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INTRODUCTION

On October 20, 2008, Provost Cynthia Hughes Harris appointed an Organizational Analysis Task Force of Faculty, Deans and Administrators to examine the current academic organizational structure of the academic units of the university. Provost Harris charged the task force to “review the effectiveness” of the manner in which the Florida A &M University Academic programs are housed. Specifically, the task force was asked to “confirm the appropriateness of the existing organizational structure of our academic units or to provide recommendation of alternative structures that would strengthen the university” and its commitment academic growth and integrity.

The task force was chaired by Rodner B. Wright, AIA, Dean of the School of Architecture and consisted of a total of 34 members from the following Colleges and Schools and administrative areas: College of Arts and Sciences: Dr. Genyne Boston, Associate Professor, Department of English, Dr. Shelby Chipman, Associate Director, Department of Music, Dr. Merlin Langley, Professor, Department of Social Work, Dr. Adrian McCollum, Assistant Professor, Department of Biology, Dr. Gary Paul, Associate Professor, Department of History, Dr. Elliott Treadwell, Professor, Department of Physics, Mr. Luther Wells, Professor, Department of Visual Arts; College of Education: Dr. Genniver Bell, Dean, Dr. E. Newton Jackson, Jr. (Jackson State University) Associate Dean/Associate Professor, College of Engineering(FAMU-FSU): Dr. Clayton Clark, II, Assistant Professor, Civil Environmental Eng., Dr. Reginald Perry, Associate Dean/Professor, Electrical & Computer Eng.; College of Engineering Sciences Technology & Agriculture: Dr. Ogheneko Onokpise, Associate Dean/Professor, Dr. Verian Thomas, Director/Professor, Agricultural Sciences; College of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences: Dr. Frank Emmanuel, Professor; Dr. Cynthia M. Harris, Director, Institute of Public Health, Dr. Ken Redda, Professor, Basic Sciences; School of Allied Health Sciences: Dr. Barbara Mosley, Dean, Dr. Eric Toran,),Interim Director, Physical Therapy, (Declined participation with task force) School of Architecture: Roy Knight, Professor, Dr. Richard Rome, Director of MLA (Retired) School of Business and Industry: Dr. Sandra Drumming, Associate Professor, Department of Accounting; Dr. Daaim Shabazz, Associate Professor, Department of International Business; School of General Studies: Mr. Harold Henderson, Professor, Dr. Lisa Lang, Professor; School of Journalism/Graphic Communication: Dr. Dorothy Bland, Director, Division of Journalism, Dr. Bettye Grable, Associate Professor, Division of Journalism, School of Nursing: Dr. Doris Ballard-Ferguson, Professor, Dr. Janet Marshall, Professor; Environmental Sciences Institute: Dr. Jennifer Cherrier, Associate Professor, Dr. Richard Gragg, Associate Director/Associate, Library-Management: Brenda Wright, Assistant Director, Office of Academic Affairs: Dr. Fay Vaughn-Cooke, Associate Provost (became ill), Dr William Hudson, Director of Retention (Replacement), Dr. Donald Palm, Assistant Vice President; Office of Institutional Effectiveness: Dr. Gita Pitter, Associate Vice President.

METHODOLOGY

Initially, meetings were held with the full task force, however, the size of the task force dictated that smaller groups working together would be more effective.

The task force was divided into 3 sub-committees: Groups I, II & III. Where possible each group had at least one member from each college or school. The task force chair selected a chair for each group. Group I was chaired by Dr. Verian Thomas, Professor and Director of Agricultural Sciences; Group II was chaired by Professor Dorothy Bland, Director of Journalism; and Group III was chaired initially by Dr. Chanta Haywood, Dean of Graduate Studies, but because of an illness she was replaced by Dr. William E. Hudson, Jr. Director of Retention.

The group members are as follows:

Group 1: Chair- Verian Thomas, Dr. Genniver Bell, College of Education; Dr. Doris Ballard-Ferguson, School of Nursing, Dr. Bettye Grable, School of Journalism/Graphic Communication, Dr. Richard Gragg, Environmental Sciences Institute, Dr. Cynthia M. Harris, College of Pharmacy, Dr. Lisa Lang, School of General Studies, Dr.
To facilitate open communication between task force members, within the groups and between groups and access to collected documents, an Organizational Analysis Task force Blackboard site was established. Each member of the task force was provided full access to the site.

**Data Collection**

The primary data examined in the study of the academic structure was supplied by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Office of the Provost, Office of the Human Resources, The Office of the President. These data items included Student Enrollments and Degrees Awarded by College and Schools, Productivity Analysis, including Sponsored Research, College and School Organization Charts, 2007 Presidential Transition Colleges and Schools SWOT Analysis; FAMU Major and Degree Inventory, University’s Organizational Charts and FAMU Strategic Plan; 2004-2005, 2012-2013 and 2010-2020. Each of the data items was posted on Blackboard for task force members to have access. In addition to those documents, a historic timeline of the FAMU Academic Structure was developed by the School of Architecture’s library staff. This timeline extended from 1887 when there was one academic division to the current structure of 13 Colleges and Schools and one Institute.

Each member of the task force was encouraged to meet with their respective Dean and/or Director and faculty to keep them apprised of the process as well as solicit trends and recommendations for consideration.

Each group met throughout the spring and summer semesters separately to review the data provided, as well as samples from other institutions, and to devise a strategy for considering the existing organizational structure. Each was charged with proposing independently a set of recommendations. The task force Chair met with each group initially then met with the Group chairs periodically to review the group progress and provide additional requested information.

On August 4, 2009 the full task force met in the School of Architecture building to present a draft of the recommendations of the three groups. This meeting was the basis for a subsequent presentation at the Faculty Planning Conference, August 12-14, 2009.

**2009 Faculty Planning Conference**

The session at the Faculty Planning Conference was entitled “Academic Organizational Structure for a 2020 Vision”. It was described as follows:

“The Provost has charged the 36 members of the Organizational Analysis Task Force with the review of the University’s existing academic, organizational structure for effectiveness and efficiency. In particular, the Task Force was asked to determine the appropriateness of the existing academic programs and program groupings to train our students in emerging areas of critical thinking and new technologies in order to make them “society-ready” graduates, who will be competitive in the global economy.”
This session was held in the Grand Ballroom on the afternoon of August 13 and it was well attended by members of the faculty. The format of the session was organized so that after the formal presentations, the participants could break up into smaller discussion groups with task force members. The faculty in attendance was encouraged to fill out a brief questionnaire. It asked them to write down any questions that they may have about the presentations and solicited recommendations from them along with the rationale and reasons? We collected approximately 80-90 responses. The comments were transcribed as draft notes and placed on Blackboard for the task force members to review.

Organization Analysis Task Force Workshop

The task force met on Friday, February 26, 2010 from 11:30 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. in Room 451 of the Lawson Teaching Gym. The workshop was facilitated by Attorney Rosalind Fuse-Hall, Chief of Staff. The task force accomplished its objective, which was to combine the recommendations from the three subcommittees to organize the academic structure into a more synergistic and efficient structure.

There were several areas that were reflected in each of the three sets of recommendations even though the groups functioned independently. The first was that the School of Graduate Studies and the School of General Studies were both service units and not academic units. The School of Graduate Studies would be more effective under the Office of Research providing a seamless interface between funded grants and graduate support.

The task force also agreed that many of the service functions of the School of General Studies were duplicated in other parts of the University and that the reorganization would provide the opportunity to eliminate the School of General Studies and link its functions to the Office of University Retention in conjunction with the academic units of the university. Further, it was also commonly proposed by the three sub-groups that issues and activities related to academic advisement, retention and progression of our students in lower divisions could also be addressed by creating a similar entity for upper division which would form the basis for an Honors College.

The task force agreed to cluster the college and schools in the health sciences into a Center for Health Sciences, divide the disciplines in the College of Arts and Science into three distinct entities: one for Science and Technology, one for Art and Humanities and another for Behavior and Social Sciences. In addition, the College of Engineering Sciences, Technology & Agriculture would be changed to College of Agriculture and Environmental Sciences, housing a Agricultural Sciences and Environmental Sciences. Such changes, which are preliminary in nature, are intended to reflect synergy between the academic programs particularly in relationship to shared teaching responsibilities, collaborative research opportunities, and reduced expenditures based on the minimizing duplicated effort and offerings.

Presentation to the Provost and to the University Community

The Chair of the Task Force met with and presented the summary of the process and actions of the task force to the Provost. As a result of having received the preliminary summary the Office of the Provost is now engaged in developing plans to share the summary and the subsequent final report with the university community. The process of sharing is critical for the goal of achieving input and feedback from stakeholders throughout the campus. Although the membership on the original task force reflected a cross section of the university and over the course of its existence, the task force provided opportunities for input from a variety of groups and individuals, it is at this stage that wide-scale review and response is essential. It must also be noted that although the original charge of the task force focused on assessing the best organizational structure for the delivery of the FAMU academic programs, over the several years in which the task force was in operation, the fiscal challenges faced by the university increased due to a series of devastating budget cuts. The response of the university to the recommendations of the task force must now, more than ever, reflect the current economic climate, the anticipated continuation of that climate for the next several years and, the repositioning of the university as the economy strengthens in the future. During the period of time that the Organizational Analysis Task Force was engaged in its analyses, the university adopted a Strategic Plan “2010-2020 Vision with Courage.” The goals and guiding principles of the Strategic Plan must also be considered as the reorganization of the academic units is proposed.
As we move into the next phase of activity related to the results of the Organizational Analysis Task Force, the following next steps have been identified:

- Present final Report to the Provost in response to the original charge
- Disseminate the final Report of the task force to the university community
- Charge members of the task force as well as other key members of the university community to engage in, lead, and facilitate discussions of the recommendations contained in the report with a broad representation of the community including but not limited to: faculty, Faculty Senate, students, staff and alumni.
- Develop approaches and strategies to capture and compile the responses and feedback emanating from the Report
- Analyze the responses and feedback by: select members of the task force (including the Chair and the three sub-committee chairs); select members of the Office of Academic Affairs (including the Provost, the VP for Institutional Effectiveness, the AVP for Academic Affairs); select members of the President’s Leadership Team (including the CFO, the Chief Communications Officer and the Chief of Staff); and others that may be identified as critical to the task.
- Present the final recommendation to the Provost and President who will be responsible for any modifications they deem necessary followed by it being finalized and disseminated

It is expected that the following timeline will be followed:
December 2011 -- Presentation of the methodology to the Board of Trustees
January 2011 – Final Report to the Provost
January 7, 2011 – Dissemination and discussion of Report within the university community
February 2011 -- Preliminary Analysis of results of dissemination and discussion
March 2011 -- Reorganization finalized and announced