

Office of Research & Planning

Prepared by: Keith Wurtz

Research Briefs from the Office of Institutional Research Spring 2010 Reorganization Survey

Purpose: The purpose of this brief is to summarize the feedback from the Spring 2010 Reorganization Survey to help inform the process of reorganizing the disciplines in Instruction.

Methodology: Respondents were asked to group the divisions in either two or three divisions based on which disciplines they would like to see in the same division. Most of the respondents grouped the disciplines into three divisions (88%), and only three respondents (12%) grouped the disciplines into two divisions. The results were tallied by manually identifying which grouping for each respondent had the most similar groupings with other respondents.

Sample: Thirty-eight faculty, staff, and administrators completed the survey (see Table 1). Sixty-six percent of the respondents were faculty. Most of the respondents were from the Career Education and Human Development Division (41%), followed by Letters and Learning (35%), and Arts and Sciences (24%).

Table 1. Current Assignment and Academic Division of Each Respondent.	Table 1.	Current	Assignment ar	d Academic	Division of	of Each	Respondent.
-----------------------------------------------------------------------	----------	---------	---------------	------------	-------------	---------	-------------

Assignment and Division	#	%
Current Assignment		
Full-Time Faculty	25	65.8
Classified Staff	12	31.6
Administrator	1	2.6
Total	38	100.0
Current Academic Division		
Career Education and Human Development	15	40.5
Arts and Sciences	9	24.3
Letters and Learning	13	35.1
Total	37	100.0

Findings: Table 2 illustrates the division groupings based on the tallies shown in Table 3. The first grouping is similar to the current Career Education and Human Development Division except that social science courses like psychology, sociology, anthropology, and economics were excluded from this grouping. The second grouping is most like the current Arts and Sciences Division. The main differences are that the second group includes the social science courses excluded from the first group, excludes the science courses like biology and anatomy, and includes all of the disciplines from the Letters and Learning Division. The final grouping includes all of the science disciplines, which were previously within the Arts and Sciences Division.

Table 2. Division Groupings based on Responses Illustrated in Table 3.

Group I	Group II	Group III
AH	ASL	ANAT
BUSAD / ACCT /	ANTHRO	BIOL
MARKET		
Child Care Center	ART	CHEM
CD / EDUC	CHC	ENGR
CIS	ECON	GEOL / GEOG /
		OCEAN
EMS	ENGL	MATH
Emergency Training	HIST	MICRO
Center		
FIRET	INTDIS	PHYSICS / ASTRON
PE / HEALTH	JOUR	
PSS	Learning Center / LRC	
RADTECH	Library	
RESP	MCS	
	MUSIC	
	PCD	
	PHIL	
	POLIT	
	PSYCH	
	READ	
	RELIG	
	SOC	
	SPAN / FR / JAPN / RUS	
	/ ARABIC	
	SPEECH	
	THART	

When asked how respondents would like to be kept informed, most responded that they would like to be informed through all three methods (49%): email, All Instruction Meeting, and through the Deans. In addition, 43% said that they would like to be informed only by email, 3% only through the All Instruction Meeting, and none only through their Deans.

Table 4 on the last page illustrates the ideas respondents had about which disciplines should form departments.

Table 3. Summary of How Respondents Grouped Each Discipline with Each Division.

Table 3. Summary of How Res Discipline / Program	Group I	Group II	Group III
АН	1111111111111111	1	111
ASL	1	1111111111111111	11111
ANAT	11111		1111111111111111
ANTHRO	1	11111111111	111111
ART		1111111111111	11111111
BIOL	1111		111111111111111111
BUSAD / ACCT / MARKET	11111111111	11	111111
CHEM	1111		111111111111111111
Child Care Center	1111111111111	11111	111
CD / EDUC	111111111111	11111	1111
CHC	111	111111111111	111
CIS	1111111111	11	11111111
ECON	1111	11111111111	111111
EMS	111111111111111111111	1	
Emergency Training Center	111111111111111111111	1	
ENGR	111	111	1111111111111
ENGL		1111111111111111	11111
FIRET	111111111111111111111	1	
GEOL / GEOG / OCEAN	11	111	1111111111111111
HIST		11111111111111	1111111
INTDIS	1	1111111111111	111111
JOUR		11111111111111111	1111
Learning Center / LRC	111	11111111111111	11
Library	11	111111111111111	11
Math	1	111	11111111111111111
MICRO	1111		111111111111111111
MCS	11	111111111	1111111
MUSIC		1111111111111	111111
PCD	111	111111111111	11111
PHIL		111111111111111	111111
PE / HEALTH	1111111111	11	111111111
PSS	1111111111	11	11111
PHYSICS / ASTRON	111		11111111111111111111
POLIT		111111111111111	111111
PSYCH	111	1111111111	11111111
RADTECH	111111111111111111111		
READ		11111111111111111	111
RELIG		111111111111111	11111
RESP	11111111111111111111		
SOC	111	111111111111	11111
SPAN / FR / JAPN / RUS / ARABIC		111111111111111111	111
SMS	1111111	1	111111111
SPEECH		111111111111111111	11
THART		111111111111111	11111

Table 4. Respondent Suggestions about Disciplines that should form Departments.

1. Group "like" academic disciplines. 2. Consider the number of FTEF (including adjuncts) to create some balance for the load of the deans. (That info. is not included on this page, so it is difficult for me to make my groups) 3. Place CHC, INTDIS, LRC, Library, and PCD together in the same Division, in whichever division would help to best balance out the workload of the deans. (-- OR -- What about making a 4th division that consists of these disciplines as well as counseling? Aren't the counselors already under a dean? Could that work?)

1). Social Sciences and Humanities 2). Sciences, Math and Technology
Business & Info Tech should have greater separation and a separate identification
from Fire Tech & Resp Care. Business & Info Tech can certainly continue under
Career Tech, but we need to recognize the two types of programs are not similar in
any respect and stop combining objectives, outcomes, and results into a single set of
statistics.

Child Dev and Psych. should be a department.

English, reading, and speech should be together.

I don't think the set up of disciplines is as important as the dean's and chairs. I do think that some disciplines just make sense together, for instance Business, Acct, Marketing, Econ and in our case CIS. EMT, EMS, Fire. English and Reading

I have attempted to arrange the disciplines into three divisions - divided into: 1. Human Development, 2. Math/Science, and 3. Humanities. I am still pondering the correct Division for the Library. I feel that the Library is the nucleus around which all disciplines depend. However, I lean towards Humanities because of the broad spectrum of knowledge and research demands in those disciplines.

I would suggest moving the Learning Center and Library into Student Services, since that is essentially what they are. For 3 divisions - Career & Technical, Math & Science, English & all others

Move Library Services to Student Services

No issues with the current structure.

You need arts and sciences as separate divisions, the way it is in most colleges. You need English as part of humanities and math as part of Sciences.

Have no idea what CHC; MCS or SMS are so did not place them. My rationale for putting the arts with the sciences if that they all have special laboratory needs and use potentially toxic materials so it made sense to me to have them supervised by a Dean knowledgeable in those areas.

I do not believe that the LRC and the Library should be in the same department and are not mutually-exclusive. I feel that the Basic Skills and Tutoring offered by the LRC, and PCD, and CHC should be in the first Division, Human Development. And, the Information Literacy course currently under Library Science is more appropriately associated with either the Human Development Division or the English Department under Humanities.