmental Chairs/Executive Committees in the relevant Divisions, to hear their initial thoughts and concerns about the current organizational structure, gather information regarding feedback from their faculties, and describe the four hypothetical models of Divisional and College structure that were under discussion. The committee met twice with each of the relevant Divisional Deans and the College, and once with the Dean of the Biological Sciences Division. It also met with the Deputy Deans and Collegiate Masters within the relevant Divisions, as well as other senior academic and administrative leaders, both present and former, and both inside and outside the Divisions and College. It held numerous meetings with the Provost and the Executive Vice Provost, to gather information regarding the new budget model that had been introduced shortly after the committee had begun its work. It also met with the President and the Provost, individually, in late January 2017, to obtain their perspective regarding the four hypothetical models that were being considered by the committee.

The committee conducted sustained and in-depth consultation with other Divisional and College faculty and OAAs, individually and in groups. It held town hall forums on January 25 and 26, 2017, each of which was attended by approximately 25 faculty members and OAAs. The committee also established a dedicated mailbox, and solicited written correspondence from faculty members and OAAs in the relevant Divisions and the College. The committee received 18 substantive communications from faculty and OAAs, some of whom had written as a group.

In addition to these consultations, the committee held 24 internal meetings for the purpose of evaluating and analyzing the feedback obtained from its consultations with faculty, OAAs, and senior academic leadership, and later on in the process, conducting its internal deliberations and finalizing its conclusions and recommendations.

The Chair of the committee met with the Committee of the Council on November 29, 2016, and January 31, 2017, and with the Council of the University Senate on February 21, 2017, to provide updates on the committee's work and gather additional faculty perspectives.

The committee is appreciative of the level of faculty and OAA interest and engagement that this process engendered, and believes that this is indicative of strong interest, within the Divisions and the College, in ensuring the strength, vitality, and accountability of the University's organizational and governance structures.

Appendix 3 – Charge to the Committee to Review the College and Divisional Structure

Charge to the Committee to Review the College and Divisional Structure
from Robert J. Zimmer, President
May 19, 2016

Membership of the Committee:

3. **Committee Chair: Larry F. Norman**, Frank L. Sulzberger Professor, Romance Languages and Literatures, Theater and Performance Studies, Fundamentals, and the College; Chair, Department of Romance Languages and Literatures; former Master, Humanities Collegiate Division and Deputy Dean of Humanities (HUM)
4. **Cathy Cohen**, David and Mary Winton Green Professor of Political Science; Chair, Department of Political Science (SSD); former Deputy Provost
5. **Geoffrey Greene**, Virginia and D.K. Ludwig Professor, Ben May Department of Cancer Research, and Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology; Chair, Ben May Department of Cancer Research; Chair, Committee on Cancer Biology; Co-director, Ludwig Center for Metastasis Research (BSD)
6. **Emilio Kourí**, Professor of History, Romance Languages and Literatures, and the College; Chair, Department of History (SSD)
7. **Ka Yee C. Lee**, Professor in Chemistry, James Franck Institute, Institute for Biophysical Dynamics and the College; Director, Materials Research Science and Engineering Center; Faculty Director, University of Chicago Center in Hong Kong (PSD)
8. **Anne Walters Robertson**, Claire Dux Swift Distinguished Service Professor of Music and the Humanities, and the College; Chair, Department of Music (HUM); former Deputy Provost
9. **Robert Rosner**, William E. Wrather Distinguished Service Professor, Department of Astronomy and Astrophysics, Physics, the Enrico Fermi Institute, and the College; former chair, Department of Astronomy and Astrophysics; former Director, Argonne National Laboratory (PSD)
10. **James T. Sparrow**, Associate Professor in History; Master, Social Sciences Collegiate Division and Deputy Dean of Social Sciences Division (College/SSD)

Staff of the Committee: Carol Wilinski, Secretary of the Faculties

Charge

Background

On April 28, 2016, I received a memorandum regarding the University's College and divisional structure from John Boyer (Dean of the College), Rocky Kolb (Dean of the Physical Sciences Division), David Nirenberg (Dean of the Social Sciences Division), and Martha Roth (Dean of the Humanities Division), (collectively the "Deans").

In their memorandum (Appendix 4), the Deans described a set of structural issues regarding the University's current organization of the "arts and sciences" that hampers the evolution of our work in education and research, and likewise hampers useful budgetary transparency thereby

hindering the most effective use of our resources. They further requested that I appoint a faculty committee “to explore the current financial, budgetary and structural organization of the ‘arts and sciences’,” which they defined for purposes of their memorandum to consist of the College and the Social Sciences, Humanities and Physical Sciences Divisions.

Among other things, the Deans stated that:

11. “[T]he current organization of the arts and sciences . . . creates two especially significant challenges, one having to do with budgetary allocation structures, the other with our institutional capacity to encourage and sustain cross-cutting innovation in both research and teaching.”

12. “Without second-guessing the conclusions of any committee, we believe that the current status of the Divisions and the College as independent degree-granting Faculties and as educational and research Ruling Bodies is effective and should be maintained. But we are also convinced that some level of greater budgetary, administrative, and strategic coordination among the Divisions and College as a group would be desirable, enabling them to develop more rational and transparent planning vis-à-vis the revenues generated by the College and to encourage new forms of educational and scholarly collaboration; and,

13. “We thus believe that serious and informed thought should be given to a more integrated budgetary entity and that more focused administrative, policy, and strategic leadership will be needed to achieve that end.”

On May 12, I responded to the Deans through a message to all University faculty (Appendix 5) expressing my support for their recommendation and my intent, with the Deans’ input, to appoint a representative faculty committee before this Spring’s convocation to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of various options along the lines the Deans suggested. I also indicated in that memo, as supported by Kenneth Polonsky, Dean of the Biological Sciences Division, that following the Committee’s work and any actions resulting from it I would appoint a second faculty committee to consider the structural relationship of the BSD to the College and other divisions in order to reflect and promote the connections of BSD to these areas.

The faculty committee membership reflects the input of the Deans and consists of leading faculty members with administrative experience in their areas. It also contains a faculty member from BSD to smooth the connection between the work of the two committees.

Committee Charge

The Committee is charged to:

1. further explore and fully understand what the Deans identified as the challenges posed by the current organization of the “arts and sciences,” including:
 - the system of resource allocation;
 - the capacity for flexible and forward-looking innovation in teaching and research;
2. research and evaluate the organization of the “arts and sciences” in general: the history of the arts and sciences at the University and at peer institutions, including the relevant

- roles and responsibilities played by, and interaction between and among, any and all relevant chairs, deans, and members of the provost office;
3. identify the positives and negatives of maintaining some or all of the University's existing organizational structure for the "arts and sciences"; and,
 4. outline a set of alternative organizational structures for the University's "arts and sciences," incorporating or not in some fashion our current structure, whether in place at peer institutions or otherwise, and the strengths and weaknesses of such alternatives in addressing the challenges referenced in #1 above (or any other challenges discovered by the Committee through their work).

The Committee shall issue to the president and provost a final, written report on its work by no later than January 31, 2017. This report will then be made available to all members of the University community.

While the Committee shall meet prior to the end of the Spring Quarter 2016 to discuss this charge and its execution, and begin its work this summer (particularly in gathering foundational information), the Fall Quarter of 2016 will be an important time for the Committee to obtain broad input from the faculty of the relevant divisions and the College as well as any useful input from deans, and members of the provost's and president's offices. Following receipt of the Committee's report, there will be further discussion of the report amongst the faculty, deans, and provost.

The Committee is undertaking a very important task and I want to express my appreciation to the Committee members for their willingness to serve in this capacity. I look forward to your report.

Appendix 4 – Deans’ Memorandum on the College and Divisions

University of Chicago
Memorandum
April 28, 2016

To: Robert J. Zimmer

From: John W. Boyer, Rocky Kolb, David Nirenberg, and Martha T. Roth

We write to urge the appointment of a faculty committee to explore the current financial, budgetary, and structural organization of the “arts and sciences”—by which for purposes of this memo we mean the College and the Divisions of the Humanities, Physical Sciences, and Social Sciences. The conversations that we held earlier this academic year with you and with the Provost’s Office on possible ways to track College instructional responsibilities and to link those efforts to budget allocations to the Divisions have made us painfully aware of several critical structural problems in the current budgetary and administrative frameworks within which the Divisions and the College function on a day to day and year to year basis. We are also convinced that the University would profit from creating more flexible organizational structures that would encourage greater curricular innovation and research collaborations across conventional disciplinary and Divisional boundaries of the arts and sciences.

The present organization of the Divisions and the College as distinct Faculties and Ruling Bodies of the University dates from 1930-31, and served the University well for many decades. The autonomy of each Division and the College made the Deans strong advocates for their respective functions, with Provost and President providing any necessary coordination. But the demographic, scholarly, pedagogical, and financial worlds in which the University functions have changed over the last 85 years. The complexity of the institution and of the research landscape has increased dramatically over the last half century. The professional schools, and particularly Booth, Law, and Harris, have emerged as major forces within the University, which they were not in 1931. The College and the “arts and sciences” faculties have become much more inter-dependent as the College has grown in size and institutional importance. Under these conditions the current configuration has become increasingly problematic, and has begun to impose a real cost on both the pedagogical and research mission of the faculties. Moreover, as the scale of the University has increased exponentially, the segmentation of the faculties on the quad into relatively small units has left the arts and sciences without an advocate capable of representing their collective importance within the institution.

We believe that the current organization of the arts and sciences at UChicago creates two especially significant challenges, one having to do with budgetary allocation structures, the other with our institutional capacity to encourage and sustain cross-cutting innovation in both research and teaching.

The first challenge involves the current system of resource allocation. At the present time the net revenue generated by the College is the primary source of unrestricted revenue for the Divisions, but there is no formal or even functional connection between College instruction and the revenue

that is allocated to the Divisions to support the work of the faculty. College tuition revenues currently flow to the central administration, which then allocates part of this revenue back to each Division as a “central allocation,” for which each Divisional Dean negotiates independently with the Provost. This situation has a number of consequences. First, there is no clear financial connection between the College tuition revenues and the Divisional faculties who teach College students, making alignment of incentives difficult. Second, the tangible and crucial contributions of the Divisional faculty to the financial stability of the entire University are obscured. Finally, the Divisional and College Deans negotiate separately with the Provost for financial resources, without a true and productive collective sense of the budget across the arts and sciences space, without knowledge of how that budget relates to the tuition revenues being produced by the arts and sciences faculty, and without proper evaluation of research and pedagogical needs across the larger space. The present fiscal system also discourages efficient mid- and long-range planning on the part of the Deans and the Collegiate Masters and often results in unforeseen and disruptive consequences in relation to faculty recruitment and retention, and in regard to responsible instructional planning and research support.

The second major challenge facing the arts and sciences involves our capacity for flexible and forward-looking innovation in teaching and research. The administrative and divisional boundaries established in 1931 no longer fully grasp or reflect the nature of collaboration and scholarly interaction that defines the educational and scholarly work of the faculty presently lodged in the various arts and sciences departments. As the nature of research in the arts and sciences space has changed, the lack of a coordinating function across that space has significantly constrained the possibilities for inquiry. Instruments and methodologies that were once relatively limited to particular disciplines are now of general importance across the arts and sciences, but remain isolated within divisional structures that limit their diffusion. Computation, for example, is a methodology of ever increasing importance across the entire space, from Physics to the Visual Arts, but is housed within one Division, with no mechanism for aligning diverse interests and needs across the broader environment. The same could be said for many methodologies and practices with wide applicability across disciplines, from the most basic and well-established (such as writing, statistics, and ethnography) to recently emerging ones (such as brain imaging and GIS). These methodologies and the core facilities necessary to sustain them are often isolated within Divisions, creating funding and administrative barriers to their deployment across the space. In a world in which research innovation is increasingly dependent on the diffusion of methods, techniques, and ideas across distinct spaces in a highly heterogeneous environment, the research consequences of this segmentation are mounting.

Our pedagogical activities confront similar challenges, further exacerbated by added degrees of compartmentalization. At the undergraduate level, the Core Curriculum is largely staffed and funded through the College. Undergraduate majors are left primarily to individual departments, with little College or Division oversight. The MA and MS programs are divisional, and the PhD programs are funded centrally and divisionally but structured almost entirely departmentally. The resulting lack of coordination and alignment has negative consequences for all of these levels. Divisions have few tools with which to encourage teaching in the Core. At the level of majors and minors, we lack the ability to coordinate in order to provide courses (such as “data science”) that might be critical across the range of arts and sciences departments and Divisions, from Computer Science (PSD) to Economics (SSD) to English (Hum). At the doctoral level, it is

difficult for new programs to emerge within departments, let alone between departments and divisions; this is particularly unfortunate at a time when the disciplines are themselves rapidly changing. A more coordinated structure would allow for undergraduate and graduate programs to emerge more fluidly across departments, Divisions, and the College.

Given these challenges, we believe that the time has come to reexamine existing budgetary and administrative structures with the objective of creating stronger, more logical, and more accountable connections between the financial resources generated by the College and the faculty whose primary appointments originate in the Divisions. It would be highly desirable in our view to encourage new modes of scholarly collaboration and new forms of educational experimentation that are no longer beholden to administrative and policy structures that date from the late nineteenth century. If the University is to embrace new opportunities for teaching and research in the coming century, and if the University hopes to sustain its strong national leadership role in defining the future of liberal education, we will need the capacity to mobilize both ideas and resources in ways that reflect the scholarly opportunities of our own time and not be limited by those of times long past.

We therefore write to request and recommend that the President and the Provost appoint a faculty committee to review these conditions and the changed landscape across the University, and to recommend a set of possible improvements. Without second-guessing the conclusions of any committee, we believe that the current status of the Divisions and the College as independent degree-granting Faculties and as educational and research Ruling Bodies is effective and should be maintained. But we are also convinced that some level of greater budgetary, administrative, and strategic coordination among the Divisions and College as a group would be desirable, enabling them to develop more rational and transparent planning vis-à-vis the revenues generated by the College and to encourage new forms of educational and scholarly collaboration. We thus believe that serious and informed thought should be given to a more integrated budgetary entity and that more focused administrative, policy, and strategic leadership will be needed to achieve that end.

We are not the first institution to confront these challenges of the contemporary university. Others have met them in a number of ways, some of which would be inappropriate here given the history and culture of UChicago. We are an institution with a particularly strong and proud tradition of faculty governance, and our approach to the challenges of coordination across complexity should maintain that tradition.

This makes it all the more important that a faculty committee be charged with the crucial task of reviewing the organizational conditions under which we in the “arts and sciences” will be pursuing our collective and collaborative work of teaching and discovery in the twenty-first century. We suggest that the committee be formed this Spring 2016, and asked to work over some appropriate portion of the next academic year to gather data, examine structures at other institutions, and confer with colleagues across the University. We would be pleased to offer suggestions as to possible members of the committee and to work with you in developing a charge that would inform and guide the work of the committee to reach productive and thoughtful recommendations.

Appendix 5 – Response to Deans’ Memorandum

To: University Faculty
From: Robert J. Zimmer
Subject: College and Divisions
Date: May 12, 2016

At the following link <https://sof.uchicago.edu/page/memorandum-college-and-divisions>, you will find a thoughtful letter written to me by Deans John Boyer, Rocky Kolb, David Nirenberg, and Martha Roth, respectively of the College, the Physical Sciences Division, the Social Sciences Division, and the Humanities Division.

In this letter, they describe how our current academic administrative structures hamper efforts to strengthen our research and education, especially in terms of curricular innovation and research collaborations across disciplinary boundaries, and likewise indicate how these structures hinder appropriate budget rationality and transparency. Many of these issues have been raised by faculty members over the years. On the other hand, the deans’ letter also reminds us that these structures have strengths and in many ways have served the University well.

Ultimately, the deans’ letter calls for an evaluation of our academic administrative structures relating to their divisions and the College, asking what alternatives there may be for maintaining the benefits of the current structure while implementing changes to resolve existing problems and capitalize on emerging opportunities. As appropriate to such an evaluation, they request that I institute a process for systematic faculty input on this question. I am fully supportive of this recommendation. Transitions in the provost’s office also make this an opportune moment for such considerations.

To this end, and with the deans’ input, I will appoint a faculty committee before this spring’s convocation to evaluate strengths and weaknesses of various options along the lines the deans suggest. While the committee can begin its work this summer, particularly in gathering foundational information, the fall will be an important time for the committee to obtain broad input from the faculty of the relevant divisions and the College. I intend that the committee will complete a report by January 31, 2017, at which point there will be further discussion of their report amongst the faculty, deans, and provost.

After the completion of this process and any resulting actions, there will be a second phase of analyzing our academic administrative structure. As recognized by the above deans and by Kenneth Polonsky, Dean of the Biological Sciences Division, the University needs to consider an appropriate structure to reflect and promote the connections of the BSD to the College and the other divisions. This too is an issue raised by some faculty over the years. It is my intent, with the support of the deans and at the appropriate time, to appoint a faculty committee to evaluate options for enhancing these linkages.

I want to express my appreciation to the deans for their initiative and in advance to the divisional and College faculty who will be engaged in this discussion and evaluation over the coming months. I look forward to working with all of you on this important matter.

Appendix 6 – Roster of Committee Members

Larry F. Norman, Frank L. Sulzberger Professor, Department of Romance Languages and Literatures, Theater and Performance Studies, Fundamentals, and the College (Chair of the committee)

Thomas Christensen, Avalon Foundation Professor of Music and the Humanities, and the College; Interim Chair, Department of Music¹

Cathy Cohen, David and Mary Winton Green Professor, Department of Political Science and the College

Geoffrey Greene, Virginia and D.K. Ludwig Professor, Ben May Department for Cancer Research and Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology; Chair, Ben May Department for Cancer Research

Emilio Kourí, Professor, Department of History, Department of Romance Languages and Literatures, and the College; Chair, Department of History

Ka Yee Lee, Professor, Department of Chemistry, the James Franck Institute, the Institute for Biophysical Dynamics, and the College

Robert Rosner, William E. Wrather Distinguished Service Professor, Department of Astronomy and Astrophysics, Department of Physics, the Enrico Fermi Institute, and the College

James Sparrow, Associate Professor, Department of History and the College; Master, Social Sciences Collegiate Division

Staff of the Committee – Carol Wilinski, Secretary of the Faculties

¹ The original roster of committee members included Anne Robertson, who at the time was the Chair of the Music Department and the Claire Dux Swift Distinguished Service Professor in the Department of Music and the College. Upon her appointment on July 1, 2016, as Interim Dean of the Humanities Division, Thomas Christensen was asked to serve on this committee as her replacement.