

University of Lethbridge Faculty Restructuring Consultation
Fair Summary Report

Table of Contents

I.	INTRODUCTION	4
II.	GENERAL COMMENTS	5
III.	FAIR SUMMARY.....	7
1.	With which other academic units do you participate in formal or informal collaborative academic activities?	7
A.	Academic Units and Staff.....	7
B.	Non-Academic Staff	17
C.	Students.....	18
D.	Anonymous.....	20
2.	Do you conduct research with colleagues in other academic units? With which other units do you typically work?	21
A.	Academic Units and Staff.....	21
B.	Non-Academic Staff	26
C.	Students.....	27
D.	Anonymous.....	27
3.	Do you collaborate on community engagement and outreach with colleagues in other academic units? With which other units do you typically work?	28
A.	Academic Units and Staff.....	28
B.	Non-Academic Staff	34
C.	Students.....	35
D.	Anonymous.....	36
4.	Are there additional academic units with which you plan to collaborate more (in teaching, learning, research, and/or community engagement)? If so, which ones?	36
A.	Academic Units and Staff.....	36
B.	Non-Academic Staff	42
C.	Students.....	43
D.	Anonymous.....	44
5.	Indicate at least one or two academic units with which your academic unit could best combine into one joint area/department.	44
A.	Academic Units and Staff.....	45
B.	Non-Academic Staff	57
C.	Students.....	58
D.	Anonymous.....	61

6. The current recommendation proposes five Faculties, broadly organized around the themes of Arts, Business, Education, Health and Science (Faculty names yet to be determined). A possible sixth unit to include the academic work and resources that extend across, contribute to, and draw from each of the Faculties is also under consideration. If you had to place yourself in one of these units, which one would be the best fit and why?.....	61
A. Academic Units and Staff.....	61
B. Non-Academic Staff	70
C. Students.....	71
D. Anonymous.....	74
7. Do you have any other thoughts or feedback on the proposed restructuring that you wish to share?	74
A. Academic Units and Staff.....	74
B. Non-Academic Staff	89
C. Students.....	92
D. Anonymous.....	95
APPENDIX A: DETAILED PROPOSALS/RESPONSES FROM ACADEMIC UNITS AND STAFF	97
1. Dean of the Faculty of Education, the Unique Structure of the Faculty of Education	97
2. Department of Psychology Response on its Requirements to Serve the University	98
3. Department of Music's Complete Responses.....	99
4. School of Liberal Education Restructuring Proposal.....	104
5. Art History and Museum Studies Program Feedback on the Discipline of Art History ...	109
6. Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry on Workloads and Activities Specific to Sciences	109
7. Department of Physics & Astronomy Response with Specific Recommendations	110
8. Department of Art Response	112
9. Faculty Member of the Music Department Letter to the Provost	114
10. University-Wide Consultation Conducted by Craig Coburn.....	116

I. INTRODUCTION

The University of Lethbridge (hereinafter the “University” or “UofL”) is examining faculty restructuring. The University’s Faculty Restructuring Task Force generated a report, which was taken to the Faculty/School councils as well as the General Faculty Council (“GFC”) for consultation. The consultation process also included a questionnaire provided to stakeholders to elicit feedback regarding faculty restructuring (the “Questionnaire”).

The University’s General Counsel office has been asked to prepare a report summarizing the information obtained through the Questionnaire to ensure confidentiality of those who submitted feedback; this is the “Fair Summary Report”.

The Fair Summary Report will be circulated to a representative group comprised of the GFC Executive and designated representatives from the Administrative Professional Officers, Alberta Union of Provincial Employees and Exempt Support Staff.

The Fair Summary Report is organized by the following questions contained in the Questionnaire:

1. With which other academic units do you participate in formal or informal collaborative academic activities? (Examples: joint programs or cross-listed courses, cognate requirements for students, guest lectures, service on supervisory committees for undergraduate theses or graduate committees, Faculty with associate memberships in other departments, joint speaker series, etc.)
2. Do you conduct research with colleagues in other academic units? With which other units do you typically work?
3. Do you collaborate on community engagement and outreach with colleagues in other academic units? With which other units do you typically work?
4. Are there additional academic units with which you plan to collaborate more (in teaching, learning, research, and/or community engagement)? If so, which ones?
5. Indicate at least one or two academic units with which your academic unit could best combine into one joint area/department.
6. The current recommendation proposes five Faculties, broadly organized around the themes of Arts, Business, Education, Health and Science (Faculty names yet to be determined). A possible sixth unit to include the academic work and resources that extend across, contribute to, and draw from each of the Faculties is also under consideration. If you had to place yourself in one of these units, which one would be the best fit and why?
7. Do you have any other thoughts or feedback on the proposed restructuring that you wish to share?

The summary of responses to each question is organized by stakeholder group as follows: (a) Academic Units and Staff, (b) Non-Academic Staff, (c) Students and (d) Anonymous.

II. GENERAL COMMENTS

The following describes some general features of each category of responses to provide context for the summaries provided below; such as what has been included, the function of Appendix A and instances where information is not featured in this Report.

i. Anonymous Responses

While the Fair Summary Report is anonymous (with the exception of identifying the responder's position or Faculty/Department/Program where appropriate), responses from individuals who did not provide their name or provided only their first name or initials have been treated as anonymous responses and included in a separate section.

ii. Alumni/Community Support Letters

The University received approximately 30 pages of alumni and support letters through the Questionnaire process; these were accepted but have not been treated as responses to the questions for the purposes of this Report. Overall, the responses were in support of the Department of Music remaining a separate entity.

iii. Academic Units and Staff Responses

Some of the responses from Academic Units and Staff included detailed proposals for restructuring or detailed explanations on elements specific to their department, program or academic discipline. Others provided responses in the form of letters or specifically waived their right to privacy and requested their comments be made public without summary. These have been compiled and attached as Appendix A to this Report and are referenced where relevant throughout the Fair Summary Report.

Specifically, two deans provided more detailed proposals on how the faculties may be restructured. The Dean of the Faculty of Education provided a comprehensive explanation of the organization of the Faculty and the roles of administrators/program specialists/administrative assistants play within the Faculty. That response is included in *Appendix A, at Item 1*.

The Department of Psychology provided a list of what it needs through the restructuring process to ensure it continues serving the University at the level it currently does, which is included in *Appendix A, at Item 2*.

The Department of Kinesiology & Physical Education provided a letter addressed to Dr. Okine rather than providing separate responses to each of the questions in the Questionnaire. The letter was reviewed and treated as a response for this Report and the elements of the letter that were responsive to Questions 1-6 have been included under each question below.

The Department of Music provided a response to the Questionnaire but noted under each question that it waived the right to privacy and requested that its comments be made public without fair summary. Given this, a summary of the responses have been incorporated into this document and a complete reproduction of the Department of Music's Responses are included in *Appendix A, at Item 3*.

The Department of Sociology provided a response to Question 7 only rather than answering each of the questions. The elements of the Department's response that address Questions 1-6 have been included under each question below.

The Department of Art did the same. The unit's full response is included in *Appendix A, at Item 5* and the portions relevant to Questions 1-6 are incorporated under each question below.

An Arts & Science faculty member conducted their own consultation and provided a response to Question 7 signed by 14 faculty members, many of which are department chairs or program coordinators. This response has been included, along with a description of the consultation conducted, in *Appendix A, at Item 10*, only; it has not been incorporated in to the summary below. We note that of the signatories, 3 faculty members also provided their own personal responses as individual Academic Staff and 6 signatories also provided responses on behalf of their departments (based on consultation with the Department). All of these responses have been included in the summary.

Units who responded are as follows: Arts & Science, Agricultural Studies, Anthropology, Art History/Museum Studies, Biological Sciences, Chemistry/Biochemistry, English, Geography & Environment, History, Kinesiology & Physical Education, Math/Computer Science, Modern Languages & Linguistics, Neuroscience, Philosophy, Physics/Astronomy, Political Science, Psychology, Sociology, Women & Gender Studies, Liberal Education, Library, Health Sciences, Therapeutic Recreation, Addictions Counseling, Fine Arts, Music, Art, Drama, Music Conservatory, History/Museum Studies, Dhillon School of Business, Education, Teaching Centre, and Academic Writing.

iv. Non-Academic Staff Responses

The University received a total of 30 responses from Non-Academic Staff¹ and one response on behalf of "the Teaching Centre and Agility". The Non-Academic Staff responses are grouped by Administrative Unit/Department or Academic Unit where the staff member identified that they work in a non-academic role in an Academic Unit. In the latter case, where the individual identified the nature of their role, this has been included to provide context to the response. We also note a common feature of the Non-Academic responses was the lack of answers or answering "n/a", "no" or "none"; particularly for Questions 2-5.

v. Student Responses

303 responses identified themselves as students. However, many of these responses did not include their full name or only initials and therefore have been included in the section summarizing anonymous responses. This left a total of 228 student responses. Most students did not submit responses to all of the questions.

Further, only a fraction of responses identified an academic unit, be it faculty, department, or program, in their response, which undermines the utility of the answer provided. This is because the Questions, with the exception of Question 7, rely on an understanding of the unit from which the responder is answering; without this information the response has no context. Thus, for Questions 1-6, if the student response did not identify an academic unit of any kind, the response has not been included in the summary. As noted, some students indicated only their faculty while others were more specific and indicated their department or program. This created some difficulty in pulling out common trends and categorizing the feedback. As such, the student responses are categorized by department where possible but sometimes by only the wider faculty.

¹ This does not count responses that did not provide a full name and are therefore included under the Anonymous group and also excludes responses miscategorized as staff when actually students (these responses were included with the student responses).

vi. Summary Format for Questions 1-6

Overall, Academic Units and Staff provided the most detailed and comprehensive answers to the questions. Generally, there was consistency or certain trends within a department or program, and sometimes faculty. As such, the summaries of the responses for Academic Units and Staff are provided in the form of a table for each question organized by department, faculty, or program (Academic Units and Staff provided varying levels of detail in this regard). Where the response was provided on behalf of an Academic Unit or is specific to the person's administrative position, this is noted; otherwise, the table includes a summary of the information provided by Academic Staff members.

As noted, there were fewer responses or less detailed responses from Non-Academic Staff and Students.² In this case, we have provided comments on the trends coming from the responses for Questions 1-6 and only provided summary tables similar to those used for Academic Units and Staff, where helpful.

vii. Summary Format for Question 7: General Feedback

The summaries for Questions 1-6 are focused on providing a sense of the substantive answers to each question and is often organized by department, program, or faculty. The summary for Question 7 is different in format because the question solicited general thoughts and feedback on restructuring. Given this, the summaries for Question 7 are not organized by faculty or department and do not detail the feedback received from every single response; instead, we determined it would be most helpful to identify and describe the common themes arising from the responses.

It was very common for Academic Units and Staff to include comments throughout their responses to Questions 1-6 that were in line with the more comprehensive response regarding restructuring provided under Question 7. Accordingly, the summary of themes under Question 7 may be read as the general trends from Academic Units and Staff across the Questionnaire.

This was less common amongst the Non-Academic Staff and Students responses; often these responses were less detailed and/or specific to the question. However, where Non-Academic Staff members or students provided general feedback in a response to Questions 1-6, these comments were included when identifying and summarizing the general trends under Question 7.

III. FAIR SUMMARY

1. With which other academic units do you participate in formal or informal collaborative academic activities?

A. Academic Units and Staff

In some cases, Academic Staff outlined the collaborative activities they engaged in without identifying the other units that participated in the collaborative activities; those answers were left out of the summary below.

Faculty, Department or Program	Response
--------------------------------	----------

² While there were a large number of student responses many did not answer questions or merely answered in the negative.

<i>Faculty of Arts & Science</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dean's Response: Collaborate extensively on all manner of managerial decision-making with every other Dean, AVP, VP and Executive Director. Along with a team of three Associate Deans, responsible for working with Chairs in all of their collaborative activities.
Anthropology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Department Response: Biology, Philosophy, Archaeology, Women and Gender Studies, Health Sciences, Religious Studies, Cultural Social and Political Thought (CSPT), Geography and Environment, Urban and Regional Studies, Liberal Education, Centre for Oral History and Tradition (COHT), and History. Have students pursuing combined degrees in Education (Social Studies major). Courses contribute to the Urban and Regional Studies program, minor in Environmental Science, major in Archaeology, and are co-requisites classes in Religious Studies. Many Academic staff relied on the Department's response. However, in addition to the units identified by the Department, Academic Staff mentioned teaching collaboration with the following: Sociology, Indigenous Studies, Women and Gender Studies, and Spanish.
Biological Sciences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Department Response: The two main departments Biological Sciences collaborates with are Geography & Environment and Chemistry & Biochemistry in co-teaching: AgBiotech, Environmental Science, and Biochemistry (in addition to teaching the Biology program). Academic Staff responses were largely consistent with the Department response, indicating collaboration but also mentioned collaborations with Psychology and Neuroscience.
Chemistry & Biochemistry	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partial Department Response³: Operationally, the Department is most closely associated with the Biological Sciences Department (re: Biochemistry major, and laboratory training in AS). To a lesser extent, the Department has been developing certificate programs that involve courses in Neuroscience and Psychology. There are cognates in Mathematics and Physics. Chemistry courses are cognates in many programs (Agricultural Biotechnology, Agricultural Studies, Biological Sciences, Environmental Science, Kinesiology, Neuroscience, and Physics). Department members frequently serve on committees in Biological Sciences and occasionally in Physics. Three department members identifying as part of the Biochemistry area/Program (hereinafter referred to as "Biochemistry Responses") explained the program and identified the most common collaboration

³ The response provided on behalf of the Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry was prepared in consultation with Department members and circulated to members prior to submission. **Note:** about 12-13 department members agreed to endorse the response, it is unclear if the individual submitting the response for the Department endorsed the response. Responses from Academic Staff identified as being in the Biochemistry program note that the response submitted by the Chair does not reflect their responses.

	<p>is with Biological Sciences as well as some collaboration with Neuroscience.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other Academic Staff members' responses were consistent with the collaboration identified in the Partial Department Response. One of these responses added that there was tension between the Department of Biological Sciences and Chemistry & Biochemistry in the provision of the Biochemistry program. • One academic Staff member Responded "n/a".
Economics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An Academic Staff member identified collaboration with Geography (within the Faculty) and outside of the faculty: Management, Education and Health Sciences.
English	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response: Members collaborate with many other units on campus but does not see how this ties with faculty restructuring given that such collaborating is, and should be, a common and necessary feature of universities. As such, the Department does not see any meaningful difference between intra-unit and inter-unit collaborations and supervisory commitments. • Academic Staff member: English is home department in which teach consistently; also teach in department of Indigenous Studies. Notes cross-listing of indigenous studies courses within the English department as a huge accomplishment; teach in Drama department. Member of SGS.
Geography & Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response: Collaborative activities, supervisory committees and joint speakers with many other units including: Biological Science; Economics; Anthropology; Sociology; History; Women and Gender Studies; Indigenous Studies; Religious Studies; Psychology; Neuroscience; Physics & Astronomy; Math & Computer Science; Chemistry and Biochemistry; Archaeology; Political Science; Health Science; Cultural, Social, and Political Thought; Management; Agricultural Studies.
History	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response: Centre for Oral History and Tradition and the Institute for Child and Youth Studies; Asian Studies; Canadian Studies; Geography (Archeology); Religious Studies; Women and Gender Studies (WGST); Art History (Fine Arts); Kinesiology (Sports History); Anthropology; Indigenous Studies; Modern Languages; Cultural, Social, and Political Thought. • Academic Staff provided similar responses: Collaborate with WGST and Liberal Education mostly. Supervisory committees for English, close connections with Religious Studies given research and courses. Also worked with Anthropology, English, Psychology, Neuroscience, and the Faculty of Education.
Kinesiology & Physical Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response: There are numerous on-going, fruitful cross-listed teaching associations with the current Health Sciences Faculty

	<p>and other health-related Sciences such as Neuroscience, Psychology, and Biological Sciences. Faculty also currently have or have had regular active co-supervision with colleagues in Fine Arts and Education. Have historically and continue to participate in cross-listed courses and co-supervised undergraduate and graduate student trainees in Sociology, History, Women & Gender Studies, and Physics (Engineering), and the Cultural, Social, and Political Thought (CSPT) graduate program.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academic Staff responses also identified: Neuroscience, Faculty of Health Sciences, the Culture, Society and Political Thought (CPST) program, Physics & Astronomy. • One Academic Staff member stated they do not engage in informal or formal collaborative activities with others in Arts & Science but noted in another question that they informally participate in academic work with the Faculty of Education as part of the majors/specialist training.
Math & Computer Science	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response: The Department has joint programs with Education, Dhillon School of Business (DSB) ⁴, and New Media. It is also part of the Data Science initiative. This answer should not be taken as an endorsement of amalgamating with any of these units. • Academic Staff responses range from “none” or only within the Department to listing the following: the Dhillon School of Business, School of Liberal Education, Physics, Chemistry, Neuroscience, Biological Sciences, Faculty of Health Sciences and generally faculty of Arts & Science.
Modern Languages and Linguistics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response: The Department works with several units including: Indigenous Studies (cross-listing), Psychology (cross-listing/independent studies supervision), Religious Studies (Japanese minor), History (Japanese minor), Education (combined degree programs), International Management (combined degree program) and Fine Arts (cross-listing, film series). Faculty members occasionally serve on supervisory committees in other departments and the Department occasionally invites faculty members from other units to participate in its Speaker Series. However, the Department noted that while it engages in this collaboration, this does not constitute a solid foundation for a functional and productive merger. Any move to amalgamate academic units must not hinge on loose connections created by cross-listed courses, occasional independent studies, and tenuous cooperation. Nor can it be based on the promise of incidental research collaborations between one or two individuals with interests that happen to coincide. Any successful and sustainable merger must be forged on principles of academic collaboration that capitalize,

⁴ The Response referred to DBS, but we believe this is a typo and was meant to indicate DSB- Dhillon School of Business.

	<p>above all, on logical and legitimate interdisciplinary research and pedagogical synergies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academic Staff member answered “none”.
Neuroscience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response: Formal collaboration with Biochemistry, Psychology, Physics & Astronomy, Faculty of Education, and Faculty of Health Sciences. • In addition to units identified by the Department, Academic Staff identified: Chemistry, Biological Sciences, Math & Computer Science, Philosophy, Kinesiology, Agility, and Liberal Education.
Philosophy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response: Geography, Physics, Neuroscience, Biochemistry, Biological Sciences, and Mathematics.
Physics & Astronomy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response: involved with the Ph.D. program, Engineering transfer program, and Remote Sensing program. Offers courses important to Kinesiology, Environmental Science, Neuroscience, Biological Science, Biochemistry, and Chemistry majors. Cognates in Mathematics, Computer Science, Chemistry, and Biological Sciences. Supervisory committees of students in Biological Sciences, Chemistry, Biochemistry, Mathematics and Computer Science, and the Faculty of Education. Taught courses in the Faculty of Fine Arts and department of Biological Sciences. Given talks in the Departments of Chemistry and Biochemistry. Have had speakers from the Departments of Biological Sciences, Chemistry and Biochemistry, Geography, Mathematics and Computer Science, Neuroscience, and Philosophy. None of the Department members are associate members of other departments at the moment, but the Department has had cross-appointments in the past with Neuroscience. • Academic Staff responses were consistent with the collaboration outlined in the Department’s response. One staff member noted that while they collaborate with many departments, collaboration does not mean the same thing as membership in a department.
Political Science	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response: Collaboration with other academic departments is relatively dispersed across the faculties. The most prominent collaborations occur with History and Philosophy. Have joint programs with Management, Education, Philosophy, Urban and Regional Studies Program, and Canadian Studies. Cross-listed courses with Women and Gender Studies. Committees for History, Philosophy, Religion, Economics, Geography, Women and Gender Studies, and Indigenous Studies. Also, some collaboration with Computer Science, Liberal Education and Sociology.
Psychology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response: Members collaborate with members of virtually all other academic units on campus but reject the premise of this question, which presumes collaboration is relevant to faculty restructuring. Faculty does not analyse data, write papers, or teach courses at council meetings, and do not see a difference between

	<p>intra and inter-unit collaborations. Collaboration should have no bearing on faculty restructuring. Similarly, under current regulations, service on supervisory committees does not require people to reside in the same faculty or department and should have no bearing on faculty restructuring.</p>
Sociology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response: There are many formal and informal collaborations across the university including but not limited to: Anthropology, Women and Gender Studies, Economics, Political Science, Geography, Indigenous Studies, Kinesiology, Religious Studies, and Faculties of Health Sciences, DSB and Fine Arts. While the Department can collaborate with many other departments or faculties, this should not impact the Departmental definitions or structures. It is inappropriate to conflate the Department's record of collaboration with appropriate structural changes. • Academic Staff member did not answer the question as they were wary of the intention of using collaboration as a basis for combining departments and strongly oppose combining Sociology with another department.
Women and Gender Studies (WGST)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response: Collaborates with all faculties. Has cross-listed courses in Asian Studies, History, Sociology, Political Science, and Health Sciences. Two faculty members are cross-appointed in History and Sociology. All faculty participate in CSPT as instructors, supervisors, and members of supervisory committees. Guest lectures in Asian Studies, History, Psychology, Sociology, and Fine Arts. Supervisors in Independent Studies and Applied Studies across disciplines. Supervisory committee members in the Faculty of Education and Faculty of Fine Arts. Also collaborate with Sociology and the School of Liberal Education. • Academic Staff Member: outlined same collaboration as the Department but added supervisory committee in Health Sciences, affiliate of the Prentice Institute for Global Population and Economy, and joint speaker sponsorships with the Institute for Child and Youth Studies and Department of Sociology.
Academic Writing Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program Response: Cross-listed courses or courses offered on behalf of Liberal Education, the Indigenous Student Success Cohort, Fine Arts, the Transfer Program in Engineering, and the School of Graduate Studies. Guest Lectures for Liberal Education, Anthropology, English, New Media, Social Work (UofC), Health Sciences (Master of Nursing programs), and the Fine Arts (graduate course). Offered workshops for Ikaisskiini, the Student Success Centre, Agility, the Teaching Centre, and SGS THRIVE. Served on committees for School of Liberal Education. • Teach in English, the Cultural, Social, and Political Thought (CSPT) program; cross-listed between Academic Writing and Liberal Education. Teach course offered jointly by the AWP and School of

	Graduate Studies. Thesis Committee for Health Science. Guest lectured in CSPT, English, and Anthropology. Presentations for SGS and Teaching Centre.
<i>Faculty of Fine Arts (FFA)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dean's Response⁵: The drama department has cognate courses and guest lectures with the English department. All departments in the Faculty have some kind of combined degree program with Education and Management. Members of the faculty serve on committees (e.g., Study Leave and Salary, Tenure and Promotion, and Search committees). Members participate in university-wide speaker services particularly the Women Scholars Speakers Series and the Cinema Studies film series. • Two Academic Staff members did not specify their department. One answered "none" and the other response echoes the Faculty's answer and adds the following: there are Combined Degrees with Arts & Science. The only cross-listed courses outside of the FFA are two Art Studio courses cross listed with Indigenous Studies. Within the FFA there are a couple of cross-listed courses between New Media and Cinema, but these are likely to be removed as the majority of Cinema offerings have moved to the Drama department. Collaboration occurs between Departments in the FFA but the autonomy of the individual departments is respected and maintained. The FFA offers a Multidisciplinary degree (the BFA) where students must include courses from at least three of our four departments, but can include courses in all four. Discussions are underway to create specific pathways within the program to offer more options, direction and structure within the Fine Arts.
Art	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response: The Department did not provide a specific response to this question in favour of providing a statement under Question 7, <i>attached at Appendix A, Item 5</i>. There, the Department highlighted the collegial and collaborative partnerships that exist among the sister departments in the FFA as well as the BFA stream with Indigenous Studies. • Academic Staff member: guest lectures in Liberal Education, History and other departments in Humanities and Social Sciences. Also supervising students in the Psychology Department.
Art History/Museum Studies Program (AHMS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program Response: The Department did not specifically address this in their response to this question. It did note that outside of the affiliation with the Studio Art program, the Department's closest disciplinary relationship is with the Department of History. It also stated that some faculty in AHMS have given guest lectures in History and collaborated with faculty in History on exhibitions.

⁵ Provided by Dean of Faculty of Fine Arts based on conversations with faculty and staff from the Faculty of Fine Arts but also conversations with some other Deans of other Faculties.

Drama	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response⁶: BFA Multidisciplinary program combines all four Fine Arts Departments; the Department contributes to the ASTeRIX Centre for Research-Creation; it has recently integrated faculty members from the Department of New Media, and is beginning to offer cross-listed courses in Cinema Studies and New Media; combined degree programs with Faculty of Education; collaboration with other Fine Arts departments; contributed to Project Sandbox and the Women Scholar's Speaker Series. • Academic Staff responses: consistent response that there is significant collaboration with the other departments in the Faculty of Fine Arts. One response notes that recently, the Department has reduced its collaboration with the English department. Another Staff member noted collaboration with Psychology and another with DSB.
Music	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response: The Department of Music and the Conservatory are perhaps the most collaborative units on campus in both formal or informal collaborative academic activities and research with colleagues in other units. The Department works with a variety of community organizations as well as performers, composers, theorists, historians, audio producers and engineers, fine-arts based interdisciplinary researchers, music education specialists, music technologists, technology-based performers, and computer and media music specialists. Primary collaborators are sister departments in Faculty of Fine Arts – Art, Drama and New Media. A list of other collaborators includes, but is not limited to: computer science (coding/programming), life sciences (e.g., neuroscience; medical research; kinesiology), business (professional administration; marketing; management), cognitive sciences, Indigenous studies, literature, linguistics, modern languages, agriculture, sociology, anthropology, ethnography, human-computer interaction, robotics, VR/AR/XR, communications technology, education, philosophy, engineering, mathematics, physics, women and gender studies, etc. <i>See also complete response in Appendix A, Item 3.</i> • The majority of Academic Staff provided responses consistent with the Department's response. Specifically, staff noted collaboration with the Faculty of Education, School of Liberal Education, Indigenous studies, Anthropology, Women and Gender Studies, Health Sciences, Kinesiology, Neuroscience, Drama, and Liberal Education. • One Academic staff emphasized the collaboration that occurs as being within the Faculty of Fine Arts – New Media, Drama and Art, which militates in favour of the FFA remaining an independent faculty. This staff member also noted collaboration with education, Liberal Education, and a number of Arts & Science departments (such

⁶ The Department provided a very detailed response to each of the questions, the response to this question is summarized here; see full answer for more detail.

	as Sociology; Geography; Modern Languages; Mathematics & Computer Science; Neuroscience (CCBN); Indigenous Studies etc.).
New Media	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Academic Staff Member: Faculty of Education (joint courses, Fine Arts rep on Education Council, Internship coordinator), Agility (through Internship program), Co-op and Career Services, and Arts & Sciences (through Internship program).
Conservatory of Music	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unit Response: The Conservatory works very closely with the Department of Music. It also provides invaluable work, integrated learning, and experiential learning opportunities for many U of L students, and especially B.Mus. students. Collaborate on programming and some of the Conservatory's operational needs with other groups such as: Sports & Recreation, Destination Exploration, and the Art Gallery, which share the same registration programs and often target similar audiences in marketing.
<i>Faculty of Health Sciences</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Academic Staff identified the following units (the first 9 units listed were identified by more than one response): Psychology, Neuroscience, Sociology, Women and Gender Studies, Education, Kinesiology, Dhillon School of Business, Nursing, Addictions Counselling, Philosophy, Public Health, Aboriginal Health, Mathematics & Computer Science, Teaching Centre, and the Prentice Institute for Global Population and Economy. One Academic Staff responded they did not collaborate outside of their unit, which was Nursing.
Therapeutic Recreation Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Program Response: Addictions Counselling, Nursing, Kinesiology & Physical Education, Psychology, Graduate Studies (Masters of Science program including Addictions Counselling, Public Health, Aboriginal Health, and Nursing), and Fine Arts. Guest lectures for Public Health. Academic Staff member also indicated Addictions Counselling, Public Health and Nursing as well as collaboration with Aboriginal Health in terms of internships/practicums.
<i>Faculty of Education</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dean's Response⁷: Work with Health Sciences in terms of the Masters of Counselling programs, which also requires work with the regulatory body (Canadian Counselling and Psychotherapy Association). Otherwise, education is unique; as professional faculty participate in informal/formal academic activities with those outside of the university i.e., school divisions, Government and Alberta Teachers' Association. Program guided by regulatory standards outside of the institution, making work with external partners extremely important. Importantly, this is one of the reasons why we have a unique organizational structure; discussed more in answer to Q7.

⁷ Note: There was no information provided on how the response on behalf of faculty of Education was created.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academic Staff also identified: Faculty of Arts & Science, SGS, New Media, Liberal Education, Mathematics, DSB, Modern Languages & Linguistics, the Writing Centre, and the International Centre. • The remainder of staff answered “none”, “no” or within the Faculty.
<i>Dhillon School of Business (DSB)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DSB Graduate Program Response: Collaborate with Faculty of Arts & Science in the creation and delivery of MSc in Management program with the business analytics concentration and collaborate with Faculty of Health Sciences in the development and delivery of the Health Services Management program. • Academic Staff responses indicated “none” or echoes the collaboration indicated by the DSB Graduate Program and added cross-listing and/or inclusion of courses from Geography, Agricultural Studies, and Agricultural Economics for the Agricultural Enterprise Management Program and Joint computer science/management major for B.Mgt.
<i>School of Graduate Studies (SGS)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dean’s Response: SGS works with every unit across campus; it does not offer its own programs, but facilitates/oversees programs offered by other units, similar to School of Liberal Education. Works closely with admissions, is developing shared position with Enrolment Services and works with the Library to offer professional development. The Dean also responded in their capacity as VP of Research/ Office of Research and Innovation Services (ORIS) noting it supports all faculties and schools in research endeavours. Works with the Library, Financial Services and Faculties. It shares information with the SGS because supervisory activities of graduate students are closely connected to grant applications and the research initiatives supported by ORIS. Some shared activities with Agility. The Office of Postdoctoral Affairs lies between Research and SGS and works closely with both.
<i>School of Liberal Education (SLE)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School Response: SLE is comprised of faculty from different disciplines therefore formal and informal collaborations can take place with any academic unit. • Academic Staff member: graduate student in neuroscience.
<i>Library</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response: The Library engages, collaborates in, and supports the day-to-day research requests of all students and faculty from across campus. There is no other department that provides such a broad cross-section of academic and non-academic services to the University community, and the community as a whole. It contributes to classes in all Faculties and Schools. It provides research consultations to faculty, graduate students, and undergraduates in all programs. It collaborates with Academic Writing and Liberal Education. Librarians teach courses in Faculty of Fine Arts and Indigenous Student Success Cohort. Also collaborates with the Teaching Centre.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Academic Staff responses echoed the Department's response on collaboration with all units and added collaboration with the School of Graduate Studies, Indigenous Studies, Indigenous Health, Indigenous Governance and Business Management and Academic Writing.
--	---

B. Non-Academic Staff

As noted above, many Non-Academic Staff members did not answer this question (and are therefore not represented in the table below). However, where the responder answered "no" or "n/a" this is included. Some Non-Academic Staff responded to this question by identifying the formal or informal activities they take part in without specifying the other academic units they collaborate with; these responses were received but have not been included in the summary table.

Most Non-Academic Staff identified collaboration with other administrative departments or, more commonly, with other Academic Units – sometimes all faculties, or certain departments. Those Non-Academic Staff that identified their home unit as being within a certain faculty appear to collaborate more with administrative units with the exception of collaboration with the Library and Faculty of Education. Overall, the responses to this question are in line with the nature of the non-Academic Staff members' position or unit.

Administrative or Academic Unit	Response
Admissions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> "n/a"
Ancillary Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Did not identify specific units but indicated that they work with administration, departments and faculties in researching and providing course materials to students. This appeared to indicate collaboration with a variety of units.
Career Bridge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Collaborate with Co-Op and Applied studies for all faculties.
Counselling Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student Success Centre, Health Centre, Accommodated Learning Centre and Indigenous services.
English Language Institute (ELI)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participates in ad-hoc activities with other units (did not specify which units), works with Faculty of Education for the Teaching English as a Second Language program and hosts events for international and modern language students.
Financial Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> "n/a"
Human Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Specifically work with the Faculty of Education but also fill in for other areas as needed.
Information Technology Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two staff members answered "none" or "n/a". Another staff member indicated that they had previously been more collaborative but there has been a recent shift towards being less involved outside of very specific IT tasks

Provost & Vice President (Academic) Office	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Academic Programming: collaboration with all academic units Indigenous Affairs: collaboration in planning new and innovative programming but the staff member did not specifically identify other units they collaborate with.
Student Enrolment and Registrar Services (SEARS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All but one staff member (who answered “n/a”) identified that they work with all academic units. Staff members added that they also worked with: the School of Graduate Studies, International Centre, Indigenous Student Services and School of Liberal Education as well as all other SEARS departments.
Student Services and Scholarships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The staff member noted they were on leave from Advancement and therefore works closely with that department and is a student in DSB.
Teaching Centre and Agility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unit Response: The Teaching Centre and Agility collaborate formally with Faculty, Instructors, Sessional Instructors, and teaching staff from across campus, regardless of faculty or department on a regular basis. It also collaborates with all Deans Offices, including Deans, University Librarian, Associate Deans, faculty, and staff; Student Services, Student Enrollment and Registrar Services; the Office of Research and Innovation Services; Calgary Campus; and Ikaisskini. It also provides supports for all students (undergraduate and graduate) from across both campuses.
<i>Faculty of Arts & Science</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Within faculty and some work with the Faculty of Education.
<i>Faculty of Fine Arts</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has been recently helping Faculty of Education on interim basis.
<i>Faculty of Health Sciences</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The staff member did not specifically identify collaboration with other units but noted they advise the Faculty of Health Sciences on the budgetary and operational impact of joint programming with DSB and Education in addition to impacts of all Health Sciences programming.
<i>Dhillon School of Business (DSB)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Works with the following: Communications, Alumni Relations, Fund Development, Career Bridge, Grad Studies, Mitacs, MyExperience Transcript, Agility, Financial Services, Legal, DSB Advising, Library, Student Success Centre. Tech Services: Provides service support to any faculty through the Teaching Centre as needed. Program Administrator (also identify unit as Faculty of Health Sciences): works very closely with SGS.

C. Students

A significant portion of students did not answer Question 1 or answered “no”, “n/a” or “none”. There were also several irrelevant answers to this question, such as concerns regarding course availability or disagreement with liberal education requirements.

Of the students that did respond, the majority merely list other academic units without providing information on the nature or degree of their participation in those units. However, quite a few responses

appear to be identifying the other academic units in which they take courses (due to the nature of their program/major or otherwise). Other students identified attending guest lectures in different units. We have provided a table below summarizing the units identified categorized into the faculty or department of the student answering the question. We note that because most of the answers merely listed the academic units, the nature and degree of the students' involvement remains unclear.

It is important to note that because this question inquires into what *other* units the student participates in collaborative activities, where the student did not identify their faculty, department, or program there is little utility in the response. Accordingly, these responses have not been included in the summary table below. Similarly, in many cases when students identified other collaborative activities such as involvement in clubs, student associations or committees, they did not specify the other unit(s) involved; these responses are also left out of the table below.

Faculty, Department or Program	Response
<i>Faculty of Arts & Science</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dhillion School of Business, Faculty of Health Sciences – cross-listed courses and the Faculty of Education. • Some students identified their academic unit as “Social Sciences”, these students identified the following units: History, Economics, Political Science, Geography, Anthropology, Psychology, Physical Education, Faculty of Education, School of Liberal Education and Faculty of Fine Arts. • A student in Agricultural Studies identified the Geography department.
Biological Sciences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chemistry, Biochemistry, and Geography.
Chemistry & Biochemistry	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biological Sciences, Archaeology
English	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Global Citizenship Cohort
Geography & Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anthropology, History, Biological Sciences, Drama/Theatre, Sociology, Environmental Science, Archeology, and Community Bridge Lab (Note the first three departments were mentioned 2-3 times).
Kinesiology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Physical Education, Psychology (mentioned twice), and Neuroscience.
Physics & Astronomy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biological Sciences, Chemistry, and Geography.
Political Science	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • History
Psychology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Neuroscience, Sociology, Anthropology, Addictions Counselling, Philosophy, Indigenous Studies, Health Sciences, Women and Gender Studies, Management, English, (first 6 departments most commonly identified).
Cultural Social and Political Thought Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The students in this program all identified Sociology and Women and Gender Studies. Students also identified, Social Work (UofC), Health Sciences, Kinesiology and History.
<i>Faculty of Fine Arts</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students identified other departments in the Faculty or Faculty of Arts or mentioned collaboration only with their own department. The following were also identified: Physics & Astronomy, Sociology,

	Archeology, Geography, Political Science, Health Science, Neuroscience, and English.
<i>Faculty of Health Sciences</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students often identified programs within the Faculty of Health Sciences such as Nursing, Addictions Counselling and Therapeutic Recreation. Also mentioned were: Kinesiology, Sociology, the Faculty of Arts & Science, Prentice Institute for Global Population and Economy and one student mentioned being involved in the humanities. A student in nursing noted “science departments”. A Therapeutic Recreation generally referenced other courses in the Faculty of Health Sciences.
<i>Faculty of Education</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Kinesiology (mentioned twice), Neuroscience, History, Music, Math, Philosophy, Modern Languages, Physical Education, Indigenous Studies, Dhillon School of Business, Faculty of Arts & Science, and one mentioned involvement with humanities.
<i>Dhillon School of Business</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Faculty of Fine Arts (twice), Management (twice), Political Science, Neuroscience, Agriculture, Public Health, Math, Economics, English, Psychology, Sociology, the Faculty of Education and Faculty of Fine Arts. Management Students identified: Linguistics, Computer Science, Economics, language cafes and Faculty of Fine Arts.

D. Anonymous

There were only a couple anonymous responses from Academic Staff members; one was a faculty member in Indigenous Studies that referred to having cross-listed courses in Modern Languages and Linguistics. The other Academic Staff member identified themselves as being in the Faculty of Arts & Science and referenced being an associate member of other units in a different faculty.

The following anonymous responses were provided by Non-Academic staff:

- A Staff member in the Teaching Centre provides support to and collaborates with Agility, the Library, and all faculties to produce events related to teaching in higher education.
- Staff members in Arts & Science identified collaborating with Education, DSB and Fine Arts.
- A Staff member in Sport and Recreation Services identified Building Maintenance.

Anonymous responses from students indicated that students in the Faculty of Arts & Science engaged with the Faculty of Health Sciences, Faculty of Fine Arts, Liberal Education, and Faculty of Education as well as with other departments in the Faculty of Arts & Science. Like the other student responses, a few of these responses identified the other units in the context of taking cross-listed courses. Students from DSB identified a joint program with the Faculty of Fine Arts, and involvement with departments in the Faculty of Arts & Science such as Political Science, Indigenous Studies, and Economics. Health Sciences students referenced involvement with the Faculty of Arts & Science (such as the Department of Sociology and reference to statistics). We note that the responses from anonymous students should be read with the same caveats outlined above under the Students section of this question.

2. Do you conduct research with colleagues in other academic units? With which other units do you typically work?

A. Academic Units and Staff

Faculty, Department or Program	Response
<i>Faculty of Arts & Science</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dean's Response: Conduct research with all Associate Deans, Directors, and staff in Faculty as well as across faculties with Deans, AVPs, VPs and Executive Directors.
Anthropology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Department Response: Relevant units and institutes include Geography and Environment, Archaeology, Biology, Liberal Education, Women and Gender Studies, Health Sciences, Religious Studies, CSPT, History, and Urban and Regional Studies and COHT. The Department has contributed to the Global Citizenship Cohort in the Faculty of Arts & Science since its inception, along with various initiatives in the School of Liberal Education.
Biological Sciences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Department Response: Members work with a number of departments and faculties for research and teaching. Most collaborations are with other science departments: Geography & Environment, Chemistry & Biochemistry, Neuroscience, Psychology and Health Sciences to name a few. Staff: None on an ongoing basis or within department.
Chemistry & Biochemistry	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partial Department Response: Many research collaborations with Biological Sciences and some in Neuroscience. As an already combined department, it has several intradepartmental collaborations. Biochemistry Responses: collaboration with faculty in life sciences i.e., Biological Sciences, Biochemistry, and Neurosciences as part of the Southern Alberta Genome Sciences Centre (SAGSC). Two members referred to some collaboration with Chemistry in the SAGSC but "to a lesser extent". Two members noted they do not share lab/equipment with Chemistry and do not apply for same grants as chemistry. All concluded based on work they do/collaboration, Biochemistry belongs in Department of Biological Sciences. One staff member: Within department or outside of university. There are very few examples of working with Physics, Biological Sciences or Neuroscience and such exceptions do not merit changes to the current departmental framework. Noted past instance of two department members moving to Biological Science was because of inability to work collegially with members of department of Chemistry & Biochemistry.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other Staff responses included: within department or outside of university, “no”, and past work with Physics and current collaboration with Biological Sciences.
Economics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Academic Staff member: Management, Education, Health Sciences, and Geography.
English	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Department Response: same response as Question 1 – collaboration occurs but no connection with restructuring nor any difference between intra and inter-unit collaboration. Academic Staff member: Drama and Academic Writing.
Geography & Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Department Response: Anthropology, Sociology, Economics, Psychology, Health Science, Neuroscience, Biological Sciences, Physics & Astronomy, Math & Computer Science, Chemistry and Biochemistry, Indigenous Studies, History, Women and Gender Studies, Fine Art, New Media, and Religious Studies. Academic Staff member: Department of Biological Science and also within department.
History	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Department Response: “n/a”. Academic Staff member: mostly with colleagues outside of the University.
Kinesiology & Physical Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Department Response: There are numerous on-going research associations with the current Health Sciences Faculty and other health-related Sciences such as Neuroscience, Psychology, and Biological Sciences as well with colleagues in Fine Arts and Education. Also share strong research and teaching connections to the Centre for Oral History and Tradition and the Institute for Child and Youth Studies. Academic Staff members largely answered “no”. One member specified: Neuroscience, Faculty of Health Sciences, and Psychology.
Math & Computer Science	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Department Response: No replies to this question. Most Academic Staff also answered “none” or “no” or only within the Department. One of these staff identified themselves in the Math department and specifically noted that there is no collaboration between Math and Computer Science. Rather, Computer Science faculty collaborate with Physics and Neuroscience. Another member specified their field is Computer Science and they collaborate with Modern Languages with interests also in New Media, Psychology, Chemistry, Biology, Physics, Finance, Health Sciences, Kinesiology, and Education.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A couple Academic Staff listed: Faculty of Education, Teaching Centre.
Modern Languages & Linguistics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response: Only one department member conducts some research with colleagues in Indigenous Studies and Psychology. No other member of the Department currently has formal collaborations within the UofL. As noted in Question 1, isolated research projects with other units are not grounds for a fruitful merger. • Academic Staff member: “No”.
Neuroscience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response: Biological Science, Psychology, and Faculty of Health Sciences. • In addition to the units identified by the Department’s response, Academic Staff identified: Biochemistry & Chemistry, Physics, Kinesiology, and Computer Science. • One staff member indicated “n/a” and the other indicated “none”.
Philosophy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response: Yes, research collaborations have occurred and are currently occurring with faculty in: Biochemistry, Neuroscience, Geography, Physics, and Environmental Science.
Physics & Astronomy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response: Ongoing collaborative research with faculty in Philosophy, and Math & Computer Science. • Academic Staff: Math & Computer Science, Geography, Chemistry, Neuroscience, Biology, Kinesiology, Psychology, Fine Arts/New Media, and Education. One notes collaboration not same as membership.
Political Science	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response: Very minimal research collaboration with other departments; most collaboration occurs with colleagues at other institutions. One faculty member collaborates with Addictions Counselling (Health Sciences).
Psychology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response: Same answer as Question 1 but re: research collaboration i.e., no relevance to faculty restructuring.
Sociology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academic Staff member: “No”, the staff member was wary of question and intent of it.
Women and Gender Studies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response: Yes, in teaching, research and community work. The Department did not identify other units but see answer to Question 1 for units indicated. • Academic Staff member: collaborate with Health Sciences, DSB, Sociology, Anthropology, and Indigenous Studies.

Academic Writing Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program Response: Work with Library on how students engage in library use and in research literacy. • Academic Staff member: Not currently.
<i>Faculty of Fine Arts (FFA)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dean's Response: Members of the FFA have conducted interdisciplinary research, in particular with members of the Sciences. Most often collaboration occurs between the four departments of the FFA. • Two Academic Staff members did not specify their department. One member answered "no". The other response echoed that collaboration occurs mostly between FFA departments but the research conducted is very different in nature to the "traditional academic research" understood outside of the FFA.
Art	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response: The Department did not provide a specific response to this question in favour of providing a statement under Question 7 (<i>Appendix A, Item 8</i>) where it emphasized the collaboration between the FFA departments. • Academic Staff member: Psychology, New Media, Library, Ikaisskini and Liberal Education but note these do not represent possible departments to merge with but rather the benefit of organic, interdisciplinary research.
Art History/Museum Studies Program (AHMS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program Response: Not generally, but some members have collaborated with faculty in History on exhibitions and smaller research projects together.
Drama	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response⁸: There are Individual research collaborations with Psychology/ Neuroscience, New Media/Library, Art/Music, and Library Sciences as well as project with speakers from the Art Gallery, New Media, Drama, and Centre for Oral History and Tradition. • Academic Staff: research within FFA as well as Psychology and DSB.
Music	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response: Echoed Response to Question 1 that it is at its core a collaborative and cross-disciplinary department. Research with colleagues in other academic units includes, but is not limited to (in no particular order): sister departments of Art, Drama and New Media, computer science(coding/programming), life sciences (e.g., neuroscience; medical research; kinesiology), business (professional administration; marketing; management), cognitive sciences, Indigenous studies, literature, linguistics, modern languages, agriculture, sociology, anthropology, ethnography, human-computer interaction, robotics, VR/AR/XR,

⁸ The Department provided a very detailed response to each of the questions, the response to this question is summarized here; see full answer for more detail.

	<p>communications technology, education, philosophy, engineering, mathematics, physics, women and gender studies, etc. Because of this nature, the Department emphasized it is in the University's best interests to preserve the current infrastructure to ensure the continuance of the robust academic unit of Music. <i>See also the complete response in Appendix A, Item 3.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academic Staff members: One emphasized the collaboration occurs with the FFA departments of New Media, Drama and Art, which underlines the need for the FFA to remain an independent unit. Another member identified: Kinesiology, Health Sciences, Education, and another identified the Conservatory as well as Drama and Art. • One Academic Staff member indicated that the nature of their contract does not permit research with other colleagues.
New Media	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academic Staff member: typically work with colleagues in Faculty of Education but will work with any unit needing student interns for experiential learning.
Conservatory of Music	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unit Response: The Conservatory is a non-credit, cost recovery unit within the UofL that focuses primarily on music education, not research.
<i>Faculty of Health Sciences</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academic Staff reference conducting research with: Faculty of Education, Faculty of Arts & Science, Kinesiology, Nursing, Public Health, Psychology, Addictions Counselling, Aboriginal Health, Teaching Centre, and Women and Gender Studies. • Others indicated "none".
Therapeutic Recreation Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program Response: Nursing, Public Health, and Kinesiology & Physical Education. • The Academic Staff's responses are consistent with the Program Response.
<i>Faculty of Education</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dean's Response: Depends on research interests. Have scholars who represent many different disciplines (i.e., Educational Psychology, English, Modern Languages, Mathematics, Sciences, Kinesiology/Physical Education, Music, Drama, Art, and Social Sciences, for instance). However, because their disciplines are typically associated with K-12 subjects, though not exclusively, there tend to be fewer opportunities to work across faculties. Some faculty have worked with colleagues in History and Liberal Education, but this is not typical or frequent. Dean noted last time worked with another unit was through the Teaching Centre, specifically the Instructional Skills Workshop. • Academic Staff responses appear to depend on area of expertise/interest and include: New Media, Faculty of Fine Arts,

	<p>DSB, Liberal Education, Health Sciences, Faculty of Arts & Sciences, and Mathematics.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Three Academic Staff members answered “no” or “none” with two of these noting they only research with colleagues within the Faculty of Education.
<i>Dhillon School of Business</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Director of DSB Graduate Program Response: collaborate with Associate Deans of Faculties of Arts & Science and Health Sciences in relation to graduate programs. Academic Staff responses: consistently “no” with a couple noting research only within DSB.
<i>School of Liberal Education</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> School Response: SLE is comprised of faculty from different disciplines therefore research collaborations can take place with colleagues in any academic unit. One Academic Staff member identified Mathematics & Computer Science and the Teaching Centre. Another staff member identified research in Neuroscience (note they are a grad student in the neuroscience department).
<i>Library</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Department Response: Librarians have done research with faculty in the Dhillon School of Business, Fine Arts, Liberal Education, and Health Sciences, among others. As above, the Library provides research support (and collection support) across all units. Academic Staff responses also indicated: Indigenous Studies, Indigenous Health, Indigenous Governance and Business Management, Indigenous Student Success Cohort (ISSC), and Academic writing.

B. Non-Academic Staff

The vast majority of responses to this question were “no”, “n/a”, or did not answer and a few answers were nonresponsive to the question. There were only a few exceptions to this, which are as follows:

- An Academic Staff member from the English Language Institute noted that while the ELI does not typically initiate research, it supports other researchers’ activities when asked.
- Similarly, a staff member from DSB that works in technology services advised that they engage in research only when technology is required.
- A staff member in the Faculty of Fine Arts identified the following units without further context: Financial Services, Financial Planning, Facilities, IT, HR payroll, and other faculty Financial Officers. It is unclear whether this denotes engagement in research activities with those units.
- A staff member in Teaching Centre and Agility noted that they collaborate on Scholarship of Teaching and Learning research projects with faculty across all academic units.
- Finally, one academic staff member in Biological Sciences identified “environmental sciences” with no further explanation.

C. Students

A large portion of students answered “no”, “none” or “n/a” or did not answer the question. There were several responses that detailed research activities but did not specify whether it involved collaboration outside of the student’s academic unit. There were also quite a few unresponsive answers; such as listing courses the student was taking from other faculties but failing to specify if this involved research activities, noting research activities outside of the University or expressing concern over being unable to register in courses outside of their faculty.

A very common theme throughout the responses was that students predominantly engaged in research within the identified department (sometimes clarified as being the student’s major) or faculty. It was very common for students identified as being in the Faculty of Fine Arts or the constituent departments to respond that they research or collaborate with the other departments within the Faculty.

As noted above, many students indicated their faculty but not their department or program. While these responses are less helpful in identifying research connections between academic units, it was common for students identified as being in the Faculty of Arts & Science to respond with specific departments within the Faculty or noting their research activities occurred within the Faculty. However, a few responses from these students identified the Faculty of Health Sciences and a couple noted the School of Liberal Education. Similarly, students from the Faculty of Health Sciences also largely identified programs within the Faculty or the Faculty itself but some identified the Departments of Kinesiology and Sociology as well as the Faculty of Arts & Science, generally.

Otherwise, there was significant variation amongst student answers. This along with the small number of answers to the question, particularly responses that provided specific information such as the student’s specific program and department, made it difficult to find general trends beyond what is mentioned above. However, it is worth noting that, perhaps unsurprisingly, students’ research activities appear to involve related disciplines (i.e., staying within social sciences or within natural/life sciences). Some examples include:

- Students in Biological Sciences identified Biochemistry and Chemistry.
- An anthropology student identified doing research with the Geography & Environment department and working with the Community Bridge Lab, which is a research and community engagement hub. The student identified working with students from Psychology and History as well as faculty from Anthropology, Geography, and the School of Liberal Education at the Lab.
- Psychology students identified Addictions Counselling.
- A Sociology student identified Women and Gender Studies and Political Science
- A Political Science student identified History.
- A student in Management identified: Economics, English, Human Resources and Labour Relations, Liberal Arts.
- Students in the Cultural, Social and Political Thought Program identified Sociology and History, Women and Gender Studies, Social Work (U of C), and Health Sciences; however, one student also noted work with students in Art, Music, and New Media.

D. Anonymous

Of the Anonymous Academic Staff, one responded that they work closely with the Library and the other from Indigenous Studies noted research activities with Modern Languages and Linguistics. Two of the

Anonymous Non-Academic Staff answered this question; both identified themselves as being from the Teaching Centre. These staff members responded that they work with all units on campus or worked with many other faculties.

Of the anonymous students, most also answered “no”, did not answer this question or did not identify their department, program, or faculty. However, those that did answer, did so in a similar manner to the students as described above. Students in social sciences identified research activities with departments such as Philosophy, Sociology, Archeology, Psychology as well as English and the School of Liberal Education. Anonymous students from DSB identified work with Economics (twice), Computer Science and Nursing. One graduate student in the Faculty of Health Sciences identified research with Graduate Student’s Association, and the Library and Ethics office.

3. Do you collaborate on community engagement and outreach with colleagues in other academic units? With which other units do you typically work?

A. Academic Units and Staff

Faculty, Department or Program	Response
<i>Faculty of Arts & Science</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dean’s Response: Mainly carry out outreach for the Faculty of Arts & Science (work with associate deans and director of communications and marketing), but work collaboratively with Deans, AVPs, VPs, Executive Directors and Directors, including those from Advancement on institutional scale engagement opportunities.
Anthropology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Department Response: Relevant units and institutes include Religious Studies, Geography and Environment, Archaeology, History, Kinesiology, Liberal Education and COHT and Institute for Child and Youth Studies (I-CYS). One Academic Staff referenced the Department’s written response. The other member identified the Modern Languages and Linguistics department.
Biological Sciences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Department Response: Will let individual academic staff answer this. One Academic Staff member answered “no” and the other noted collaboration only within the Biological Sciences department.
Chemistry & Biochemistry	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partial Department Response: Long history of significant outreach activity and have worked with the Departments of Physics, Neuroscience, and Biology as well as occasionally Computer Science and Management. Faculty members from other departments such as Philosophy and New Media have also been involved.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biochemistry Responses: yes, the iGEM program (managed by Biochemistry faculty) has benefitted from involvement of faculty in Biological Sciences. • An Academic Staff member also referred to iGEM which has always been instructed by Biochemists, with Chemists in some cases. The member noted there had never been any member of the Biological Sciences who has served as an instructor/supervisor. In the past, a few members of the Biological Science department have offered their perspective on iGEM projects and activities, however, this should not be considered as active participation. • Three Academic Staff members answered “no” and one other staff member specified collaboration only within the Department.
English	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response: Similar to Questions 1 and 2 but regarding community engagement – collaboration occurs but no connection with restructuring. • Academic Staff member: worked with Academic Writing Program in teaching at Red Crow Community College (RCC) for their UofL transfer program and teaching UofL transfer courses in Drama, English and Indigenous Studies courses at RCCC.
Geography & Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response: Anthropology, Sociology, Health Science, Economics, Psychology, Neuroscience, Biological Sciences, Physics & Astronomy, Math & Computer Science, Indigenous Studies, History, Women and Gender Studies, Fine Art, New Media, Liberal Education. • Academic Staff member: Mainly with Department of Biological Science and also within department.
History	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response: Centre for Oral History & Tradition (Kinesiology); Sociology; Religious Studies (Asian Studies); Women and Gender Studies; Fine Arts. • Academic Staff member: Mostly work within department, some community engagement with colleagues in Liberal Education, the Teaching Centre, and Agility.
Kinesiology & Physical Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response: The Department did not specifically comment on its community engagement/outreach efforts.. • Four Academic Staff members answered “no”. • The other Academic Staff members referenced collaboration with the following: The Faculty of Health Sciences, Neuroscience and Physics & Astronomy (engineering). One member noted collaboration with various departments in Arts & Science on the STP committee.

Math & Computer Science	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response: Not aware of any collaboration at the moment. • The majority of Academic Staff responded “none” or “no”. However, one Academic Staff member noted collaboration with Faculty of Education and the Teaching Centre, and another identified Destination Exploration.
Modern Languages and Linguistics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response: The Department houses the French Language Centre (FLC), which has been a recipient of significant, renewable external funding since 2009. It performs inter-faculty outreach designed to serve other units and communities; there is no mutually beneficial collaboration. FLC’s contributions (funding of well over \$1million and ongoing payment for the instruction of 2-4 courses/year) has not been acknowledged in the Task Force reports and this must be addressed. • Academic Staff member: “No”.
Neuroscience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response: Chemistry & Biochemistry, and Physics • The majority of Academic staff indicated collaboration with the following units in addition to ones identified by the Department’s: Kinesiology, Psychology, Biological Sciences. • The remaining Academic Staff answered “no”, “n/a” or only collaborating within Neuroscience.
Philosophy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response: members have collaborated with other University of Lethbridge faculty members in the Southern Alberta Climate Hub and given talks and invited lectures to the Southern Alberta Council on Public Affairs (SACPA) and other community groups.
Physics & Astronomy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response: Usually interact with the STEM departments; efforts involve collaboration with Chemistry and Biochemistry, Biological Sciences, Geography and Neuroscience. • One Academic Staff member noted little community outreach collaboration and more could be done in this area. Another member noted involvement with Let’s Talk Science which includes volunteers from many departments (e.g., Biology, Biochemistry, Chemistry, Neuroscience, and Physics) as well as work with liberal arts, Math and Education in the past. Another member identified the following units but specified collaboration not the same as membership in a department: Math & Computer Science, Kinesiology, Psychology, Fine Arts/New Media, and Education.
Political Science	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response: Tend to conduct community engagement and outreach alone. Past collaborations have occurred with the

	History department and the student societies of Political Science and History have held events together.
Psychology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Department Response: Same answer as Questions 1 and 2 but re: collaboration in community engagement and outreach, i.e., no relevance to faculty restructuring.
Sociology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Department Response: no specific answer to this question in the response provided. Academic Staff member: “No”.
Women and Gender Studies (WGST)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Department Response: Two WGST faculty serve as core members of the Support Network for Academics of Colour Plus which students and faculty from across faculties participate in. Academic Staff member: noted co-founded Support Network for Academics of Colour Plus, which collaborates with other departments such as History, Sociology, Political Science, English, Health Sciences, and the Prentice Institute.
Academic Writing Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Program Response: Have worked with the English Language Institute (ELI)/International, the Library, the Indigenous Student Success Cohort as well as regularly connecting with colleagues through Women Scholars events, Indigenous scholars’ presentations, as well as History and Philosophy colloquia. Academic Staff member: occasionally in Women’s Scholars events.
Faculty of Fine Arts (FFA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dean’s Response: Collaborate with Indigenous Studies and Women and Gender Studies. The Cinema Studies film series calls on members from a variety of departments as guest speakers. Two Academic Staff members did not specify their department; they answered “none” and most identified other FFA departments as most common collaborators.
Art	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Department Response: The Department did not provide a specific response to this question in favour of providing a statement under Question 7 (<i>Appendix A, Item 8</i>). In the response, the Department emphasized the collaborative nature of the FFA departments in being public facing, community-oriented units, and actively partnering with many cultural organizations and businesses in the city and region. Academic Staff member: Work with Recreation Services, the Music Conservatory, and kids science programs.
Art History/Museum Studies Program (AHMS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Program Response: “n/a”.

Drama	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response⁹: The Department provided an explanation of the community engagement and outreach initiatives it is engaged in. In doing so, the Department indicated collaboration with the other Fine Arts Departments as well as with the Art Gallery, New Media, Centre for Oral History and Tradition, and other local organizations. • Most Academic Staff noted extensive community engagement and collaborations with other departments in Fine Arts, one specified Music in particular. One Academic Staff member answered “no”.
Music	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response: Music and the UofL Conservatory are the greatest sources of community outreach at the University given the well over 100 combined musical events per year and countless hours of individual mentoring, faculty-led community performance organizations, and community-based teaching. The Music Department also works extensively with the Faculty of Education in public schools throughout the province, in collaboration with the Lethbridge Symphony and with the Lethbridge Public Library. It should also be noted that between 2017 and 2020, 15% of all U of L Conservatory students (530) went on to attend the U of L across all disciplines. The majority attended a B.Sc. program (104 students), then a B.A. (74 students), followed by a B.Mus. (60 students). This is a significant source of local recruiting that cannot be ignored, but rather needs to be nurtured. <i>See also complete response in Appendix A, Item 3.</i> • One Academic Staff member answered “no” and another indicated no because of their contract type. On other staff member indicated engagement with a high school but did not specify if this involved collaboration with another unit. • The remaining responses were consistent with the Department’s response. Academic Staff highlighted that cultivating a strong amalgamation with the Music Conservatory (Casa) is central to community engagement and the important role the Department plays in community engagement for the University generally. One Academic Staff member noted a concern that the question did not contemplate/include outreach programs offered by single departments (such as the music department’s many offerings) which are very important. They noted important collaboration with the Conservatory, other FFA departments and community organizations.

⁹ The Department provided a very detailed response to each of the questions, the response to this question is summarized here; see full answer for more detail.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Another Academic Staff member specified collaboration with Arts & Science (Priestly lecture series), Drama and various faculties in a report on student poverty.
New Media	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academic Staff member: Modern Languages as well as working with colleagues throughout the university as a judge for the Lethbridge regional science fair.
Conservatory of Music	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unit Response: The Conservatory is a very strong community outreach and community engagement unit within the University and collaborates with many organizations in the Lethbridge community. Have been asked to be part of many outreach events and initiatives across the university, e.g., providing entertainment for the President's Christmas party and University Advancement fundraising and donor relation events. It can not be overstated that the Conservatory is an invaluable community engagement unit that many units across campus have utilized for community engagement support. Also regularly collaborate and partner with other units such as Sports & Recreation, Destination Exploration, and the Art Gallery on outreach initiatives such as the Family Fun Day, or on our Mini U Multi-Disciplinary Summer Camps. Most solid and consistent collaborations are with the Music Department. The Conservatory provides a significant source of local recruiting to the Music Department; as such, many events organized with the Music Department are strategically designed to engage potential students and families.
<i>Faculty of Health Sciences</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most Academic Staff answered “no” or only collaboration within the Faculty. Others reference collaborating with the following: Psychology, Public Health, Women & Gender Studies, Fine Arts, Nursing and Kinesiology.
Therapeutic Recreation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response: Nursing, Public Health, and Kinesiology & Physical Education. • Academic Staff member: Public Health and Nursing.
<i>Faculty of Education</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dean’s Response: This depends on individual research interests. Overall, the members of the Faculty of Education work much more extensively on research and community engagement with colleagues who are from other universities' faculties of education, government, schools and school division, and teacher professional learning organizations. Additionally, working with Liberal Education and Mathematics for collaboration on community engagement. • Most Academic Staff answer “no” or “n/a”. One staff member identified collaborating with the English department. Another referenced collaboration with the Library as a librarian in the Faculty but emphasized success in role is being embedded in Faculty of Education.

<i>Dhillon School of Business</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DSB Graduate Program Response: “n/a”. • Academic Staff responses: consistently “no”, “none”, “n/a” (or no answer submitted).
<i>School of Graduate Studies (SGS)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dean’s Response: Collaborate with all other units on outreach/community engagement. The nature of their role in Research, has them collaborating with all other units on community engagement and outreach.
<i>School of Liberal Education (SLE)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School Response: SLE is comprised of faculty from different disciplines therefore community engagement and outreach can take place with colleagues in any academic unit. SLE has recently established the Community Bridge Lab, with the goal of providing research space, coordination, and funding for multi-disciplinary and community-engaged student research projects across the social sciences and humanities. • Academic Staff member: work with colleagues in Neuroscience working on the Building Brains Together (BBT) Project.
<i>Library</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response: Engagement activities are generally aimed at attracting a wide range of students and faculty across campus, both in academic and non-academic ways. The Library also collaborates with other academic units in creating digital collections including the Department of Biology, History and the Centre for Oral History, Geography and Archaeology. • Academic Staff responses echo the Department’s response that the Library supports all units and mention the units they particularly collaborate with such as: Indigenous students and Indigenous Student Success Cohort and Agility.

B. Non-Academic Staff

Of the 30 responses from Non-Academic Staff, over half did not answer this question or answered “no” or “n/a”.

Otherwise, the other units with which academic staff collaborate on community engagement and outreach varies significantly based on the nature of the staff member’s position. However, as with the responses to Question 1, quite a few responses identified working with all Academic units. Others identify specific academic units as well as collaboration with other administrative units. The table below summarizes the responses from Non-Academic staff where they identified engaging in community outreach.

Administrative or Academic Unit	Response
Counselling Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academic Advising, Student Success Centre, Accommodated Learning Centre, Health Centre, Housing Services, Indigenous Services, International Centre, Pride Centre, Sexual Violence Support Worker.

English Language Institute (ELI)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ELI works with International Student Recruitment and International Student Services on community engagement and outreach projects.
Financial Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The staff member identified DSB with no further information.
Provost & Vice President (Academic) Office	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academic Programming: Yes, all faculties.
Student Enrolment and Registrar Services (SEARS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The staff member noted that their role has them working with Academic Advising units and Support Staff in all faculties, SGS, International Centre, Indigenous Student Services and the School of Liberal Education to build transition and orientation programming for all new students.
Student Services and Scholarships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The staff member identified doing outreach in relation to donor stewardship for the Faculty of Fine Arts and DSB primarily, but also the Faculty of Arts & Science, particularly the history department. They also collaborate with Agility.
Teaching Centre and Agility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response: As the lead Regional Innovation Network of Southern Alberta (RINSA) member for the University of Lethbridge, Agility works closely with ORIS and DSB, and collaborates with local community on Innovation and Entrepreneurship programming and events. Agility is actively involved in community engagement activities related to learning in Arts & Science and Liberal Education. Agility has also co-sponsored/hosted community engagement events with the Faculty of Fine Arts and Destination Exploration. Agility and the Teaching Centre have worked closely with Iikaisskini and Blackfoot Elders on several indigenous focused initiatives. • A staff member identified they had not previously engaged in these activities but they have started meeting with Research Services and Indigenous Affairs and is hopeful to create synergies.
University Advancement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communications: Engages in student recruitment and retention marketing for SEARS, the Faculties of Arts & Science, Fine Arts, Health Sciences and Education as well as DSB and SGS.
<i>Faculty of Arts & Science</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Youth Outreach/Destination Exploration: Works a bit with Health and Sciences in Destination Exploration program. The staff member noted they primarily do outreach for the Faculty of Arts & Science in the areas of Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (STEM).
<i>Dhillon School Business</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student Professional Development: Yes, with Development, Alumni Relations & Community Engagement, Communications, Research Services, and Agility.

C. Students

Out of the significant number of responses received from students, the vast majority of students did not answer this question or answered “no”, “none”, or “n/a”. Of those students that did answer the question, a large portion outlined their community engagement and outreach without identifying the other

academic unit(s) or students identified collaborating with external organizations. This left a much smaller sample of student responses to this question. Accordingly, we have provided a narrative summary below, rather than a table.

Overall, there is significant variety amongst students' answers to this question; while quite a few students have engaged in community outreach within their departments or related departments within their faculty, there was also a fair amount of collaboration across academic units. For instance, students from the Faculty of Education described collaboration with students and faculty in the Math department to offer external programming to high school students and a student in DSB identified being heavily involved with the Drama department. Students from the Faculty of Fine Arts largely described collaboration within the faculty but also mentioned collaboration with the Modern Languages department as well as "science departments and Social Science courses". A student referenced the Student Connections Club, which includes students of all faculties and works on reaching out to prospective students.

Students in the Cultural, Social and Political Thought program, referenced collaboration with the Departments of Art, Sociology and History as well as the Institute for Child and Youth Studies (I-CYS), Centre for Culture & Community, and ASTeRIX. Students from the Faculty of Health Sciences identified Nursing and Kinesiology. Students in the Faculty of Arts & Science referenced collaborating with students from Fine Arts, Arts & Science, DBS, Health Science, and Education through the University Student Union as well as departments of Chemistry and Biology and community outreach via the Community Bridge Lab Initiative, which has members from Anthropology, History, Liberal Education, and Geography and Environment.

D. Anonymous

An anonymous faculty member answered this question and noted they only collaborate with colleagues outside of the University. An anonymous Non-Academic Staff member from the Teaching Centre noted they worked with Agility in promoting events involving community partners. Another staff member from SEARS noted working with all academic units. Otherwise, student responses included irrelevant answers to answers in the negative. However, there was one response from a graduate student in Health Sciences who advised that they collaborated with the following groups: DBS, the Health Centre, the Graduate Students Association, facilities & maintenance, IT and New Media, among others.

4. Are there additional academic units with which you plan to collaborate more (in teaching, learning, research, and/or community engagement)? If so, which ones?

A. Academic Units and Staff

Faculty, Department or Program	Response
<i>Faculty of Arts & Science</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dean's Response: It will be more important than ever for the five or six faculties to work together to ensure that we uphold the principle of Liberal Education and support the four pillars subsequent to the restructuring process.
Anthropology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Department Response: A member has recently affiliated with the Prentice Institute, and another anticipates potential collaboration with a member in Geography and Environment

	<p>with a research interest in migration. The Community Bridge Lab project includes two members of the Department in community-engaged learning and research with colleagues from Geography and Liberal Education.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One Academic Staff member referred to the Department's response for this and the other identified the Modern Languages and Linguistics Department (Spanish) and Indigenous Studies.
Biological Sciences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response: "No". • Academic Staff member: "No".
Chemistry & Biochemistry	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partial Department Response: The Department is developing modular certificate programs that may include future involvement with Physics, Math & Computer Science, Neuroscience and perhaps Management. • Biochemistry Responses: Yes, with Biological Sciences and Neurosciences to develop a certificate in Cellular and Molecular Medicine, and a course-based Masters in Computational Life Sciences based on the current certificate in Bioinformatics. • Three Academic Staff answered "no" and one specified this is the case given the point in their career. • One Academic Staff member indicated that they envision teaching more with other math/science instructors and engaging in inter-faculty collaborations to enhance true liberal education opportunities to show how disparate disciplines are actually related (e.g., like Chemistry of Art course with Fine Arts). Another answered that there are no new initiatives for teaching or research, but they are in the process of implementing a new Biochemistry program (since fall 2020) which would be derailed, cause much disruption, and provide no benefit if there is a merger as being proposed by some biochemists.
English	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response: There are a number of possibilities but these need to be considered organically and approached in ways that promote their likely success. We have therefore identified the need for a process of discovery (rather than a rule to meet non-reflective, short-term demands) and have chosen to jumpstart this by reaching out to other, more-or-less, cognate units, such as: (i) Drama, (ii) New Media, and (iii) the Writing Program. • Academic Staff member identified Drama and Fine Arts and continued collaboration with the Teaching Centre.
Geography and Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response: Future collaboration could include many academic units; further collaborations with Anthropology and Women and Gender Studies is likely.

History	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response: Geography (Archeology); Religious Studies; Women and Gender Studies; Art History (Fine Arts) • Academic Staff Member: Religious Studies.
Kinesiology & Physical Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response: The Department did not specifically identify other units with which it plans to collaborate more but identified that it would continue to engage in the collaboration outlined under Questions 7 and 8. • About half of the Academic Staff members answered “no”, not at the moment or did not answer. The remainder indicated plans to collaborate with the following: Faculty of Education, History, Physics & Astronomy (Engineering).
Math & Computer Science	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response: YYC Campus, and will likely continue existing collaboration with Education and Management. This answer should not be taken as an endorsement of amalgamating with any of these units. • Just over half of the Academic Staff answered “none” or “no”. • Of the remaining, the Academic Staff identified the following units: Liberal Education, Nursing/Health Sciences, the Faculty of Education for a Mathematics Education Program, DSB (for programs in supply chain management and crypto currencies), Chemistry and Physics.
Modern Languages and Linguistics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response: “No”. • Academic Staff member: “No”.
Neuroscience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response: provided no answer. • Most Academic Staff answered “no” or “n/a”. • One Academic staff member noted a repeated interest in teaching anatomy course in Biological Sciences but was prevented from doing so. They would be happy to do so if it is not a one-off as interested in strengthening ties with Biological Sciences. • One Academic Staff member indicated intent to collaborate more with Geography & Environment, another indicated Health Sciences. Another indicated Computer Sciences, and another indicated Psychology.
Philosophy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response: The Department has had preliminary discussions with the Political Science Department about the possibility of creating a Philosophy, Politics and Law (PPL) program, which presents a potential new revenue stream. The Department noted its serious concern about a PPL program being housed in the Dhillon School of Business, it must be housed in a Humanities program to be successful. The

	<p>Department provided further information on a potential PPL program and the benefits it may bring to the University.</p>
Physics & Astronomy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response: Potential for future collaboration with Neuroscience, Geography, and Chemistry and Biochemistry. In teaching, the Department interacts with many different departments, faculties and through the Teaching Centre. • Academic Staff indicated: Math & Computer Sciences, Neuroscience, Biology, Kinesiology, Psychology, Fine Arts/New Media, and Education. One noted that they are ramping down activities so are not actively looking for new collaborations but remains open to opportunities.
Political Science	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response: Philosophy, Economics, Religious Studies, Anthropology, Cultural Resource Management, Addictions Counseling, and Women and Gender Studies. Some discussion with Philosophy on the creation of a Philosophy, Politics, and Law (PPL) program, modeled on the program currently offered at McMaster.
Psychology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response: Same answer as Questions 1-3 but re: short- and long-term plans to collaborate more with other units, i.e., no relevance to faculty restructuring.
Sociology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response: No specific answer to this question was provided in the Department's response. • Academic Staff member: "No".
Women and Gender Studies (WGST)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response: WGST plans to collaborate with any department, faculty, and program that integrates critical race studies, gender and sexualities, disasters, and feminist scholarship. • Academic Staff member: Yes, with Department of Geography and Environment, Indigenous Studies, Health Sciences, and the Dhillon School of Business.
Academic Writing Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program Response: Liberal Education and Library in developing more offerings for the new information and communications minor and developing accessible stand-alone modules for increased student media literacy. • Academic Staff members identified: plans for collaboration with Library, SLE, education and possibly Health Sciences as well as DSB and most science departments.
Agriculture Studies Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program Response: Liberal Education and the Library.
<i>Faculty of Fine Arts (FFA)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dean's Response: Members have robust research and teaching programs that may call upon members of a variety of other

	<p>departments; most often collaboration occurs between the four departments of the FFA.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Academic Staff identified further collaboration within the FFA departments.
Art	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Department Response: The Department did not provide a specific response to this question in favour of providing a statement under Question 7 (<i>Appendix A, Item 8</i>). However, in its statement the Department highlighted potential collaboration or synergies with the Department of Indigenous Studies. Academic Staff member: Possibly Liberal Education and continuing with Psychology (Barrett/Henzi lab).
Art History/Museum Studies Program (AHMS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Program Response: “n/a”.
Drama	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Department Response¹⁰: Interested in creating a BFA multidisciplinary/special topics course taught in collaboration with all Fine Arts Departments. Currently proposing a BA program in Cinema Studies. Preliminary conversations have begun with the Music Department about a Popular Music and Performance stream as well as increased offerings in Musical Theatre. Plans from the recent AQA process emphasized need to collaborate more closely with Education but this should not be taken as an indication that the Drama department should be housed under the Faculty Education. The majority of Academic Staff echoed the Department’s response adding that Education students make up a large portion of classes, that the BA in Cinema studies would rely on courses from Departments as diverse as New Media, Music, Modern Languages, Religious Studies, and Indigenous Studies and added an intention to collaborate with the following units: Art, English, New Media, Music, Indigenous Studies, History, Geography, Neuroscience, Anthropology, Marketing, Computer Sciences, Modern Languages, DSB and Archeology. In responding, one Academic Staff member noted that the Faculty of Fine Arts’ A.Q.A. and S.T.P. policies are vital to positive engagement with other faculties, and another emphasized that while there are extensive collaborative opportunities with other academic units, particularly with Education, this is not a rationale for combining Fine Arts or any of its units into another unit. The strength of FFA and the Departments is in its independent nature.
Music	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Department Response: The Department plans to collaborate more closely with the Conservatory on supporting its community

¹⁰ The Department provided a very detailed response to each of the questions, the response to this question is summarized here; see full answer for more detail.

	<p>engagement through various faculty initiatives, particularly in the area of service allocation. Plans to continue research with colleagues in other academic units referenced above under Questions 1 and 2. <i>See also complete response in Appendix A, Item 3.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Academic Staff also identified: Art, Anthropology, WGST, Faculty of Education, Computer Science, Life Sciences, Cognitive sciences, Indigenous Studies, Literature, Agriculture, Sociology, Ethnography, robotics, VR/AR/XR, Modern Languages and History. A few (three of seven) Academic Staff answered “no” or did not answer.
New Media	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Academic Staff member: open to all opportunities and was recently approached by Health Sciences.
Conservatory of Music	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unit Response: The Conservatory will explore new and interesting collaborations at the UofL with regard to wellness and mental health funding becoming available as the world begins to recover from COVID-19. Music would pair very well with mental health workshops or a wellness retreat/festival. The Conservatory may also be able to explore potential cost-savings and collaborations with Continuing Education courses or a Continuing Education unit and the University explores this. However, at this time, the Conservatory has many other stronger connections with other units that present countless opportunities at this particular time.
<i>Faculty of Health Sciences</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some Academic Staff answered “no” (approximately 4 staff members) and one answered that they were unsure. The remaining responses indicated an intention to collaborate more with: Education, Kinesiology, Social Work, Psychology, Mathematics & Computer Science, Aboriginal Health, Addictions Counselling, and Management.
Therapeutic Recreation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Department Response: Education. Academic Staff indicated: Addictions Counselling, Education, Fine Arts, Management (DSB) and Aboriginal Health.
<i>Faculty of Education</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dean’s Response: Attempted to collaborate with the organizers of the PUBLIC Professor Speakers series to include scholars from the Faculty of Education but was told this was an Arts & Science initiative with no plans to expand. The Faculty therefore continued its own Research Conversations and Seminars, which draws interest from the school teaching community and further demonstrates that the Faculty shares more common interests with external partners. However, the Dean continues to feel there is much that can be done together going forward.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The majority of Academic Staff answered “no” or “n/a”. One staff member identified DSB as a unit it wishes to collaborate more with.
<i>Dhillon School of Business</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DSB Graduate Program Response: Will be strengthening collaboration with Faculty of Arts & Science and Faculty of Health Sciences to improve existing programs and potentially creating more graduate level programs. The majority of Academic Staff answer “none”, “no” or did not answer. One Academic Staff member noted development of a masters program in business analytics in collaboration with Computer Science and anticipates further collaboration opportunities with Computer Science and Statistics. A couple of members noted the scope to do more with Agricultural Studies and another noted possible collaborations with Agility.
<i>School of Graduate Studies (SGS)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dean’s Response: Opportunity to work more closely with Liberal Education and Faculty of Education as well as Library and Agility.
<i>School of Liberal Education (SLE)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> School Response: SLE is comprised of faculty from different disciplines, so additional collaborations could take place with any academic unit.
<i>Library</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Department Response: The Library is consistently collaborating with all units across campus; that is core to its mission. It has existing collaborations with every other faculty in terms of teaching, collections, research, and outreach and is always looking for new opportunities to work with each and every unit on campus. This is why it is critical that the Library remains disciplinarily agnostic and advocate for the Library to be included in a 6th (multidisciplinary) unit. Academic Staff responses echoed the Department’s that the plan is to collaborate with all units, added plans to collaborate with Innovation Zone or did not answer.

B. Non-Academic Staff

The vast majority of Non-Academic Staff responses to this question were “no”, “n/a”, or they did not answer the question. Only 6 staff members and one Unit provided a response, and their responses were quite particular to their role in the relevant Administrative Unit or Faculty.

Two staff members from Student Enrolment and Registrar Services identified their intention to work with “all” or “all units” without further elaboration. The staff member from the English Language Institute (ELI) conveyed that they would like the ELI to collaborate with more academic units in general, particularly in community engagement but they are open to other opportunities as well. The staff member in Youth Outreach from the Faculty of Arts & Science noted they would like to do more outreach and recruitment

with Engineering as it becomes a full degree. In addition, the staff member noted that Destination Exploration could also be an asset to Agriculture in terms of outreach and youth education.

The Teaching Centre and Agility response outlined that the units have started conversations to increase collaborative initiatives with Ikaisskini. In addition, the Teaching Centre would continue to be an important support unit to all faculties and schools as the University's Continuing Education offerings are expanded. The staff member from the Teaching Centre responded that they have collaborated and look forward to continuing to do so with Advancement, Convocation, Student Services and started to do so with Research Services and Indigenous Affairs.

C. Students

The vast majority of students responded "no", "n/a", "unsure" to this question or left it blank. Many of the answers in the negative emphasized that the student planned on remaining in their program or department given the focus of their studies. It was also very common for student responses to this question to reflect a general desire to collaborate in the future without providing information on which units they wish to collaborate with or continue to collaborate with.

A few students provided details on areas of studies they want to explore or the trajectory of their degree or career. For instance, one student provided details about the course of their studies over the coming year such as plans to pursue an Honours Thesis in the Department of Anthropology and a desire to reach out to former professors in the Faculty of Health Sciences, and perhaps Women and Gender Studies for advice. Another student in the English department expressed a desire to take classes in social theory. In this vein, several students answered this question by identifying other academic units they eventually want to transfer to or courses they want to take. One student answered this question very generally by noting they would like to continue taking courses outside of their faculty/discipline. Another couple of students identified plans to teach.

Some students listed academic units without providing information on the type of collaboration contemplated. Most responses of this nature from students in the Faculty of Arts & Science listed departments within the Faculty; however, a couple identified the Faculty of Health Sciences. There were a few answers that merely specified "research" and/or "community engagement". Finally, quite a few students from the Faculty of Arts & Science expressed to be accepted into the Faculty of Education.

The academic units identified by students are outlined in the table below; the faculty, department or program in the left-hand column is the unit in which the student is currently enrolled.

Current Faculty, Department or Program	Response
<i>Faculty of Arts & Science</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Health Sciences, Education, Music, Fine Arts and Education. Students identified as being in "social sciences" identified: Physics, Music and "humanities".
Anthropology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Faculty of Health Sciences, Women and Gender Studies, Anthropology Club (includes members from Sociology, Women and Gender Studies, Indigenous Studies, philosophy, Religious Studies, History, Geography and Environment).
English	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Anthropology, Women and Gender Studies, and Sociology.
Geography and Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Agility Centre.

Modern Languages and Linguistics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> History and Religious Studies.
Political Science	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sociology and History.
Psychology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DSB, Health Sciences and Neuroscience.
<i>Faculty of Fine Arts</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> English, History, and Modern Languages and Linguistics.
Music	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Education, Drama and Kinesiology. Students also identified “Cognitive Research” and the Indigenous Student Centre.
<i>Faculty of Health Sciences</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Education, Kinesiology and Sociology.
<i>Faculty of Education</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A student in Education emphasized that the Faculty needs to work with all other faculties to deliver its programming; the program requires students to take courses from across various disciplines which demonstrates the multi-disciplinary nature of the academic discipline of Education.
<i>Dhillon School of Business</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Education, Political Science, and Art. A student in the Management program identified Linguistics.

D. Anonymous

Anonymous responses from an Academic Staff member in DSB indicated a desire to work on a Potential Agricultural Science Program and another in the Faculty of Arts & Science indicated the Library as well as “Humanities and Social Sciences”. A member in Indigenous Studies noted an intention to collaborate more with Anthropology. Anonymous Non-Academic Staff in Arts & Science indicated Fine Arts and another in Student Affairs indicated “all units”. Anonymous student responses indicate students in DSB intend on collaborating with New Media and the Agricultural Studies Program, a Neuroscience student identified Addictions Counseling and an Arts & Science student indicated the Faculty of Education.

5. Indicate at least one or two academic units with which your academic unit could best combine into one joint area/department.

It is relevant to note under this question that throughout responses to Questions 1-4 and particularly Question 5, several Academic Units and Staff took issue with the nature of the question as implying that collaboration with other units was a logical basis to merge those units. Others answered the question but specified that while the unit collaborated with certain other units in formal or informal matters this did not translate into the basis for merging those departments. Some responses denied any connection between collaboration/research and faculty restructuring noting that collaboration amongst academic units is and should be a common feature of a university. The Modern Languages Department highlighted that merging units should be based on synergies in pedagogy and meaningful interdisciplinary research rather than informal or tenuous connections via cross-listed courses. The Department noted that occasional independent studies and collaboration can dissipate as situations change. A large portion of the Academic Units and Staff articulated the desire to keep their department structure intact and instead explore other options for costs savings such as an “administrative merger” (i.e., sharing a Chair across two

departments). Similarly, some answered the question but noted that they did not believe merging was in the best interests of the Department or the University.

A. Academic Units and Staff

Faculty, Department or Program	Response
<i>Faculty of Arts & Science</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Faculty Response from Dean based on consultation¹¹: Vast majority of faculty members in Arts & Science wish to keep their department intact to maintain developed research, pedagogical, service and collegial relationships and friendships. Ideal arrangement of departments in separate Faculty of Arts and Faculty of Science will not be the same as the current structure, so will be a challenge to limit disruption. Provided a detailed proposal for the organization of departments in the 5 proposed faculties: <p>I. FACULTY OF ARTS</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> History, Art History & Religious Studies English and Modern Languages Human Geography, Anthropology and Archaeology Sociology and Women & Gender Studies Indigenous Studies and ISSC Political Science, Philosophy and Law Music and Drama Visual Arts and New Media <p>II. FACULTY OF SCIENCE AND ENVIRONMENT</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Earth Systems and Environment Psychology and Neuroscience Biological Sciences Chemistry and Biochemistry Physics and Engineering Mathematics and Computer Science <p>III. DHILLON FACULTY OF BUSINESS</p>

¹¹ Consulted with: Faculty of Arts & Science Governance Advisory Committee, Arts & Science Planning Committee, School of Innu Planning Committee, Faculty of Arts & Science Dean's Think Tank, Dean's Advisory Committee, Arts & Science Council, Statutory Dean's Council, Provost's Committee and numerous Transformational Task Force Meetings, including Faculty Structures as well as with program Chairs, the University of Lethbridge Student's Union and countless faculty members.

	<p>Add Economics</p> <p>IV. FACULTY OF HEALTH SCIENCES</p> <p>Add Kinesiology and Physical Education</p> <p>V. FACULTY OF EDUCATION OTHER UNITS</p> <p>The Library, Teaching Centre and Agility, Liberal Education, School of Innis and Academic Writing could all continue to report to the Office of the Provost and/or Office of the President.</p> <p>Alternatively, they could constitute a SIXTH faculty, focused on knowledge, creativity and innovation.</p>
Anthropology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response: Geography & Environment. The Department has strong connections with faculty that teach human geography as well as archaeology. • Academic Staff responses indicated that the unit did not fit with any other department due to the diverse nature of research and teaching in Anthropology. While department members could fit in Religious Studies, Sociology, Indigenous Studies, Archaeology, Spanish, or History, this would only be as individual faculty rather than a coherent group of anthropologists.
Biological Sciences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response: None. The Department is already extremely large and delivers four programs. Any overlap with other departments are with a subset of a faculty. The Department is clear that it wishes to stay as is. • Academic Staff member: Biochemistry.
Chemistry & Biochemistry	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partial Department Response: Biological Sciences is most aligned in terms of research interests, programs and laboratory instruction and to a lesser extent the Department is aligned with Physics. However, the Department notes it does not believe merging is in its best interests or the interests of other departments. • Biochemistry Responses: The Biochemistry program should be moved to Biological Sciences. Faculty in the current Chemistry & Biochemistry department that do not fit with Biological Science would benefit from Chemistry and Physics merging into one department. • One Academic Staff member emphasized that members of both Chemistry and Biochemistry have been working closely and have a significant overlap with their activities, in terms of teaching, research and service. The member noted that a group of Biochemists has proposed merging the Biochemistry program with the Department of Biological Sciences but during several meetings in the Department no beneficial outcome of this potential merger has precipitated. The member emphasized

	<p>there is no advantage to merging Biochemistry with Biological Sciences as it will create a massive department spread across campus, with many groups of researchers that have no overlap in either teaching or research activities. If any of the groups within or outside want to establish collaborations, they can do so. The member noted that only two biochemists have research collaboration with the members of the Biological Sciences.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Three Academic Staff members responded “none” because the Department was already combined and very large. One of these members identified that while this was their position, if a choice must be made, Biological Sciences has the most in common with the Department. • One Academic Staff member answered that there is a high degree of integration possible with Science Commons and proposed that one “area” of science be organized as a Faculty or School and within that there could be smaller natural units functioning as a series of “mini-academic units”. For example, the member sees good integration between Neuroscience, Biological Sciences, Chemistry and Biochemistry, Physics & Astronomy.
Economics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academic Staff member: DSB.
English	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response: There are a number of viable possibilities but, as with Question 4, this must be approached organically and in ways that promote success. The Department has therefore identified the need for a process of discovery and have chosen to reach out to other connected units such as: (i) Drama, (ii) New Media, and (iii) the Writing Program. However, the synergies that could be created do <u>not</u> require combination with the units so long as university administration manifests greater flexibility. • Academic Staff member agreed the Department would combine well with Drama (or Theatre Studies). Could see merging English, Theatre/Drama and Film Studies.
Geography & Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response: The Department is already a combination of faculties with diverse research interests, which is what this exercise is focussing on; further additions of scholars from fields like Anthropology, Sociology and Biological Sciences may work in some systems of organizations but are unlikely to save money as Geography & Environment is already one of the largest departments on campus.
History	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response: Preference is to leave the departments/faculties in their existing state. However, could combine with Religious Studies due to natural affinity in terms of research and teaching interests therefore resulting in a relatively easy integration between the two departments. Also mentions

	<p>the option of absorbing some of the trained historians currently in other faculties such as Fine Arts (art historians), Kinesiology (historians of sport), Geography (Archaeologists) etc. But in making this suggestion the Department highlighted that while other Humanities departments (Political Science, English, Philosophy) may appear similar, their pedagogical goals and methods are such that any attempt to combine these with History would be extremely harmful.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academic Staff concur that Religious Studies is best fit. Some natural connections with political Science but notes other members of the Department do not agree.
Kinesiology & Physical Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response: The best option is to continue as currently constituted within the Faculty of Arts & Science. However, if Faculty of Arts & Science is disbanded, the most logical home is as a “School of Kinesiology” within a Faculty of Kinesiology and Health Studies. Emphasized it is <u>not</u> appropriate for the School of Kinesiology to administer the Departments of Athletics, and Sport and Recreation. The focus and interests of these departments are not compatible. • One Academic Staff member echoed the Department’s response regarding a School of Kinesiology alongside a School of Nursing in the Faculty of Kinesiology Health Sciences. Another Staff member indicated the Department should stay in the Faculty of Arts & Science or the Faculty of Health Sciences and another indicated Arts and Science. • Other Academic Staff responses included: Health Sciences, Neuroscience, Psychology and Therapeutic Recreation.
Math & Computer Science	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response: None. It is already a combined department of two units. • Most staff indicated “none”. • Two Academic Staff indicated that it is already a combined department with 3 units: Math, Computer Science and Statistics and the Department is having significant difficulties functioning and dealing with different cultures between the units. They indicated that issues arise when the Department committees or decision makers must come to conclusions for the other units without having the culture and knowledge to do so. Both Academic Staff members stated that amalgamating different Academic Units is a bad idea and will not lead to efficiencies; the members advised that it would be in the best interests if the Math & Computer Science department was split. Similarly, one Academic Staff member took issue with the question as it assumes a best outcome takes the form of amalgamation and this was not the case given the Department was combined. The

	<p>member provided feedback that it would be more efficient for Math to only be combined with Statistics.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One Academic Staff member answered “none” but if it had to, a Statistics department could be added and another indicated Computer Science.
Modern Languages and Linguistics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response: None. Cannot in good conscience indicate that the Department has identified another unit which it can be combined with. The Department already operates as amalgamated multi-disciplinary academic entity (French, Spanish, Japanese and Linguistics), and it already shares administrative support with Department of Indigenous Studies. The Department cannot be merged with units that do not have a primary focus on language and language acquisition. If compelled, however, the least disruptive merger would be with the Department of Indigenous Studies, but this is not ideal. The Department emphasized there are issues with the notion of merging units. Instead, it is more than willing to work on other cost saving measures that do not involve merging.
Neuroscience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response: Biochemistry, Psychology and Kinesiology. However, notably the Department discussed this at meetings and states that it unanimously <u>does not</u> wish to be combined with another department, especially not Psychology. • Two Academic Staff members emphasized that the Department should not be combined with any other unit. • Eight Academic Staff members identified Psychology. However, consistent with the Department’s answer, four of these staff members placed caveats on this stating “not as a whole”, that Psychology was identified only based on fit, that it was not ideal, or there was no benefit in combining with it. • Two Academic Staff members indicated Biological Sciences. However, one in answer to Question 7 indicated the significant negative impact merging the Department would have on its research excellence, grant funding and ability to attract students to the University. The other indicated that it was “a stretch” and the Department should definitely not be combined with Psychology. • One staff member noted that all units should be abandoned or left as they are, the issue is not the academic units. • One Academic Staff indicated the Department of Geography & Environment. Another indicated natural sciences units like Biological Sciences or Biochemistry. • Another member indicated Biological Sciences, Chemistry & Biochemistry, Mathematics & Computer Science, Physics &

	Astronomy, and Psychology but later indicated that they did not want to be merged with the Department of Psychology.
Philosophy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Department Response: None. The Department strongly opposes merging with another department. Is open to an “administrative merger” of sharing one alternative chair across two departments to reduce expenses (2 years chair is from one department then next 2 years chair is from the other, alternating). It would also be open to sharing an administrative assistant between 2 departments. However, if it decided, against the Department’s (and other departments’) wishes, that there will be a merger of departments, it proposes merging with Department of Political Science. The Department has discussed this with Political Science and both departments agree there is some potential for integration. Although philosophy understands that Political Science’s first choice is the Department of History.
Physics & Astronomy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Department Response: None. If a merger is considered for the Department it must be consulted; there are subgroups within units that the Department may have the potential of successfully combining with. Two Academic Staff members referred to the Department’s response and noted insufficient input has been provided to allow for a suitable response to the question. One of these members emphasised that the current department was quite efficient and should not be merged with another unit. The other noted that a partnership with the proposed Engineering program could work. One Academic Staff member identified Math & Computer Science.
Political Science	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Department Response: If cannot remain autonomous, then History is first choice of department to combine with. Also find Philosophy acceptable as well as Geography but only human geographers and this would depend on whether Geography is split in the restructuring.
Psychology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Department Response: Strongly emphasized that the Department does not wish to combine with any other academic unit and that an independent Department of Psychology is in the best interest of the University and its students. References December 18, 2020 letter to Dean Letts regarding the Faculty Restructuring Task Force Report outlining the Department’s position which remains the same. As the most profitable department in Arts & Sciences, altering the nature of the Department would disrupt this success; if the aim is to improve the University then merging units with Psychology would not achieve this goal. The Department unequivocally opposes a merger with neuroscience – explained catastrophic consequences in December 18th letter. The only unit Psychology

	<p>could merge with and suffer the least harm is the Department of Physics & Astronomy. No change in name, merely share resources. This is because of: the close physical distance; similar size of the Departments, which means neither would dominate the other politically; difference in discipline would be a strength because it would not interfere with each other in terms of search committees, timetabling or curriculum and by combining most profitable with least profitable departments, move towards the middle to address financial disparities among units; and similar priorities (i.e. teaching and research with excellent Tri-Council funding and robust graduate programs). However, in merging, neither department would change its name or any programs as a result. Rather, the Departments would simply share resources and cooperate to fairly allocate these resources.</p>
Sociology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response: The Department of Sociology is deeply concerned about maintaining departmental identity and therefore has questions about what a combination with Anthropology would mean for the Department before it can decide whether it agrees with this arrangement or not. However, the Department notes that while Anthropology and Sociology may appear somewhat similar to the outsider, there are significant differences in disciplinary approaches. The Department further indicated it was unclear why the pairing with Anthropology was being proposed and not other combinations. For example, WGST has suggested pairing with the Department and it recognizes the well-established working relationship with WGST, which has been cultivated in a number of ways (cross-list of courses, shared supervision of Honours Theses students & graduate students, shared GTA assignments, double majors or minors).
Women and Gender Studies (WGST)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response: None, it is best for WGST to stand alone. This is because of the interdisciplinary and trans-disciplinarity nature of the teaching and research areas of the Department. • Academic Staff member: consistent with Department's response that it is interdisciplinary and should be a standalone department.
Academic Writing Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program Response: The program would most effectively be jointed with the School of Liberal Education given that courses complement each other and faculty have much to offer one another. • Academic Staff member: same as program response.
Agriculture Studies Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program Response: Economics.

<p><i>Faculty of Fine Arts (FFA)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dean's Response: There may be some advantages to combining with Social Science and Humanities Departments to form a new faculty. • One Academic Staff member advised that based on discussions with colleagues it appeared that the current recommendation was made without consultation with FFA. Fine Arts does not fit well into any of the proposed unnamed Faculties. The failure to include Fine Arts as a unique entity reads as if it is already viewed less favourably than other Faculties. The Fine Arts are unique in this institution and Creative Research is not well understood beyond the FFA. Reducing the autonomy of the Fine Arts by amalgamating it with unrelated discipline would significantly damage the FFA's reputation and provide the appearance that Fine Arts are of lesser value than other disciplines. However, if a choice must be made, then it would be Arts, but it should be a Faculty of Fine Arts and Humanities or perhaps a grouping with Humanities and/or Liberal Education, but even then, there must be guarantees of some autonomy for the Fine Arts. • The other Academic Staff member responded "None" and it is unwise to combine Music with any other unit.
<p>Art</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response: The Department did not provide a specific response to this question in favour of providing a statement under Question 7 (<i>Appendix A, Item 8</i>). However, its statement indicated that it should not be combined with any other units. Rather the current structure of the Faculty of Fine Arts with the four departments should be maintained to ensure the existing collegial and collaborative partnerships amongst the Departments and the established structure (which is currently serving students well) continues. The Department noted potential opportunities for cross-disciplinary development and collaboration with certain other units which it has synergies with (such as departments that offer the MA and PhD programs in Cultural, Social, and Political Thought) but noted it did not suggest a merger with such departments. • An Academic Staff member commented on the pairing for AHMS. They responded in a manner with the program's response that the Department of History is the best fit for AHMS and it would not be a good fit with new Media.
<p>Art History/Museum Studies Program (AHMS)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program Response: The Department of History. Outside of the program's affiliation with the Studio Art program, its closest disciplinary relationship is with the Department of History. Both the AHMS program and History have strong ties with the Galt Museum & Archives and students overlap in terms of their programs of study, but also in their interests. Both AHMS and History emphasize critical reading, writing, and research skills as

	<p>cognate skills in both disciplines. In addition, there are History courses listed as GLER options as part of AHMS's various program planning guides. Faculty in the AHMS program have given guest lectures in History, collaborated with faculty in History on exhibitions and smaller research projects together. If the Art and New Media departments are merged, AHMS requests that its instructors join the Department of History rather than this combined department.</p>
Drama	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response¹²: The Department unanimously opposes being amalgamated with any existing unit. Doing so would compromise existing curricular and research cultures and undermine the ability of the University to meet several key performance metrics. Without endorsing either option and maintaining the position that amalgamation would have a negative effect, the Department noted that examining other Canadian post-secondary institutions demonstrates two options: Department of Performing Arts with both Music and Drama, and Department of English and Drama. But the Department outlined issues with both of these options. • Academic Staff responses echoed the Department's response that combining Drama with any other department would not work. This is because of the number of courses and programs offered, and the intensive nature of the theatrical production activities, there would be too much work for a Chair to accomplish along with responsibilities for another department or program. Particularly, as Chairs in Drama teach three courses rather than the two taught by most Chairs in Arts & Science. Similarly, a Chair would need a background in theatre and drama to function well. One member noted that while many synergies exist between the Drama department and other faculties, the strongest alliances are within the Fine Arts Faculty and any merger with other faculties requires the internal structure (e.g. S.T.P and A.Q.A. policies) remain intact. • Similarly, another Academic Staff member noted there would be no administrative cost savings in combining with another unit, particularly music. • Another academic Staff member provided a detailed response on why the Faculty of Fine Arts must remain an independent faculty with the departments as currently constituted. In sum, this is because the Faculty is a fully-functioning and highly multi-faceted entity that could be uniquely damaged if any of its

¹² The Department provided a very detailed response to each of the questions, the response to this question is summarized here; see full answer for more detail.

	existing components are not understood or managed with the necessary expertise.
Music	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response: The Department strongly believes that the four departments within the FFA must be preserved and emphasizes the concern over combining academic and administrative units. The nature of the question underscores the lack of understanding. The UofL has its own units, particularly Fine Arts. However, suggests that the Department of Music may be combined with the Conservatory to strengthen existing structures. <i>See also complete response in Appendix A, Item 3.</i> • Three Academic Staff members' responses are consistent with the Department's response that the FFA must be preserved as it is – an independent unit with the current departments. • One Academic Staff member noted they would like to see Music and the Conservatory combined with the Director of the Conservatory made a full-time member of the Music Department. Another indicated possibly combining with the Drama department. • Two Academic Staff members emphasized that the Music department is already large with the equivalent of several academic units (it already combined with Digital Audio Arts). As such, merger is not viable or practical.
New Media	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academic Staff member: Agility could be an interesting choice for New Media; while they have a desire to work closer with Education, it would not be a conducive fit for other colleagues in the Department. Computer Science or even the Dhillon School of Business could be interesting choices given joint-degree programs with both.
Conservatory of Music	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response: None. The Conservatory of Music operates using a cost-recovery budget model. It has Lease Agreement at Casa, and operates with only 2 administrative support staff. There are no substantial cost-savings or efficiencies to be had by combining the Conservatory with another unit. The Conservatory's area of expertise is very specific and different than most academic units on campus; it would be best for the Conservatory and UofL to remain autonomous but well connected to the Music Department. This will also continue to set the institution apart where other Conservatories typically fall under Continuing Education and have very few connections to Music Department.
Faculty of Health Sciences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academic Staff identified the following units (ordered from most mentioned to least): Kinesiology, Psychology, Neuroscience, Sociology, Education, Social Sciences, Business, and Women and Gender Studies.

Therapeutic Recreation Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program Response: Addiction Counselling would be the most appropriate given similarities in program. Kinesiology and Public Health also may be appropriate. In general, however, there should be no separate schools created in the new Faculty of Health. • Academic Staff echoed the Program's response but noted if schools are created in the Faculty (which is not recommended) it is important that the Program be kept with health and wellness, not recreation.
<i>Faculty of Education</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dean's Response: Worries about combining with other units and a change in name in terms of what that might signify to others outside of the University. Considered possibility of combining with Teaching Centre given positive personal relationship. However, the Dean does not think Teaching Centre would benefit from merging with Education. • The majority of Academic Staff stated there was no other unit that should be combined with the Faculty. Many went on to comment that combining with another unit would not be beneficial to the Faculty or the University. • One staff member identified that so long as the specific programmatic requirements of the Faculty are maintained, it could work well with any area or department or faculty whose area relates to one of the 11 teaching majors (Art, Career and Technology Studies, Drama, English Language Arts, Indigenous Education, Mathematics, Modern Languages, Music, Physical Education, Science, Social Studies). It could also absorb Indigenous Studies, proposing that the Faculty of Education, Liberal Education, and Indigenous studies would be a good combination. The staff member emphasized that the Faculty would not combine well with any of the "hard sciences" i.e. not Social Sciences or humanities. • Another Academic Staff member identified the Library, International Centre and Teaching Centre as units that would fit well with the Faculty. Another stated that if there is a combination, the Faculty of Education must retain its identity and preserve the essential components of the program (Field experience, student program services – specialized advising supports for students key to professional development and wellness, and dedicated instruction and access to specialized Curriculum Resources facilitated by the Faculty of Education Curriculum Lab).
<i>Dhillon School of Business</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DSB Graduate Program Response: see potential synergies by having Economics and Political Science join DSB. Would also be

	<p>beneficial to welcome some colleagues from other units with strong knowledge/skills in data analytics, informatics etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A majority of Academic Staff identified Economics. Academic Staff also mentioned Health Sciences, Political Science, and Statistics. • One staff member was unsure but noted agriculture related programs across the University could be combined as well as a possibility of combining Agility with entrepreneurship/Business Link/Student Professional Development in DSB.
<i>School of Graduate Studies (SGS)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dean's Response: Library, Teaching Centre, Agility, Academic Writing, School of Liberal Education, Continuing Education/Extension, Co-op and Career Bridge. This could be called the School of Comprehensive and Professional Learning. Under this structure, ORIS may need to be separate from this unit, as the focus of the proposed school would be on curriculum, programming and student support.
<i>School of Liberal Education (SLE)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School Response: Given that SLE is comprised of faculty from different disciplines, it is not appropriate to combine with any other academic area or department. However, SLE could absorb the Academic Writing Program and the Teaching and learning aspects of the Teaching Center, which serve all students across faculties. • Two Academic Staff indicated possible combinations with: Library or the Teaching Centre. One also identified the Academic Writing Program. Another staff member provided a response consistent with the School's response.
<i>Library</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response: As a cross-disciplinary unit the Library is most aligned with Liberal Education, Teaching Centre, and the Academic Writing Program. There is less of a fit with the School of Graduate Studies. If the Library cannot remain independent, it must be within a 6th multidisciplinary unit given the worry that being siloed into one faculty would impede the central, cross-disciplinary function of the Library. Note: The head of this 6th unit must retain the title of "Dean of Libraries" or "University Librarian" to remain in line not only with the PSLA but also with peer institutions. • Academic Staff responses echo the Department's response regarding the interdisciplinary nature of the Library and the utility of not being aligned with any one academic unit. Some staff specifically stated that the Library should not be combined with any other unit as this would be detrimental to the Library. Others identify that the Library should not be combined but could bring other units under it such as: the Teaching Center, the Writing Center, and the Academic Writing Program.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One staff member highlighted the importance of the University Librarian having acquired the professional and academic designation of a professional librarian.
--	--

B. Non-Academic Staff

About half the Non-Academic Staff did not answer this question or answered it with “n/a”. Some staff provided feedback not specific to their unit; nonetheless, this has been included in the summary table below. A couple of staff included feedback that was unresponsive to the question or went beyond the scope. Where this was the case, the comments were included in the summary under Question 7.

Administrative or Academic Unit	Response
Counselling Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Health Centre
English Language Institute (ELI)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ELI advised it is happy being part of International, since this area understands the target market it serves.
Information Technology Services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two staff members suggested that Central ITS could combine with ITS in other units. Both responses provided examples of other IT units (such as Library, Teaching Centre, and Student Info Services) but appear to suggest that the amalgamation need not be limited to the units identified.
Student Enrolment and Registrar Services (SEARS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One staff member noted that the Registrar's Office has already been amalgamated with Enrolment Services. Another member provided a suggestion that Liberal Education and SGS be absorbed by all other faculties. The three other members answered “n/a”.
Teaching Centre and Agility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unit Response: The academic units that would be logical to combine with are the Library and School of Liberal Education because all of these units serve faculty and students from all faculties and schools. The staff member agreed that the Library is a suitable unit to combine with.
University Advancement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Communications: While the staff member did not provide feedback specific to their unit, they suggested that the general administration for SGS be moved to SEARS, with program-specific graduate administration (e.g., Advising) being placed in the respective faculties.
<i>Faculty of Arts & Science</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The member advised “Science, Engineering, central youth outreach for the University”; it is unclear if this means only youth outreach should be centralized or the member is also advising that the academic units of Science and Engineering could be amalgamated. The member noted Biochemistry.

<i>Faculty of Fine Arts (FFA)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Operations: Recommend that there be a School or Department of Performing Arts and Cinema (formerly Music and Drama), and a School or Department of Visual Art and Design (formerly Art and New Media). The staff member also advised that Fine Arts could partner well with humanities-based programming, such as History, English, Modern Languages, Indigenous Studies, and Women's Studies.
<i>Faculty of Health Sciences</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The member supports the potential combinations discussed to date involving Health Sciences (the member did not identify these combinations).
<i>Dhillon School of Business (DSB)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The member listed "Economics, Political Science New Media, maybe Psychology". The member suggested that economics be added to DSB and that support needs of Health Sciences and DSB be combined as they are in the same building, which would alleviate the workload on central IT.

C. Students

As with previous responses, many students did not respond to this question. Further, some students did not identify their current academic unit, making responses less useful; as such, these responses are not included in the summary table below. Most responses identified academic units without explanation, making it difficult to pull out themes with regard to the reasoning behind units identified.

Overall, most responses identify academic units that are currently within the same faculty in which the student is currently enrolled. For example, students in the humanities often identify other departments within the humanities as potential units that may be combined. Similarly, students in sciences identify other sciences as possible combinations.

Another theme within student responses to this question is that many students feel their academic unit is unique and it would be challenging or detrimental to amalgamate with another academic unit or units. Many students indicated a desire to remain with the status quo. In particular, students in the Faculty of Fine Arts often expressed that it would be inappropriate for their academic unit to be combined with others.

Faculty, Department or Program	Response
<i>Faculty of Arts & Science</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A few students identified Health Sciences and Fine Arts. Other students identified Academic Writing or Education. A student noted that combining units would take away from the individual identity of those faculties and another referenced that no further combinations should occur as departments are already too reliant on combinations. Students identifying themselves as being in "general sciences" or "science" listed: Education or Environmental Science, and Biology and Environmental Sciences. Another student expressed that units should not be combined.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Of the students identified as being in “social sciences” one listed: Anthropology and archeology; history, women’s studies and religious studies. Two others expressed “none” or that units should be kept separate.
Anthropology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sociology and Women and Gender Studies were mentioned by two students. • Otherwise, a student listed: Geography & Environment, History, Indigenous Studies, Public Health, Health Sciences, Linguistics, Psychology, Biology, Cultural Studies, Religious Studies, English, Liberal Education, Philosophy • Another student stated “none” and expressed concern that restructuring will negatively affect everyone on campus.
Biological Sciences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One student identified that biological sciences is already very broad so should not be combined. • Two students identified Neuroscience and Biochemistry and another student identified “Environmental Sciences”.
Chemistry & Biochemistry	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One student identified “biology + chemistry” and another identified Biology as well as Neuroscience.
English	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students mentioned Academic Writing, Drama, Liberal Education and Education, and Fine Arts.
Geography & Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition to the programs already part of the Department (Geography, Archeology, Environmental Science) students identified Anthropology, Computer Sciences and Biological Sciences. • Two students expressed that the Department should not be combined as it is already an amalgamated unit. • A few students identified themselves as being Environmental Science, two of these students proposed: Environmental Science and Biology, and Geography/Biology.
Kinesiology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One student identified that Kinesiology and Health Sciences should be combined in some aspect to permit the overlap between disciplines. Another student stated that Kinesiology should be its own school. • One Kinesiology student proposed “Fine Arts and Arts”
Math & Computer Science	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A couple students mentioned Education. Another student submitted that Economics as well as Physics & Astronomy would be best absorbed into the Department. • One student expressed the unit should not be combined with any others.

Modern Languages and Linguistics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One student identified History.
Neuroscience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One student identified: Psychology, Biology, Biochemistry
Physics & Astronomy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One student identified merging Physics with Math & Computer Science. Another expressed the unit should not be combined with any others
Political Science	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One student identified History, Philosophy, Economics but expressed concern with combining units.
Psychology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most students identified Sociology or Neuroscience as a good combination with Psychology. One also referred to “addiction studies”. One student expressed disagreement with the notion of combining units.
Agriculture Studies Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One student identified: Biology, Geography and Economics.
Cultural Social and Political Thought Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One student answered “none” because the academic units as currently established offer the best delineation of areas. The other student identified Sociology and Anthropology as well as perhaps Women and Gender Studies.
Indigenous Studies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Two students expressed that the unit should not be merged at all.
<i>Faculty of Fine Arts</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Several students expressed that the Faculty of Fine Arts and its departments should not be combined with other units. Others listed: Faculty of Arts & Science and Faculty of Education or Art and New Media.
Drama	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One student listed Education and Music, another specified “none”.
New Media	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One student listed Art and Computer Science; another expressed that no unit would be completely suitable, because the area is specialized.
Music	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Several students expressed that Music, and the Faculty of Fine Arts generally, should not be combined and kept independent. One student expressed that New Media could be part of the Digital Audio Arts Program. Another merely listed “Digital Audio Arts”. One student listed Drama and Art.
<i>Faculty of Health Sciences</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students listed: Sociology, Education and Psychology.
Nursing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One student expressed that Nursing should not be combined with other programs. Two students mentioned Public Health.
Therapeutic Recreation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students identified: Health Sciences, Nursing, and Social Work.

<i>Faculty of Education</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students identified: Neuroscience, Counselling, Kinesiology, Psychology and Sociology, Faculty of Arts & Science, and one specified “Neuroscience and all Arts”. • Another student identified Liberal Education, but that it may fit better in an academic unit containing the library and graduate programming. The student mentioned that academic advising, as should be more collaborative and/or integrated. • A student expressed that units should not be joined.
<i>Dhillon School of Business (DSB)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students identified: Social Science, Computer Information Systems, as well as Economics, Kinesiology, Social Science, and Liberal Education. One student proposed that DSB take over Theatre Management and other Arts Management programs. • Some students expressed they weren’t sure or that DSB should stay as it is. • One student proposed combining Agriculture and Biology; it is unclear if this was intended to be also combined with DSB.

D. Anonymous

Anonymous Academic Staff responses included one staff member that was concerned about the nature of the question as it presumed amalgamation was beneficial. The Academic Staff member noted that a better approach would be to create incentives for people to look for efficiencies on their own; for example, promoting joint hires or allowing departments that create joint savings to retain some of the funds for speakers or student activities. A faculty member in Indigenous Studies identified Modern Languages & Linguistics, and Anthropology.

An anonymous Non-Academic Staff member in the Teaching Centre identified the Library Writing Centre and Liberal Education. Anonymous student responses contained a similarly wide variety of responses as observed in the Student responses summarized above. While more limited in number, the trend of responses falling in line with the student’s academic discipline could be observed in the anonymous responses.

6. The current recommendation proposes five Faculties, broadly organized around the themes of Arts, Business, Education, Health and Science (Faculty names yet to be determined). A possible sixth unit to include the academic work and resources that extend across, contribute to, and draw from each of the Faculties is also under consideration. If you had to place yourself in one of these units, which one would be the best fit and why?

A. Academic Units and Staff

In answering this question, many Academic Units and Staff noted an objection to the proposed Five Faculty Model (the “5-Faculty Model”). Some units expressed a lack of understanding on why the 5-Faculty Model was chosen, given their view that there are no significant financial savings, and the University has not provided other justification for doing so. There is a concern that the 5-Faculty model has been chosen in an arbitrary or hasty manner without engaging in meaningful consultation with departments and Academic Staff regarding the optimal number of faculties and their composition. The Academic Units and Staff of the FFA are particularly concerned about the 5-Faculty Model and that Fine Arts is missing or is being erased. These themes are further explored in the summary under Question 7.

Please note that there appears to be some confusion arising from the wording of this question and whether the proposed model contemplates a Faculty of Health and a Faculty of Science or one Faculty of Health and Science. Answers provided to this question have been accurately reflected in the table below to show when an Academic Staff member referred to a Faculty of Science, a Faculty of Health or a Faculty of Health and Sciences (or Health Sciences). While responses were provided respondents did not necessarily agree with the assumptions from the question.

Faculty, Department or Program	Response
<i>Faculty of Arts & Science</i>	
Anthropology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response: The Department is deeply concerned that a Faculty of Social Sciences is not an option within the current layout. The social sciences fall in-between the arts and sciences, and much of the work overlaps each. The distinction between Arts and Sciences is ill-informed and symptomatic of those proposing it being unaware how sciences which focus on the social elements of society work. If forced to choose, the Faculty of Arts would be more appropriate, but the Department emphasizes that this choice is faulty and limited. • Academic Staff responses are consistent with Department’s response and the concern that there is no contemplation of social sciences.
Biological Sciences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response: If given the option of the current Faculty of Arts & Science, the Department would stay in this faculty. However, if the Faculty is split, then the Department would fall under the Faculty of Science. • Academic Staff member: The entire exercise of changing faculties is not for cost savings, it is to balance the number of faculty in each Faculty. I was shocked to see that some 'Faculties' had 20 faculty members and how much senior admin they had. I don't know how a justification is made to have 2-3 Deans/Assoc/Assist Deans in a Faculty with under 50 members, which is smaller than the Biological Sciences department.

Chemistry & Biochemistry	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Partial Department Response¹³: All members of the Department support the formation of a Faculty of Science that would include Chemistry and Biochemistry. Creation of a Faculty of Science would be better equipped to understand the nature of the workload and activities in Science departments (which is significantly different from Social Sciences and Humanities) and address the issues facing the discipline. Currently, despite the commonalities between science departments, they never meet as a group and science operations are not discussed at Arts & Science Council. The Department provided further details on the workload and expectations of science departments and benefits of a Faculty of Science, <i>which is included in Appendix A, Item 6</i>. Academic Staff responses, including the Biochemistry Responses, also indicate the Faculty of Science as the correct home for the Department. One response indicated the Faculty or School of (Natural) Science.
Economics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Academic Staff member: Business.
English	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Department Response: Department concerned that a reasoned justification for the five faculties appears to be missing. The one offered rationale of reducing costs, needs more work given that there are other clear alternate combinations to achieve the same, if not better, outcome. There is a clear need for a proper process of discussion and discovery. However, without this, it is obvious that English is a department of the Humanities, regardless of how that is constituted. The Department's primary objectives are maintaining the integrity of the English major and sustaining long-standing inter-unit relationships. Academic Staff member: Would be at home in Faculty of Arts or if called Fine Arts & Humanities. Believe it is important for Fine Arts to be distinct but merging it with Humanities makes sense as the two compliment each other.
Geography & Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Department Response: Because the names of the faculties have yet to be determined, difficult to answer. The Department is by definition an amalgam of disciplinary expertise that has served the University and students well. Unwilling to be split into component parts and assembled with other departments; this makes no sense, savings will not be found by entrenching

¹³ See footnote 3: approx. 12 members of the Department agreed to endorse the response, however the response to this question noted "all members of the Department support the formation of the Faculty of Science that includes Chemistry and Biochemistry". This is consistent with the Biochemistry Responses, which also endorses the program belonging in the Faculty of Science.

	<p>division when it is not necessary. Opposes the Five Faculty Model, specifically the splitting of Arts & Science.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academic Staff member: Faculty of Science and Environment given research and teaching experience in realm of sciences.
History	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response: The Department has serious concerns about the efficacy of the 5-Faculty model. If, however, it is forced to choose, the natural fit is with an “Arts” unit. • Academic Staff member: opposed to creation of a Faculty of Arts. However, if this is the only option then would fit under Arts.
Kinesiology & Physical Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response: The Department should remain as currently constituted under the Faculty of Arts & Science. However, if that is not an option, there should be a School of Kinesiology within the Faculty of Health. • Consistent with the Department’s Response, 6 Academic Staff members indicated that, if necessary, there should be a School of Kinesiology within Faculty of Kinesiology and Health Studies. These staff members reproduced the detailed letter from the Department included in its entirety or just item #2 of the letter regarding the creation of a School of Kinesiology in the Faculty of Health Sciences. • One Academic Staff member noted that while Health Sciences appears to be a logical fit and it would work for that staff member, they are just one person in the Department and Kinesiology is not synonymous with Health Sciences. It is a multi-disciplinary unit that covers humanities, social science and science. Health is not a good fit for such a diverse discipline. The member explained that Arts & Science has been an ideal fit for the Department and splitting these is not ideal as Kinesiology does not belong in a Faculty of Arts only or a Faculty of Science only. In fact, other universities have an independent faculty of Kinesiology for this reason. Proposes option of Kinesiology straddling the two Faculties (of Arts and Science) as a creative solution. • One Academic Staff member specified Health and Science.
Math & Computer Science	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response: If Arts and Science must be separated, then the Department would fit under the Faculty of Science. • The majority of Academic Staff responses agree that Science is the best fit. A couple of responses identified that it is not the best fit given the Department’s overlap with Education and Business but is the best in the circumstances. Another member also picked up on the strong connection with Education.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One Academic Staff member stated the Faculty of Arts was the best fit because math is concerned with creativity, beauty, and abstract thought. Another member indicated the Faculty of Science but stated that they preferred the present structure of a Faculty of Arts & Science.
Modern Languages and Linguistics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Department Response: If the 5-Faculty Model is implemented, the Department would fall under the Faculty of Arts. Although, the Department emphasized its strong objection to the Model and its separation of Arts & Sciences. It noted the 5-Faculty Model is the only one where the Department would merge with any other academic units and it does not understand why the 5-Faculty Model was chosen. Merging the Department with any others would significantly disrupt the Department's inner workings, existing relationships and operation which is already comprised of 4 distinct units. The Department has already made concessions to operate in this manner and any further merger would dilute the individual units, the visibility and importance of languages.
Neuroscience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Department Response: Faculty of Science for a variety of reasons, including: the Department's research tools draw on all other natural sciences and mathematics, there are existing research synergies, there is a history of successful research grant funding through National Science and Engineering Research Council (NSERC), its program requirements are from other Science departments, and nearly all students have prior degrees in Science, Math or Engineering. Most Academic Staff also identified the Faculty of Science as the only option. The remainder indicated a faculty of "Health and Science". One staff member noted support for the Faculty of Science but the requirement that the faculty has a strong leader with an understanding of what faculty in each department do. Another emphasized the detriment that would be experienced if Neuroscience was moved into Faculty of Health.
Philosophy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Department Response: The Department strongly believes the only good home for it in the current model is the Faculty of Arts. Given its unique integration of disciplines and disciplinary knowledge, Philosophy is a humanities discipline, and one that is at the very centre of Liberal Education and the Critical Thinking mandate of the UofL. It is a pillar of Liberal Education. The Department strongly opposes being placed in the Dhillon School of Business or Faculty of Science.
Political Science	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Department Response: The Faculty of Arts would be the best unit, but this is assuming the faculty would be home to departments in Social Sciences and Humanities. The

	<p>Department noted that the failure to identify a Fine Arts faculty is somewhat confusing. The Department unanimously opposes joining the Business faculty as indicated in one proposal.</p>
Physics & Astronomy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response: The Department belongs in the Faculty of Arts & Science. However, if the five faculties are the ones listed, the Department naturally fits under the Faculty of Science as physics is the fundamental science that all other sciences are based upon. • Most Academic Staff indicated the Faculty of Science. One Academic Staff echoed the Department's concerns about the separation of Arts & Science in terms of efficiency and costs saving. Noting, this is already happening in the current model and is inconsistent to be aiming to merge departments on the one hand and separating the faculties on another.
Psychology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response: Opposes the 5 Faculty Plan but believe that criticism of the plan and processes leading to it are the domain of "higher level collectives (e.g. GFC)". If the Department had to place itself under one of the 5 Faculties, it would choose Science first because it is a department of quantitative scientists who apply scientific methods and publish in scientific journals. However, if a Faculty of Science cannot guarantee the Department's autonomy, it will have to consider alternatives.
Sociology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response: In the current configuration the Department would fall under the Faculty of Arts; however, it does not fit well with a faculty of Fine Arts and Humanities (which was the name proposed in earlier documentation) as it is not a Fine Art or Humanities discipline. Accordingly "Social Sciences" would need to be clearly indicated into the Faculty's name. • Academic Staff member: In a faculty with other social sciences.
Women and Gender Studies (WGST)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response: WGST does not fit into any one of the 5 faculties. It would be suited to the possible 6th faculty if this becomes the School of Critical Studies. Another possibility is falling under a Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities or, a Faculty of Creative and Critical Studies. • Academic Staff member: consistent with department response. Also notes that Social studies is absent from the model. If the 6th faculty draws on critical studies and global studies then could fall under it.
Academic Writing Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program Response: Would be most effective in a sixth unit with Liberal Education but also see benefits in greater connections with the Library.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Academic Staff echo the Program's response but also note that the Program could find a happy home in a Faculty of Arts, given the traditional location of writing studies in the humanities.
<i>Faculty of Fine Arts (FFA)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Academic Staff members identified the Faculty of Arts but emphasized that the faculty would need to be renamed to retain its unique nature and recognize that it is one of the only fine arts faculties in Alberta. The title "Faculty of Fine Arts and Humanities" was proposed.
Art	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Department Response: The Department did not provide a specific response to this question in favour of providing a statement under Question 7. Its statement emphasized the importance of retaining the current structure of four departments under the FFA and that merging any combination of the departments under the Faculty would not work. The Department noted that creating a faculty that contained the four departments in the Fine Arts in addition to a select number of departments from the Humanities and Social Sciences would usher in a significant change in institutional identity and require a thoughtful and consultative rebranding exercise to ensure the success of the new structure. Consistent with the Department's response the Academic Staff member identified Art as the best fit but noted their opposition to the name "Fine Arts" as being an outdated, colonial and hierarchical term.
Art History/Museum Studies Program (AHMS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Program Response: The only possibility of those listed is the Faculty of Arts.
Drama	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Department Response: The Department unanimously agrees that Drama must be under a larger organizational structure that retains a designation of Fine Arts. Erasing Fine Arts from the names of the faculties erases a whole history and network of internal and external relationships. Ideally, this would be within a Faculty where the majority of academic staff are from the Fine Arts. The Department proposed that the FFA absorb stand-alone unit or units like: the School of Liberal Education and/or Indigenous Studies or other congruent units such as English, Modern Languages and Linguistics, and/or Women and Gender Studies. This should occur rather than the Faculty being absorbed into an unsuitable "super-Faculty". Academic Staff concur that an independent FFA must be maintained given the specific and unique nature of the Faculty. Arts is too broad. Most emphasize that it is integral that the unit title contains "Fine Arts".

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One Academic Staff member noted that a faculty must have a Fine Arts faculty member in leadership. Another member echoed the option of FFA incorporating stand alone units. Another Academic Staff member stated that because the existence of a FFA is unlikely, they proposed bringing the four departments, maintained as independent departments, under the Faculty along with the following units: 1. History, Religion, Political Science and Philosophy; 2. Anthropology, Human Geography and Archeology; 3. English, Modern Languages and Linguistics, 4. Sociology, and Women and Gender Studies. These units along with each of the 4 current departments in the FFA would come to a total of 8 departments, each with a chair and coordinators. The staff member provided rationale for this proposal.
Music	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Department Response: The Department belongs in a Faculty of Fine Arts along with departments of Art, Drama and New Media. The current proposal ignores that Fine Arts is a distinct entity from Arts and the impact removal of the FFA name or reduction of its autonomy can have on the programs, reputation and donor base. The combination of the FFA with any other entity must preserve the name of the FFA and must be led by a fine arts researcher or practitioner given the lack of understanding of the nature of Fine Arts. <i>See also complete response in Appendix A, Item 3.</i> All Academic Staff members echoed the sentiment outlined in the Department's response that the FFA should remain independent with the current department structure. However, if a combination of areas is unavoidable, the term Arts should be avoided and instead, use something along the lines of: the "Faculty of Fine Arts and Humanities" or the "Faculty of Fine Arts and Community". One member noted agreement to this proposal on the understanding that there is no blending of departments within Fine Arts. One of these staff members included a letter they had drafted to the Provost with the rationale for retaining the FFA as an independent unit. <i>A copy is included in Appendix A, Item 9.</i>
New Media	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Academic Staff member: The 6th unit would be the best place for New Media as its work can extend to all other faculties. However, notes hope that the proposal would not place Fine Arts with Humanities as they are very different and there is little synergy between humanities and the other departments in Fine Arts (other than New Media).
Conservatory of Music	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Department Response: Best fit under the faculty with the other Fine Arts Departments.

<i>Faculty of Health Sciences</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All Academic Staff indicated the Faculty of Health Sciences or the Faculty of Health and Science.
Therapeutic Recreation Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Program Response: Health and Science. The Program advises that no separate schools should be created in newly formed Faculty of Health. However, if schools are formed then Therapeutic Recreation must be kept with school focusing on health and wellness rather than recreation. Academic Staff member's response is consistent with the Program response.
<i>Faculty of Education</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dean/Faculty Response: Best fit under the Faculty of Education. While there is a close relationship with the Teaching Centre (potentially part of a possible sixth unit) but their mandate is important to the University as a whole. Academic Staff responses agree that a Faculty of Education is best. Many indicate this is appropriate given the specialized mandate of a professional faculty, its structure (including practicums) and unique relationships with external parties (school boards, Alberta Education etc.). One Academic staff member noted that the Faculty also draws from many other faculties similar to the SGS, so it may be best fit with SGS in a 6th unit. Another member raised concerns with joining with the Teaching Centre and the Writing centre as both are considered non-academic units.
<i>Dhillon School of Business (DSB)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DSB Graduate Program Response: Business. The majority of Academic Staff identified the Faculty of Business.
<i>School of Graduate Studies (SGS)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dean's Response: Combine SGS, Liberal Education, Career Bridge, the Library, the Teaching Centre, and Academic Writing/the Writing Centre together into a possible 6th unit because these don't belong in any of the other Faculties and to combine with other units would risk perception that it only supports that one faculty. Need to be separate from other faculties but still working closely.
<i>School of Liberal Education (SLE)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> School Response: Given that SLE is comprised of faculty from different disciplines, it does not fit into any of the proposed five faculties. It serves all students across all faculties and majors. Academic Staff responses also indicate that SLE does not fit into any of the 5 faculties given its multi-disciplinary nature/connection to all academic units and programs. If necessary, it could be part of the unnamed 6th faculty. Some Academic Staff indicate this could also into the Library,

	Academic Writing, and the Teaching Centre, which is <i>not ideal</i> but would make most sense operationally. Another emphasized that SLE should remain in the 6 th faculty alone.
<i>Library</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Department Response: If the Library cannot remain independent, the only option is to be located in the 6th multidisciplinary unit given the worry that being siloed into one faculty would impede the central, cross-disciplinary function of the Library. Note: The head of this 6th unit must retain the title of “Dean of Libraries” or “University Librarian” to remain in line not only with the PSLA but also with peer institutions. Suggest “Dean of Libraries and Liberal Education”. • Academic Staff responses are largely consistent with the Department’s position that the only suitable Faculty is the possible 6th unit, which would serve all of the other 5 faculties. Some staff recommend the 6th unit also include Liberal Education and Academic Writing, which also serve entire campus. Most staff highlight the issue of perceived favoritism/lack of independence that would result from including the Library under one Faculty. One member emphasized that the Library should be the primary and leading unit of the 6th unit.

B. Non-Academic Staff

Just under half of the Non-Academic Staff did not answer this question or answered it with “n/a”. Two staff members noted their confusion as to how the question applied to them and wondered if they had filled out the wrong questionnaire.

Otherwise, there were common trends amongst the responses. Specifically, where the staff member is located in an Academic Unit, they identified the proposed faculty that corresponded with their Unit. Specifically, staff in Education chose Education and those in DSB chose Business. A staff member in the Faculty of Fine Arts noted their current position would be well suited in a Faculty which includes Arts. Finally, the two Non-Academic Staff located in the Faculty of Arts & Science both chose the Faculty of Science or “Health & Science”¹⁴ based on the fact they worked in the Biological Sciences department or were primarily focused on youth outreach in “STEM” areas (Science, Technology, Engineering and Math).

In contrast, the Non-Academic Staff located in Administrative Units either identified the 6th unit¹⁵ or responded that none of the proposed faculties would work.¹⁶ However, the reason for both of these responses was the same – because the Unit serves Academic Staff and students from across all faculties or schools.

¹⁴ This appears to be symptomatic of the confusion arising from the wording of the question, which was also observed amongst some Academic Staff and many Student responses.

¹⁵ Staff in ELI, SEARS, and Teaching Centre. Note one staff member in IT Services provided feedback that the 6th unit should enforce GLER principles, but it is unclear if in doing so the staff member meant to respond that their unit should be in the 6th faculty.

¹⁶ Staff in IT Services and SEARS

Several responses went on to provide further rationale for keeping Administrative Units separate from other faculties. For instance, a Non-Academic Staff member from the Teaching Centre highlighted the work the Teaching Centre has done over the years to make sure it is not connected to any one faculty so Academic Staff in other faculties do not feel isolated from its services. The staff member identified this independent nature as a strength of the Teaching Centre as it means that faculty members from across the institution are more willing to work with the Centre. The Non-Academic Staff expressed concern that if the Teaching Centre is moved into one faculty, collaborating with, and helping Academic Staff in other faculties would become much more difficult.

The response to this question from the Teaching Centre and Agility Unit echoes this sentiment. The Unit identified the 6th unit as the only one that “makes sense” because it provides programming and support to students and faculty from across campus. In answer to Question 7, the Unit further emphasized that if the current reporting structure is not an option, the consensus from broad consultation with faculty¹⁷ is that the best alternative is a 6th Academic Unit that includes the Teaching Centre, Agility, University Library, and School of Liberal Education.¹⁸

One Non-Academic Staff member from SEARS explained that the 6th Faculty should consist of units such as the Writing Centre, Teaching Centre, Agility, and the School of Liberal Education under the leadership of the Library. The staff member highlighted that the expertise various librarians would bring to the University’s Liberal Education philosophy would be beneficial. While another staff member from SEARS indicated that a 6th unit may not be necessary. They explained that centralizing units that serve all faculties (like SEARS) would lend itself to providing increased access to these services. Thus, while the member states a 6th unit may not be needed, they appear to contemplate a unit made up of all cross-faculty services; indeed, they added that advising should be added to this grouping.

Finally, although provided in response to Question 7, one Non-Academic Staff member comments on the benefit of keeping Academic Units and Non-Academic Units separate are relevant here. They suggested that where an academic unit does not fit into one of the proposed 5 Faculties, such as the School of Liberal Education, it could be fit under the Faculty of Arts in order to keep Academic Units separate. That way units that serve all students and faculty can remain independent from the Academic Units; this includes the Library.

C. Students

Some students answered this question but did not identify their faculty, department, or program, which undermined the utility of the answers. As a result, responses that failed to identify their academic unit were not included in the summary. Responses that identified the faculty, such as Arts & Science, were included in the summary, but we note that the responses may be less useful because of the number of departments in the Faculty of Arts & Sciences and the lack of information on the unit the student is answering from. In addition, there were responses that made suggestions beyond the scope of the question, for example, regarding future proposals for collaboration with departments and comparisons of similar departments. Those responses were not included in the summary.

Unsurprisingly, in general, students in the Faculty of Health Sciences, Faculty of Education, and Dhillon Business School responded that the appropriate proposed faculty was Health, Education, and Business,

¹⁷ The Unit noted it consulted with the Teaching Centre Advisory Council, Teaching Centre staff, Deans, University Librarian, and several current and past Teaching Fellows and BoG Teaching Chairs.

¹⁸ Teaching Centre and Agility referenced and endorsed the organizational chart provided by the Interim University Librarian to the Office of the Provost.

respectively. Within the responses from students in the Faculty of Arts & Science, there is a greater degree of variation as between students enrolled in Sciences versus Humanities. There was general consensus within some departments, but disagreement in others. In particular, many students in Social Sciences commented that their program could fit into either Arts or Science.

Most responses from students enrolled in the Faculty of Fine Arts reluctantly classified their academic unit in the proposed Faculty of Arts but noted that it was not a perfect fit and emphasized that the Faculty of Fine Arts should remain separate. Finally, we also observed some confusion from graduate students on whether it was necessary to place the School of Graduate Studies in one of the proposed faculties or whether their specific degree program should be placed in one of the suggested faculties.

Below is a table outlining the responses received. Where more than one student identified a faculty, this is noted in brackets with the number of times it was mentioned. It is important to note that there appears to be some confusion with respect to the wording of the question – specifically, whether the proposal contemplates a Faculty of Health and Science or separate units (i.e., a Faculty of Health and a Faculty of Science). Many students had the impression that “Health and Sciences” was intended to be one faculty. As a result, those that responded with “Health and Science” may have assumed that it was one choice of faculty, rather than attempting to indicate that their academic unit could fall into one of the proposed “Health” or the “Science” faculties. This is unclear. We have therefore reflected the variations of responses in the summary table.

Faculty, Department or Program	Response
<i>Faculty of Arts & Science</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Science (x3) • Arts • Education • Arts and Science • Science should be split into human and life sciences. • Students identified as being in “Social Sciences” indicated: Arts or that none of the options are appropriate (x3).
Anthropology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Science • Arts and Science • The proposal does not provide an acceptable unit for Anthropology, but if forced would choose Science. • Anthropology can fit into all of these faculties, but would most align with Arts, Sciences, or the possible sixth unit.
Biological Sciences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Science (x5) • Science and Education • Health and Science
Chemistry & Biochemistry	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Science • Either Health or Science

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Health and Science
Economics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Science
English	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arts and Education • Arts
Geography & Environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arts • Arts and Science • Science • Health and Science • Science; however, a BSc in Geography also requires some social science courses. • Archeology can fit under either Science or Arts and normally is both.
Indigenous Studies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education
Kinesiology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Science (x2) • Health and Science (x4)
Math & Computer Science	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Science (x4) • Science and Education • Science or a new separate unit.
Modern Languages and Linguistics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arts (x2)
Neuroscience	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Science (x3)
Physics & Astronomy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Health and Science • The 6th Unit or Science
Political Science	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arts • None of the proposed faculties are a good fit.
Psychology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arts • Health and Science (x3) • Science (x2) • Arts and Science • Science, but hesitant to put it in one group.
Agriculture Studies Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agriculture should be its own faculty.
Cultural Social and Political Thought Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arts (x2)

<i>Faculty of Fine Arts</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Arts (x7) but one student noted they firmly believe it should stay separate.
Drama	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Arts (x2) but one student responded that losing the title of a department of Fine Arts would be detrimental.
New Media	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Arts (x3) but one student indicated Arts only if they have to.
Music	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Arts (x5), but one student noted this was far too broad of a term. Arts and Education (x2) Music needs to be separate from the other Arts classes because it is a very different art form. None fit perfectly, but Arts is slightly better. This would not account for the scientific aspects of audio studies.
<i>Faculty of Health Sciences</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Health (x9) Health and Science (x6)
<i>Faculty of Education</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All students identified the Faculty of Education, except for 2 which identified both Education and Science.
<i>Dhillon School of Business</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All students from DSB (as well as those identified as in management programs) identified Business.

D. Anonymous

An anonymous Academic Staff member of the Faculty of Arts & Science took issue with the proposal and the failure to have Humanities and Social Sciences in the list of contemplated faculties. This failure indicated to the Academic Staff member that there is some confusion over the distinction between Fine Arts, and the Arts in the sense of Humanities and Social Sciences. Another Academic Staff member from DSB identified Business and the member from Indigenous Studies identified Arts or Science.

A response from an anonymous Non-Academic Staff member from the Teaching Centre supported the creation of a 6th unit in which the Teaching Centre would be housed. An anonymous Non-Academic Staff member from the Faculty of Arts & Science identified either Arts or Science as they are already working with these students and faculty members as an advisor and is well versed in the curriculum, academic regulations, and processes.

The anonymous responses from anonymous students generally align with the comments identified above in the Students section. For the most part, students in the Faculty of Health Sciences, DSB and one from the Faculty of Education identified the corresponding faculty in the 5-Faculty Proposal. Again, responses from students in the Faculty of Arts & Science saw a greater degree of variation but most students identified a faculty in line with the discipline in which they are enrolled.

7. Do you have any other thoughts or feedback on the proposed restructuring that you wish to share?

A. Academic Units and Staff

The following is a summary of the common themes across the Academic Units and Staff, with the most common themes addressed first moving to the common but less prominent themes. There was a significant amount of Unit-specific feedback on elements/features unique to the Academic Unit. To a large extent this feedback is covered in the discussion below as well as in the responses summarized under Questions 1-6 and the detailed responses in *Appendix A*.

i. Concerns with the Restructuring Process

A clear theme in the responses of Academic Units and Staff was concern over the process in which restructuring has been undertaken; many worried that the University will not “not get it right”, which will result in further costs (monetary and otherwise). The specific concerns regarding the process are outlined below.

a) Context and Timelines

As mentioned above, responses from predominantly Academic Staff, and some units, disclosed concern over engaging in restructuring at this time. Responses often highlighted the COVID19 Pandemic and characterized this as an extraordinary time, not conducive to making such substantial and significant changes at the University. Academic Staff highlighted that strained or low morale and tension at the University due to nearly two years of the Pandemic, recent terminations and early retirements, and a lack of agreement. Responses included concern that faculty, staff, and students are tired and stressed, and some mentioned disillusionment. Some Academic Staff referred to the significant human cost that will be required to accomplish the proposed restructuring and that Faculty and Staff do not have the capacity or morale to support these fundamental changes at this time. It was also noted that, in addition to this environment, potential further disruption and impact on morale will result from restructuring itself, specifically combining departments leading to further discord at the University. Connected to this, as discussed further in the next theme, a common concern was the amount of work/human cost needed to accomplish the proposed restructuring. One response noted that the restructuring would likely come around the time of the next provincial elections, which could result in a new government that will not impose the same cutbacks on post secondary institutions.

Overall, a theme emerged that given this context, it was not the time to engage in the fundamental changes contemplated or, more commonly, that engaging in decision making on such an expedited basis is problematic. Some Academic Units and Staff expressed that the process has been rushed and they have been subject to tight timelines that are not conducive to good decision-making and the hasty implementation of the restructuring plan will impede their ability to manage the change. One response noted that the negative impacts of this has already been seen on the low numbers of student enrollment/drop in student retention for the next semester as a result of students feeling anxious over the negative impact restructuring will have on their programs. It was often cited that financial consideration was being placed ahead of the academic interests of the University as a whole and the rushed nature of the restructuring process has led to a lack of or insufficient meaningful consultation and participation of faculty and departments (i.e., experts in the disciplines).

b) Insufficient Meaningful Consultation

A very common theme across Academic Units and Staff was that while they understand the budget cuts and financial constraints prompting restructuring, it is being done without a clear vision and sufficient meaningful consultation, which could result in the restructuring failing to achieve its goals. Indeed, while some Academic Units and Staff expressed theoretical support for restructuring it was often undermined

by the manner in which the process has occurred and the perceived lack of engagement of the experts in the disciplines – Academic Units and Staff.

A significant number of responses expressed that they have heard the rationale for restructuring but had not been meaningfully engaged in the restructuring process. It was expressed that the meetings held were merely to communicate decisions already made rather than soliciting feedback from Academic Units and Staff. A significant number of responses highlighted the importance of meaningful consultation in terms of combining departments and the ability to do so successfully. Academic Units and Staff indicated concern that the unique nature of their units will not be taken into account when making decisions on amalgamation.

Further, while some recognized the utility of the Questionnaire in gathering feedback, this was deemed insufficient. Many responses indicated that the restructuring proposal demonstrated an inadequate understanding of the academic disciplines and unique elements of each department. Similarly, many responses connected the lack of meaningful consultation with the questions on the Questionnaire. Responses indicated that the questions themselves were problematic as they suggested a certain outcome – specifically, combining units and proceeding with the 5-Faculty model. It was therefore commonly expressed that the questionnaire process did not represent the search for meaningful feedback.

A common sentiment was the amalgamation of departments and the 5-Faculty Model presented was a fait accompli or foregone conclusion decided upon without meaningful consultation on the number of faculties and their composition. Some responses expressed being blindsided or surprised about the steps taken. Responses indicated concern that Academic Units and Staff have been presented with only one model (the 5-faculty Model) when meaningful consultation with them has yet to occur. Other Academic Units and Staff referenced that they had made prior submissions or attempted to provide feedback on the model but had received no reply or indication that their feedback was received and considered.

Similarly, concerns were raised regarding the extent to which the feedback from Academic Staff and Units will be valued and considered going forward, particularly with regard to amalgamating departments. Many indicate that engagement with the departments and faculty is integral to the success of any restructuring steps. This was particularly the case in terms of decisions on what departments will be merging. A common response from Academic Units and Staff was that they had been unable to have sufficient conversations amongst their departments and with other departments on this topic. It was expressed that time must be set aside for such discussions either in advance of or once decisions have been made on the constitution of the restructured faculties. Accordingly, responses from Academic Units and Staff indicate a desire to see further, meaningful consultation on the restructuring model (most notably on the specific amalgamations of departments and constitution of the faculties) to ensure its success.

c) Insufficient Information/Lack of Clarity

Concerns over the lack of meaningful consultation were often paired with expressions of confusion or lack of information and clarity in the restructuring process. Many responses from Academic Units and Staff indicated a lack of understanding of the restructuring decisions made and trust in those decisions particularly when Academic Units and staff do not feel sufficiently engaged in the decision-making process. Responses indicated that Academic Staff/Units remained unconvinced that the structure being proposed is the solution or they questioned whether other less disruptive alternatives had been

considered. Academic Units and Staff expressed that they have been left wondering if other models of faculty restructuring, including the status quo, had been investigated.

Some Academic Staff and Units expressed concern that the model proposed was decided upon without consideration of relevant research on restructuring that has been completed at other post-secondary institutions (as well as input from the UofL's faculty and departments). Other responses noted concern that the current proposal was being made without a clear vision for the future of the University or reference to the institutional strategic plan (this was often connected with the feeling that the process is being rushed).

Another common theme was concern over insufficient information or a lack of transparency. Some Academic Staff and Units indicated that they were being told "we are in this together" but the process did not reflect this. Responses indicated that Academic Units and Staff feel they are being asked to accept the information and proposals provided by the Task Force/Administration on faith rather than evidence. On the other hand, other responses expressed an understanding that the current environment is difficult and that they appreciated the efforts made to conduct the process in an open manner. However, even where this was the case, the responses raised the concern that there is insufficient information/evidence to demonstrate that the proposed restructuring model will result in real, long-term savings or, that there is a total lack of concrete evidence to this effect.

This sentiment was expressed by a large number of Academic Units and Staff. A significant number of responses highlighted that the current proposal did not provide concrete financial data to support it – this included data on not just the savings that would result, but also the cost of the restructuring itself. This was often highlighted as an impediment to the Academic Unit or Staff concluding that they support the proposal or are able to adequately provide feedback on it (see also concerns over the minimal costs savings outlined in the next theme). For example, while the Psychology department noted its support for restructuring to address the budget crisis in general, it provided a detailed list of requirements (see *Appendix A, Item 2*), which included, among other things, "presentation of a fully costed and transparent ledger demonstrating that the benefits of faculty restructuring outweigh the costs over short, medium, and long-term time scale; and an effective strategy for student retention".

Alternatively, many responses noted the lack of data as the basis upon which they questioned the need to restructure at all. While some Academic Staff note appreciation of the effort to consolidate and improve efficiencies in the University, in most cases this is coupled with comments that they have very limited or insufficient data to support the proposition that the restructuring will result in cost savings that will address the budget crisis. In this vein, a common concern (discussed further in the next theme) was that such a significant reorganization of the University would, itself, be very costly (both monetary and "soft" costs) and cause disruption to the University community. Many cited a likely negative impact on productivity, morale, relationships between faculty, staff and departments, and students. As such, Academic Staff and Units commented that without concrete data on the cost-savings that would result from the reorganization, particularly in the face of the costs associated with the change, they are resistant to supporting or agreeing to restructuring and/or the proposed model.

d) Relevant/Correct Principles and Other Options

Finally, as mentioned above, many Academic Units and Staff saw the 5-Faculty Model as being unilaterally imposed without sufficient consultation and therefore information on whether the model would be successful, not just in terms of cost savings, but also ensuring continued academic success of the institution. Connected to this is the common concern that decisions are being made on incorrect or incomplete considerations. Academic Units and Staff expressed that while they recognized some changes may be fiscally expedient, the changes being contemplated were not sufficiently focused on principles of

improving student experience, the flow of ideas, research collaboration and support, and the equitable distribution of funding among Faculties. Instead, the proposal appeared based on business models rather than reflecting the diversity of pedagogical and research approaches taken within and across units. Responses often noted that financial considerations were being placed ahead of the academic interests of the University.

The notion that the restructuring model was chosen based on incomplete or inaccurate considerations was in many cases expressed in the Academic Unit and Staff responses to Questions 1-4, which request information regarding collaboration between academic units. A significant number of responses to these questions, as well as the additional comments provided in answer to Question 7, indicated an objection to basing restructuring decisions on collaboration between Academic Units.

Some argued there is a complete lack of connection between the ability to collaborate across units and the ability to successfully amalgamate with that unit. It was expressed that inter-unit collaboration is an expected characteristic of post-secondary institutions, regardless of the organization of academic units and, therefore, should not be used to govern the proper organization of departments and faculties. Some Academic Units and Staff provided feedback that merging units should instead be based on synergies in pedagogy, methods of research and only meaningful, consistent inter-unit research. Responses indicated concern that reorganization based on more tenuous or informal collaboration would result in significant issues in terms of the functioning of the Academic Units.

Others expressed that there is no logic or truth that changing Academic Units will increase research collaborations to the benefit of the institution. This is because UofL is a small institution where Academic Staff already engage in significant inter-unit collaboration. Many pointed to the information submitted to show the extent of collaborative efforts already occurring in an organic manner and expressed concern that restructuring in an effort to increase or reflect this collaboration is misguided or worse, will have the contrary effect. It was further noted that it is beneficial to the University to have cross-faculty collaborations; as such, restructuring to place academic staff with shared interests together could be counter-productive.

This feedback dovetails with the overwhelming view of Academic Units and Staff that their current department structure should be left intact¹⁹. Many Units or Staff articulated the desire to instead explore other costs saving options.²⁰

Related to the proffering of alternatives to amalgamation or reorganization, often Academic Staff noted a concern that in the process, the University has not assessed its current strengths or unique characteristics in order to think more creatively about how it can capitalize on this in the face of the budgetary issues. Some expressed that there were alternate ways to not just find cost savings but increase the productivity of the UofL's faculty, its competitiveness amongst other post-secondary institutions, and therefore see a rise in student recruitment. The feedback in this regard was often connected to unique features of the institution or areas of development that could provide increased revenue. Feedback from the Faculty of Education, the Conservatory of Music, and the Departments in the Faculty of Fine Arts emphasized this point. Another unique feature touched upon was the University's Liberal Education tradition and the interdisciplinary nature of the institution that comes with it.²¹ For example, one

¹⁹ With the exception of some tensions raised by units such as Math & Computer Science and Chemistry & Biochemistry.

²⁰ One suggestion was exploring an "administrative merger", which was sharing a chair across two departments. See also the detailed proposals in *Appendix A* and the theme below regarding Alternate Proposals/Ideas.

²¹ See theme "vi. Liberal Education" at the bottom of p.84 regarding inconsistent feedback received on the merits of liberal education.

suggestion was to capitalize on interdisciplinary teaching and learning ventures by offering cross-disciplinary degrees that present prospective students with a guarantee that they can graduate with a major as well as another credential (a second major, a minor, a concentration). That other credential would be rooted in the liberal education tradition and would therefore be made possible with a smaller teaching faculty by cross-listing courses.

ii. *Minimal Cost Savings and the Risks and Costs of Restructuring*

Academic Units and Staff raised concerns over not just the lack of financial data supporting the proposal (as outlined above), but a very common theme was a significant concern over the financial justification that has been provided. A significant number of responses raised concerns that the data provided disclosed very minimal cost savings, did not account for, or provide data on the costs associated with the restructuring process and the analysis undertaken was flawed.

The most common issue raised with the financial data provided is that while they understand the financial constraints prompting restructuring, the proposed model would result in very minimal savings. A large number of Academic Staff and Units responses refer to cost savings in the range of 1-3% and specify that this level of cost savings is insufficient to warrant the disruption and costs that will be incurred by going ahead with the proposal. Interestingly, some feedback was that the savings are being overestimated and many, as noted above, emphasize that there is insufficient or only hastily compiled evidence of the savings that will occur.

Many Academic Units and Staff express that pursuing the proposed restructuring will only result in scraping together a small amount of savings in the short term but will not result in long term savings and efficiencies due to the new amalgamation and structure of the Academic Units. The concern that the proposal has only short-term benefits, or minimal benefits at all, was widespread amongst Academic Units and Staff. Many responses express concern that the restructuring will result in the University offering less at a higher cost to students due to a decrease in faculty and administrative support, limited opportunities to hire, and a negative impact on morale and cooperation throughout the University.²²

Further, many Academic Units and Staff often expressed that the issue is that there is insufficient evidence to show that doing so will result in savings in the long term that outweigh the cost of the effort itself. A very common comment is the evidence that restructuring will save substantial money is not compelling and it has not accounted for the incredible costs associated with restructuring. The feedback refers to both monetary and human or soft costs required to institute the restructuring and make it successful. Responses refer to the significant amount of work required to redefine governance structures, documents, policies, and procedures, to rebuild or build relationships between units and faculty and reorient all University stakeholders to the new organization. Many responses referred to the chaos, confusion and dissatisfaction that could result from restructuring and are concerned this will undermine any current successes departments or faculties have.

These concerns link back to the theme addressed above that Academic Units and Staff feel unable to make an informed and strategic evaluation of the proposed restructuring without sufficient data on the cost savings and the costs associated with the changes.

In addition, there were quite a few responses from Academic Staff and Units that took issue with the analysis undertaken in the restructuring process. Academic Staff and Units expressed that while they recognize the impact of the financial crisis must be addressed, the proposed restructuring is based on a

²² This is often linked to concern about the already stressed and drained University community due to COVID.

“flawed” analysis or metrics that do not consider other elements, such as the academic integrity of the University’s programs. Comments from Academic Staff and Units on the issues in the analysis include:

- The proposal erroneously conflates a reorganization of structures with a potential for what appears to be minimal cost savings;
- Reliance on enrollment does not provide an accurate picture. Every discipline is different, and enrolment is not a metric that applies equally. The viability of a department must be evaluated on the whole rather than focussing on the lowest enrolments and removing those courses;
- Centralizing services is not inherently problematic, but evaluation methods used for this purpose are problematic;
- Savings from reducing administrative positions such as Deans, Associate Deans, and Chairs may eliminate administrative stipends for a handful of individuals, but will not eliminate the base salaries for those individuals if they are tenured faculty members and stay on at the university;
- The purported savings from collapsing Dean or Chair roles has been overestimated. The response noted that the University has not back-filled 185 course releases with full time continuing, tenure track faculty, as such it is illogical to claim the level of savings stated. The only logical measure is actual current expenditures on sessional instructors who will not be rehired;
- Overall savings are actually more minimal than what is projected (roughly \$1,019,341 to 1,414,432) and there will be costs for restructuring; as such, restructuring faculties will not result in significant savings, particularly for 2022-23. The only faculty restructuring plan that will result in the savings required for 2022-2023 is the 2-faculty model due to the economies of scale;
- The reduction of three Deans will save over \$1.12 million as compared to new faculty hires, which will save \$2.63 million; however, in looking at these cost savings a very important aspect to consider is the impact on the University’s ability to recruit students, bring in grants and teach;
- Alternative models appear based primarily on a reorganization to balance credit hours, but credit hours do not capture things like the work, time, and costs involved in offering hands-on activities such as science labs, rehearsals, or practice sessions in many Fine Arts courses;
- The restructuring goals are contradictory. The University is attempting to create equal sized faculties and to cut the budget, but it will result in keeping some faculties small and providing them additional funds;
- The areas of reduction will not result in costs savings and will create new issues. Specifically, reducing the number of administrative positions (i.e., Deans or Chairs) will result in increased administrative workload for those positions, requiring additional compensation to reflect the workload and may take a faculty member away from teaching and research. Department heads will be able to keep up with administrative duties and maintain their academic duties;
- Similarly, if more faculty are added to a department, the University will need to hire a department head. While a Chair may already be efficient in their role, the amount of work Chairs are being asked to do is already substantial and Chairs lack good administrative support;
- The numbers do not add up. The data shows fewer Deans but very little change in administration cost at the institution otherwise. Any real savings seem to come from voluntary retirements somehow incorporated into the restructuring models. If un-replaced retirements are the savings plan, then this is in effect a cut to faculty and will have a negative impact on UofL’s programs, including student recruitment, enrolment, and retention; and

- One response encouraged review of analysis conducted on PSE costs in Alberta conducted by faculty members to assist in identifying where cost savings need to be derived.

In addition, quite a few responses stated that the analysis undertaken, and financial data was based on questionable, incorrect, or flawed assumptions but did not specify the specific flaws.

Several responses commented on the reliance on economies of scale to reduce costs. Some Academic Staff highlight that the changes being proposed are inconsistent with the attempt to achieve economy of scale. For instance, responses note the Faculty of Arts & Science as it is currently structured achieves economy of scale with almost 200 faculty, one Dean and three Associate Deans, but this is being restructured. Other responses argue that basing costs saving on achieving economies of scale does not work. One response noted that they have seen other organizations rely on economies of scale to reduce average costs by spreading fixed costs over a larger base, but instead the opposite occurs. The changes create disagreements, faculty stress and administrative issues; particularly, it requires a separate, large, and expensive infrastructure established to administer a new, expanded faculty. Other responses highlight that the current economies of scale achieved by combining departments or the Faculty of Arts & Science do not work and have their own inherent issues which would be magnified if the restructuring created further amalgamations.

Ultimately, the common theme from Academic Units and Staff in this regard is that based on the current information, the risks associated with the restructuring appear to outweigh any economies or savings that may result. Responses indicate a belief that the proposal will only result in short-term benefit and cause significant damage to the departments, faculties, and the University as a whole.

iii. Concern over a “One Size Fits All” or “Top-Down” Approach to Restructuring

Another common theme from the Academic Staff and Unit feedback is that the restructuring proposal is being imposed without regard to the academic realities of each department and the features unique to each department or discipline, which will undermine the Academic Unit’s success and in turn harm the University. The restructuring process as well as the questions in the Questionnaire appear to have triggered this concern. This ties back to the second theme outlined above on the restructuring process and concerns regarding meaningful consultation. Many Units and Staff have characterized the restructuring proposal as a “one-size fits all” approach or a “top down” mandate being imposed without a complete understanding of the relevant factors from experts in each discipline.

Overall, Academic Units and Staff are concerned about the consequences of newly formed organizational arrangements, mismatched unit cultures, and resulting impact on faculty, staff, and students. Even where the Academic Staff member or Unit expressed support for the restructuring²³ they expressed concern that decisions will be made to amalgamate units without a sufficient understanding of the various disciplines, the unique features of each unit/program and what will or will not work.

One Academic Unit response referenced concern with a “history of unilateralism” where decisions have been made without consulting the impacted department. This led to a concern that the same will occur when it comes time to amalgamate units. Another response advised that a better approach to the reorganization would be to start with smaller units and build up larger units by finding synergies, rather than mandating the larger groups and forcing the constituent departments to make it work. In addition, responses often referred to appearances of commonality between disciplines that are not borne out in

²³ We see this particularly in the majority of the Life/Natural Science units in terms of support for a separate Faculty of Science.

practice as well as an insufficient understanding of the impact certain restructuring decisions will have on the unit's success.

Accordingly, nearly every Academic Unit and most Academic Staff provided feedback on their unit or discipline's unique structure and the resulting elements that must be considered when determining the new organizational structure.²⁴

For instance, the Therapeutic Recreation Program (similar to other professional programs) raised the accreditation requirements from the Committee on Accreditation of Recreational Therapy Education (CARTE) that are integral to the Program. CARTE requires that the Program have a director or coordinator that is a Certified Therapeutic Recreation Specialist. As such, to be compliant, the Program must continue to have a program director or coordinator; this must be accommodated in the restructuring. Similarly, CARTE has specifications as to course descriptions and learning objectives which means there is limited crossover in courses unless other programs at the UofL are willing to ensure they list the learning objectives as specified by CARTE.

Both the Therapeutic Recreation Program and the Faculty of Education²⁵ highlighted the importance of having administrative support trained in the specifics of their program. Therapeutic Recreation specified that given its dual online and on-campus program, there is additional complexity in the Program's registration process and course sequencing. An academic advisor who is specifically assigned to Therapeutic Recreation is integral to provide extra help in this regard and a successful student experience. Centralizing this expertise could therefore undermine the Program. Similarly, the Faculty of Education highlighted that it conducts its own admissions process, and the education program depends on a nuanced admission process that allows the Faculty to select candidates based on a number of relevant factors and balances admission numbers across the subject major areas. As part of this, the faculty advisors work closely with potential applicants to ensure they have the appropriate prerequisites and will be able to complete the program with the major and/or specializations they qualify for. Given this, the Faculty of Education highlighted that moving the admission process to a centralized unit would make it very difficult to provide the individualized advice and support to applicants. It could also have the effect of undermining the viability of the program, which depends on admitting students based on nuanced factors (not just admitting the applicants with the highest GPAs).

The Faculty of Education also highlighted the important role field experience (or practicums) plays in the program. Responses identified that half of the undergraduate teacher education program is delivered in the field via practicums, which require meaningful collaboration with external partners (such as school boards/divisions). It also requires significant administrative support with specific expertise to organize and administer the practicums as well as ensure continued relationships with the external partners. As such, Academic Staff and the Faculty of Education emphasized the importance of maintaining the administrative support the Faculty requires in order to maintain the program and, in turn, its reputation for excellence within the field. The responses highlighted that consideration of how the Faculty of Education fits into the restructuring and efficiencies obtained must take these characteristics into account.

Another common element raised was the ability of a Dean or departmental Chair to adequately and appropriately administer a faculty/department made up of several units. Not only was the amount of work

²⁴ See also the next Theme regarding the proposed Faculty of Arts for a related discussion in terms of issues raised by the Social Sciences and Fine Arts disciplines.

²⁵ See also the submission from the Dean of the Faculty of Education in *Appendix A, Item 1*.

raised as an issue²⁶, but Academic Staff and Units raised the importance that a Dean and/or Chair be knowledgeable in the field represented by the department and the expertise of the faculty members within it. Feedback referenced the difficulty posed in ensuring that a Dean or Chair has the necessary expertise in multiple fields or disciplines. Responses expressed it is important that these administrators possess the requisite knowledge to be able to evaluate the performance of the department members in a fair and equitable manner and be of equal assistance to students of different majors. As such, a reorganization that does not consider the departmental Chair's knowledge risks disadvantaging members in units that are moved or combined in new ways for several years. Relevant to this, the Philosophy department proposed an option of having two Departments chaired by one person but requiring that the Chair alternate between the two departments in two-year intervals.

A related concern mentioned in some of the Academic Unit and Staff responses was the ability of large departments made up of multiple units to set up effective STP and curriculum committees. Similar to the comments regarding the Dean/Chair's expertise, the responses noted that relevant expertise and appreciation for the nuances of the discipline in question are integral to these committees and their decision making.

Another relevant thread running through the feedback is from units that identified themselves as already having been amalgamated and the issues they are experiencing as a result. For instance, Academic Staff from Math & Computer Science noted that their department was already a combined one consisting of three units: Mathematics, Computer Science and Statistics. The responses indicated that further amalgamation would result in costs to the University outweighing any benefit achieved. The feedback disclosed concern that the amalgamation has not resulted in efficiencies and instead has created issues. The Department's response indicates that while it has been combined for many years, it still struggles with many aspects such as how to best divide work among the chair and associate chair and how to best structure committees (among other things). The Department noted that administrative support staff is overburdened with work across the disciplines in the Department and the Department is currently undergoing a cultural review. Responses from Academic Staff in the Math & Computer Science Department echo this. Staff expressed that the Department is currently inefficient in terms of its organization and use of resources, and that internal politics is impeding the Department's success.

Similarly, sentiments of already being a large, amalgamated department were expressed by other units such as Chemistry & Biochemistry, Biological Sciences and Geography & Environment. Other Academic Staff/Units, such as Neuroscience and Physics & Astronomy, also indicated that they are already sharing administrative support and do not feel they have sufficient assistance. Given this, the units express that further amalgamation would likely result in further decrease in infrastructural support.

Finally, the responses from Academic Staff and Units indicate that quite a few units are concerned that the amalgamation contemplated will undermine the viability and success of their programs. The feedback from Units and Staff specifies that further amalgamation will create disruption within a variety of aspects of the program such as: the evolving intersection of programs, degree streams, courses, facilities, agreements, policies, procedures, teaching and research practices, donors, community partners, and external networks of support already created by the various departments.²⁷ The concern regarding public standing/reputational impact was also raised by various Academic Units and Staff such as Physics & Astronomy, the Faculty of Education, the Fine Arts Departments, the Department of Psychology and the

²⁶ Several responses mentioned that Chairs are already stretched thin and do not have sufficient administrative support to accomplish their duties.

²⁷ Wording as expressed by the Department of Art's response to Question 7 but similar sentiment expressed amongst other units and staff.

Conservatory of Music, among others. These units explained that the reputation and, in turn, success in student enrollment and obtaining research funding, would be directly impacted by the restructuring if the unit was amalgamated with others in a manner that impeded its ability to run its program effectively and/or decreased its visibility.

iv. *Splitting the Faculty of Arts & Science*

Some departments and Academic Staff engaged in natural or life sciences indicate support for splitting the Faculty of Arts & Sciences and creating an independent Faculty of Science.²⁸ Comments in support of this change largely focus on the distinct nature of the work Academic Staff engage in, both in terms of teaching/supervisory responsibilities and workload as well as research methods.²⁹ Generally there is a sense that creation of a faculty devoted to science will be beneficial to the constituent departments (subject to the feedback on amalgamation of departments).

Three departments (Geography, Kinesiology and Psychology) already have programs and research in both Social Sciences and Sciences, and strongly oppose a separate Faculty of Science. As indicated in the responses to Question 6, there are several departments that oppose the split between Arts & Science and/or takes issue with being placed in a “Faculty of Arts”. This is a common theme for departments that fall within the realm of social sciences. Departments such as: Anthropology, Geography, History, Kinesiology, and Psychology, as well as to some extent the Departments of Political Science and Women and Gender Studies.

Feedback from these Academic Units and Staff indicate a concern that there has been a lack of understanding and attention paid to the theoretical or methodological approaches of these disciplines which exist somewhere in between humanities and science. Several responses noted the name “Faculty of Arts” does not sufficiently recognize the social sciences; these responses indicated the name of the faculty in which these departments are placed should state “social sciences” or “humanities”. The Department of Geography & Environment emphasized the interdisciplinary nature of the Department and necessity of Arts & Science remaining in one faculty. Both the Political Science and Geography & Environment departments as well as a couple Academic Staff members also noted that splitting the Faculty of Arts & Science is contrary to the liberal education model that is core to the UofL. Kinesiology clearly articulated its desire to continue in the current structure under a Faculty of Arts & Science. Failing this, given the proposal for the Faculty to be Arts or Science, Kinesiology responded that it should be placed under the Faculty of Health but as a School of Kinesiology.

A further, evident concern regarding the proposed Faculty of Arts is the nearly unanimous³⁰ view of the departments in the Faculty of Fine Arts (“FFA”) that the 5-Faculty model is unacceptable and detrimental to the University as it “erases” Fine Arts from the institution.

²⁸ Notably, the Department Response from Biological Sciences does not agree with the split. There are also some exceptions amongst the Academic Staff. See *Appendix A, Item 7* for the response from the Department of Physics & Astronomy, it references working well within a Faculty of Arts & Science but the ability to continue its success in a Faculty of Science.

²⁹ See *Appendix A, Item 6* for the Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry’s comments on the distinct nature of the work in Sciences, which provides the character of the comments made in responses on this topic.

³⁰ Unanimous across departmental responses, some nuanced responses from a couple of Academic Staff members.

There is a common concern across FFA Departments³¹ that the failure to maintain the departmental structure, and more significantly the loss of identity as a stand-alone faculty in the province has harmful implications for the Departments as well as the University as a whole. The responses indicate that the FFA is one of the few independent Fine Arts faculties in Canada, and it has worked very hard to establish itself and its national reputation. The FFA's reputation and ability to recruit students and faculty is premised on the fact it is a comprehensive, cohesive faculty that is separate from other faculties at the UofL. The Academic Units and Staff express a concern that merging the FFA with another faculty, signals to the public that the University no longer values Fine Arts nor views it as a distinct entity. Quite a few responses refer to this as being a signal that the University is alongside the government, which has a clear disdain for the Fine Arts.

The FFA Department and Academic Staff responses also highlight the unique nature of FFA Departments. Many emphasize the different structure of teaching duties and research. Academic Staff comment that while their research has some similarities to the academic research in the humanities, there are differences. Staff note that creative research conducted in the FFA is really only understood and supported within the FFA. Academic Staff feedback emphasized that the FFA currently maintains its own set of supplemental policies to ensure that the sorts of artistic activities, public performances and exhibitions, and other creative outputs FFA faculty engage in can be equitably considered along with and alongside academic publications and other "traditional" research outputs. This is important in terms of STP, Merit and Pay Equity. These factors lead to the concern that if the FFA departments were merged with another discipline, their work and structure would not be understood and result in detrimental impact on the department and students. Many responses underscored the importance of being administered by a Dean with the relevant knowledge and experience in the Fine Arts. The general sense in the feedback is that reducing the autonomy of the FFA by amalgamating it with an unrelated discipline would significantly damage its reputation and provide the appearance that Fine Arts are of lesser value than other disciplines.

Overall, the responses from the FFA Units and Academic Staff indicate a feeling that the restructuring proposal was made without consultation from the FFA and does not leave room for or contemplate the FFA. Fine Arts does not fit well into any of the proposed unnamed Faculties. The failure to include Fine Arts as a unique entity reads as if it is already viewed less favourably than other Faculties. The Fine Arts are unique in this institution and creative research is not well understood beyond the FFA. However, if a choice must be made, then it would be Arts, but it should be a Faculty of Fine Arts and Humanities or perhaps a grouping with Humanities and/or Liberal Education, but even then, there must be guarantees of some autonomy for the Fine Arts.

Ultimately, the feedback from these Academic Units and Staff demonstrates a strong objection against the creation of a "Faculty of Arts". These responses indicate that the FFA must remain a distinct Faculty, or at the very least the name of the reorganized faculty must include the term "Fine Arts" in its name.

In sum, the responses on this theme indicate a general sense that if the UofL is going to proceed with the 5-Faculty Model, it is very important that the University work closely with the Academic Units to ensure they are successfully transitioned to the new structures with the least disruption possible.

v. *Liberal Education*

There are competing views on what to do with the School of Liberal Education in the restructuring efforts. There is a "camp" that advocate for finding cost savings by getting rid of the School altogether or getting

³¹ including New media based on the response of one academic staff member that identified themselves as part of the New Media department, specifically.

rid of the School and incorporating aspects of its role into other Academic or Non-Academic Units. However, there is another group of responses that argue the School of Liberal Education is a key distinguishing feature of the UofL. They, therefore, advocate for efforts to capitalize on the School as a means to differentiate the University, increase the institution's profile and student enrollment as well as be the basis for new programs to generate further revenue.

vi. Workload Equity

The issue of workload equity between disciplines is a theme that came up throughout the responses from both Academic Staff and Academic Units (as indicated to some extent in the foregoing discussion).³² As indicated by the following comments, the feedback highlighted discrepancies in the nature of the work/workload of faculty between disciplines and that this would need to be explicitly considered:

- The 'problem' with a faculty the size of Arts & Science (which is good and if you are looking at economies of scale) is that the workload of a scientist is very different than that of someone in the humanities. If a big faculty like Arts & Science was able to recognize that and that a one size fits all model does not work, that would solve a lot of problems.³³
- Professors supervise majority of independent studies and grad students, but this is not credited as teaching and still required to teach 4 courses, deeply unfair.³⁴
- The Department of Sociology emphasized in its response that it has previously raised the issue of workload changes that will result from restructuring, but this had not yet been publicly discussed or sufficiently addressed.
- Faculties differ in their standard assignment of teaching (with members of the Faculty of Arts & Science assigned 4 courses per academic year, and members of most of the other faculties assigned 5 courses). This unequal distribution of labour should be assessed and openly discussed across faculties. Standardizing the number of courses taught across campus to 5 would yield significant cost savings. This change alone calls into question the need to merge departments, which penalizes Chairs by increasing their workload, while clawing back course releases as workload compensation.³⁵
- It is not apparent that consideration has been made in regard to either the diverse research and teaching responsibilities across disciplines, or to ways that workloads vary. Any restructuring must properly reflect departmental contributions to Graduate Studies, Independent Studies, and the faculty's participation with cross-disciplinary Institutes, and perhaps, most importantly, the writing component required in all of our course offerings. These workload issues are nowhere addressed in the current proposals.³⁶
- Current tenured and tenure-track faculty members in the FFA teach five courses, while Arts professors in Arts & Science teach four, even though FFA faculty are all nominally evaluated on

³² See *Appendix A, Items 2, and 6*

³³ Response from Academic Staff in Biological Sciences.

³⁴ Response from Academic Staff in Chemistry & Biochemistry.

³⁵ Response from the Department of Art.

³⁶ Response from the Department of History.

the same 40-40-20 rubric. How can this fundamental inequity be addressed when FFA faculty are in the same administrative unit overseen by a single senior administrator?³⁷

vii. Complexity of Curriculum

We note that the majority of responses from Academic Units and Staff that touch upon the subject agree that the University's curriculum is too complex. Various responses noted this aspect when identifying other concerns but also as a means to streamline the University's operation and provide potential cost savings. However, there were a couple of Academic Staff that clearly disagree with this assessment. One Academic Staff member provided feedback that the notion the University's curriculum is too complicated is not based in evidence and therefore did not warrant the time and attention to simplify, as some are advocating. The Academic Staff member noted that there had been a program in Arts & Science that was complicated, and the Faculty investigated fixing it, but research showed the program was the same almost across the country and simplifying that program will make it harder for graduates of UofL to get into grad school.

Another Academic Staff member characterized the concern over an overly complex curriculum as merely feeding into a narrative that did not benefit the University. The Academic Staff member noted that the University's Liberal Education curriculum was what made the institution unique in the Province of Alberta. They argued it should be maintained and examined as a means to differentiate the institution, rather than seeking to change it for the sake of simplification and provided the following suggestions:

- Offer students the option to replace their LER requirements with a Liberal Education semester as an alternative to completing the Liberal Education lists. For example, a co-ordinated semester built around the themes of Environment or Epidemics could offer courses that draw from the traditional breadth of academic perspectives of Humanities/Fine Arts, Social Sciences, and Sciences, while also offering the potential for Health Sciences and Business to contribute courses to a Liberal Education semester.
- While there are cumbersome curriculum processes that could be simplified to help reduce workloads, more effective IT might go a long way to modernizing and streamlining processes. It is also critical to ensure that these administrative changes make sense to the academics and that we ensure that academics remain in charge of curriculum.
- Some departments need to update their curriculum based on the extensive changes (and in some cases reductions) in expertise experienced over the last couple of years to ensure that departments can offer their curriculums, and sometimes simplification could be one of the ways to do this. However, if the University is going to look at curriculum changes, simplification can only be one aspect of what the disciplinary experts should be considering when looking at curricular changes as quality of education must remain the priority.

viii. Increased Departmental Autonomy

Throughout the feedback, a notable recurring comment was that while restructuring as contemplated is an option it must be accompanied by increased departmental autonomy and some decentralization to be successful. Responses highlighted that while there may be efficiencies found in creating 5 similarly sized faculties, a main driver of efficiency will come from having the unit having independent decision-making power. This is because the units are the ones that understand their functions and know best what is

³⁷ Response of an Academic Staff member in the Department of Drama.

needed to thrive. In this way, to a certain extent, decision making can be speeded up and streamlined by ensuring those with the expertise in the discipline are the ones making the decision. Several Academic Staff noted that the Academic Units need to have substantial budgetary control (decentralizing the budget), autonomy over workloads and outreach efforts, as well as greater freedom over organizing the unit's curriculum.

ix. *Alternate Proposals/Ideas*

As noted throughout the foregoing themes, quite a few responses included alternatives to the restructuring proposal, suggestions for the proposal, or tactics to use during the restructuring process. In addition, a sample of the various suggestions, proposals and ideas are included here:

- Departments could be combined and/or moved between existing Faculties, and Academic Units like SGS and the School of Liberal Education eliminated, without fundamentally changing the current Faculties in the manner contemplated (i.e., 5-Faculty Model).
- Reduce use of air conditioning in the summer and heating in the winter (A 1- to 2-degree difference could lead to important cost savings), reduce unnecessary energy use (this could include classroom computers and projectors running through the night, unnecessary lighting in offices during the night, etc.) and reduce spending on watering lawns on campus.
- Increasing revenues via higher parking fees – the current fees are very inexpensive compared to other universities in Canada and research clearly shows that low-cost parking discourages more sustainable modes of transportation (walking, cycling, transit use, and carpooling).
- Investing in resources the University already has, like hiring advanced undergrads to run tutorials and to serve as markers/TAs for large classes, can provide more individual attention to help keep our students more engaged and successful while being a cost-savings measure.
- Reduce the number of senior administrators in small faculties (less than 40 people) by placing these together in one faculty with one dean and one or two associate deans. These groupings can operate as units under the larger faculty much like departments currently do in Arts & Science. Can also re-examine the amount of management required for faculties (using School of Graduate Studies as efficient example).
- The savings presented in the Provost's budgetary model relies on the reduction of around 20 academic staff positions; instead, the University could consider pursuing substantial savings through retirements and a temporary hiring freeze. This would be less disruptive than changing the institutional organization in place.
- Instead of immediately moving to merging departments, first address the single largest administrative burden faced by Chairs and Deans: the PAR process. There are many elements of the PAR process that can be streamlined without changing the Agreement; this should be looked at seriously. Second, give Chairs more responsibility in some areas to increase efficiency. This is because reacting to decisions that affect the unit that are made at higher administrative levels without unit consultation can be very stressful and time consuming for Chairs.
- Return to the original Transformational Task Forces Faculty Structures analysis and focus on reworking the curriculum and reimagining the nature of the Liberal Education Requirement as well as simplifying the curriculum.
- Bring the faculties of Fine Arts and Liberal Education back into Arts & Science to be administered by 1 Dean and 4 Assoc Deans. This would be 1 Associate Dean each for Sciences; Social Sciences

and Humanities; Fine Arts; and Liberal Education to administer each sub-faculty. Each faculty would report to its own Associate Dean, and the Associate Dean for Liberal Education, which is a small faculty, could be given extra administrative duties. The Dean of Arts & Science would off-load department specific matters to Associate Deans and be able to focus on academic leadership. This would reduce the number of faculties by 2 and create minimal stress for faculty and staff as all faculty and staff continue in present reporting alignments. Expansion of the Art & Science faculty would also reduce overall admin costs by relying on economies of scale. More can be achieved by amalgamation of departments within faculty or across faculties.

- Create a new faculty of Graduate Studies, Research, and Information, administered by a single Dean and three Associate Deans for each of: 1) Graduate Studies; 2) Research Services; and 3) Library.
- Increased use of cross-appointment of faculty to two departments. This may assist with the fact that not all faculty members will be satisfied with the faculty or department groupings to which they are assigned. This may particularly be the case where the faculty member has established research relationships that do not fit with the grouping. Encouraging cross-appointments can help maintain collaborative relationships and facilitate service gap-filling when there are leaves and other reasons for committee vacancies.
- Make decisions on reorganization from the ground up through collegial governance and the creation of favourable conditions such as administrative and financial decentralization, or some hybrid thereof. These, paired with a system of rewarding units (departments, faculties, and schools) for envisioning and implementing successful growth initiatives, yields a culture of competition, innovation, responsibility, and efficiency.
- Start with smaller units and build up larger units by finding synergies, rather mandating the larger groups and forcing the constituent departments to make it work.

B. Non-Academic Staff

As noted throughout this report there was a fairly small number of responses from Non-Academic Staff and of those responses, a small fraction provided additional feedback under Question 7 or general comments under other questions. Accordingly, it is difficult to pull out many common themes amongst the responses. However, we have picked out themes that arose out of more than one (usually around 2-3) Non-Academic Staff member and provide summaries below.

It is interesting to note that in contrast to responses from Academic Staff and Students, the responses from Non-Academic Staff do not indicate a significant attitude against restructuring. Most of the comments from Non-Academic Staff acknowledged the financial situation facing the University and the need to make some changes; comments were largely constructive and focused on providing additional information to consider or suggestions. There were a few comments that referenced the feeling that certain senior University administrators were receiving too high of a salary and should take reductions as a means of cost savings.

i. Timing and Impact on Staff and Students

A couple of responses raise concerns about the fact that restructuring is occurring before other task force initiatives, the impact on students that may result from doing so as well as the amount of time/effort required to implement some of the contemplated changes.

Two Non-Academic Staff members raised a concern that the faculty restructuring should be the last of the task force recommendations to be instituted. Before this, two other recommendations should be implemented; the curriculum clean up and the advising taskforce. The responses noted that the advising task force and curriculum clean up efforts may help inform the restructure. One staff member highlighted that by having a better understanding of the student experience, academic and non-academic needs currently delivered at the faculty level, as well as curriculum & policies that can apply across the student population, the University will be in a better position to determine strategic alignments that will position it well for the long term.

Further, the implementation of the Advising task force would involve centralizing advisors or at least ensuring advisors operate in a consistent manner across faculties. Having this scheme in place could make changes in faculties easier by guaranteeing consistent service from all advisors, easy sharing of student files and the ability to advise students across faculties. This could lessen any impact the restructuring may have on students.

Another staff member raised a concern about the impact that may result from amalgamation of service units. While this makes sense for communications and IT, the response raised a concern that the level of service that staff and students have come to know and expect from other units, such as advising or student services, will not survive the changes. The staff member highlighted that such services can be quite different across faculties and it is not realistic to expect staff to know all programs in all faculties.

The Non-Academic Staff responses also expressed concern over the amount of “behind the scenes” work that will be required to make the restructuring operational. As an example, the staff member referred to the fact that every new faculty or changed faculty name will require changes to program codes, which means all programs under it would need to be reapplied. This would require months of work and testing and would impact academic history, which would also require a long period of time to address.

ii. University Profile and Teaching Standards

A couple of Non-Academic responses raised concerns that amalgamation and restructuring will undermine the current teaching standards and reputation of the University. A Non-Academic Staff member from DSB referred to an example of DSB’s workshops being combined with those offered by Career Services and open to all students. There was drop in student enrollment in DSB’s Student Professional Development Program programs and less effort being put into attracting new employers, and program workshops have become general. The staff member expressed that combining such services resulted in the program becoming more general, which is not always beneficial.

Somewhat similarly, the Unit response on behalf of the Teaching Centre and Agility emphasized that having a high-profile Teaching Centre is as important to the University as an Office of Research when attempting to recruit new, high-quality faculty. The Unit emphasized that teaching must continue to have the same level of prestige and support as research to ensure the University remains competitive. In this way, the Unit is concerned that amalgamating with other units would dilute the Teaching Centre’s profile and, in turn, harm the University’s reputation.

iii. Comments on the Faculty of Fine Arts

Similar to the responses from Academic Staff and Units, the Non-Academic Staff in the Faculty of Fine Arts (FFA) provided responses emphasizing the unique and important role the FFA plays in the University, but with a focus on the Faculty’s non-academic operations.

Staff members highlighted that the FFA is unique because it also contains three non-academic operations: the Conservatory of Music, the Art Gallery and to a lesser degree the Theatre Operations. The Conservatory and Art Gallery are resources to various departments within the FFA but also provide outreach to community. The responses noted these units contribute to the vibrancy and life of the University community as a whole and play an important role in the community. In addition, the Conservatory is a cost recovery operation with gross enrolments nearing \$1million prior to COVID.

The staff members emphasized that these are unique features requiring special consideration in restructuring. Particularly, these three units must continue to be guided and led by arts-based administrators on campus, within a faculty that supports arts-based programming. The responses stated that the Conservatory and Art Gallery's mandate must be solidified and understood by senior management as well as the Dean of the new Faculty to ensure their role to the University as well as the Community remains intact. One Non-Academic Staff member noted that the University's FFA is a leader within the arts community in Lethbridge and is named as one of the most impactful cultural entities south of Calgary. As such, any changes in structure must also come with a commitment to strengthen the programs and future of the arts at the UofL and also within Lethbridge.

It is also interesting to note that in contrast to the responses from Academic Staff and Students from the FFA, a Non-Academic Staff member in the Faculty submitted a response stating that the Departments in the FFA, although unique, are not essential in structure to the academic and non-academic outcomes for the Faculty and for the strategic priorities of the University. Rather, combining departments within the FFA or eliminating departments entirely, would be a forward-thinking and transformational change, which will provide great benefit for future students. As noted above under Question 5, this staff member therefore proposed creating a School or Department of Performing Arts and Cinema (formerly Music and Drama), and a School or Department of Visual Art and Design (formerly Art and New Media). The rationale for this is that doing so would combine resources, eliminate redundancies, create further opportunities for students, and realize further expansion of program offerings in the long term.

iv. Suggestions

Amongst the Non-Academic Staff responses, there were a few more specific proposals or suggestions, which we mention in brief:

- Have the ITS helpdesk field all "general questions"; it can answer the question or route a department specific question to the correct unit. This would reduce strain on IT staff in various departments given the volume of general questions these units receive.
- The English Language Institute teaches English to non-native speakers and to individuals/groups who need to improve current language skills, but there is room for ELI expansion to non-traditional students in non-degree programs (i.e., Continuing Education). Also, at other universities non-native English speakers could earn undergraduate credit for taking high-level English language classes beyond the minimum needed to meet the University's English Language Proficiency Requirement for admission.
- Advising should be restructured entirely. With 80% of students having a customized program planning guide, it's difficult to direct students to Advising for help because the unit is so busy and other departments end up advising students when they really should not. To address this issue, the University could also streamline the degrees, reduce how complex the course offerings are, and provide an online degree audit tool.

- An important combination not yet seen in the restructuring information is Business and Technology (Computer Science, New Media, etc.). Combining these areas would better serve to prepare our students for workplace needs, but also present the UofL with opportunities to harness student learning in getting updated tech/system needs for the university in place under budgetary constraints.
- The proposed 6th unit should maintain the University's Liberal Education principles, and it could do so by structuring it so that everyone is a part of the 6th faculty in addition to one of the other 5. The 6th unit would have a Dean that could be a co-dean to the other faculties and the unit would serve as a "catch all" for any offering needed to support the University's programs that do not fit under one of the other 5 Faculties.

C. Students

The following is a summary of the common themes across the student responses to Question 7. Out of the 228 Student Responses, a very small portion (just shy of a quarter) included responses under this question. However, to the extent students provided general feedback under the responses to previous Questions 1-6, the content of their responses will be reflected in the below summary. Any irrelevant comments or comments regarding program content unrelated to restructuring were excluded.

i. Support for Restructuring

Out of the student responses to this question, only a few reflected explicit or unqualified support for the proposed restructuring. The responses in support of restructuring cited the financial benefits or "business sense" as an appropriate justification for the process. A few further responses saw restructuring as a process to combine academic units where synergies existed for students to optimize access to courses and research resources.

Some student responses expressed more reserved support for restructuring, stressing that although there may be some economic benefits to restructuring, any restructuring should not come at the expense of students and faculty. These comments stated that restructuring should not be used as an excuse to cut services/offerings, faculty, and wages. Other comments mentioned support of restructuring, but also emphasized the importance of ensuring the changes made are sustainable or forward looking so that further changes would not be required in the case of changes to government funding or other external factors.

ii. Impact of Restructuring on Faculty/Staff and the University's Reputation

One of the most common themes in student feedback was a concern over the impact restructuring would have on Faculty and Staff. Students worry that restructuring will result in lower salaries for professors and academic faculty or that restructuring will be used as an excuse to hire fewer professors. Students expressed both of these possibilities could impact the quality of instruction at the University.

Some of the most strongly worded student responses raised concern over the potentially diminished reputation of the institution. Many students discussed the potential negative impact on the reputation of not just individual academic units but also some students expressed fear that the overall reputation of the University will be tarnished by the restructuring process. A common theme in this regard is that combining departments will cause the constituent units to lose their individualized identity. Students expressed that this could result in lower enrollment numbers and less external funding. Interestingly, several students took the amalgamation of academic units to mean that the University saw those units as

less important or deserving of less attention/recognition than the academic units that will remain independent.

iii. Potential Impact of Restructuring on Students

Many responses opposed restructuring, without elaboration. However, the majority of responses raise concerns with or oppose restructuring due to uncertainty over the impact restructuring may have on students' academic programs, access to student services, and the overall student experience. Responses suggested that many of the students' questions remained unanswered, which has created uncertainty/worry over whether restructuring would be beneficial to them or actually negatively impact their interests. Indeed, some responses sought clarity on the potential consequences of restructuring (such as the loss of professors, loss of courses, loss of departments, and reduced quality of research opportunities) and noted that they could not provide accurate feedback without this information.

The most common areas of uncertainty and concern are as follows:

a) Access to classes

Students across faculties raised a concern that their current challenges with course registration may be exacerbated by the restructuring. Specifically, students are concerned that restructuring will limit the number of classes offered and/or result in a decrease in the variety of courses offered making it even more difficult to enroll in required courses and potentially delay graduation. In addition, students expressed that they worry restructuring will result in the University eliminating degree programs which they are partway through completing. Some students seek reassurances that their programs will not be eliminated, and their graduation date will not be affected by the restructuring.

b) Academic Support

There were mixed responses from students on whether restructuring would streamline the provision of academic advising to students or whether the specialized knowledge advisors possess would be lost. Some students expressed the need for a very specific transition and training process should academic advising be centralized to ensure specialized or institutional knowledge can be passed along to ensure students receive continued support.

Many students stressed the need to maintain or increase the number of academic advisors and expressed concern that restructuring would result in a reduction of the number of advisors. Students stated that academic advisors are already stretched thin, and it is difficult for students to obtain appointments. In the vein of student support, a few comments addressed the important role Associate Deans play in being a resource for students in each faculty. Students expressed a concern that by reducing the number of faculties and departments, there will be fewer Associate Deans and this valuable resource and support will be lost.

c) Representation of Student Interests

Another common theme was a concern that the restructuring will negatively impact student representation on University councils and boards. In particular, a few students raised concerns that student representation on the General Faculties Counsel (GFC) will be diluted by the proposed restructuring. Students reasoned that with fewer faculties, each student representative on the GFC will represent a greater number of students, potentially resulting in less nuanced representation of student interests.

d) Student Retention

Finally, a few responses suggested that students will feel a lower degree of pride and sense of belonging to larger faculties. Students connect this with a decreased ability for the University to retain students currently enrolled.

iv. Faculty/Department Concerns

Many responses cited concerns specific to their faculty and department or program.

It was common for students enrolled in the Faculty of Fine Arts to express opposition to restructuring on the basis that it will remove the independent nature of the Faculty. In particular, responses from students in the Music department stated that restructuring will negatively impact the extensive resources required by Music students. Their comments emphasized that the independence of the Music Department plays an important role in its success within the University as well as within the larger cultural scene of Lethbridge and Southern Alberta. Students mentioned that the Music Department has already endured several recent funding cuts which has resulted in fewer courses and limited access to instruments. Students worry that restructuring may further decrease funding and exacerbate the recent issues.

A few student responses noted a general concern that any funding cuts resulting from restructuring will disproportionately impact the Fine Arts and Humanities programs as compared to Science and Business. In addition, responses from students in the Faculty of Arts & Science expressed concern over the separation of Arts and Science under the restructuring proposal. Students expressed that doing so will be very confusing given the significant crossover between departments in the current faculty. Particularly, students noted that separating Arts and Science may make it more difficult for interested students to take out-of-faculty courses.

v. Concerns with the Restructuring Process

A common theme running through student comments was a concern with the restructuring process itself. Specifically, concerns over the manner or process through which the proposed restructuring was communicated and how feedback was sought. The feedback highlighted a concern that students have not been properly informed about the restructuring process and proposal; some specifically commented on a lack of information about whether restructuring will be beneficial for students.

In this vein, students also noted that the questions were difficult to respond to and the Questionnaire lacked the necessary context for them to provide a satisfactory answer. Students expressed that the criteria through which academic units would be combined was unclear. Several students also provided feedback under Question 7 or in answer to the other questions that the wording of the questions did not apply to them or clearly was not meant for students. Some took this as an indication that the University was prioritizing faculty feedback over the feedback of students.

Similar to the concerns raised by Academic Staff, some students commented that there has been a lack of transparency and meaningful consultation throughout the process. Some students mentioned consultation with the student community and others also mentioned a lack of faculty consultation. One student noted there was no student involvement in the restructuring process and the decision has already been made. Students commonly highlighted their role as stakeholders and the individuals paying tuition.

Finally, some students raised concerns over the lack of notice or communication from the University on providing feedback. Feedback included that the notice provided to submit feedback to the proposed changes was extremely short, that they were only alerted to the proposed restructuring through informal channels, and there was a lack of communication from University representatives about the process.

Feedback also included a concern that the Questionnaire was only provided in an online format, which reduced accessibility.

vi. *Minimal Cost Savings*

A few students raised a concern that the proposed savings from restructuring are very minimal (1-2%), and such small savings do not justify the change being contemplated. Students commented that any potential costs of restructuring may reverse any marginal savings.

vii. *Suggestions and Other Comments*

Some students included suggestions on how to restructure faculties amongst the student responses. The suggestions are as follows: eliminate degrees that do not result in clear career prospects; create a separate social sciences faculty (particularly because the sixth unit category is reserved for resources that cross disciplines); rename the proposed Faculty of Arts to include Fine Arts; and restructure IT services to save costs and improve workflow.

While less constructive, other common responses from students included the following:

- Comments from students threatening to leave the University to attend a different institution, or to strike if the restructuring process continued;
- Comments questioning the necessity of the survey, suggesting that the University has access to student data on their academic units and the other academic units they engage with;
- Comments that restructuring should not result in tuition increases; and
- Comments suggesting that the University senior administration is overpaid and should take pay cuts.

D. Anonymous

One anonymous Academic Staff member provided a response to Question 7. They expressed extreme dissatisfaction with the restructuring process, noting that it has been poorly managed thus far, the opportunity for innovation has been lost, and there has been no meaningful consultation. The member expressed concern for the long-term implications of this process and the restructuring.

Only a couple of anonymous Non-Academic Staff members provided general feedback. One anonymous staff member highlighted that it was important for advising units to remain a part of a faculty and be supervised by faculty members. The staff member reasoned that the complex academic decisions guiding the advisors' work needs to be made by academics that understand the curriculum and the integrity of the degree.

The other staff member provided feedback "from the perspective of the student experience and enrolment management" and recommended that restructuring be focused on achieving the following goals: (1) Simplifying the students' navigation of their degree programs and support services; (2) Combining current faculties in a way that positions the University well strategically and competitively; (3) Reinforcing Transformation Task Force decisions that have already been implemented, rather than reducing their effectiveness; (4) More evenly distributing workload for Faculty leaders; and (5) Maximizing cost savings.

The anonymous responses from students generally mirror the responses from other students as outlined above, although some used stronger language to communicate their opposition of the restructuring

proposes or to emphasize the need to reform their departments. Anonymous student responses re-iterated concerns with respect to keeping adequate course selection, reasonable ability to enroll in mandatory courses, and ensuring the high standard of instruction. There were also a handful of responses that suggested that individuals (mostly senior administration) take pay cuts to meet budgetary constraints instead of proceeding with the restructuring process.

viii. *Limited Qualifying Support to Restructuring*

There were responses from some Academic Units and Staff expressing support for the 5-Faculty proposal or some type of restructuring.³⁸ Many of these noted support for restructuring on the basis that the University must evolve to stay competitive and thrive or that some reorganization of the University was due. However, the vast majority of responses expressing support for restructuring did so in a qualified manner. The notion of feedback, building trust and ensuring that important organizational decisions are not made hastily or without adequate information was a common thread throughout the feedback.

A very common response was that while supportive of restructuring, to be successful it must be the result of a highly consultative and collaborative strategic planning process, driven as much as possible by the disciplinary experts themselves. Success in the restructuring process was often connected to the extent to which each unit and faculty within the unit were consulted on the proposed changes and the ability to provide feedback on the unique elements that must be accommodated in doing so. Indeed, almost every Academic Unit and staff member throughout their responses to any/all of the questions emphasized the particularities of their unit in terms of what needed to be changed or what was working well and should therefore be left intact. Some Units or Academic Staff provided detailed explanations about their unit and the unique features that must be accommodated³⁹.

Others expressed support for restructuring but qualified it with a concern over the timing and environment in which it is being considered – the COVID-19 Pandemic and the impact this has had on faculty and students. A common comment was that the University community was already under a great deal of stress and anxiety because of these environmental impacts. As such, it was often recommended that, where possible, restructuring should attempt to reduce disruption (such as maintain groupings of intact departments).

It should be noted that there was a large portion of Academic Staff and Units that provided responses objecting to the 5-Faculty proposal and/or the notion of amalgamating departments and reorganizing faculties as a means of cost saving. A few responses indicated an objection to restructuring or changes at all, but this was the minority; most included some recognition of the budget crisis and the need to take steps to find cost savings and improve operational effectiveness.

Accordingly, even where the response indicated a rejection of the proposed restructuring model it was often accompanied by a counterproposal or commentary on how to make the proposal work for the Unit and/or the University. However, as indicated above, many of these responses included concerns over the approach taken to restructuring, the timelines imposed, and the strong resistance being demonstrated amongst the University Committee. These concerns were summarized above.

³⁸ Most of which came from Health Sciences or Natural/Life Science units with exceptions.

³⁹ See for example, submissions from the Department of Psychology, the Dean of Education, or the Art History/Museum Studies Program in *Appendix A*.

APPENDIX A: DETAILED PROPOSALS/RESPONSES FROM ACADEMIC UNITS AND STAFF

Appendix A contains the detailed proposals/responses from academic units and staff who explicitly consented or requested that their submissions be made publically available.

1. Dean of the Faculty of Education, the Unique Structure of the Faculty of Education

I would like to address what I think is a misconception about the organization of the Faculty of Education and the roles of our administrators/program specialists/administrative assistants. Please note that this is my perception of working in administration over six years and if I have misconstrued this in any way, the fault is mine alone. However, as the university community is in the throes of a new organizational structure, I feel that it is imperative that I address this issue.

I have come to understand that “on paper” there are concerns that the Faculty of Education appears what has been referred to as top heavy. It is very important to me to point out not only our unique organizational structure but also the reasons for this structure in meeting our program needs, and the needs of our field partners, the Alberta Teachers’ Association, and Alberta Education/government partners.

Our cadre of faculty (tenure-track, instructors, and sessionals/Master Teachers – this can number up to 80 individuals every semester) have one administrative assistant. Her duties include: textbook orders, room bookings, course outlines, ordering materials and supplies. As we have dozens of new people every semester especially in supervisory roles, much of her time is spent helping them understand policies and procedures, meeting deadlines, and answering questions as they relate to teaching. (Supervisory responsibilities are most often handled by our Field Experiences personnel).

As I mentioned earlier in the questionnaire, the Faculty of Education is home to three important offices needed to meet the needs of our students entering and graduating professional programs for careers regulated by Alberta Education and the College of Alberta Psychologists. These offices include: Field Experiences (FE), Student Program Services (SPS), and Graduate Studies and Research. Each office has responsibilities to students, our faculty, other faculties (given the two-degree programs), and our field partners (government and regulatory).

By way of one example, I would like to indicate that during any given year, our SPS undergraduate office fields over 600 applications (emails, phone calls, and application forms) and admit 240+ students, with specific major and GPA requirements (based on the needs of the Field). Our graduate offices field approximately 200 applications for the MEd and Counselling Psychology programs.

Field Experience and Grad Studies make 1000+ practicum placements for student teachers, interns, and counselling psychology students - requiring practicum agreements and confidentiality agreements. Our undergraduate program provides more practicum experiences than any other teacher education program in Western Canada, including one full course called Orientation to Teaching which provides an additional 60 hours of classroom observation for students who would like to apply to the Faculty of Education. This is one of the reasons why our graduates are sought after and what employers tell us distinguishes them from other universities.

The placement process also requires oversight for payments and thank-you letters/certificates to teachers, schools, and students (who practicum placement fee covers the cost of mileage and billeting). These individuals also provide workshops across Spouthern Alberta for supervisors, teachers and

administrators in order to carry out effective and successful supervision in schools. We also do not exit students who are not successful without providing extensive remediation opportunities, support, and advice, allowing them to either continue their programs or complete their degrees in their disciplines.

My conversations with colleagues across Western Canada indicate that currently we have fewer individuals carrying out these tasks given the number of students we have than other universities of a similar size to us. Please know that I would be very happy to provide a tour of our offices and an overview of each person's roles and responsibilities at any time.

The AQA reports for both our undergraduate and graduate programs are also available and contain information about the unique structure of the Faculty of Education, and indeed all faculties of education of a similar size. Larger faculties of education situated in large urban centres have somewhat different structures but they, too, maintain robust Field Experiences, Student Program Services, and Graduate Studies Offices.

This past year has seen the Faculty of Education lose 30% of its teaching faculty through voluntary retirement, in addition to losing all members of the dean's office (the dean, the EA, and the financial officer). Currently, we have two individuals from other departments acting as financial support to us and the EA for the dean is in a temporary position. I simply want to ensure that the work of the Faculty of Education, integral to the University, but unique at the same time, is fully understood in these times of restructuring.

2. Department of Psychology Response on its Requirements to Serve the University

We understand the severity of the current budget crisis. It is critical that the U of L act swiftly to mitigate the fallout from this externally imposed threat to our continued excellence. The Department of Psychology endorses action that is in the best long-term interest of the University, its employees and students, and the broader Southern Alberta community.

The Department of Psychology is successful. We earn grants, publish papers, train many successful graduate students who go on to use their skills, teach well-subscribed courses, earn outstanding student reviews, and attract large amounts of tuition revenue for the university. The following list outlines what is needed to ensure we can continue serving the university at this high level:

1. Maintain the autonomy of our major for all degree programs: The B.A., B.Sc., M.A. and M.Sc. in Psychology and Ph.D. in Evolution and Behaviour. Our graduate program is not a luxury or added bonus, but is essential to the productivity and prestige of our department. It must be protected at all costs.
2. Presentation of a fully costed and transparent ledger demonstrating that the benefits of faculty restructuring outweigh the costs over short-, medium-, and long-term time scale.
3. Fair compensation for department chairs commensurate with their assigned duties. Chairs do a great deal of work. Combining departments inevitably will increase chairs' workloads. If chairs are not fairly compensated, few faculty members will be willing to undertake the task, potentially leading to inequity with respect to those few who are prepared to step up. It is well known that certain groups within academic environments (e.g., women, people from visible minorities) are more likely to be asked to take on service, and to accept such positions at a personal cost to themselves (with respect to both career and homelife).
4. An increase in the number of faculty members. We continue to be grossly understaffed in comparison to the rest of Arts and Science (e.g., based on faculty:enrollment ratios). Our students have trouble graduating on time, and we have no choice but to hire multiple sessional instructors each term, potentially

compromising the quality of education that our students receive and most definitely comprising the choices that students are able to make with respect to subject matter and course content.

5. An effective strategy for student retention. Hundreds of tuition-paying students drop out of the U of L every year, but we have not heard one word about improving retention since this crisis began. We no longer have the luxury of taking our students for granted. To focus on growth and ignore retention is like continually filling a bucket with water while failing to notice the huge hole in the bottom

6. Formal assurance that Psychology will not be merged with the Department of Neuroscience. As we wrote in our reunification letter earlier this year: “Psychology will bear most of the costs of reunification, beginning with loss of autonomy. The Departments of Psychology and Neuroscience are different. Our colleagues in Neuroscience work with captive rodents, but we study human beings and wild animals. They enjoy minimal teaching responsibilities, while we balance teaching and research. They work in wet labs, and we do not. They want to hire neuroscientists, whereas we want to hire psychologists. We could go on, but the point should be clear by now: the two departments have radically different political interests. If we merge, Psychology faculty will be badly outnumbered. We will become a permanent minority in our own department, outvoted on every issue. Consequently, every facet of our majors’ university experience – from the professors that teach them, to the curriculum they study – will be compromised by competing interests in Neuroscience. The “merged” department will still be a Department of Neuroscience. Psychology will be an appendage, and our students will suffer for it.”

7. Formal assurance that Psychology will not be dissolved or divided. We are one of the most popular, profitable departments on campus. If members we were scattered across units, we would not be able to maintain a high level of cohesion for our undergraduate programs.

3. Department of Music’s Complete Responses

With which other academic units do you participate in formal or informal collaborative academic activities?

We would like to clearly state for the record that we waive the right to privacy and request these comments be made public without fair summary. They can be released entirely WITH identifiers.

The Department of Music and the U of L Conservatory are perhaps the most collaborative units on campus. This extends to formal or informal collaborative academic activities AND research with colleagues in other academic units. Through the Conservatory we are able to collaborate with a profoundly wide array of community organizations (the Lethbridge Symphony Orchestra; the Allied Arts Council; Casa; City Hall, to name a few) and as performers, composers, theorists, historians, audio producers and engineers, fine-arts based interdisciplinary researchers, music education specialists, music technologists, technology based performers, and computer and media music specialists (to name just some of the facets of our expertise and depth) in the Dept. of Music, we work with a very wide spectrum of experts and units across campus and in the culture industry continuously. It is in our very nature to work as part of a collaborative unit with experts (scholars, researchers, industry specialists) from other sectors of society and within the institution in order to function. Our primary collaborators are our sister departments of Art, Drama and New Media. A list of other collaborators includes, but is not limited to: computer science (coding/programming), life sciences (e.g., neuroscience; medical research; kinesiology), business (professional administration; marketing; management), cognitive sciences, Indigenous studies, literature, linguistics, modern languages, agriculture, sociology, anthropology, ethnography, human-computer interaction, robotics, VR/AR/XR, communications technology, education, philosophy, engineering, mathematics, physics, women and gender studies, etc..

Do you conduct research with colleagues in other academic units? With which other units do you typically work?

We would like to clearly state for the record that we waive the right to privacy and request these comments be made public without fair summary. They can be released entirely WITH identifiers.

As stated in our response to the previous question, the Department of Music is perhaps one of the most collaborative units on campus and we actively conduct research with colleagues across the institution. We reiterate that this extends to formal or informal collaborative academic activities AND research with colleagues in other academic units which includes, but is not limited to (and in no particular order) our sister departments of Art, Drama and New Media, computer science (coding/programming), life sciences (e.g., neuroscience; medical research; kinesiology), business (professional administration; marketing; management), cognitive sciences, Indigenous studies, literature, linguistics, modern languages, agriculture, sociology, anthropology, ethnography, human-computer interaction, robotics, VR/AR/XR, communications technology, education, philosophy, engineering, mathematics, physics, women and gender studies, etc.. Music Researchers (and more generically – Arts-Based Researchers) are at their core collaborative and cross disciplinary. We must collaborate to exist. The above list is a small sampling of who we work with. It is in the University's best interests to preserve our infrastructure in order to ensure the continuance of this robust academic unit.

Do you collaborate on community engagement and outreach with colleagues in other academic units? With which other units do you typically work?

We would like to clearly state for the record that we waive the right to privacy and request these comments be made public without fair summary. They can be released entirely WITH identifiers.

The Department of Music and the U of L Conservatory are the greatest sources of community outreach at the University of Lethbridge. With well over 100 combined musical events per year and countless hours of individual mentoring, faculty-led community performance organizations, and community-based teaching, we are the most successful representatives to the greater community for the University. The Music Department also works extensively with the Faculty of Education in our public schools throughout the province, in collaboration with the Lethbridge Symphony and with the Lethbridge Public Library. It should also be noted that between 2017 and 2020, 15% of all U of L Conservatory students (530) went on to attend the U of L across all disciplines. The majority attended a B.Sc. program (104 students), then a B.A. (74 students), followed by a B.Mus. (60 students). This is a significant source of local recruiting that cannot be ignored, but rather needs to be nurtured as proposed below.

Are there additional academic units with which you plan to collaborate more (in teaching, learning, research, and/or community engagement)? If so, which ones?

We would like to clearly state for the record that we waive the right to privacy and request these comments be made public without fair summary. They can be released entirely WITH identifiers.

The Department of Music plans to collaborate more closely with the U of L Conservatory on supporting its community engagement through various faculty initiatives – particularly in the area of service allocation. In future, we plan to continue research with colleagues in other academic units which include, but is not limited to (and in no particular order): our sister departments of Art, Drama and New Media, computer science (coding/programming), life sciences (e.g., neuroscience; medical research; kinesiology), business (professional administration; marketing; management), cognitive sciences, Indigenous studies, literature, linguistics, modern languages, agriculture, sociology, anthropology, ethnography, human-

computer interaction, robotics, VR/AR/XR, communications technology, education, philosophy, engineering, mathematics, physics, women and gender studies, etc.. "

Indicate at least one or two academic units with which your academic unit could best combine into one joint area/department.

We would like to clearly state for the record that we waive the right to privacy and request these comments be made public without fair summary. They can be released entirely WITH identifiers.

The Department of Music, which includes academic programs, studio programs and digital audio arts programs, is concerned that the emphasis on combining administrative and academic functionalities overall within the FFA will be unsustainable for the health of the institution. The budget "savings" suggested by the Provost's presentation do not take into account the enormous HR, re-branding, and multitudinous "soft-hours" that will be spent in responding to the challenges of this project. We suggest a true analysis of the University Wide challenges (both administratively, economically, and academically) that will arise from this proposal be presented to the University community as soon as possible. The Department of Music feels that we are being asked to engage in damage control, rather than make concrete, collaborative, and informed plans for the future of the Faculty of Fine Arts and our own Department.

The nature of this question seems to us to underscore the lack of understanding the institution has of its own units – particularly those in the Fine Arts. We would therefore like to offer some concrete plans to ensure the health and autonomy of the Department of Music and U of L Conservatory of Music. The Department of Music strongly believes that preserving the identities of each of the four individual departments within the FFA is critical to preserving its overall coherence as a functional mechanism in the university for art teaching research and creation. The Dean in FFA has been increasingly downloading high-level tasks onto the chairs of the four Departments. It is not possible to consolidate these rolls further as they are already so extensive.

FFA Department infrastructure and administrative structures function extremely efficiently, and we believe that maintaining the integrity of the four Departments will also maintain efficiency of operations throughout a combined FFA+. We feel there is no functional advantage to administratively combining any of these four departments as the chairs of these departments are already at the limit of what is possible to effectively administer active fine-arts-centric units. No one chair could manage the detailed and varied tasks required to oversee such a combined entity. The Department of Music alone is the size of a faculty – with 20 full-time tenured/tenure-track/continuing faculty members and 10 contracted Studio Teachers.

We do, however, have a suggestion which would strengthen existing structures and more effectively cement partnerships within a FFA+. In the case of Music, the most logical re-combination is to re-structure the Department of Music and the U of L Conservatory into a combined conglomerate unit. We feel a clear MOU in the FFA to establish the administrative infrastructure of such an entity, which would retain a strong Conservatory Directorship and vibrant academic Music Chair working in concert with both the academic and community-based aspects of our programs, would be very advantageous. This could also cement future partnerships with the Music Education program at the University. Specifically, the U of L Conservatory's director should be placed in the Dept of Music and become part of the Department's leadership and oversight responsibilities. The specifics of such a move would need careful consideration to preserve the considerable work currently being done by both units to ensure their success.

We feel the impact of the U of L Conservatory on recruitment (as noted above) and streaming of students to the U of L is grossly misunderstood and overlooked by the institution. As demonstrated above, U of L Conservatory students do not just come to the Department of Music, but rather the University as a whole.

This proposal would ensure this avenue of education, recruiting, and community outreach is nurtured and protected.

The current recommendation proposes five Faculties, broadly organized around the themes of Arts, Business, Education, Health and Science (Faculty names yet to be determined). A possible sixth unit to include the academic work and resources that extend across, contribute to, and draw from each of the Faculties is also under consideration. If you had to place yourself in one of these units, which one would be the best fit and why?

We would like to clearly state for the record that we waive the right to privacy and request these comments be made public without fair summary. They can be released entirely WITH identifiers.

The Department of Music belongs firmly in a Faculty of “Fine Arts”. We also believe this to be true of our sister departments of Art, Drama and New Media. We feel that the current themes proposed by the restructuring documents grossly ignore the definition of “Fine Arts” as a distinct entity from “Arts”. The Fine Arts are unique in this institution and Arts Based Research is very poorly understood outside the FFA.

We also feel that the institution is unaware that the FFA has a significant and established reputation in the national academic and artistic world. It is recognized as a destination faculty for young artists and musicians and has produced significant national and international-level talent who return and contribute to the reputation of our programs. Furthermore, we are recognized by a significant donor base who are specifically funding programs and research in the Fine Arts. We worry that any removal of the FFA name or reduction in its autonomy would jeopardize this formidable source of support for our programs.

The Dept. of Music also feels that it is important to acknowledge that the Faculty of Fine Arts generated the 3rd largest numbers of credit-hours in the University averaged over the last ten years. The FFA at U of L is currently one of, if not THE only unified FFA in the province. All others are combined faculties. We believe protecting this unique marketing opportunity by preserving the only faculty solely concerned with production, teaching and research of Art should be considered an inherent strength when crafting the restructuring proposal. The FFA should be left autonomous for this reason.

The Dept. of Music is united in the opinion that should a combination of the FFA with ANY other entity within the U of L be legislated, it MUST preserve the name FACULTY OF FINE ARTS AND...?? We believe that removing this descriptor from our faculty, in the current climate of de-emphasizing the Arts in the overall educational landscape, will be viewed by the province as a withdrawal of support for the Fine Arts within the university and send a clear message that their destructive agenda is warranted and successful. The re-structuring committee must ensure that any combined structure will preserve the name of the Faculty of Fine Arts+.

The Department of Music believes that any combined FFA+ MUST be led by a fine arts researcher or practitioner. The nature of Fine Arts research is VERY poorly understood in the overall University, whereas the nature of research in the other areas is very well supported and articulated institution-wide and is also well understood by Fine Artists (who receive tri-council grants and work within established A&S research parameters). It is therefore imperative that a Fine Arts practitioner be installed as the Dean of any combined FFA+ structure.

Do you have any other thoughts or feedback on the proposed restructuring that you wish to share?

If you wish to submit a diagram or Excel spreadsheet to accompany your written response to Question 10, please do the following:

- **Indicate within this textbox that you have submitted an accompanying document**
- **Email your accompanying document to provost@uleth.ca**

- In the subject line of that email use: “Additional document – [INSERT YOUR FIRST NAME, LAST NAME].” Please ensure the name you use in the subject line matches the name you used within the Qualtrics submission.

PLEASE NOTE: Only accompanying documents will be accepted as feedback at the email address. To ensure transparency and inclusion within the fair summary, feedback (other than diagrams/tables/etc.) must be submitted via this Qualtrics form.

The following information is provided on behalf of the Department of Music. We would like to clearly state for the record that we waive the right to privacy and request these comments be made public without fair summary. They can be released entirely WITH identifiers.

The current restructuring proposal blatantly excludes the Fine Arts as an academic entity. This is not a matter of semantics; it is clear from discussions with Chairs across the institution and discussions in GFC that the Fine Arts are not clearly understood as being included in “Arts” as a structural theme and that the institution does not truly understand this significance. We reiterate that the Faculty of Fine Arts, if it is to be combined, should be the parent faculty not an offspring department. We must preserve the Fine Arts name and infrastructure to exist as a robust unit in the University.

The Department of Music has long been concerned about teaching equity across the institution. Currently, music professors teach five courses and Instructor IIIs teach eight courses. The re-structuring committee must consult with the committee responsible for teaching equity. An analysis of a possible reduction in sessional staff appointments in A&S to increase the teaching loads concomitantly of our colleagues in A&S must be considered and presented soon to justify this enormous undertaking. This may be a much more efficient means to consolidate the professoriate and streamline program delivery.

The Department of Music offers seven degree programs. They are BMus - Digital Audio Arts, BMus - Music, BMus - Music/BEd (combined degrees), BA (Music), BA (Music)/BEd (combined degrees), BA (Music)/BMgt (combined degrees), and an MMus. Each program offers unique pathways for students to realize their goals as artists, researchers, educators, technologists, producers, arts managers, etc. within the discipline of music. Our programs are widely recognized within a FFA framework and are supported by Fine Arts networks, donors, and infrastructure that have been nurtured and refined since the inception of the University itself. We have a long history of national leadership coming out of our Department in the MusCan organization (the Canadian University Music Society) and our digital audio arts major alone is among the most recognized and sought-after undergraduate programs in the country. The U of L DAA program has one of the few Canadian Audio Engineering Society student chapters and is heavily involved with this international organization in publishing academic papers by U of L DAA undergraduate and graduate students.

We do not feel a robust analysis of the threats to the integrity of our programs or their reputation and branding, in the wake of a proposed restructuring, has been properly undertaken. We fear the dilution of our programs, despite assurances to the contrary, will inevitably follow the removal of a Fine Arts academic faculty from the University or Provincial landscape. This is clear upon examining the complete exclusion of “Fine Arts” from any restructuring proposals currently on the table.

We are also gravely concerned that Fine Arts research and service activities will not be accurately or appropriately characterized or evaluated in any non-Fine Arts combined academic unit. Arts Based Research and service is very clearly understood and defined throughout the FFA and its four departments and has over the years been expertly evaluated by artists, arts educators, and arts researchers. This must remain in place.

We reiterate that removing the “Fine Arts” faculty from the academic topography of the University will be catastrophic to the Department of Music’s programs, reputation and branding and be viewed by the

province as a withdrawal of support for the Fine Arts in general thereby sending a clear message that their destructive agenda is warranted and successful. As we clearly state above, the U of L Conservatory must continue to be considered part of the FFA in the restructuring model and if possible be combined with the Dept. of Music. It is one of the most significant community engagement faces of the FFA. The preservation of the synergies between the Conservatory and the music dept are critical to our long-term recruitment and music education operationalization plan. The re-structuring plan must commit to keeping the Conservatory a part of the FFA so that we can continue to draw on its considerable community impact to enhance our program delivery.

The Department of Music is deeply committed to Equity Diversity and Inclusion and Indigenization in its curricular offerings and in the structuring of its educational experiences. By acting on our recent Academic Quality Assurance program review process we have been leading out in our faculty in the Indigenization of our curriculum and the diversification of our department. We recently hired a female BIPOC audio engineer with a specialization in Black Music audio production last Spring and we recently held a faculty retreat which focused on making substantive changes to our department by structurally incorporating Indigenous ways of knowing/knowledge into our curriculum and manner of delivering information. This curricular and departmental diversification process, a process in which everyone is respected and has a voice, is an ongoing effort and requires the implementation of sustained and clear targets to balance curricular imperatives and to address inequities in the gender and ethnic make-up of our department. We must reflect the reality of our amazing and diverse world and embrace inclusion at all levels of our program delivery including our hiring practices.

We fear the damage control efforts forced upon us by this recent restructuring proposal will derail these efforts in favour of the daily pragmatics of academic survival. This is a simple reality; we will be forced to justify our existence in an alien context, and this will become our prime concern. We see this as becoming a reality since no mention whatsoever of EDI and Indigenization was mentioned in the restructuring plans. This concerns us deeply!

The Response included text from letters of support for the Dept. of Music from Alumni, Community Members and Supporters of our department submitted as evidence of the strong feelings these individuals have regarding Department of Music and the FFA. Another Academic Staff member of the Music Department included further support letters from alumni in their response to Question 19.

4. School of Liberal Education Restructuring Proposal

December 13, 2021

Prepared by: Shelly Wismath, Dean SLE, in Consultation with Core Members of SLE and members of SLE Council.

SUMMARY

The School of Liberal Education (SLE) provides much more than it costs us for the University of Lethbridge, via recruitment, retention, pedagogy, and donor funding, and therefore should be maintained as a separate School with a dean, with slight modifications as outlined below.

Recruiting Advantage: **Liberal Education is our recruiting advantage** as it continues to define our institution in Alberta. The current generation of students values our four-pillar model, and understands and appreciates the education offered at the University of Lethbridge. Indeed, it is our differentiator, what **makes us a destination** unique in Alberta and in Western Canada. Our strong structure to promote and

implement our model, going beyond breadth lists and first year “general education” courses to explicit reflection and integration **also helps us to recruit faculty.**

Historical Background: The founders of the University of Lethbridge based the University’s teaching and learning philosophy on Liberal Education. These founders, faculty and alumni are loyal to this philosophy of teaching and learning as it has created leaders who can lead based on a wide knowledge of different disciplines. For example, Dave Mowat, Past President of Alberta Treasury Branch, purposefully recruited from the U of L because of the Liberal Education learning that enables students as employees to think through problems from different perspectives.

After many years of failed attempts to revise Liberal Education at the U of L, it became apparent by 2014 that we had to articulate the values and benefits of Liberal Education to faculty members and students and also to the wider population. In 2014 the University began a very fulsome two-year review of our implementation of Liberal Education. This review included focus groups and frequent further consultation with faculty, students, staff and alumni, and resulted in a very clear realization that the previous attempts at operationalizing Liberal Education here had been woefully inadequate, to the point where we had lost even our understanding of the basic Lib Ed philosophy. Our “we all do Lib Ed” approach had evolved into **no-one** actually coordinating and planning Liberal Education delivery in a way that coherently integrated our pillars in a way visible or valued to potential and current students. The work of the Lib Ed Revitalization Team (chaired by Shelly Wismath) led to a series of recommendations and change, culminating in the formation of the School of Liberal Education in 2017. The School was mandated to revitalize and reconfirm our commitment to Liberal Education as the foundational teaching and learning philosophy of our university, and to effectively operationalize that commitment with a clear structure and leader.

Philosophy: Our four-pillar model of Liberal Education encompasses breadth and integration of knowledge and viewpoints across disciplines, including multiple ways of knowing; it foregrounds critical thinking via evidence-based reasoning and articulate communication and it brings together the knowledge and skills our students learn into a commitment to improve the world around us, at all levels from local to global. One of our strengths has been that our philosophy, and our School Structure providing a central coordination, allows us to reach across all units of the university, bringing together students from all degrees and majors, as well as faculty, staff and community members, for a common approach to teaching and learning. This also allows us to work together with other units on the University’s main strategic priorities, of Liberal Education, Indigenization and Internationalization.

Operationalization of Philosophy: In its first four years, the School of Liberal Education has been a resounding success at its goals of enrolment growth, course development, curriculum design including Breadth reductions, and promotion of our philosophy across a wide community. These are outlined below.

- a) **Course Development and Enrolments:** By centralizing the coordination of Liberal Education, we have tripled our enrolments in LBED courses, especially first year courses, and students who take our intro courses return for higher-level offerings in various disciplines across all faculties. (See Appendix B.) Even in the last two years when overall university enrolments have declined, we have maintained growth in our enrolments (13.2% in 20-21 and 8.1% in 21-22), indicating student interest and support. We have increased the number of Indigenous and International students in our courses, and of students taking a minor in Lib Ed. Our unique 2-week Early Start First Year Experience smooths the transition from high school to university for many students, with data showing improvement in student retention from first to second year. Other innovative programming includes the Conversational Indigenization course (LBED 1850, a safe space to engage in conversation on Reconciliation and Indigenization) and the Core Brain Story course (LBED 2850, a science course for non-science majors).

- b) **Operationalization Across Other Units:** The SLE oversees the breadth lists, including new course submissions, and helps students from all faculties meet their breadth requirements. We currently offer 4 packages of courses (plus combinations of several of those) which not only give students an intensive Lib Ed experience across all four pillars, but allows them to reduce their List requirements by 2 courses. This will help both students and their advisors, as they plan their programs. We are now developing additional such course packages, with 2 to 4 course reductions, for students in programs such as Fine Arts, Management and Health Sciences who have tight major requirements and want more flexibility in completing their List requirements. For instance, we are currently working with the Faculty of Education to set up a package of Lib Ed course requirements for the proposed new four-year B.Ed. which will allow students to complete their list requirements efficiently and do (the equivalent of) a minor in Liberal Education. This package could also be used as is, or with appropriate adjustments, by other Faculties as desired, and could include a requirement for an Indigenous-content course.

In addition, a review of the A&S courses on the Lib Ed Lists needs to be conducted to better articulate those entry level courses. This is a major project and will require additional help.

- c) **Promotion and Fund-Raising:** Through centralized coordination, we have instituted a variety of successful community-wide initiatives: the annual Lib Ed Symposium, a popular Speaker Series, a Common Book Project, the national short-story writing competition The Bridge Prize, and a new proposal for a Community Bridge Lab, as well as regular outreach on campus and in the larger community. A practical part of the promotional goal is fund-raising, and even in four years we have brought in significant funding, for scholarships, programming initiatives and an endowed chair. (For details please see Appendix A).

Budget: The budget for the current SLE is modest, with 93% of our budget devoted to salaries (2 tenured professors, one tenure-track, one Instructor II, and a .25 admin assistant). Beyond faculty salaries, our cost is \$25,000 for a dean stipend and \$10,000 for a decanal research stipend. The Dean role also carries an almost full-time teaching role. Given our small size and our strong outreach across campus and to the wider community, we produce a lot for the cost we incur. An itemized list below (see Appendix A) shows that the School has brought in more revenue than expenses for each of the last four years, as our philosophy and School are attractive to donors. Liberal Education as a differentiator can be seen as a revenue/funding generator for the University. Of particular note is a recent two-million-dollar endowment for a named chair in Liberal Education. The centralized coordination and promotion of fundraising is only in the early stages.

Modifications: There are some areas of the university's academic structure which would fit well into a slightly larger School of Liberal Education, including the Academic Writing Program and the teaching and learning aspects of the Teaching Center. Academic Writing, which also serves all students across faculties and majors, and which develops writing and communication skills which align with our critical thinking pillar, would clearly fit well within SLE. This would save the course-relief cost for one Co-ordinator position (currently in A&S). This alignment would also provide for more academic oversight in meeting the needs of all faculties. Academic Writing 1000 is one of the most sought-after courses by students and clearly contributes to student success and graduation rates.

Some aspects of the Teaching Centre would be able to grow in new directions in SLE with a more sustaining teaching and learning focus, based on Scholarship of Teaching and Learning principles. This could result in savings from one or more position eliminations in the Teaching Centre.

Such changes would allow some minor cost reductions, while enhancing both philosophy and structure of Liberal Education on campus to enable a broader impact to respond to student demand. This restructuring will likely result in increased recruitment, retention, and overall enrolment for all faculties, and it would

allow us to capitalize on the name-recognition, fund-raising and support that the SLE has built up in the past four years.

Donor Support:

SLE has identified a donor willing to offset the cost of the Decanal and research stipends for at least five years conditional on keeping the structure as a School with a dean. There is greater potential from fundraising to contribute to offset the operational cost of the School in the future as the very philosophy of teaching students how to think and not what to think appeals to donors. A dean is required to represent the U of L in fundraising initiatives and through the governance structure of the University, including for example Provost's Committee, Statutory Deans' Council, and GFC.

CONCLUSION

Overall, the School of Liberal Education contributes much more to the university, in recruitment, retention, philosophy and fund-raising, than its cost indicates, and the significant lost-opportunity costs in these areas from cutting or reducing its exposure would far outweigh any cost savings.

SLE Proposal - APPENDIX A

PROJECTS IN SLE, 2017 – 2021:

- Symposium, annually for five years now, 130 people every year, across students, faculty, staff, community.
- Lib Ed Living Room, 5 talks per year, usually 60 to 100 people attending.
- Common Book Project, reaching approximately 1000 people per year, now in 5th year.
- Minor in Lib Ed has graduated 18 students so far, with 13 currently registered.
- New minors in Innovation across Disciplines and in Information & Communications (joint with Library and Academic Writing).
- Early Start Experience for incoming first year students run for the last three summers, with data showing improved grades and retention.
- Strong Indigenization efforts, including course content, sponsorship of Conversational Indigenization course, and Common Book choices; agreement with the Blackfoot Confederacy for the School of Liberal Education to use the Turtle Effigy symbol, via artwork from a local Indigenous artist.
- Regular outreach at New Student Orientation and various Recruitment events.
- UVolunteer Partnership with Volunteer Lethbridge, last 6 years.
- The Bridge Prize, housed in School of Lib Ed, brings national attention and publicity for U of L, with over \$60,000 committed by one donor.
- Fall 2021 Proposal for Community Bridge Lab, with seed funding of \$30,000.
- Number of scholarships now endowed: Walker Wood, Boora (\$100,000 endowment), Friends of Lib Ed (\$1,000 scholarship endowed), President's Grant for International Community Development (up to \$5,000 each for up to 5 students per year).

FUNDING BROUGHT IN by SLE, 2017 - 2021:

- Evelyn Hamilton Chair in Liberal Education, two-million-dollar endowment to fund a named Chair, Fall 2021 (position to commence July 1, 2022).
- New one-million-dollar donation to SLE for Work Integrated Learning, confirmed in December 2021.
- Walker Wood Fund, award of \$1,000 annually to a student taking at least 2 Lib Ed courses per year for up to four years.

- Muthada Boora Family Award, a \$100,000 endowment set up in 2018 which provides 4 annual \$1000 scholarships based on essay on value of Lib Ed and adjudicated by SLE.
- Friends of Lib Ed Prize, has been \$500 and moving to \$1,000 annually, for student in Lib Ed 1000 and 2000.
- Friends of Lib Ed Fund, set up in 2016, expected to reach \$50,000 by Spring 2022; this fund pays the Friends of Lib Ed Prize annually, and also supports speakers and other promotional events for School of Lib Ed.
- Bridge Prize, a national short-story writing competition offered every two years starting in 2020. Alumni donor contributes \$10,000 in prize money each round, as well as funding for juror honorariums, promoting and processing the Prize and applications, adjudication, etc. The Bridge Prize has brought in, and continues to bring in, national recognition to U of L in various literary and media circles, including a large in-kind cost.

SLE Proposal - APPENDIX B: ENROLMENT GROWTH, LIB ED COURSES

Academic Year	Total # Enrolments	% Change from 2013.	Yr to Yr change	LBED 1000 #	# Courses	# IS/AS	DC	# Minors
2013-14	342	0		110	15			
2014-15	448	31.0%	31.0%	102	15			
2015-16	575	68.1%	28.3%	159	16		1	
2016-17	660	93.0%	14.8%	141	18	1	1	1
2017-18	714	108.8%	8.2%	186	*** 16	6	1	3
2018-19	827	141.2%	15.8%	184	26	6	2	12
2019-20	1155	237.7%	39.7%	284	27	18	2	17
2020-21	1307	282%	13.2%	216		5		16
2021-22 Projected As of Jan.3/22	1396	308.1%	8.1%					13

5. Art History and Museum Studies Program Feedback on the Discipline of Art History

Some feedback about the importance of our academic discipline: What is art history and why is it important?

Art History is the study of visual human expression through history while Museum or Curatorial Studies is the field that encompasses the ideas and issues involved in the museum profession: from the practical, day-to-day skills needed to operate an art gallery museum, the curation or creation of exhibitions, to theories on the societal role of museums. Art History is a historical discipline that seeks to reintegrate the work of art into the original context of its making and reception, foregrounding its significant status as both historical document and act of social communication. At the same time, Art History seeks to understand the ways in which the work of art transcends the historical moment of its production, taking on a range of different meanings in later historical periods, including our own. Museum Studies supplements this history by examining the institutions of the museum and art gallery and the formative roles they have played throughout history in our understanding of the visual arts, heritage, and material culture more broadly.

Skills that we teach in Art History/Museum Studies: The skills of visual literacy and analysis are not innate but may be acquired through training and practice. Students of Art History/Museum Studies become proficient in cultural analysis and historical interpretation. Art History and Museum Studies thus envisions themselves as uniquely well positioned to train students from a variety of disciplines in the light of the dramatic visual turn that has gripped the humanities, social and hard sciences over the course of the past few decades, with more and more disciplines becoming vitally interested in visual forms and modes of communication. In class, we evaluate works of art through close observation, critical analysis as our students consider influential forces like patronage, politics, class, belief, gender, and ethnicity in their analysis of art forms. They examine styles, techniques, themes, and chronology, comparing and contrasting art forms from varied perspectives. Ranging from antiquity to the present, our objects of study are drawn from the rich and complex cultures of the global world: Africa, Asia, the Americas, the Middle East, and Western, Central, and Eastern Europe.

6. Department of Chemistry & Biochemistry on Workloads and Activities Specific to Sciences

All members of this department support the formation of a Faculty of Science that would include Chemistry and Biochemistry. Our workload activities in Science are significantly different from our colleagues in the Social Sciences and Humanities. We operate research facilities that must be maintained and stocked with equipment/supplies/software etc. We are involved with substantial paperwork associated with safety. We teach 80% of the Independent Studies courses in AS and train 80% of the graduate students at UL, all of which involves direct, hands-on training and supervision involving complex manipulations and sophisticated equipment.

We are expected to maintain constant external funding, typically in the form of NSERC DG and are frequently applying for funding from other organizations. To obtain and maintain such funding, we must publish papers. Workload for faculty in the Sciences has long been a matter of concern. We compete for research funds with our peers at other institutions most of whom have substantially lower standard teaching loads than four courses per year (five courses prior to 2001). If we are to grow the graduate program and continue as a research intensive university, there must be some recognition that the non-teaching workload of science professors must be considered when making teaching assignments. These needs would be better understood and, we believe, accommodated within a Faculty of Science.

In spite of the fact that the Science faculty have so much in common in terms of needs and concerns, we do not meet as a group. Issues that are central to our operation are never discussed at AS Council. We used to meet, however, and when we did we made real progress. Early sabbaticals after three years and renovations to create suitable lab space came out of meetings in the early 90s. The move to a four course teaching load came out of a meeting of NSERC grant holders with the VPA in 2000. The development of the grad program was also spearheaded by the needs of the science faculty. And of course, the push to put up a suitable science research facility also came from the science faculty. When we have worked together as a cohesive group, we have made great strides in improving our competitiveness in the research endeavour and allowed us to transform this institution into one that is research intensive. We believe that as a Faculty of Science we will be better able to deal with the problems that threaten us now.

7. Department of Physics & Astronomy Response with Specific Recommendations

We the members of the Department of Physics and Astronomy, having attended the Faculty Restructuring presentations and reviewed documents that were circulated by the administration, provide below our feedback.

We understand the financial challenges that the University faces and appreciate the time and effort that the members of the senior administration have put in to formulate a restructuring plan in an effort to mitigate some of them. That said, we feel much of the proposed solutions belong to uncharted territory with scant evidence that they have a significant chance of success, based on established facts or otherwise. Au contraire, there exists examples, where “hybrid departments” or “merged departments” have been rife with academic, administrative, and interpersonal issues and in general such units tend to be unattractive to potential faculty members looking for a position creating issues with recruitment and retention. We are happy to discuss specific examples if the administration so desires.

It was mentioned in the presentation that one does not have the option of “doing nothing”, that there is advantage in the economy of scale, in aligning faculty and department/area support structures and in reducing the number of academics in leadership roles and keeping more faculty members engaged in core research and teaching activities. While these may be good ideas in principle, much of it is already in place. We already share our Administrative Support with other department(s) and our Chairs do an incredible job in running of the Department, over and above their regular teaching and research responsibilities. The course relief that they receive hardly compensates for this and is in fact less than that offered at most Canadian institutions.

A departmental Chair is completely knowledgeable in the field represented by the Department, and the expertise of the faculty members within it. It is practically impossible to have a Chair who has the necessary expertise in multiple fields or disciplines, and thereby be in a position to properly evaluate the performance of all members, e.g., in their PARs, in their STPs, in the ranking of Study Leave applications in a fair and equitable way and be of equal assistance to students of different majors. In the end, a few less Chairs across faculty would likely translate into a few less yearly course reliefs, surely a minor saving compared to the risks and uncertainty that it brings, especially in terms of student retention and enrolment growth.

Our departments and its members are known nationally and internationally for their research strengths, achievements, and training of students of the highest quality, and restructuring without compelling rationale will only put at risk the concrete gains that have been made over the years. We have not seen any concrete or even tentative plans to mitigate these potential issues, some of which will inevitably arise. Clearly, the fallout will affect the students in more ways than one, in the short, medium, and long run. In

summary, we believe that the restructuring proposal was not driven by academic considerations, and while it may bring in some short-term benefits, it may well cause irreversible and irreparable damage to the Departments, faculty and the institution and diminish the ability of our outstanding professors to deliver the programs that our students deserve. It also has the potential to damage the Departments, Faculties, and the University's national and international reputation.

As for specific suggestions, we have the following recommendations:

- That the Department of Physics and Astronomy retain its full identity. Our research capacity continues to grow steadily, and a disruption of its integrity will be detrimental to this progress.
- Our current teaching resources are already split three ways between Astronomy, Engineering and most of the subfields of Physics. We were also directly involved with Remote Sensing. Our department has been willing and eager for quite some time to co-design (and even co-teach) courses for different majors with members of other departments and suit it to the other majors. E.g., we have been willing to offer courses on Environmental Physics for the Environmental Science program, the Physics of Music and Physics of Gaming for the Faculty of Fine Arts, Introductory Neurophysics for the Neuroscience program to mention a few ways in which our department can enhance these programs and work with other units.
- The current Faculty of Arts and Science has served us well. However, we would probably function better within a new Faculty of Science.
- If a departmental merger is to happen then we must be directly involved from the very beginning. We need to be involved with the extent of the merger, how the merger is to take place, and with whom. It is important for everyone to understand how the resources are shared, how the administrative duties are shared, and how research and teaching resources are shared.
- Every discipline is different, and enrolment is not a metric for which one size fits all works. For example, in the Sciences the contact time with students is typically double most other disciplines because of the labs. That said, we are open and interested to discuss ways of increasing our enrolment, such as the introduction of micro-credentials. E.g. include Quantum Information and Technology, Entrepreneurship and Innovation, Experimental Techniques, Theoretical and Computational Techniques, Digital Electronics, Analogue Electronics, and Astronomy and Astrophysics.

We have envisioned many different multidisciplinary programs with other units at both the undergraduate and graduate level that would attract students and enhance several units.

E.g., include a Mathematical Physics program with Mathematics and Computational Science, a Quantum Computational Physics program with Mathematics and Computational Science, a Biophysics program with Biological Sciences and Chemistry and Biochemistry, a Medical Physics program to name a few.

We also note efforts within our department to obtain provincial approval of a four-year Engineering program at the U of L; this will certainly increase enrolment and advance our institutional funding and reputation. Finally, members of our department will continue to explore collaboration opportunities with the UofC and the UofA, as we foresee potential for such in the near future in quantum and other areas.

Many in the Department are worried about the approach to the restructuring and these new units. One size does not fit all and that should be recognized. A better approach might be better to start with smaller units and build up larger units by finding synergies rather than combine large groups and make them work together to fit inside a forced unit. Our department has always focused on how we compare with other Physics Departments in Canada and abroad. We have used this as our metric for our research and the quality of our programs. This produces a reputation that is respected both nationally and internationally.

We thank you for your consideration and remain for any assistance that may be required in these challenging times.

On behalf of the Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Lethbridge All department members signed.

8. Department of Art Response

- The proposed 5-Faculty model lacks clear description and direction and we do not see this proposal, nor the process it engages, as a viable path forward. It poses a significant disruption to the delivery of programs and curriculum across campus, and sidelines the strength and centrality of the Humanities, Social Sciences, and Fine Arts as core to our university's current structure, mission, vision, and identity (none of these areas are named in the current proposal).
- The proposed 5-faculty model does not provide a convincing or transparent cost savings analysis. For example, a reduction in the number of Deans by 2 (or by 1 in the case of a 6th faculty) would create negligible savings. Further, the cost-savings proposed by combining departments and thereby reducing the number of Chairs negates the detailed, operational, and essential role that Chairs play in governing. Reducing the number of Chairs will not yield the cost savings needed in this budget crisis, and the associated costs to the institution have not been adequately addressed. These include loss of disciplinary expertise, loss of institutional memory, disruption to timetabling and program planning, disruption of student services, diminished student advising, administrative confusion, increased break-down in communication, loss of unit autonomy resulting in diminished incentivizing for innovations in program growth and delivery. The notion that this work can be rolled into larger units with lower costs fails to recognize that without fair compensation, faculty motivation to serve in these roles will be reduced. Chairs currently bear the burden of the minutiae – these efforts are not without cost to those who conduct this work.
- Top-down and hasty decisions to merge departments would be harmful to their management and productivity, and the contemplation of such a move reveals a lack of appreciation of the intimate and evolving intersection of programs, degree streams, courses, facilities, agreements, policies, procedures, teaching and research practices, donors, community partners, and external networks of support. The sustained commitment by generations of scholars, artists, staff, and students to build a world-class institution would be significantly undermined. In academic institutions, successful restructuring efforts normally emerge from the ground-up through collegial governance and the creation of such favourable conditions as administrative and financial decentralization, or some hybrid thereof. These, paired with a system of rewarding units (departments, faculties, and schools) for envisioning and implementing successful growth initiatives, yields a culture of competition, innovation, responsibility, and efficiency.
- We are committed to engaging in a meaningful process where options for academic organization are presented and discussed, and we could emerge with a renewed vision of our university.
- We would also encourage a thorough review of administrative processes to ensure that we are efficiently run and are better able to serve our students. Student Registration services at the undergraduate and graduate level are particularly cumbersome leading to ongoing and significant frustration for students and faculty alike, despite, or perhaps because of, attempts to centralize these services. The increased presence and oversight of Risk and Safety Services is creating a fear-driven, inflexible institutional culture that is undermining academic and creative conversation, pedagogical innovation, community outreach and collaboration opportunities. We believe that these units are

disproportionately empowered and that their overreach is damaging to the healthy functioning of our institution.

- One matter that is frequently discussed but remains unaddressed, is the matter of workload equity among academic staff within the various faculties. That faculties differ in their standard assignment of teaching (with members of the Faculty of Arts and Science assigned 4 courses per academic year, and members of most of the other faculties assigned 5 courses), this unequal distribution of labour should be assessed and openly discussed across faculties. Standardizing the number of courses taught across campus to 5 would yield significant cost savings. This change alone calls into question the need to merge departments, which penalizes Chairs by increasing their workload, while clawing back course releases as workload compensation.
- The Faculty of Fine Arts is unique and highly regarded in the province of Alberta and in Canada with an established and stellar national reputation. It is recognized as a destination faculty for students of Art, Drama, Music and New Media, and makes significant artistic and academic contributions at the national and international levels. The current, independent structure of the Faculty of Fine Arts is central to the identity of the University of Lethbridge, and to lose that identity through absorption into a larger unit, would level a devastating blow to our institution.
- Each of the four departments in the Faculty of Fine Arts – Art, Drama, Music, and New Media – have evolved to become complex, productive, and efficiently run departments. The FFA offers dozens of degree programs with majors and minors, certificate programs, post-diploma programs, and combined degrees with faculties and departments across campus. The FFA has the third largest student population, and serves the university well by being public facing, community oriented, and by actively partnering with many cultural organizations and businesses in the city and region. The collegial and collaborative partnerships that exist among the sister departments in the FFA are well-established and highly valued. However – and this cannot be overstated – the four departments have vast philosophical, material, practical, and disciplinary differences. Merging any combination of the four Fine Arts departments into convenient couples would not work – functionally or conceptually. Each department is already well-managed and far-reaching in its scope and range of program offerings, facility needs, publicity needs, management needs, and research expertise.
- The Department of Art is comprised of three separate disciplinary units: Art Studio, Art History, and Museum Studies. At many Universities, these are structured as distinct departments, and our collaboration across quite different areas has been productive but not without challenges in terms of determining comparable workloads, etc. To add further distinct areas to the Department of Art would disrupt, for no clear benefit, the established structure which is currently serving students well.
- The Department of Art offers seven degree programs. They are: BFA – Art (Art Studio or Art History/Museum Studies Major); BFA – Art/BEd (Art Studio Major) [combined degree]; BFA – Indigenous Art (Art Studio or Art History/Museum Studies Major); BA – Art (Art Studio or Art History/Museum Studies Major); BA – Art/BEd (Art Studio Major) [combined degree]; MFA – Art (Art Studio Major); MA – Art (Art History / Museum Studies Major). The Department of Art also supports the following additional degree programs: BFA – Multidisciplinary Post-Diploma Degrees (Admission after a Two- or Three-Year Diploma). Each program offers unique pathways for students to realize their goals as artists, art historians, curators, leaders in the museum and art gallery sector, educators, arts administrators, arts managers, etc. within the discipline of Art. Our programs are widely recognized within a FFA framework and are supported by Fine Arts networks, donors, and infrastructure that have been nurtured and refined since the inception of the University. We fear the dilution of our programs and research expertise will inevitably follow the removal of a Fine Arts Faculty from the University of Lethbridge.

- If the Faculty of Fine Arts must be expanded, disciplinary synergies could productively be found between existing departments and newcomer departments. For instance, the Department of Art has a BFA stream in Indigenous Art (with majors in both Art Studio and Art History/Museum Studies) and given that we also have a CRC in Indigenous Art and Technology and a search for an Indigenous Art Studio tenure-track position in process, we could imagine a productive partnership with the Department of Indigenous Studies. This does not suggest a merger of the two departments (which would just cause unnecessary disruption and headaches), but an opportunity to solidify and explore cross-disciplinary development in Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion.
- Another possibility for cross-disciplinary development might be found through the inclusion of those departments that offer the MA and PhD programs in Cultural, Social, and Political Thought. These programs are based on a learning model that fosters an environment of interdisciplinary engagement and exchange, research, peer mentoring, and collaboration. The overall academic aims of the major are to emphasize a breadth and depth of social, cultural, and political thought and to instill the intellectual and practical tools to work successfully with community partners and agencies to facilitate social change. These same principles apply to the undergraduate and graduate programs in the Department of Art, and we already have a solid track-record of collaboration with these programs. Examples include UofL MFA – Art graduates who have gone on to become candidates in the PhD CSPT program; Art faculty supervisors and supervisory committee members in the MA and PhD CSPT programs; and MFA students who have completed CSPT course offerings. The Department of Women and Gender Studies, the Department of Sociology, and the Department of History would provide exciting opportunities for collaboration.
- Envisioning a faculty that is inclusive of the four departments in the Fine Arts in addition to a select number of departments from the Humanities and Social Sciences would usher in a significant change in institutional identity. A thoughtful and consultative rebranding exercise would be essential for ensuring the success of this new faculty structure.

9. Faculty Member of the Music Department Letter to the Provost

SUBJECT: Faculty Restructuring Survey DATE: 7 January, 2022

Dear Dr. E. Okine,

My underlying message is described by the first bullet point (below): The Faculty of Fine Arts should remain an independent faculty.

- The Faculty of Fine Arts (FFA) should remain an independent faculty

Examining the research-creation being conducted in the FFA, exclusively, is enough to illustrate a great capacity to "participate in formal or informal collaborative academic activities" (see survey, pg. 4) and, "conduct research with colleagues in other academic units" (see survey, pg. 5). The amount of collegial research-creation among the members of the four FFA departments is extensive and warrants this serious pronouncement: the Faculty of Fine Arts should remain an independent unit.

The reasons for this are threefold.

Firstly, the sheer quantity of performative research-creation produced by its members (scholar-artists and students) deserves a distinctive spotlight in the public eye; by distinctive, I mean that work in the FFA garners special attention from, and is taken more seriously by, community members and prospective students if the community understands the work to be generated from a group of members consolidated

into one unit. To merge, in name, with another faculty would diminish the capacity of the FFA to attract prospective students.

Secondly, a concern related to re-structuring is that members of another unit, whose specialty is detached from Fine Arts research-creation, would expect access privileges to high-tech resources in the FFA departments. This could potentially lead to a deterioration of the high-tech resources, if non-FFA members are granted access privileges. Please consider that the FFA is the home of arts-based research (ABR), which is fundamentally a "practice-based" form of research. ABR praxis requires specialised tools – the tools and the artwork become synonymous in some instances. Consequently, any misuse of FFA resources diminishes the quality of FFA specialised tools and diminishes the capacity to teach students.

The third reason for maintaining the Faculty of Fine Arts as an independent unit is the most important: scholar-artists who have an understanding and historical knowledge of content creation and practices involving the performative arts are the only people who should be associated with "Fine Arts". A naming system, which resembles "Fine Arts and X", incorrectly infers that members of X may also have artistic knowledge and performative expertise, or that the fine artists have knowledge of X. In short, this naming scheme, Faculty of Fine Arts and X (or the inverse), undervalues the rigorous ABR that occurs in the Fine Arts.

- Community engagement and outreach in the FFA are inherent

Collaboration on "community engagement and outreach with colleagues in other academic units" (See survey, pg. 6) is already robust and extensive in the FFA. In fact, community engagement is inherent in most of the artistic forms practiced in the FFA – it is our natural state; it is in our very nature to engage community. Moreover, community engagement and outreach are learning outcomes for FFA students. The focus on community is another reason why the FFA should remain an independent faculty. The combination of the FFA with another unit/faculty, whose specialty is detached from Fine Arts research-creation, would not enhance community engagement and outreach further. However, from the perspective of the Department of Music and the Digital Audio Arts, a stronger amalgamation with the Music Conservatory (Casa), which was founded by the teaching faculty in the Music Department, could increase community engagement and outreach. Furthermore, the young artists, who receive basic training at the conservatory, are naturally positioned to continue their musical development at ULethbridge. In addition, the music area of the Faculty of Education should consider the teaching opportunities that could be cultivated by a stronger integration between the Music Conservatory and the Department of Music (e.g., integrated learning).

- The FFA will always be a collaborative unit

A "plan to collaborate more (in teaching, learning, research, and/or community engagement)" [See survey, pg. 7] is sure – and absolute – for scholar-artists in the FFA. Just like community outreach and engagement (above), collaborating with other units is what we already do – it is our natural state; it is in our very nature to work as part of a collaborative unit. That is to say, it is the nature of the FFA scholar-artist to work with experts (scholars, researchers, industry specialists) from other sectors of society. A short list of these sectors includes: computer science (coding/programming), life sciences (e.g., neuroscience; medical research), cognitive sciences, Indigenous studies, literature, linguistics, agriculture, sociology, anthropology, ethnography, human-computer interaction, robotics, VR/AR/XR, communications technology.

For example, in 2018, I co-produced a SSHRC-funded (approx. \$80K) "Interactive Art, Science, and Technology" networking, research presentation, and performance event. We hosted over 70 specialised Fine Arts scholar-artists from thirteen different Western Canadian institutions at ULethbridge. Despite the diversity of Fine Arts disciplines represented at this event, we were united by the fact that collaboration

was central to our artistic practices. If ULEthbridge wants to maintain the integrity that comes from having liked-minded scholar-artists – artists united by their openness to collaborate and by their liberal education principles, then the FFA should remain an independent faculty and should not be tethered to any other unit. This collaborative worldview will be at risk if any other unit, whose specialty is detached from Fine Arts research-creation, is combined with the FFA.

- Maintaining an independent FFA will result in distinctive and positive metrics

An interdisciplinary skillset is coveted in both academic and industry milieus; this is exemplified in the often expanded Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (STEM), resulting in Science, Technology, Engineering, the Arts and Mathematics (STEAM). In the case of STEAM, the Fine Arts is included. A STEAM approach at ULEthbridge requires that the A (in STEAM) remains independent – its autonomy from other sectors/units is what distinguishes STEAM from STEM. As a result, this unique position among the other key sectors has a distinctive value that can be measured in society.

In short, the value of being able to work in an interdisciplinary fashion, which is central to the FFA, is measurable and can support ULEthbridge as it responds to any future constraints related to measurable programme outputs. For instance, as a Fine Arts practitioner, I maintain an interdisciplinary worldview; my particular expertise is integrating (1) classical music creation (as an industry content provider) with (2) innovative technology, which often originates from distant disciplines, ranging from biomedicine to avionics.

This year (2022-2023) is exemplary of this integration. I am at the centre of diverse projects: (1) I co-founded a new non-profit, entitled New Music LAB [Lethbridge, AB], for the promotion of new classical music in Southern Alberta, with support from The Canada Council for the Arts (nearly \$50K); (2) I am a leading musical creator/member in a expanded reality (XR) project at the Société des Arts Technologiques (Montreal), working with a satellite computer programming team from Mozilla (developers of the Firefox browser; global community of open-source developers). The distinctiveness of what I do hinges on my identity as an independent Fine Artist, whose interdisciplinary nature enables both normative research-creation practices and high-tech exploration – this is the value I bring to the collaborative team.

I believe the same attention to identity must be given to the FFA; the distinctiveness of the FFA, especially in the context of interdisciplinary collaboration, can only be maintained – and valued – if it remains an independent unit.

10. University-Wide Consultation Conducted by Craig Coburn

Methodology of Consultation:

The following response is part of a university-wide consultation that I conducted beginning in early December.

I assembled a group that comprised of all department chairs and coordinators from across the University. We began an email discussion based on focused questions that I derived to try to fill out the missing consultation. The group assembled on the agreement that it would engage without preconceived notions of outcomes. The questions were simple and were asked to resolve how they saw themselves, as senior academics, and leaders on this campus, in a new university structure. I also conducted a series of key-informant interviews with past Vice-Presidents, Deans (retired and current) of many different areas so that our thinking on this process could reflect the depth of experience present. I also interviewed leaders of the UL Student Union to gauge their concern for the future of this institution.

I was not able to get signatures from all faculty who participated. The missing signatures include faculty from the Fine Arts, Writing Centre, and notably the Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry and the Department of Physics and Astronomy. While all were included in every email exchange, their lack of familiarity with a group like this and general lack of trust - in these processes kept them silent but informed.

I have heard from some of the science department chairs and the concern is that they finally see something they want (Faculty of Science) and were refusing to sign the response included in this survey as they saw this as threatening their desire. They were active in the discussion. I have done the best that I can and accepted all changes suggested without alteration to reflect the views of faculty members. There was headway made with this group - it is, after all, this group that will ultimately either agree to or will reject any change. It is clear that they feel threatened, are exhausted, and are generally in very poor spirits. It is my responsibility to clearly reflect the reality of this attempt at consultation. Given enough time, it would have arrived at a structure that everyone could live with and may even have the effect of lifting spirits in an attempt to advance our university. Without this opportunity, the fear that this effort has all been futile pervades.

Response:

- The current restructuring model, in our opinion, may result in marginal savings with a real risk of further costs from rebranding and increased complication for our students. The Transformational Task Forces Faculty Structures review was clear that the most impactful cost savings would result from restructuring our curriculum and refocusing our institution on our Liberal Education foundation and modernizing administrative processes. We are committed to engaging in a meaningful process where options for academic organisation are discussed, options presented, and we could emerge with a renewed vision of our university to better serve our students and society.
- We are committed to engaging in processes that would see the expansion of instruction into the summer semesters and the revisioning of what we are able to offer students that is unique in the post-secondary arena in Alberta.
- In our opinion, the proposed 5-Faculty model lacks clear definition of intent and direction. It is presenting a finished structure without regard to how the existing academic expertise would be accommodated. Requesting that departments select one of the five faculties is building a structure to fit the problem rather than having the structure emerge. It is also confusing as we're told that names have not been finalized – but it is clear that the gross structure is decided. While we appreciate the need for financial savings, we are unsure how this model represents the greatest savings/least disruption model that we need in the near future. The proposed structure, while providing a more level number of faculty members per faculty, does not reflect best practices where administrative structures are created to deliver programs not the other way around. It may or may not achieve any efficiencies. We also can see little advantage in the critical areas of cost savings or program growth. Saving a few Deans/Associate Deans and Department Chair positions will not yield the cost savings needed and the associated costs to the institution have not been adequately addressed. This model has been presented as the only solution when many possible solutions exist.
- There has been little recognition of the detailed and critical work that Department Chairs and Coordinators must do to ensure the operation of the university. There has been discussion about the size of various faculties, but this approach lacks understanding of the key organisational and operational roles that Chairs and Coordinators perform in running our university. The notion that this work can be rolled into larger units for lower costs fails to recognize that without some form of compensation, faculty motivation to serve in these roles will be reduced and the work required to manage large departments is

prohibitive. We currently bear the burden of the minutiae – these efforts are not without cost to those who conduct this work. No focused consultation has been conducted with this key leadership group.

- Faculty members salaries represent the greatest budgetary line item. This is normal for any a knowledge-based enterprise. We are sure that a model exists within the institution that quantifies the procession of academic wage over career cycles and as we renew our faculty the costs associated with offering our programs to our students will (we expect) decrease over the next decade. Without proper financial modelling and transparency, it is difficult to accept that we have, as an institution, arrived at the point where we can no longer afford to pay faculty, even with budget cuts.

- Other models of faculty restructuring were not presented with any conviction. For example, merging the professional schools has not been investigated/presented. These faculties (Health Science, Education, and Dhillon School of Business) are small and have expensive programs. While merging various departments from Arts and Science into these units seems like a viable option – it does not acknowledge that the reason that Arts and Science is less expensive is that it has already attained a level of efficiency that may be lost if it were reorganized. We should be looking for models that allow students to pursue their interests without developing complicated methods of accounting for what faculty a student “belongs” to – this notion is counter to a Liberal Education philosophy.

- We think that the original Transformational Task Forces Faculty Structures analysis that points towards reworking the curriculum and reimagining the nature of the Liberal Education Requirement is a viable way forward. In the absence of a Financial Emergency, revision of core academic operations in a panic can result in irreparable damage to the institution on many fronts. We can engage in restructuring our operations without causing harm. We are not convinced that the vague notions of efficiencies and talk of synergies resulting from merged units has been given satisfactory investigation. A quick literature review shows that university restructuring is a recurring theme with variable success. A thorough investigation into the reasons for failure would seem prudent.

- A reimagined Liberal Education initiative would involve structuring our student experience around a new, but not untested, model of course delivery. Our School of Liberal Education has shown growth in offerings that seek to streamline lower-level course delivery and has proven efficient and popular with students. Such a model could be expanded to cover breadth requirements for our students and reduce the number of first-year offerings for non-majors. These programs are currently running at large U-15 Universities like the University of Toronto and the University of British Columbia. There are other innovations in student experience being offered by the University of Saskatchewan with a first-year research experience and the list goes on. When the larger universities in this country have identified that there are more efficient ways to offer quality undergraduate experiences, we should follow suit.

- We are missing opportunities to improve those things which we are better able to achieve than larger institutions. We cannot offer paler versions of the experiences offered at the University of Alberta. We are not the same style of institution and moves to transform this university into a similar academic structure does not identify the key ingredients that make the University of Lethbridge a desirable place for students and faculty. With significantly revitalized first-year structures we could realize better student retention and with subtle innovations like summer teaching opportunities or jump-start style programs, we could be offering 4-year degrees in less time than our competition and an increase in the total number of students graduating each year would reflect positively on the financial bottom line.

- The current administrative processes of our university are very expensive and difficult to navigate. We must move away from paper-based systems of signatures and meaningless processes that do nothing but cost money. For example, a graduate student must register three times per year. Most large universities realized that a single annual registration is adequate at a savings of 2/3 of the registration effort annually.

There is no reason to continue to be last. Students still cannot see what courses are offered next year which would allow them to better plan their program. They also have no way of registering for classes via their phones – we are at least 20 years behind other institutions.

- By reducing what we're offering but not changing the way that we operate, we will simply be the Less with Less university. This is a sad vision for our institution.

The response was signed by various faculty, many of which were department chairs or program coordinators. Of the 14 signatories, 3 also provided their own personal responses as individual academic staff. In addition, 6 of the signatories provided responses on behalf of their departments on consultation with their department.