

Restructuring update

We are posting the latest school change plans on our website; the current plans, as of this message, can be found [here](#).

The administration has introduced yet another change in approach in recent days. Proposed schools would, at least temporarily, not be placed in any current or future college but report directly to the provost (who will be Meera Komaraju, current dean of CoLA, subject to BOT approval). The administration has provided no rationale for this major change of plan. It is unclear whether all of the proposed schools would report to the provost for a time, or how long this temporary status would last. The fact that the administration has gone to the trouble of proposing an awkward tenure and promotion system for faculty who are not in any college suggests it could last for some time.

Meanwhile, college RME's have been put on the back burner, presumably as part of the same decision to have schools temporarily report to the provost. In recent days, we have asked Associate Provost DiLalla a number of questions about the status of restructuring. He responded (promptly enough) that most would better be answered in a meeting of the administration-FA communications committee that has yet to be scheduled. But he did provide this update on the status of college-level changes.

Based on feedback that we received on the College-RMEs, we adjusted our College-level planning. Accordingly, the originally-submitted college-level RME documents contain outdated information. We have let deans know that [updated](#) versions of the College-level RME will be provided for consideration as appropriate in the future. We can't say with certainty at this time when that will be. I do not anticipate that it will be this semester, although I can't rule that out entirely.

Given [grave concerns we raised](#) about the reckless proposal to restructure colleges in a matter of days, we welcome the temporary withdrawal of the college RME's. But the lack of any administrative explanation for their change in course (other than "feedback"), it remains difficult to evaluate what the administration is up to. Among the unknowns is just how much restructuring the administration will try to push through this summer, when most students and many faculty are out of town.

One thing that is clear is that the administration is still proposing that we start to implement restructuring before we've decided on what the final structure of the university will be. Most units would be restructured twice, once into a school without a college, and then into a new collegiate home. For at least some period of time, the proposed schools would exist in a transitional state, without any college structure, with one provost trying to do the work currently done by multiple deans and deans' offices. And unless all the schools are rolled out at once, there will be some units left in the remnants of colleges, while other schools are reporting directly to the provost.

The rational way to rebuild something is to agree on a design and only then start the actual rebuilding. If we are to introduce schools, it would make far more sense to start by deciding which departments to merge in which combination, and which

departments are to remain as departments (or be promoted to school status), then finalize the college structure, and then implement everything at once. Instead we seem to be in a change first, ask questions later mode. In the absence of any alternative justification from the administration, the natural explanation remains that the chancellor wants to get something done by implementing some changes as soon as he can, thereby securing a “win” he can show the board, even at the cost of a chaotic transition period.

FA help with school plans

We would be happy to send FA reps to meet with faculty who are voting on program changes, or talk with any faculty who want to share concerns that we can include in our reports on Article 9 changes to the Graduate Council and Faculty Senate.

BOT next week

The SIU Board of Trustees will meet in Carbondale next week:

Wednesday, April 11 at 2:00 pm in Ballroom A.

Thursday, April 12 at 9:00 am in Ballroom B. (The meeting will kick off with committee meetings, with the full meeting to begin sometime after 10:00 am.)

Agendas for both meetings can be found [here](#). In addition to what will no doubt be a diversity of public comments, there are plenty of important items on the agenda.

- The board will vote on a plan to [reapportion \\$5.125 million](#) in state appropriations from SIUC to SIUE (item GG). Chancellor Montemagno has come out against this proposal [on his blog](#). The argument for the redirection of funds is that the allocation of state funding should change, at least to some extent, after decades in which SIUE has grown and SIUC has shrunk. News of this reallocation was just breaking on campus as this newsletter was drafted. We in the FA may have more to say about it once we’ve had a chance to analyze this more and consult more with faculty.
- The chancellor will give a report (item D), which will presumably include his current take on restructuring and his commentary on the reallocation proposal.
- The board will vote on the appointment of Meera Komarraju as interim provost (item P). Constituency group involvement in her selection appears to have been negligible, with only token consultation with faculty leaders and none with students.
- The board will vote on authorizing \$55,000 to move Chancellor Montemagno’s lab equipment from Alberta to Carbondale, where it will become property of SIUC (item FF). The chancellor’s contract included \$61,000 in moving expenses for his household and equipment. My assumption would be that \$61,000 was thought sufficient to move both. Instead, the chancellor spent more than that to move his household and that of his daughter. He was told to refund the money spent to move his daughter, but still spent enough on his personal items that no

funds were left to move the equipment. This item, unusually, comes without a presidential recommendation.

These are another set of vital BOT meetings, and we encourage faculty to attend, speak up, and support speakers they agree with. The views of faculty (and others) expressed at board meetings make an impact, whether this is through formal statements, support for speakers, or in the simple fact of high attendance at a given meeting. If you are interested in addressing the BOT on either day (both have a public comments period), contact BOT secretary Misty Whittington at mistyw@siu.edu.

Tenure and promotion review letters

This is the time of year when untenured faculty receive annual review letters. If your review letter is negative, you have the right to submit a written response, but must do so within 10 days of receipt of the annual review (CBA 13.02). One phrase to be particularly concerned about is “unsatisfactory progress toward tenure”; this phrase could be used to justify non-reappointment via CBA 11.09. If you have any concerns about your annual review, or simply would like an experienced member of our grievance committee to read over your letter to see if there is anything in it you should be concerned about, contact grievance committee chair [Randy Hughes](#).

In solidarity,

Dave Johnson

FA [Website](#)

FA on [Facebook](#)

OFFICERS

Dave Johnson, President dmj2@me.com

Segun Ojewuyi, Vice President sojewuyi@gmail.com

Debbie Bruns, Secretary brunsdebbie@gmail.com

Joe Shapiro, Treasurer jpshapiro@gmail.com

Dan Becque, DRC Chair mdbecque@gmail.com

COLLEGE REPS

Agriculture: Paul Henry phenry@siu.edu

CASA: Sam Pavel spavel@siu.edu

CoEHS: Patrick Dilley pdilleyphd@me.com

CoLA: Anne Fletcher beasleybe@earthlink.net

Library: Phil Howze phowze@siu.edu

MCMA: Rob Spahr rspahr@siu.edu

Science: Randy Hughes hrhughes@siu.edu