



Cleveland State University

engagedlearning™

CSU 2.0 Academic Task Force

CSU 2.0 ACADEMIC TASK FORCE

FINAL REPORT

DRAFT

November 30, 2020

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary: Five Summary Recommendations.....	3
Introduction and Background.....	6
Reimagining CSU: General Observations.....	7
The Thirteen Issues: Community Feedback and Final Thoughts.....	11
Appendix A: The Recommendations, the Strategic Priorities and Metrics for Success....	27
Appendix B: Task Force and Working Group Membership.....	31

Executive Summary

Introduction

The CSU 2.0 Academic Task Force was charged to “develop a series of recommendations to better align academic programs, increase interdisciplinary collaboration, improve student outcomes, and reduce costs with a savings target of \$4.5 million.” More specifically, the Task Force was asked to consider 13 aspects of University structure, policy and practice that appeared to offer possibilities for heightened efficiency while also presenting opportunities to strengthen the University academically.

The Task Force’s Final Report, for which this Executive Summary serves as an introduction, includes 31 recommendations related to the 13 issues identified in our charge as well as several broader recommendations related to the CSU 2.0 planning process. This Summary includes a consolidated statement of the recommendations that bear most heavily on the challenge of reducing the University’s operating costs. The sources of the more detailed recommendations from the Final Report included in each of the following consolidated summaries are referenced in parenthesis at the end of each Summary Recommendation. For a discussion of how our recommendations support President Sands’ Statement of Strategic Priorities and how the implementation of our recommendations can be evaluated, please see Appendix A.

First Summary Recommendation

The Task Force embraces the central goal of CSU 2.0 as articulated by President Sands: to strengthen the University as an academic institution while achieving greater efficiency in our operations. We believe this means that, in looking for savings, priority should be given to areas of the budget that have the least negative impact on the student experience, especially with respect to pursuing academic interests and completing degrees. Concurrently, new investment priorities should be given to initiatives that enhance the student experience. (Final Report: General Observations)

Potential Savings: Estimates of potential aggregate savings from the two Summary Recommendations for which we were able to make them (Summary Recommendations 3 and 4), range from a low of \$1.5 million to a high of \$5.1 million, with most of the difference linked to the number of colleges and departments remaining after a restructuring of our academic units. More detail regarding these estimates is provided below. Some additional savings will be possible by pursuing Summary Recommendations 2 and 5 but, for reasons also summarized below, we have not attempted to estimate amounts in these two instances. We note, however, that precisely because our Task Force was asked to focus on the academic side of the

University, many of our recommendations, if not implemented with care, could have adverse effects on our students or on the scholarly work of the faculty. While we put forward these recommendations in good faith and in recognition of the pressures the University faces, we hope that campus leaders will look first outside the academic area for savings.

Second Summary Recommendation

In pursuing efficiencies within the academic area, priority should be attached to reducing costs for staff support through greater sharing of resources among units and greater collaboration among staff members currently serving different parts of the University. (Final Report: Issues 2, 3, 4, 11, 12)

Potential Savings: Although the Task Force identified a number of administrative areas where greater efficiency with respect to staff support may be possible, we did not make a detailed estimate of potential savings because we believe this work should be carried out collaboratively with the Administrative Task Force.

Third Summary Recommendation

There should be a review of current policies and practices with respect to the management of our course offerings, including but not limited to those related to minimum course enrollments, the numbers of general education courses offered by individual departments, and multi section courses. (Final Report: Issues 7, 8)

Potential Savings: Low Estimate: \$691,500; High Estimate: \$1,320,000

Fourth Summary Recommendation

Consideration should be given to realigning the current configuration of colleges, departments and schools. Our Final Report includes five possible reconfigurations and summarizes the benefits and concerns associated with each without specifically recommending any one of them. We do, however, propose the creation of a new College of Health Professions that would bring together the University's major programs in the health area. While we do not recommend any change in the structure of the Honors College, we do recommend consideration of expanding its impact through a more strategic deployment of scholarship dollars.

More broadly, we think that some form of realignment of the eight academic colleges, either one of the models suggested or a new combination of units, will be necessary to achieve major savings from the academic area. We stress that, in the time available to us, we have been able to conduct only a preliminary review of this matter and that additional analysis is needed before any final decision is made. In particular we stress that there are serious concerns with

any of the possible reconfigurations we have identified that need to be considered during the next stage of review, and we urge that the review process be transparent and consultative. (Final Report: Issues 1, 2, 3, 5)

Potential Savings: The savings arising from realignment will vary greatly depending on the extensiveness of the change. To illustrate the range of possibilities, we provide the following scenarios:

	Low Estimate	High Estimate
Closing 1 College:	\$795,000 (eliminating dean’s office)	\$1,266,000 (eliminate dean plus 5 depts.)
Closing 2 Colleges:	\$1,590,000 (eliminate two deans)	\$2,532,000 (eliminate 2 deans and 10 depts)
Closing 3 Colleges:	\$2,386,000 (eliminate three deans)	\$3,798,000 (eliminate 3 deans and 15 <u>depts.</u>)

Fifth Summary Recommendation

The parts of the University that support academic research—the libraries, the research office, the Graduate College—should not be exempt from the search for savings, but efficiencies in these arenas need to be pursued with an acute sense of the importance of scholarship and research to both our educational work and our reputation. In reviewing these areas we have identified places where savings may be possible but we also must protect (and if possible increase) investments that clearly strengthen the University. In short, support for research must be strategic and targeted and savings must be sought in places that do not harm high priority activities. (Final Report: Issues 10, 11, 12)

Potential Savings: As noted in the discussion of our Second Summary Recommendation above, we have not attempted to identify potential savings from staff support, including staff support for research, believing that this work should be done collaboratively with the Administrative Task Force. Beyond efficiencies related to staffing patterns, savings may be possible in support for individual research centers, and non-personnel budgets of the Graduate College and Office of Research, but specifying the magnitude of such savings—which we do not think will be large—will require a more fine grained analysis of current expenditures than has been possible for the Task Force.

The Final Report

Introduction

This Final Report summarizes the thinking of the CSU 2.0 Academic Task Force on the issues President Sands asked us to consider. It is informed by a careful review of the feedback we received in response to our Interim Report, which was distributed to all CSU faculty and academic support staff on September 14. The Task Force thanks everyone who read the Interim Report and shared their ideas with us. We were impressed that so many colleagues took the time to think carefully about the issues with which we have been wrestling.

This Final Report is divided into two major parts, which are preceded by a brief Background section summarizing our charge and reviewing the deliberative process we have followed. The first major part, titled “Reimagining CSU: General Observations,” includes comments on the CSU 2.0 planning process and on the specific issues identified in our charge. The second major part, “The Thirteen Issues,” contains more focused thoughts on those specific issues in light of the feedback we have received and our own further discussions.

Background

The Academic Task Force is one of five task forces established by President Sands during July 2020 to reimagine the future of Cleveland State University. The Task Force includes 13 faculty, administrators and students appointed by the President, who charged us to “develop a series of recommendations to better align academic programs, increase interdisciplinary collaborations, improve student outcomes and reduce costs with a targeted range of \$ 4-5 million.” To achieve these goals, the Task Force was asked to examine 13 issues:

- (1) Recommendations to realign/consolidate colleges, schools and departments (including Honors College)
- (2) Recommendations to restructure/realign support units within schools
- (3) Redefine Office of the Provost support to academic units
- (4) Opportunities to assess/reduce administrative costs
- (5) Opportunities to maximize multi-disciplinary connectivity by better aligning academic programs
- (6) Co-op experience-co-op classroom integration
- (7) Evaluate/realign course offerings
- (8) Maximize seat utilization
- (9) Assess workloads/incentives

-
- (10) Review/assess subsidized entities (centers and institutes)
 - (11) Reimagine libraries
 - (12) Review/assess Office of Research
 - (13) Major program and curriculum recommendations

Our work has included three phases: first, between late July and early September, proceeding through three Working Groups, we conducted an initial review of the 13 issues in our charge, produced the Interim Report, and created a website accessible to all CSU faculty and staff containing additional information about our deliberations; second, from September 14 to October 9, we sponsored a public comment period during which Task Force members met with colleges and departments to discuss the Interim Report and our website was available to receive written feedback from individuals and groups, an opportunity that resulted in 523 responses to our surveys and approximately 250 single-spaced pages of written comments; third, since October 9, we have reconsidered the 13 issues assigned to us in light of the feedback we have received and our own further thinking on these matters.

Reimagining CSU: General Observations

The CSU 2.0 Planning Process

The Task Force applauds the view, consistently articulated by President Sands, that a central goal of planning for CSU 2.0 must be to put the University in a position to strengthen our academic programs and scholarly work while also improving outcomes for our students. CSU faces significant challenges during the next several years, including financial challenges, and must seek ways to operate more efficiently even as we work to strengthen ourselves academically. The Task Force has appreciated the opportunity to participate constructively in the effort to identify practices, policies and innovations that can move the University forward in this demanding context.

The Task Force considered the specific topics assigned to us—potential restructuring of academic units, changes in current patterns involving class size and class schedules as well as faculty workload, and support for libraries and research activities—appropriate subjects for consideration in the CSU 2.0 planning process. At the same time, our work has underscored the reality that significant changes in University structures and policies, while undoubtedly essential given the realities we face, inevitably raise concerns among those affected by them. We have found it difficult to identify major changes in the structure of colleges and departments that would readily achieve broad agreement. We do not conclude from this outcome that changes should not be made, but we do conclude that they should be approached with care and through a consultative process that allows appropriate time for consideration of difficult issues within units, as well as structured opportunities for relevant stakeholders to be heard.

We have done our best to think carefully about the issues we were asked to consider and to solicit feedback from the campus community with regard to our ideas. But in the time available to us—less than four months during a period when the University was beginning classes in the midst of a pandemic—we have been able to conduct only a preliminary review of the issues identified in our charge and to identify possibilities that need additional analysis and discussion before changes can actually be implemented. We therefore recommend that, as the CSU planning process moves forward, the ideas presented in this report be subjected to further consideration through a process characterized by transparency, deliberation and consultation.

In formulating our recommendations, we kept the potential impact of possible changes on our students as our most important consideration, and we urge that University leaders also give priority to this principle as the CSU 2.0 planning process moves forward.

Finally, we wish to acknowledge that the Academic Task Force is only one of five CSU 2.0 task forces. We have dealt solely with issues, policies and structures related to academic programs and scholarly activities. Other task forces are focused on the administration of the University, diversity and inclusion, athletics, and growth and innovation. The goal of all this work, which we heartily endorse, is to examine every part of CSU in the search for the most beneficial changes. We urge the University's leaders to make sure the insights of all five task forces are part of the ongoing campus-wide discussion of our future.

The Challenge of Restructuring

No issue the Task Force has discussed has aroused more concern within the faculty than restructuring our colleges and departments. This is perhaps not surprising since these structures have a large impact on faculty members' professional identities as well as their day-to-day circumstances. These structures also influence the position of individuals and units in the University's governance processes.

The Task Force was charged with considering four potential benefits of modifying the current organizational structures of our academic units, especially at the college level: (1) Fostering interactions among departments and programs that focus on similar issues; (2) Enhancing CSU's visibility and reputation in the world beyond the University; (3) Improving the balance among the colleges with respect to size; (4) Reducing operating costs.

With respect to fostering inter-disciplinary interactions, our deliberations have led us to believe that there can indeed be benefits from structural change—programming related to health care seems to us the clearest case for benefits—but we also learned that a great deal of cross disciplinary collaboration is happening within current structures, so we caution against overstating the benefits of structural change in this regard.

It is harder for us, as faculty, to assess the benefits of restructuring in improving the University's visibility—our “brand”—in the world beyond CSU; we can be fairly confident in predicting how various structures would be viewed by academic colleagues around the country, but less clear when it comes to non-academic constituencies. We do understand that the way we organize ourselves into colleges contains messages about who we are and what aspects of our work we want to make especially visible.

College size also merits serious discussion. If we think of size in terms of numbers of faculty, CSU's current organization, with some large colleges and some small ones, creates asymmetries with respect to governance participation and the role of deans. More parity in this context makes practical sense. But there are other ways to think about size, for example in terms of students or student credit hours generated and thought needs to be given to the definition in considering realignment. Whatever the definition, fewer colleges would reduce the number of deans' offices and almost certainly yield savings, though by our estimates the numbers would not be large, probably in the \$1 to \$2.3 million range annually depending on the number of colleges post realignment. Fewer colleges would also mean fewer faculty required for many committees but implicit in this would be reduced diversity of disciplinary representation in University governance.

Balanced against the benefits of restructuring must be concerns about potentially negative consequences of this kind of change. As the discussion of our specific recommendations in the next major section will highlight, we found it difficult to identify reconfigurations that don't stir opposition in some part of the faculty, and some of the possibilities we suggested in our Interim Report aroused passionate dissent.

Some members of the faculty expressed concern about the pedagogical consequences of restructuring. Some worried that students would be confused by this kind of change or that enrollments would decline. Some feared an impact on the University's mission or the reputation of particular units or our ability to attract external support. Beyond these apprehensions, any significant restructuring will entail a great deal of administrative work and some additional costs, for example redoing college bylaws and governance arrangements, restructuring personnel committees and procedures, and redesigning websites, printed materials describing the colleges and even external signage.

We come away from our discussion of restructuring both intrigued by potential benefits this could yield and chastened by the complexity of accomplishing such a change. As the CSU 2.0 process continues, we urge University's leaders to proceed cautiously and to carefully and realistically assess both potential gains and likely drawbacks of structural realignment. If the possibility of structural change at the college level is to be given further consideration, we urge

that it continue to be done through the same transparent, consultative and deliberative process we have employed during initial planning.

The Search for Greater Efficiency

The Task Force found widespread support for the goal of improving the efficiency of our operations. Faculty and staff understand that resources are constrained and likely will become more so in the period ahead. At the same time, we were impressed by the differences among University's academic programs and the difficulty of making generalizations about efficiencies that apply equally across units. Thus, with respect to policies governing class size, course caps, multi-section courses, the number of general education courses offered by individual departments, and course load reductions for administrative work, we found both a general understanding that University-wide policies are necessary and a caution about one-size-fits-all approaches. Programs in instrumental music, laboratory science, social science and studio art all pose different challenges. Guidelines about their operations need to be designed thoughtfully, in consultation with affected units, and administered in a way that allows for variation among departments.

One somewhat unexpected finding is that there appears to be significant variation across the University with respect to enforcement of current policies related to program management and patterns of awarding course load reductions for administrative work. Our recommendations regarding the importance of enforcing policies on course minima produced expressions of surprise from units that think such policies are currently in place. We believe consistency across the University with respect to these kinds of policies as well as uniformity of enforcement would go a long way to promoting trust between the faculty and the administration.

Career Preparation and Experiential Learning

We found widespread support for student experiences, in and out of the classroom, that promote readiness for careers but considerable opposition to mandating a single approach to achieving this goal. For example, we found little support for a University-wide requirement with respect to co-ops, internships or capstone experiences but widespread appreciation of the value of these opportunities.

Support for Research and Libraries

The Task Force strongly affirms the importance of the Graduate College, the Research Office and the library in supporting the scholarly activities of faculty across all parts of the University. Faculty must do research to get tenure, but research also is necessary for faculty to stay current and advance in their subject areas and attract enrollment. Our students, especially our

graduate students, are also engaged in research, and supervising that work requires that faculty have a firm grasp of the state of their fields. We recognize that CSU is not a rich institution and that support for research, graduate education and libraries must be strategic and targeted, but, if we are to succeed as a university, support must also be as generous as possible.

The Thirteen Issues: Community Feedback and Final Thoughts

Issue 1. Realign/consolidate colleges, schools, and departments (including Honors College)

Preliminary Recommendation

The Task Force's Interim Report presented five possible realignment scenarios involving the eight academic colleges (excluding the Honors College, which we thought should not be realigned, and the Graduate College). The five scenarios were put forward as possibilities to be considered, not as recommendations. Three proposed six colleges, two proposed five colleges. It was noted from the outset that the Cleveland Marshall School of Law and the Monte Ahuja College of Business would most likely not be realigned. While the Interim Report recommended against realigning the Honors College, it did propose the possibility of reducing scholarships in order to provide additional support for a larger number of Honors students.

Feedback on the Preliminary Recommendation

The Task Force received voluminous feedback on Issue 1, including 121 online responses from full-time faculty to our survey on this issue. We received no negative feedback on our recommendation regarding the Honors College. There was general agreement about creating a college focused on health care. Beyond these two matters, none of the five possible reconfigurations met with overall support. In some cases, one college found a proposed "merger" acceptable but the proposed partner in the merger did not. Similarly, proposals for some schools/departments to separate from one college to join another were acceptable to some but not to others. The proposed departmental mergers caused much consternation and some respondents suggested that this issue be addressed later, after the basic plan for college realignment is decided.

Final Recommendations

Consider leaving the Honors College as is but redistributing scholarship monies; also consider using scholarships more strategically, for example to recruit outstanding students.

Consider creating a College of Health Professions (actual name to be determined) that includes Health Sciences programs, Nursing, and those programs in Health and Human Performance that

align with the disciplines in the new college. Undertake further analysis and consultation with respect to the possibility of adding Social Work and Counseling Psychology to this college.

Consider leaving the College of Law as a freestanding unit but insist that it develop strategies to improve its enrollment and fiscal performance.

Consider leaving the College of Business as a freestanding unit but adding the Department of Economics and the Sports Management Program.

Beyond the above four recommendations, the Task Force has found it difficult to identify reconfigurations of the colleges that reduce the current number without stirring significant concerns among some parts of the faculty. This is not to say that a reconfiguration would not make sense for CSU; rather, it is to say that there are costs as well as benefits to any of the comprehensive reconfigurations we have been able to identify in the time available to us. Substantial additional analysis and consultation will be needed before arriving at a final decision on this matter.

Discussion of departmental mergers should be undertaken once plans for realignment at the college level are solidified with a goal not to have departments of fewer than 15 faculty, but also to avoid making departments too large. We recognize that some units will remain small due to their complex nature, e.g., the Dept. of Theatre and Dance.

To illustrate the complexity of constructing a comprehensive reconfiguration of the colleges, we provide below five possibilities that we believe have merit but which also present significant challenges. We are persuaded that some form of these potential reconfigurations, as proposed or in some combination, is necessary to realize real cost savings, although in each case there would be concerns among some affected units that would need to be addressed during the next phase of planning.

We note that none of the possibilities listed below is exactly the same as any of the five included in our Interim Report. This reflects our careful weighing of the feedback we received from the faculty during the public comment period, as well as our continued reflection on and discussions about possible configurations.

Alternative One: Five Colleges

1. College of Health Professions: Health Sciences, Nursing, Health and Human Performance
2. College of Business: Add Department of Economics and Sports Management Program
3. College of Law

4. College of Liberal Arts, Social Sciences, Urban Studies and Education & Human Services

5. College of Science, Technology, Engineering and Math

Benefits:

- This reconfiguration incorporates the College of Health Professions and the expanded College of Business and preserves the autonomy of the College of Law.
- This reconfiguration significantly reduces the number of colleges and therefore maximizes potential savings.
- A College of Liberal Arts, Social Sciences, Urban Affairs and Education eliminates two small colleges and achieves greater balance among the colleges in terms of size. This college has the potential for promoting heightened interactions between urban studies and allied academic disciplines as well as with an education program that has an urban emphasis.

Concerns:

- A College of Liberal Arts, Social Sciences, Urban Affairs and Education and Human Services increases the already widely distinct programs currently in CLASS. The faculty from Urban Affairs expressed concern that realignment into a college this large might negatively impact external funding, top national rankings, enrollment and branding of their programs.
- The faculties from both Sciences and Engineering expressed concern that this realignment might negatively impact external funding, PhD programs, and branding of their programs.

Alternative Two: Six Colleges

1. College of Health Professions: Health Sciences, Nursing, Social Work, Health and Human Performance

2. College of Business: Add Department of Economics and Sports Management Program

3. College of Law

4. College of Urban Affairs, Social Sciences and Education: Urban Studies, School of Communication, Dept. of Sociology, Anthropology and Criminology, and College of Education and Human Services Depts. not moved out to other units.

5. College of Arts and Sciences: School of Communications, Dept. of Sociology, Anthropology and Criminology and the School of Social Work leave CLASS

6. College of Engineering

Benefits:

- This reconfiguration has the same benefits with respect to Health Professions, Business and Law as Alternative One.
- A College of Arts and Sciences is a widely used model of academic organization in major American universities; creating one avoids the difficulties associated with linking Science with Engineering.
- This reconfiguration has the same benefits with respect to Urban Affairs, Social Sciences and Education as Alternative One.

Concerns:

- The College of Arts and Science split 16 years ago, a faculty-led action. Not all faculty would support this configuration. This would create a large college though its size would be somewhat mitigated by CLASS losing the Schools of Communication, School of Social Work, Department Economics, and Department of Criminology, Anthropology and Sociology and COSHP losing the School of Health Sciences.
- The faculty from Urban Affairs expressed concern that a merger with Education might negatively impact external funding, top national rankings, enrollment and branding of their programs.

Alternative Three: Six Colleges

1. College of Science, Nursing, and Health Professions: COSHP plus Nursing and aligned programs from Health and Human Performance
2. College of Business: Add Dept. of Economics and the Sports Management Program
3. College of Law
4. College of Urban Affairs, Education and Human Services and Social Science: School of Communications, Dept. of Sociology, Anthropology and Criminology join from CLASS
5. College of Liberal Arts: School of Social Work remains; School of Communications, Dept. of Sociology, Anthropology and Criminology move to LCUA and Dept. of Economics moves to Business
6. College of Engineering

Benefits:

- This reconfiguration has the same benefits with respect to Business and Law as Alternatives One and Two.

-
- This reconfiguration has the same benefits with respect to interactions between Urban Affairs, the Social Sciences, and Education as Alternatives One and Two.
 - This reconfiguration could promote heightened interactions between the Sciences and the programs in the proposed new College of Health Professions.

Concerns:

- Adding Nursing to COSHP increases the size of the college, which is already one of the largest in the University. Possible future expansion of the new College of Health Professions by the addition of new health programs would enlarge it further. Keeping Health Professions and the Sciences combined could dilute some of the branding benefits of creating a new College of Health Professions.
- This reconfiguration has the same difficulties with respect to Urban Affairs and Education as Alternatives One and Two.
- This configuration keeps Social Work in CLASS. Analysis of whether removing Social Work from CLASS, where they are willing to remain, should be done. If Social Work remains in CLASS, then efforts to enhance cross-college collaborations with the College of Health Professions will need to be instituted.

Alternative Four: Six Colleges

1. College of Health Professions; Health Sciences, Nursing, Health and Human Performance
2. College of Business; Add Department of Economics and Sports Management Program
3. College of Law
4. College of Urban Affairs and Social Sciences; School of Communications, Dept. of Criminology, Anthropology and Sociology join Urban.
5. College of Liberal Arts, Education and Human Services; With the School of Social Work
6. College of Science, Technology, Engineering and Math; Includes Psychology

Benefits:

- This reconfiguration has the same benefits with respect to the Colleges of Health Professions, Business and Law as Alternatives One and Two.
- This reconfiguration would be acceptable to both Urban Affairs and the Social Sciences and would promote synergies between these units while preserving Urban's value with respect to CSU's brand as an urban university.

Concerns:

- The faculties from both Sciences and Engineering expressed concern that this realignment might negatively impact external funding, PhD programs, and branding of their programs.
- The faculty from Education consider themselves social scientists and do not feel well aligned with the arts.
- Even with the addition of the School of Communication and the Dept. of Sociology, Anthropology and Criminology, Urban Affairs and Social Sciences remains a very small college (~55 faculty). [Political Science faculty align with the Humanities rather than with Urban Affairs.] Anthropology may consider remaining with the College of Arts, Education and Human Services. CLASS faculty express pedagogical concerns about splitting some Social Sciences from the Humanities.

Alternative Five: Seven Colleges

1. College of Health Professions; Health Sciences, Nursing, Health and Human Performance
2. College of Business; Add Dept. of Economics and Dept. of Sports Management
3. College of Law
4. College of Urban Affairs, Social Sciences and Education and Human Services; Urban Studies, School of Communication, Dept. of Sociology, Anthropology and Criminology, and College of Education & Human Services depts. not moved out to other units.
5. CLASS: School of Social Work remains.
6. College of Science; includes BGES, Chemistry, Physics, Math, and Psychology
7. College of Engineering and Technology

Benefits:

- This reconfiguration has the same benefits with respect to Health Professions, Business and Law as Alternatives One and Two.
- This reconfiguration has the same benefits with respect to potential synergies between Urban Affairs, the Social Sciences, and Education as Alternatives One, Two and Three.
- This reconfiguration is seen by many faculty as far less disruptive than the other four alternatives.

Concerns:

- Faculty from Urban Affairs are open to merging with the Social Science departments listed but expressed concern that a merger with Education might negatively impact external funding, top national rankings, enrollment and branding of their programs. Education, identifying as social science, feels well aligned with Urban Affairs.
- This configuration keeps Social Work in CLASS. Analysis of whether removing Social Work from CLASS, where they feel well aligned, should be done. If Social Work remains within CLASS, then efforts to enhance cross-college collaborations with the Health Professions will need to be instituted.

Issue #2: Restructure/realign support units within academic units

Preliminary Recommendation

We did not make recommendations with respect to support units, noting the existence of an Administrative Task Force. The complexity of support staffing in some colleges requires an in-depth analysis of functionality and restructuring of support staff would be dependent upon college realignment, which is as yet unknown. We noted, too, with recent recurring budget cuts, support staff is already lean in some units.

Final Recommendation

Administrative staffing decisions should be made once plans for realignment are solidified. Efforts should be made to find savings and efficiencies across all academic support units.

Issue #3: Redefine Office of the Provost support to academic units

Preliminary Recommendation:

We recommended consideration be given to having two Vice Provost positions: a V.P. for Faculty Affairs and a V.P. for “Academic Affairs” (title to be determined). We also recommended consideration be given to integrating Performance Management into Academic Affairs, which would necessitate a realignment of resources to support this function in the Provost’s office. It was noted that cutting V.P. positions from three to two leaves no room for unexpected expansions of tasks, e.g., the current pandemic.

Feedback on Preliminary Recommendation

There is agreement on reducing the number of V.P.s in the Provost's office.

Final Recommendation

Reducing V.P. positions from three to two in the Provost's Office and integrating Performance Management into this office should be considered, with the caveat that there is the potential for unexpected tasks being assigned to arise, e.g., the extensive effort to curb cheating in online classes. The reduction to two V.P. positions would not be possible if a decision is made to assign the Dean's responsibility for the Graduate College to the Office of the Provost.

Issue #4 Opportunities to assess/reduce administrative costs

Preliminary Recommendation

We reiterated the concerns raised with Issue #2 with respect to opportunities only presenting themselves once a realignment strategy is adopted. We noted there would be eventual savings by reducing the number of deans and dean's offices. Likewise reducing the number of departments within colleges would produce modest savings, e.g., chair/director stipends. We recommended the removal of what we termed the "Golden Parachute," which allows senior administrators to maintain 80% of their salaries when returning to a faculty position. Over time this would result in a substantial reduction in administrative costs.

Feedback on Preliminary Recommendation

There is agreement on eliminating the Golden Parachute. It was also suggested that reducing the number of departments could lead to a reduction in revenues.

Final Recommendation

The Golden Parachute for senior administrators returning to the faculty should be eliminated.

Issue #5: Opportunities to maximize multi-disciplinary connectivity by better aligning academic programs

Preliminary Recommendation

We noted that within the five alternative reconfigurations presented in our interim report there were opportunities for enhanced interaction among disciplinary groups, as could be achieved by combining all professional health programs in a single college.

Feedback on Preliminary Recommendation

The idea that a realignment will bring about greater interdisciplinary work or create synergies is not convincing to many of our respondents. Many hold the view that such cooperative efforts are the result of interested faculty coming together. This is already occurring among faculty from different colleges and disciplines and many are not convinced reorganizing disciplines into

new administrative structures will greatly [or even] enhance the interdisciplinary work already in existence.

Issue #6: Co-op experience and co-op classroom integration

Preliminary Recommendation #1: Consider the recommendation of Careers Across the Curriculum to introduce a Career Development Capstone requirement, to be taken near the end of a student's major study, which would have an extensive orientation to workforce entry.

Summary of Feedback: Faculty were generally supportive of the idea of career preparation for our students, but many expressed concerns about having a capstone requirement to advance this goal. Many units reported that they already had career preparation components embedded in their curricula and did not want a solution prescribed from above on a goal they had already addressed. There were consistent concerns that requiring a capstone would hamper flexibility in the curriculum.

Final Recommendation #1: Add Professional Preparation as a General Education skill area, like the recently added Civic Engagement category. Where appropriate, pre-existing career development courses can be thus identified and highlighted as such. As appropriate to their discipline, academic programs should add coursework (either within courses or as separate courses) with career development content. Embedding career preparation in coursework, as appropriate for each discipline, can provide professional development experience so that students who are interested in internship and employment opportunities are ready to pursue them and succeed in them.

Preliminary Recommendation #2: Review the Community Engagement General Education proposal as a possible vehicle to implement the potential Capstone from Careers Across the Curriculum or to institute an internship or co-op experience.

Summary of Feedback: Faculty did not express opposition to linking career preparation to community engagement. In a similar spirit, many units expressed support for experiential learning, but had substantial concerns about treating an internship or co-op as the primary vehicle for that learning. All responders were adamant that we should not require an internship experience, as that would conflict with the family and work schedules for some of our students and slow progress to graduation.

Final Recommendation #2: Instead of requiring every student to have an internship, require every major to offer internships as an elective option. In tandem with this curricular development, provide University support at the college and department levels for increasing internship activity, including connectivity with employers, workload credit for faculty

overseeing internships, permission for a zero-credit internship course option, and other steps to facilitate the logistics of this process. This plan is intended to work in tandem with Recommendation #1 to provide students additional professional preparation within their majors.

Issue #7: Evaluate/realign course offerings and #13 major program and curriculum recommendations

Preliminary Recommendation: Review the number of general education courses offered on the schedule that meet the same general education requirement to see if the courses are enrolling efficiently.

Summary of Feedback: Most of the comments seem to support review of the general education classes, though the suggestion was that this review take place at a University level rather than at a departmental level. There were some concerns raised about classes in Music and how some of these curriculum changes would impact music students.

Final Recommendation: No change to recommendation. Discussion was limited to SEM (Seminar) and LEC (Lecture) courses. Discussion, as it relates to Music, should be pursued between the Department, Dean's office and Provost's Office.

Issue #8: Maximize seat utilization

Preliminary Recommendation #1: Have strict scrutiny on courses that do not meet course minima.

Summary of Feedback: Many of the comments were specifically from departments that were already attempting to strictly follow these guidelines, and hence, did not understand why they were not being followed. One suggestion is to consider paying part-time faculty to teach low-enrolled classes, although this may conflict with the Collective Bargaining Agreement. Some respondents worried that we may lose students if classes are canceled.

Final Recommendation #1: To provide context to our discussion, the Working Group felt that some individuals providing feedback didn't realize that in small programs these types of enrollment situations are a chronic problem. If small classes must continue, we need to be vigilant on scheduling practices. We also understand that there will always be exceptions. Hence, we suggest no changes to this recommendation.

Preliminary Recommendation #2: Look to optimize the number of sections for multi-sectioned courses. In Fall 19, 90 distinct courses had more than 3 sections being offered. This accounted for 630 different sections.

Summary of Feedback: The few comments that were received were supportive of this recommendation.

Final Recommendation #2: The Task Force recommends no changes to this recommendation.

Preliminary Recommendation #3: Look at course caps. There are significant differences in the caps for many courses. We understand caps are put in place for pedagogical reasons, including accreditation and physical space limitations. But, in many instances, differences in caps exist for the same courses. This needs to be examined further.

Summary of Feedback: Concerns were raised regarding increasing course caps. Some suggested establishing course caps according to national standards. Others suggested avoiding a “one-size-fits-all” approach to this issue.

Final Recommendation #3: The Task Force understands that the need for faculty to provide feedback to students, especially in online courses, makes course caps necessary. While there are instances where face-to-face classes had much higher caps than online classes, we felt that at a time the University is dealing with the challenges of COVID 19, we should eliminate this recommendation.

Preliminary Recommendation #4: Have course minima for lab courses.

Summary of Feedback: While there were not many comments related to this recommendation, the few comments were supportive.

Final Recommendation #4: No change to the recommendation.

Issue #9: Assess workloads/ incentives

Preliminary Recommendation #1: Normally, implement a 7-credit ceiling on unfunded research in workload assignments.

Summary of Feedback: Of all of the workload proposals, this produced the most negative response. While relatively few faculty have a workload assignment that would be affected by this recommendation (31, according to our Working Group’s calculations), there was consistent concern that this recommendation would send a message to faculty, and potential faculty

during recruitment, that CSU is de-emphasizing research, which is a vital part of our local and national profile. Faculty from units where funding is difficult to secure felt specifically that their research would be de-valued by this recommendation and would harm morale.

Final Recommendation #1: Implement a 7-credit ceiling as the normal maximum for unfunded research credit in workload assignments. Faculty and chairs may make a case for an exception to that ceiling, but that exception must be approved by the Dean and Provost, as currently done in most units.

Preliminary Recommendation #2: Assess the amount of credit assigned to faculty for departmental administrative service and align it more carefully to reflect department size and need.

Summary of Feedback: Feedback on this proposal was somewhat divided. Some units reported support for this recommendation but were concerned that it must be implemented fairly across the University. A large number of responses pointed out that in a time of reduced staff support, faculty are working harder to cover administrative tasks, and that course releases are a highly cost-effective incentive for this work. Faculty were particularly concerned that student-facing service work (advising, mentoring, etc.) might suffer if releases are reduced.

Final Recommendation #2: As college realignment is being implemented, faculty, chairs, and deans will work together to assess and specify the amount of workload credit assigned to support administrative service in their new units, based on both unit size and specific administrative needs.

Preliminary Recommendation #3: Assess course releases for administrative service outside of departments and schools, including those for Faculty Senate officers, committee chairs, and broader University initiatives.

Summary of Feedback: Feedback on this recommendation was similar to responses to Preliminary Recommendation #2. Respondents were not opposed to the idea of “assessing” these releases but were concerned that reductions could hamper vital governance work or key initiatives.

Final Recommendation #3: Faculty Senate and Deans should work with the Provost to assess and specify the amount of workload credit assigned to support leadership and administrative service for Faculty Senate Officers, College and University Committee Chairs, and other positions linked to key governance work and University initiatives.

Issue #10: Research centers and institutes

Preliminary Recommendation #1: Continue to invest strategically in centers that show the most promise of success in obtaining external funding.

Preliminary Recommendation #2: Assess cost-neutral or moderate-return centers to determine if smaller institutional investments or pitches to external donors (e.g., foundations, private donors) might leverage growth. Those that are cost-neutral should be retained but deprioritized relative to moderate return centers for such interventions.

Preliminary Recommendation #3: Centers that are defunct or have been inactive for five or more years should be removed from CSU webpages such as the list on the Office of Research page, and care should be taken to ensure that those that are active demonstrate their activity on their respective websites or pages.

Summary of Feedback: Feedback received by the Task Force in response to the above three recommendations was largely positive. The majority of respondents favored all three recommendations. Feedback was most favorable toward Recommendations #1 and #3. The most variable response was to Recommendation #2, with nearly one-third expressing a neutral stance and just over half favoring.

Final Recommendations:

The Task Force recommends going forward with all three preliminary recommendations.

The report from our Working Group noted that not all centers and institutes were included in their analysis, since some directors did not respond to our questionnaire. Further, the Working Group did not send the questionnaire to all Directors, either because we were not aware of their centers/institutes or their centers/institutes were not listed on the Office of Research webpage. This latter group includes, but may not be limited to: Center for Educational Leadership; Center for Excellence in Education; Community Learning Center for Children and Youth, STEMM Education Center at CSU; Center for Educational Technologies and the Confucius Institute. Because of these omissions we have added a fourth recommendation regarding to Issue #10:

Recommendation #4: The centers that were not reviewed by our Working Group should be assessed as the CSU 2.0 process moves forward. Moreover, as with the centers we have reviewed, any investment/cost-share for these entities should be assessed as to alignment with CSU priorities and return on investment.

Issue #11: Reimagine libraries

Preliminary Recommendation #1: Leverage and enhance collaborative relationships between the main and law libraries to improve student and faculty success and create opportunities for efficiencies.

Preliminary Recommendation #2: Continue the review of main library staffing and budget necessary for meeting the needs of students and faculty. Consider maintaining staffing level and materials budget at the main library and investing in strategic resources.

Preliminary Recommendation #3: Create and formalize collaboration between the main library and the Office of Research (or its reimagined successor) to make decisions about research-oriented memberships and subscriptions.

Preliminary Recommendation #4: Continue the review of law library staffing and budget necessary for meeting the needs of students and faculty. Consider maintaining staffing level and materials budget at the law library and investing in strategic resources.

Preliminary Recommendation #5: Obtain a systematic evaluation through OCLC Worldshare of main library collection to guide future collection decision-making, including additions when funding allows.

Summary of Feedback:

Feedback received on these recommendations was largely positive or neutral. A large majority of survey respondents favored Recommendations #1 and #2. The remaining recommendations received largely neutral or positive ratings, with few or no negative responses, indicating a lack of controversy. Several comments received through the survey and reports from colleges indicated a need to bolster the library's collection to allow CSU to maintain its position as a student-centered research institution. New feedback from the library indicates that OCLC Worldshare assessment may not be the best option for a systematic review of the collection, given the price quote and reviews by other universities.

Final Recommendations:

The Task Force recommends adopting recommendations #1-#4. Broadly, we advise maintaining current support for the library while continuing to search for efficiencies in a digital world and through collaborations between the law and main libraries, between the Office of Research and the main library, and between CSU libraries and external institutions, such as other universities in the region. We want to emphasize that the purpose of Preliminary Recommendation #3, regarding collaboration between the main library and the Office of Research in making decisions about memberships and subscriptions, is intended to facilitate the involvement of faculty in these decisions. Finally, we are adding a new fifth recommendation as follows:

Final Recommendation #5: Consider shifting the focus of collection evaluation efforts from what other libraries hold to what our own faculty and students need, as determined by faculty and student feedback.

Issue #12: Office of Research

Preliminary Recommendation #1: Consider merging the Office of Research with the Graduate College under the leadership of a Dean for Research and Graduate Studies. This would be only a variation in title from the organization of CSU circa 2005.

Preliminary Recommendation #2: Consider hiring an Associate Dean for Research in line with the current Associate Dean for Graduate Studies (of the Graduate College).

Preliminary Recommendation #3: In conjunction with the merger, consider streamlining and consolidating the combined staffing of the two offices, including combining some support staff duties with those of an analogous position in another unit. Maintain enough regularly funded positions to support the work of these two offices because funds-available positions could disappear.

Preliminary Recommendation #4: Explore the return on investment for the budget allocated to travel, institutional memberships, subscriptions, and a research magazine.

Summary of Feedback

Written feedback was not individualized on each recommendation. Feedback focused predominantly on the general recommendation of merging the Graduate College with the Research Office. There were a few instances of support for a merger, but more instances conveyed concern that a merger reflected a return to the past. Concern was specifically raised that a merger could reduce the support that faculty need in grant proposal and research project development, industry connections, and working across disciplines, as well as support for undergraduate research. With respect to the online survey, the predominant response was neutral for individualized recommendations other than the merger. More were strongly opposed than strongly in favor, but even more were in favor, with roughly 1/3 choosing neutral. Combining both written and survey results suggests a merger is not supported at this time.

Final recommendations:

Given the feedback, we rescind our recommendation of a merger at this time. Support emerged for the need for a strong Graduate College and a strong Research Office. This change does not mean, however, that the effort to find efficiencies and cost savings in the work of the Office of Research and the Graduate College should not be a priority. On the contrary, savings could well be achieved if the Provost's office continues with three Vice Provosts, with one of them also serving as the Graduate Dean, although concern was raised that this scenario would increase the workload on the Associate Dean for Graduate Studies. As we observed with

respect to Issue #2 above, there should be an ongoing effort to achieve greater efficiencies in the work of all our academic support units.

Conclusion

We offer the ideas contained in this report not as finished or fully actionable recommendations but rather as carefully considered possibilities for addressing the issues we have been asked to review. We present these ideas to the leadership of the University in the hope that they will prove useful in informing the next phase in the process of reimagining CSU. We understand that the University faces challenging times and that difficult decisions will need to be made. We share the President's goal of ensuring that the reimagining process, despite the challenges we face, will result in a stronger, more vibrant CSU and improved experiences and outcomes for our students. We have appreciated the opportunity to represent the voices of the faculty, staff and students in this continuing work.

DRAFT

Appendix A

A central goal of CSU 2.0 is to advance the goals of President Sands' Statement of Strategic Priorities. This Appendix discusses the ways in which the recommendations of the Academic Task Force relate to these goals and suggests ways of measuring the success of our recommendations in that context. For purposes of this Appendix the Task Force's recommendations are summarized in the consolidated format used in the Executive Summary of this final report.

First Summary Recommendation

The Task Force embraces the central goal of CSU 2.0 as articulated by President Sands: to strengthen the University as an academic institution while achieving greater efficiency in our operations. We believe this means that, in looking for savings, priority should be given to areas of the budget that have the least negative impact on the student experience, especially with respect to pursuing academic interests and completing degrees. Concurrently new investment priorities should be given to initiatives that enhance the student experience. (Final Report: General Observations)

Relationship to Strategic Priorities: The Statement of Strategic Priorities was released in December 2018, well before the onset of COVID 19. At that time the University faced projected challenges with respect to demographic patterns, state support, and regional competition. The pandemic added new difficulties; it dramatically increased the importance of remote instruction; added costs related to the health and safety of the campus community; reduced the capacity of the state to support public universities; and fostered worries among potential students about attending college. If CSU is going to flourish in the period ahead, and achieve the ambitious goals set forth in the Strategic Priorities, it is imperative to become more efficient. This First Summary Recommendation conveys the Task Force's understanding of the challenges the University faces and suggests a framework for making critical decisions about reducing operating costs and redirecting savings.

Measuring Successful Implementation: Successful Implementation of this recommendation should mean that the University is able to continue improving the student experience at CSU despite any new financial pressures. The best measures of success in this respect will be our ability to continue to attract strong students and to achieve our enrollment goals, while also continuing to improve key measures of student success, including persistence and graduation rates and satisfaction with the CSU experience.

Second Summary Recommendation

In pursuing efficiencies within the academic area, priority should be attached to reducing costs for staff support through greater sharing of resources among units and greater collaboration among staff members currently serving different parts of the University. (Final Report: Issues 2, 3, 4, 11, 12)

Relationship to Strategic Priorities. One of the goals identified among the Strategic Priorities is strengthening the campus community. We believe our call for greater sharing of staff resources among administrative units and greater collaboration among staff in delivering services can have the effect of breaking down administrative siloes and promoting a spirit of shared commitment to advancing the work of the University during a difficult period. We stress that we do not welcome the prospect of reducing staff support for our academic units--we are pretty lean in this respect already, and we greatly value our staff colleagues—however, we are in a time when all parts of the University must accept a measure of belt tightening in order to free up resources to invest in our academic work. An enhanced spirit of collaboration and shared purpose can be a benefit of the unwelcome need to streamline our operations.

Measuring Successful Implementation: The best measure of success in implementing our Second Summary Recommendation will be our ability to continue the effectiveness and productivity of our academic and support units with reduced staff support and to maintain a high level of morale within with campus community.

Third Summary Recommendation

There should be a review of current policies and practices with respect to the management of our academic programs, including but not limited to those related to minimum course enrollments, the numbers of general education courses offered by individual departments, and multi section courses. (Final Report: Issues 7, 8)

Relationship to Strategic Priorities: The strategic priorities clearly recognized the need for CSU to reduce operating costs in order the find dollars for investment. Managing our programs more efficiently while still meeting the needs of students is one of the most important steps we can take within the academic arena to accomplish this two-part goal.

Measuring Successful Implementation. Success with the Third Summary Recommendation will be achieved if we are able to generate significant savings without having an adverse impact on our students as measured by enrollments in courses affected by this initiative.

Fourth Summary Recommendation

Consideration should be given to realigning the current configuration of colleges, departments and schools. Our Final Report includes five possible reconfigurations and summarizes the benefits and concerns associated with each without specifically recommending any one of them. We do, however, recommend the creation of a new College of Health Professions that would bring together the University's major programs in the health area. While we do not recommend any change in the structure of the Honors College, we do recommend consideration of expanding its impact through a more strategic deployment of scholarship dollars.

More broadly, we think that some form of realignment of the eight academic colleges, either one of the models suggested or a new combination of units, will be necessary to achieve major savings from the academic area. We stress that, in the time available to us, we have been able to conduct only a preliminary review of this matter and that additional analysis is needed before any final decision is made. In particular we stress that there are serious concerns with any of the possible reconfigurations we have identified that need to be considered during the next stage of review, and we urge that the review process be transparent and consultative. (Final Report: Issues 1, 2, 3, 5)

Relationship to Strategic Priorities: A major theme of the Strategic Priorities is advancing CSU's distinction as a public, urban research institution by creating new colleges that can attract more diverse talent and create multidisciplinary partnerships. A related goal is building world class, ranked programs where CSU can achieve distinction. The recommended College of Health Professions would be a major step toward these goals and the other reconfigurations we recommend for consideration offer additional possibilities that have the potential to heighten our impact and stature in specific areas. A realignment of colleges and programs also has the potential to enhance our role as an "anchor" Institution by enhancing our contributions to workforce development for regional employers. Finally, the expanded role we envision for the Honors College advances an additional goal of the Strategic Priorities.

Measuring Successful Implementation: An evaluation of whatever realignment is ultimately implemented must refer back to the four potential benefits of restructuring discussed in the first section of this Executive Summary: (1) Fostering interactions among departments and programs; (2) Enhancing CSU's visibility and reputation; (3) Improving the balance among colleges with respect to size; (4) Reducing operating costs. Among the things that will drive a final decision on realignment will be the priority attached to each of these potential benefits by the University's leaders, so the strategic goals of that realignment must be a primary basis for assessing its success. Beyond that it will be important to track any impacts on students

(enrollment levels; preferences as to major, persistence rates; satisfaction), on the scholarly work and research productivity of the faculty, and, more broadly on the morale of the CSU community and faculty and staff satisfaction with their working conditions.

Fifth Summary Recommendation

The parts of the University that support academic research—the libraries, the research office, the Graduate College—should not be exempt from the search for savings, but efficiencies in these arenas need to be pursued with an acute sense of the importance of scholarship and research to both our educational work and our reputation. In reviewing these areas we have identified places where savings may be possible, but we also must protect (and if possible increase) investments that clearly advance the strength of the university. In short, support for research must be strategic and targeted and savings much be sought in places that do not harm high priority activities. (Final Report: Issues 10, 11, 12)

Relationship to the Strategic Priorities: The Statement of Strategic Priorities is ambitious with respect to CSU’s research mission, setting a target of \$50 million in funded research and seeking distinction as a public urban research institution. The accomplishment of these goals depends upon protecting our most important research assets, pursuing savings with sensitivity to our research mission, and seeking ways to enhance support for research activities that promise the highest impact on our overall standing as a research university.

Measuring Successful Implementation: The central measure of success in implementing our Fifth Summary Recommendation will be our ability to realize significant savings without adverse impacts on the library’s ability to support our educational programs and on the scholarly and research productivity of the faculty. Indeed, the hope is that we will be able to redirect some resources in ways that actually enhance CSU in these areas. It will be important to track actual outcomes in all these respects.

Appendix B

CSU 2.0 Academic Task Force:

Advisor: Richard Freeland, Ph.D., former President, Northeastern University

Co-Chair: Bob Krebs, Ph.D., Professor, College of Sciences and Health Professions

Jianping Zhu, Ph.D., Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs

Task Force Members:

1. Cheryl Bracken, Ph.D., Interim Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs
2. Jeff Karem, Ph. D., Chair and professor, College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences
3. Jose Mendez, student, previous Campus Activities Board Vice President
4. Anne Nelson, Assistant Dean, Monte Ahuja College of Business
5. Joan Niederriter, Ph. D., Associate Professor, School of Nursing
6. Meghan Rubado, Ph.D., Assistant Professor, Urban Studies
7. Hana Shaheen, student, SGA Vice President
8. Jonathan Wehner, VP Enrollment Management & Student Success
9. Crystal Weyman, Ph. D., Professor and Chair, College of Sciences and Health Professions (Alignment)
10. Chansu Yu, Ph.D., Professor, Washkewicz College of Engineering
11. Sajit Zachariah, Ph. D., Dean, College of Education and Human Services

Ex Officio members:

1. Marius Boboc, Ph.D., Vice Provost for Academic Planning
2. Allyson Robichaud, Ph.D., Interim Dean, College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences

Support staff: Michael Artbauer, Chief of Staff, Office of the Provost

Working Group 1: College/Department Realignment

- Chair: Allyson Robichaud, Ph.D., Interim Dean, College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences
- Bill Bowen, Ph.D., Professor, Levin College of Urban Affairs
- Marius Boboc, Ph.D., Vice Provost for Academic Planning
- Don Allensworth-Davies, Ph.D., Associate Professor, College of Sciences and Health Professions
- Beth Ekelman, Ph.D., Professor and Director of Master of Occupational Therapy program
- David Forte, Ph.D. and J.D., Professor, Cleveland Marshall College of Law
- Bob Krebs, Ph.D., Professor, College of Sciences and Health Professions
- Anne Nelson, Assistant Dean, Monte Ahuja College of Business
- Hana Shaheen, student, SGA Vice President
- Chansu Yu, Ph.D., Professor, Washkewicz College of Engineering

Working Group 2: Instructional Efficiency

- Co-Chair – Jeff Karem, Ph. D., Chair and professor, College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences
Sajit Zachariah, Ph. D., Dean, College of Education and Human Services
- Cheryl Bracken, Ph.D., Interim Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs
- Carole Heyward, J.D., Clinical Professor of Law
- Karla Hamlen Mansour, Ph.D., Associate Professor, College of Education and Human Services
- Ray Henry, Ph.D., Associate Dean, Monte Ahuja College of Business
- John Holcomb, Ph.D., Interim Vice Provost for Academic Programs
- Sanda Kaufman, Ph.D., Professor, Levin College of Urban Affairs
- Tracy Porter, Ph.D., Associate Professor, Monte Ahuja College of Business
- Aaron Severson, Ph.D., Associate Professor, College of Sciences and Health Professions
- Jenn Visocky-O'Grady, MFA, Professor, College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences
- Johnathan Wehner, Vice President, Enrollment Management and Student Success

Working Group 3: Research/Library Support

- Chair – Crystal Weyman
- Lauren Collins, Director, Law Library
- David Lodwick, Director, Michael Schwartz Library
- Jose Mendez, student, previous Campus Activities Board Vice President
- Joan Niederriter, Ph.D., Associate Professor, School of Nursing
- Meghan Rubado, Assistant Professor, Levin College of Urban Affairs
- Dan Simon, Ph.D., Associate President for Research
- J Mark Souther, Ph.D., Professor, Liberal Arts and Social Sciences