

**Program Change Plan
School of Psychological and Behavioral Sciences**

Provided to Faculty in the following affected units:

- Department of Psychology
- Rehabilitation Institute¹

This program change plan is in keeping with Sections 9.04 and 9.05 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA).

A. Description of Proposed Change:

This plan establishes a **School of Psychological and Behavioral Sciences** by merging the Department of Psychology with degree programs separated from the Rehabilitation Institute². Once established, the School of Psychological and Behavioral Sciences will be housed administratively, on a temporary basis, in the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs area³.

The proposed degree inventory for the School of Psychological and Behavioral Sciences appears below. The names and academic requirements of the degree programs will not change.

CIP	Degree	“Source” Academic Unit
42.0101	BA, Psychology	Psychology
51.2399	BS, Behavior Analysis and Therapy	Rehabilitation
51.2399	MS, Behavior Analysis and Therapy	Rehabilitation
42.0101	MA, Psychology	Psychology
42.0101	MS, Psychology	Psychology
42.0101	PHD, Psychology	Psychology
	Minor, Psychology	Psychology

¹ This plan includes a “reduction” in the Rehabilitation Institute by separating the degree programs in Behavior Analysis and Therapy (BAT) and moving the programs to the School of Psychological and Behavioral Sciences.

² Excluded from this plan are the degree programs in Communication Disorders & Sciences, Rehabilitation Services, Rehabilitation Administration & Services, Rehabilitation Counseling.

³ See the statement at end of this document that is separate and apart from this program change plan regarding college-level considerations.

Organizational Structure of School of Psychological and Behavioral Sciences:

The School will be led by an A/P Director who will report to and serve at the pleasure of the Dean of the College⁴, and who will be appointed following a search conducted in keeping with the University's Hiring Policy and Procedures. The University Policy on Department Chair responsibilities presently applies to School Directors. In keeping with this policy, the School Director is the chief academic, administrative, and fiscal officer for the academic unit and serves at the pleasure of the Dean. The Director is responsible for overall management and leadership of the unit and is expected to contribute to the mission of the University.

Specific duties of the Director will include, but are not limited to⁵: planning, development, coordination, review, and administration of undergraduate and graduate instructional programs; advancing learning outcomes of students enrolled in the School's academic programs, as well as students enrolled in service courses offered by the School's faculty; ensuring faculty excellence through effective recruitment, retention, and evaluation of personnel; advancing and coordinating accreditation-related activities including program assessment; maintaining effective recruitment, retention, and degree completion rates of students enrolled in the School's academic programs; providing educational leadership, fostering excellence, and creating a culture of increased research, scholarship, and creative activity among faculty; developing and recommending budgets to the Dean, as well as administering approved budgets and controlling expenditures within the unit; promoting alumni relations and representing the School and its constituent divisions and programs to various constituencies; conducting all business and activities in compliance with applicable law, policies of the SIU Board of Trustees, University Policies and Procedures, the College and School Operating Papers, and other guidance and directives of the Dean; and fostering an environment that advances Institutional goals regarding diversity and intolerance of discrimination.

Initially, an Interim Director for the School will be appointed on a term basis by the Provost following usual campus processes for appointing interim administrators. The Interim Director will be appointed via search waiver, in consultation with faculty members who comprise the School, and with approval of the Office of the Chancellor and the Office of Affirmative Action. Faculty and staff members will have an opportunity to express their preference regarding possible candidates for the Interim Director Position, and to provide feedback about possible candidates.

The search for the permanent School Director may be internal or external, consistent with current practice for hiring of Department Chairs and School Directors. We anticipate that the permanent School Director search will be initiated after the assignment of the School to

⁴ See statement on College structure that is separate and apart from the Program Change Plan, at the end of this document.

⁵ Adapted from university policy on duties of Department Chairs, which apply to School Directors.

an academic college. In keeping with university hiring procedures and policy, an approved position announcement will be created for the Director Position; a search committee will be approved through the Affirmative Action Office; applications will be solicited; applications will be reviewed by the search committee; approved interviews will be conducted; and, a hiring recommendation that is informed by faculty and search committee feedback will be made by the Dean, with final approval by Provost and Affirmative Action Office.

Each of the (former) academic units that comprise the School of Psychological and Behavioral Sciences will have the status of **Division** within the School. Each of the two divisions will be led by a faculty member who serves in the functional role of Division Coordinator. The duties of the Division Coordinator may vary based on the complexity and needs of the Division. Division Coordinator duties will reflect a service assignment in the faculty member's annual workload assignment. It is anticipated that this service assignment will correspond to a "release" from one-to-two 3-credit hour courses per year, depending on the Division's complexity (i.e., a 12.5% or 25% FTE service assignment). The service assignment will be determined by the School Director in consultation with the Division Coordinator and the Dean and in compliance with the collective bargaining agreement. Depending on the complexity of the Division's programs and needs, Division Coordinators may also receive summer appointments in support of the division and its programs. Service duties of the Division Coordinator may include, but may not be limited to: consulting with the School Director and/or support staff regarding course staffing needs; providing input to the School Director to inform the Director's assignment of workload to faculty; assisting with student concerns; coordinating accreditation-related activities if appropriate; assisting the School Director with program assessment.

Following establishment of the School, Faculty will create an operating paper pursuant to Article 5 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement. During the period of creation of the School Operating Paper, day-to-day management of the unit will be guided by applicable provisions of each division's former department/school operating paper and former college operating paper⁶.

Affected faculty from this proposed school have asked for clarification regarding the manner in which personnel / staffing decisions will be made under the School model, and regarding the manner in which the interests of small programs will be protected under the School Model. With respect to staffing, the School Director will work proactively with Division coordinators to ensure that staffing needs (e.g., teaching of courses, civil service staffing needs) are addressed. Such an approach is presently applied in multi-program academic schools, and in complex academic departments. With respect to protecting 'voice' for smaller programs, the administration recommends consideration of operating paper language that could assist with this concern. For example, an operating paper might include

⁶ This approach is provisional, recognizing that interim operating procedures could be subject to impact bargaining.

provisions that establish a “senate” representation model for curriculum or other critical committees. The administration is committed to the programs involved in this school being equal partners, and will work with the School toward establishment of effective operating paper procedures.

B. Rationale

A general goal of this plan is to revitalize and reposition our academic programs in order to create opportunities for greater collaboration among students and faculty. SIU’s academic programs and structure have remained largely unchanged in a changing higher education marketplace. Accordingly, this plan aligns programs that relate to each other in order to foster synergy and innovation.

The program change plan for the School of Psychological and Behavioral Sciences was an outgrowth of feedback (see “White Paper” provided by the Department) from the Department of Psychology, in consultation with faculty affiliated with the BAT program, on a previous proposal for a School of Social Sciences and Multicultural Studies. Following additional consultation and discussion with faculty and other stakeholders, the administration developed a new proposal under the Article 9 process for a School of Psychological and Behavioral Sciences. This program change plan was finalized following votes by the Department of Psychology and the Rehabilitation institute to exit the 90-day consultation period.

The proposed School unites two units with a strong disciplinary affinity, and a history of effective collaboration. The School of Psychological and Behavioral Sciences will be a catalyst for curricular and research expansion in academic areas that have proven to be highly popular with our students. Students who are pursuing degrees in the School will benefit from the opportunity to learn, research, and develop practical skills in a dynamic academic environment. The school will also foster and enhance collaborative research and curricular opportunities for faculty and students.

C. Impact on Faculty Lines and Faculty Workload

Faculty Lines.

This plan has no effect on Faculty lines. There will be no eliminations of faculty positions under this plan.

Workload.

Faculty workload assignment is governed by the terms of the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA). Additionally, the CBA requires School Operating papers to include the “criteria to be applied when determining workload”. Consistent with current practice in other Academic Schools at SIU Carbondale, and in keeping with the provisions of the CBA, workload assignments will be made by the School Director, with consultation and input from Division Coordinators, and subject to approval by the dean. To summarize, all Faculty workload assignments will continue to be made in accordance with the procedures established and required by the collective bargaining agreement.

The merger of the planned academic units / degree programs into a school will contribute to more equitable distribution of service-related tasks across faculty, freeing faculty from some service obligations required to support the academic unit and the university. By spreading such responsibilities out in larger schools, individual faculty members will have additional opportunities to engage in teaching and research activities. Additionally, to the extent that the current academic structure may contribute to curricular overlap and duplication (by way of similar courses being offered in multiple programs), we anticipate that the reorganization plan may result in decreased pressure to staff required courses.

General Promotion and Tenure Considerations for Tenured and Tenure Track Faculty.

Affected Faculty members who hold tenure in the Department of Psychology or the Rehabilitation Institute will have their tenure transferred to the School of Psychological and Behavioral Sciences. The plan will not result in any loss of tenure for any Faculty member in the Department of Psychology or the Rehabilitation Institute.

Faculty members who presently hold tenure track appointments in the Department of Psychology or in the Rehabilitation Institute will have their continuing, tenure-track appointments transferred to the School of Psychological and Behavioral Sciences, with no change to their tenure probationary period.

Promotion Considerations for Tenured Faculty. Under the terms of the current Collective Bargaining Agreement, the promotion guidelines and procedures articulated in the operating papers in force at the time of the tenured faculty member’s most recent promotion will apply to a promotion review case that occurs after the proposed merger and establishment of the School of Psychological and Behavioral Sciences. Note, however, that the tenured faculty member may elect to apply the promotion guidelines and procedures of the operating paper of his or her new school to the promotion / tenure review case. The promotion standards and procedures articulated in the 2016 SIUC Employees Handbook also apply to promotion review.

Tenure and Promotion Considerations for Tenure Track Faculty. Under the terms of the current Collective Bargaining Agreement, the tenure and promotion guidelines and procedures in the operating papers in force at the time the faculty member was hired into the tenure-track position will apply to an initial tenure / promotion review case that occurs after the proposed merger and creation of the School of Psychological and Behavioral Sciences⁷. Note, however, that a tenure-track faculty member may elect to apply the tenure/promotion standards of the operating papers of his or her new school to the promotion / tenure review case. The promotion and tenure standards and procedures articulated in the 2016 SIUC Employees Handbook also apply to promotion and tenure review.

Provisional Promotion and Tenure Procedures for Current Tenured and Tenure track Faculty.

The procedures outlined in this section are provisional given that the Faculty Association reserves the right under Article 9 to bargain impact of any implemented program change.

SCHOOL-LEVEL REVIEW

The Director of the School of Psychological and Behavioral Sciences shall coordinate the process and shall write the School-level recommendation letter.

1. For candidates formerly appointed in the Rehabilitation Institute: unless the faculty member chooses to apply the new School of Psychological and Behavioral Sciences Operating Paper provisions, the former Operating Paper of the Rehabilitation Institute shall govern the process and shall define the standards and criteria for promotion and/or tenure.
 - a. For such candidates, any academic-unit-level requirements regarding letter-solicitation, etc. that were included in the former Rehabilitation Institute Operating Paper shall apply.
 - b. For such candidates, the academic-unit-level committee would be comprised of appropriate (as defined by the former Rehabilitation Institute Operating Paper) faculty members who had held appointments in the former Rehabilitation Institute, augmenting if needed per CBA requirements.

⁷ Clarification: If promotion and /or tenure occurs after the ratification of the new school operating paper, such operating paper will govern future promotion applications

2. For candidates formerly appointed in the Department of Psychology: unless the faculty member chooses to apply the new School of Psychological and Behavioral Sciences Operating Paper provisions, the former Operating Paper of the Department of Psychology shall govern the process and shall define the standards and criteria for promotion and/or tenure.
 - a. For such candidates, any academic-unit-level requirements regarding letter-solicitation, etc. that were included in the former Department of Psychology Operating Paper shall apply.
 - b. For such candidates, the academic-unit-level committee would be comprised of appropriate (as defined by the former Department of Psychology Operating Paper) faculty members who had held appointments in the former Department of Psychology, augmenting if needed per CBA requirements.

COLLEGE LEVEL REVIEW

As noted above, upon formation of the School, it will temporarily be assigned to the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs area. College level review of any promotion and tenure cases proceeding **during the period of the School's assignment to the Provost area** shall follow the procedures below:

1. The applicable former College Operating Paper shall govern with respect to College-level procedures, standards and criteria. The College-level committee shall be comprised of appropriate (as defined by the applicable former College Operating Paper) faculty members who had held appointments in the applicable College.
2. The College-level committee vote / recommendation shall go to the Dean of the College in which the candidate's former department / school was assigned. The Dean shall make an independent recommendation based on the evidence in the dossier, applying the governing standards of the appropriate operating papers and taking into consideration , the vote / recommendation of the unit-level committee, the vote/recommendation of the college-level committee, and the recommendation of the School director.

Following assignment of the School to a new academic college (see statement at end of this document that is separate and apart from the Program Change Plan), the following procedures shall apply:

1. Unless the candidate elects to apply the operating paper from the "new" College, the applicable former College Operating Paper shall govern with respect to College-level

procedures, standards and criteria. The College-level committee shall be comprised of appropriate (as defined by the applicable former College Operating Paper) faculty members who had held appointments in the applicable College.

2. The College-level committee vote / recommendation shall go to the Dean of the “new” college. The Dean shall make an independent recommendation based on the evidence in the dossier, applying the governing standards of the appropriate operating papers and taking into consideration , the vote / recommendation of the unit-level committee, the vote/recommendation of the college-level committee, and the recommendation of the School director.

PROVOST LEVEL REVIEW

The Dean’s recommendation shall be forwarded to the Provost who shall proceed according to current policies, procedures and practice.

D. Impact on Students and Ability to Maintain Curricula

There will be no negative impact on students. To the contrary, we anticipate significant benefits to students in the integrated school model. They will have exposure to a wider range of faculty and will have opportunities to engage in cross disciplinary research, curriculum, and co-curricular activities.

The catalog under which a student enrolled as a major will continue to govern that student’s curricular requirements. That is, an existing student whose major will be housed by a School rather than a department will have identical requirements to those in place when s/he entered the major. S/he will be able to continue their current programs through graduation based on the requirements specified in the Undergraduate or Graduate Catalog as of the date they enrolled in the program. We will ensure that we deliver on our commitments to students enrolled in every program. Future changes to curriculum will be the responsibility of the faculty, and such changes would follow established campus procedures (e.g., the NUI or RME process).

Given no reduction in faculty as part of the reorganization plan, there are no implications for ability to maintaining the curricula⁸. Again, the degree programs currently housed by the component academic units will simply be housed in the broader administrative structure of the School.

⁸ With exception of any proposal to eliminate a degree program. Any such proposals will be separate and apart from this program change proposal.

E. Estimated Financial Costs or Savings, Including Source(s)

Although cost-reduction was not the principal purpose of the overall reorganization proposal, we anticipate that implementation of the campus-wide plan will result in permanent (projected) administrative cost savings by way of a campus-wide reduction of administrative positions (e.g., fewer dean positions, elimination of department chair and school director positions), which will allow us to invest strategically in future initiatives. Across campus, for each former department chair / school director, the difference between Faculty salary and chair/director salary, plus any summer salary committed for the chair/director will be saved on a permanent/projected basis. Such savings will be balanced against the salary costs associated with appointing an A/P School Director on a 12 month basis, plus any summer salary expenditures committed for division coordinators.

For the School of Psychological and Behavioral Sciences in particular, we do not anticipate significant initial salary cost savings given that an A/P administrator does not lead the Behavior Analysis Program.

An analysis of support staff needs will be undertaken for the proposed school. This may result in additional savings if it determined that staffing consolidations are warranted. Note that there will be no layoffs of employees in civil service positions as a result of the program change plan, although it is possible that there will be re-assignment of some civil service positions, allowing us to allocate positions to the areas of greatest need. For example, we anticipate that civil service positions might be re-assigned to support complex Divisions (e.g., to assist the School Director with scheduling, personnel tasks, etc). Over time, additional savings may be generated following the reorganization by reducing duplicative courses through more efficient coordination in the Schools.

F. Comparison of similar programs at Peer Institutions (if applicable)

This program change plan represents an administrative restructuring of existing degree programs and academic units. The "School Model", with multiple degree programs housed in the School, is already functioning effectively at SIU in the School of Allied Health, the School of Information Systems and Applied Technology, the School of Art and Design, the School of Music and the School of Architecture. In such programs, faculty members who serve as division, area, or program coordinators / directors provide support and consultation to the School Director as part of their service assignments, with adjustment to workload assignments provided as appropriate, and with commitment of summer assignments in some cases, as required by the needs of the unit. School Directors at SIU have demonstrated their ability to understand, support, and represent the disparate academic disciplines represented in their schools, to advocate for wide-ranging academic programs, and to support, mentor, and evaluate fairly and equitably the faculty who teach

and engage in scholarship in varied disciplines. School Directors at SIU have also demonstrated their success at supporting undergraduate and graduate students from multiple academic disciplines.

The proposed School of Psychological and Behavioral Sciences is highly similar in terms of programs and focus to Departments of Psychology and Departments of Psychological Science at US research universities. We are aware of Schools of Psychology or Psychological Science at institutions such as Clark University, Oregon State University and Xavier University.

G. Possible Consequences of the Proposed Change on the University's Carnegie Status

The proposed change will have no direct / explicit impact on the University's Carnegie Status. However, one of the goals of the campus-wide re-organization plan (see point B) is to invigorate, enhance and expand Faculty research and creative activity by increasing synergy and collaboration. This includes the goal of expanding extramural grant / contract activity and increasing Ph.D. production. The reorganization plan will contribute to the broader institutional goal of increasing the University's Carnegie Status to R1 (Highest Research Activity).

[END of Program Change Plan]

Separate and apart from the Program Change Plan provided above to Faculty under Sections 9.04 and 9.05 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement, the following information is provided for informational purposes:

Upon establishment of the School of Psychological and Behavioral Sciences, it will be housed administratively, on a temporary basis, in the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs area, with the interim director of the School reporting to the Provost. Ultimately, we propose that The School of Psychological and Behavioral Sciences be part of the **College of Health and Human Sciences**.

Neither establishment, elimination, nor renaming of Colleges by the University is subject to the requirements of Article 9. Additionally, assignment by the University of Departments and/or Schools to Colleges is not subject to Article 9. However, establishment of Colleges and assignment of Departments / Schools to Colleges **is** subject to established campus shared governance processes and to any requirements of the Board of Trustees and the IBHE. RME(s) to rename the College of Applied Sciences and Arts, and to assign academic schools to the renamed college, will be submitted at an appropriate date. Such RME(s) will follow established procedures (e.g. review by Faculty Senate and/or Graduate Council), with opportunity for feedback by faculty, staff and students.

RME for Program Change Plan

Reasonable and Moderate Extension (RME)

PROPOSED ADDITION/ABOLITION, RE-ALLOCATION, OR RE-ESTABLISHMENT OF AN EDUCATIONAL UNIT, CURRICULUM, OR DEGREE IN THE COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS AND THE COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND HUMAN SERVICES

I. Program inventory

This RME is to create a School Psychological and Behavioral Sciences by way of a merger of the programs in the Department of Psychology (College of Liberal Arts) and the degree programs in Behavior Analysis and Therapy (BS, MS) in the Rehabilitation Institute (College of Education and Human Services). The School of Psychological and Behavioral Sciences will be housed administratively, on a temporary basis, in the Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs area. The degree programs, graduate certificates, and minors will remain intact. Additional details are provided in the accompanying Program Change Plan.

A. Current listing of approved programs (list all within the major)

CIP Code	Major/Minor	Degree	Unit
42.0101	Psychology	BA	Psychology
51.2399	Behavior Analysis and Therapy	BS	Rehabilitation
51.2399	Behavior Analysis and Therapy	MS	Rehabilitation
42.0101	Psychology	MA	Psychology
42.0101	Psychology	MS	Psychology
42.0101	Psychology	PHD	Psychology
	Psychology	Minor	Psychology

B. Proposed listing

CIP Code	Major/Minor	Degree	Unit
42.0101	Psychology	BA	Psychology and Behavioral Sciences
51.2399	Behavior Analysis and Therapy	BS	R Psychology and Behavioral Sciences
51.2399	Behavior Analysis and Therapy	MS	Psychology and Behavioral Sciences
42.0101	Psychology	MA	Psychology and Behavioral Sciences
42.0101	Psychology	MS	Psychology and Behavioral Sciences
42.0101	Psychology	PHD	Psychology and Behavioral Sciences
	Psychology	Minor	Psychology and Behavioral Sciences

PROPOSED ADDITION/ABOLITION, RE-ALLOCATION, OR RE-ESTABLISHMENT OF AN EDUCATIONAL UNIT, CURRICULUM, OR DEGREE IN THE COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS AND THE COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND HUMAN SERVICES

II. Reason for proposed action

This action relates to the Program Change Plan for creation of a School of Psychological and Behavioral Sciences.

III. Program delivery mode

Same as current delivery mode.

IV. Anticipated budgetary effects

Please refer to the accompanying Program Change Plan.

V. Arrangements to be made for (a) affected faculty, staff and students; and (b) affected equipment and physical facilities

Please refer to the accompanying Program Change Plan. There will be no reduction in faculty resulting from this plan. There are no changes in curricula, so there is no effect on current students. Staff may be re-assigned or added depending on the needs determined by the new school. All inventory will be assigned to the new school. The physical facilities will remain the same in the short term. A campus wide space plan is being developed that will address the needs of the new school in relationship to the campus.

VI. Will other educational units, curricula, or degrees be affected by this action?

The plan has no direct effect on other educational units, curricular or degrees. In general, the merger should build on the existing collaboration between the units.

VII. Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes

This criteria only applies to new programs. All current assessment activities will remain in place.

VIII. Catalog copy to be deleted or added

Will be provided once the approval is completed.

IX. The requested effective date of implementation

July 1, 2018

PROPOSED ADDITION/ABOLITION, RE-ALLOCATION, OR RE-ESTABLISHMENT OF AN EDUCATIONAL UNIT, CURRICULUM, OR DEGREE IN THE COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS AND THE COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND HUMAN SERVICES

X. Approval signatures to submit Proposal for Processing

Approve Disapprove

Signature, Dean of College of Agricultural Sciences

Date

Approve Disapprove

Signature, Dean of College of Education and Human Services

Date

Submit signed forms to the Associate Provost for Academic Program, Room 15 Anthony Hall, MC 4305. For assistance, please contact apap@siu.edu or call Ruth O'Rourke at 3-7654,

Additional Materials Submitted by Affected Units

David L. Dilalla

From: Michael R Hoane
Sent: Tuesday, February 13, 2018 8:40 AM
To: David L. Dilalla
Subject: School vote

Hey Dave,

The faculty in the proposed School of Psychological and Behavioral Sciences held a joint meeting (psyc and BAT) on Feb 12th and voted 16-2 in favor of opting out of the 90 day review period.

Thanks,
Mike

Michael R. Hoane, Ph.D.
Professor & Chair
Director, Restorative Neuroscience Lab
Neuroscience Research Center
Department of Psychology
Life Science II; Room 281
Southern Illinois University
Carbondale, IL 62901

618-453-3517

From: Carl Raymond Flowers <cflowers@siu.edu>
Sent: Friday, March 23, 2018 3:51 PM
To: David L. Dilalla <ddilalla@siu.edu>
Cc: cflower@siu.edu
Subject: Re: Check in RE Psych and Behavioral Sciences

David

Two main questions arose today and discussion that the RI faculty suggested that answers were sought from the APAP.

a) How will the School operate day-to-day in regard to staffing (GAs and Civil Service)?

b) As the Behavior Analysis and Therapy faculty may be outnumbered by other programs, how are resources to be administered within the new school without BAT losing its identity; that is, the BAT program faculty wants assurances that its concerns will be heard.

Subsequent discussion followed and a motion was made, seconded, and approved to exit the 90-day discussion period to the proposal of establishing the School of Psychology and Behavioral Sciences.

Vote was 8 - 0 to approve the motion (2 faculty were absent).

Carl R. Flowers, CRC, LCPC
Director and Professor
Rehabilitation Institute
Southern Illinois University
(618) 536-7704, (618) 453-8271 (Fax)



Join us in 2024: eclipse.siu.edu

Proposal to form a School of Psychological and Behavioral Sciences

We agree that a reorganization of the Colleges on campus can be a vibrant and inspiring opportunity to make our units better. In light of the currently proposed organizational chart it appears that Psychology could be split into two groups; some moving to neuroscience, in the new College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, the others staying in the School of Social Sciences, within the College of Liberal and Performing Arts. In considering this possibility, the Psychology faculty voted unanimously to stay together (19-0). We also began the discussion of forming a School of Psychological and Behavioral Sciences, which is a better representation of our skill set than the currently proposed School of Social Science.

We propose that this new School of Psychological and Behavioral Sciences should house Psychology and Neuroscience, allowing our faculty to be affiliated with whichever program best matches their interests and expertise, while at the same time remaining together within the same School, allowing for continued collaboration and interaction. The Department of Psychology at present has many cross-listed faculty. Initial talks with these faculty, as well as related departments on campus has generated a lot of interest in combining with the Psychology faculty into this new School. This proposal would bring them together to form a synergistic cohort of scholars. We propose combining faculty from Behavior Analysis and Therapy (BAT), Rehabilitation Services, Quantitative Methods, and some affiliated faculty in Political Science, Special Education, and Exercise Science (all of whom are trained as psychologists/neuroscientists). In addition, once formed, there may be other faculty from across campus that may wish to be cross-listed, or relocate to one of the programs within this new School. Placing these natural partners together would allow us to better serve our undergraduate students with more course offerings, our graduate students with course offerings and mentorship opportunities, and increase the potential for interdisciplinary collaboration leading to external grant proposals and funding.

The departments with the largest numbers of students and faculty are psychology (~400 majors, ~400 minors, ~40 neuroscience minors and ~100 graduate students) and BAT (~60 majors and ~130 graduate students). The BAT program also offers an off-campus Master's degree program in Chicago that brings in revenue exceeding \$500,000 a year. Psychology also has a good record of extramural funding for our graduate students with extramural funding covering 40% of the departments training assignments this year. Faculty in the BAT program also brings in around \$750,000 in extramural funding a year. Psychology is awaiting final approval on a fee generating accelerated Master's degree in Applied Psychology (standard 4+1). Psychology houses 2 Centers or research units that are revenue generating, Applied Research Consultants (market/applied research) and Core Institute (campus drug and alcohol climate surveys). The BAT program houses the Autism Center and Project 12-ways. Combining with faculty from the other proposed units would allow for a greater expansion of services and research opportunities.

As an additional area of expansion, Psychology would like to offer a B.S. in psychology (currently we only offer a B.A.) and a B.S. in neuroscience (currently it is offered only as a minor within Psychology). We are one of the few Universities in the State of Illinois to not offer a B.S. option in Psychology, while the University of Illinois-Champaign, Northern Illinois University, and Illinois State University offer a B.S. option. Exit interviews with our undergraduates, as well as requests at open houses, indicate that the demand is present for these degrees. Once the proposed programs are combined into the School of Psychological and Behavioral Sciences, the combined expertise of the faculty will present an opportunity to expand the portfolio of degrees offered within the School, creating the potential for increased recruitment of undergraduate students and increasing the number of Ph.D's. awarded per year (currently in Psychology we average 20 per year). For example, faculty in the BAT program are in the early stages of planning an Executive Ph.D. Program that would target working professionals that would benefit from the higher terminal degree.

As stated previously, there are already some cross appointments between several of these programs and we believe that this natural synergy could fast-track implementation. The BAT faculty have voted unanimously to join the School of Psychological and Behavioral Science. The faculty within Psychology are also in strong support of this new School. There are several possible locations for this new School. Many faculty believe that this new School could exist as a standalone school similar to the School of Education, School of Law, and School of Medicine. This structure would be similar to how Psychology is organized at Georgia Tech and Dartmouth, schools that have served as models for the current reorganization plan. Alternatively, from a disciplinary perspective, the School of Psychological and Behavioral Sciences could be included as the third School within the College of Health and Human Services (with the name changed to the College of Health and Human Sciences). A third option would be to house the School of Psychological and Behavioral Sciences as the fourth School within the College of Liberal and Performing Arts.

School of Psychological and Behavioral Sciences

- Psychology
- Behavior Analysis and Therapy
- Rehabilitation Institute
- Exercise Science*
- Neuroscience
- Quantitative Methods
- Political Science*
- Special Education*

*may only include faculty with current cross-appointments with psychology or BAT.

Response to "Program Change Proposal for Establishing School of Psychological and Behavioral Science"

Kathleen Schmidt, Ph.D.

Assistant Professor and Undergraduate Program Director
Department of Psychology

As provided by Article 9 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement, written responses to program change proposals by affected faculty shall be included in the program change plan. This document articulates arguments for rejecting the Program Change Proposal for Establishing School of Psychological and Behavioral Science.

As suggested by the proposal, formalizing relationships between the programs housed in the Psychology Department and the Behavioral Analysis and Therapy programs housed in the Rehabilitation Institute may prove mutually beneficial. However, accepting the program change proposal is not in the best interest of the affected faculty or the programs they represent.

The proposal does not represent a collaboration between administration and faculty to achieve a concrete goal. Faced with losing departmental autonomy and disciplinary identity, faculty in the proposed School of Psychological and Behavioral Science developed a contingency plan aimed at retaining our ability to serve our students and maintain research productivity. Acceptance of this proposal, however, should not be based on any assumptions of specific University-wide changes. A desire to be pragmatic may motivate support of the proposal, but pressures to expedite the Article 9 process have not allowed for the full consideration of its consequences.

Below, I have enumerated six arguments against the program change proposal. These points are specific to this proposal but add to a growing list of global concerns that have prevented the majority of our campus and larger community from supporting the Chancellor's reorganization plan as a whole.

1. **Poor Fit in the College of Health and Human Services.** Moving the programs currently housed in the Department of Psychology to the proposed College of Health and Human Services is unwise. Most of the other programs in the proposed College are designed to train health practitioners and service professionals. The goals of the programs and metrics of evaluation for associated faculty do not align with those defined by the Department of Psychology. The department has four PhD programs, two of which are accredited by the American Psychological Association. The specific needs of these PhD programs or those of research productive faculty may not be understood by administrators and decision-making bodies chosen to represent the majority of programs and faculty in the proposed College. This potential move also suggests a privileging of applied and health relevant research enterprises in the field. Psychology is a vast discipline built upon basic research that cannot be abandoned, ignored, or undermined. Psychology faculty whose research does not have behavioral or physical health applications should be especially concerned that our programs are being positioned in a College whose mission is service and not science.

2. **Insufficient and Abstract Rationale.** The rationale provided in the proposal does not directly relate to many specific changes that it suggests. Specifically, the school structure and placement in the proposed College of Health and Human Services is not explained or justified by the proposal. Over the course of the last several months, the larger conversation about the Chancellor's plan for academic reorganization has produced drastic shifts in the rationale for the major features of the University-wide plan. Evidence that these features will achieve any of the goals that at one point "motivated" these plans has never been provided. In fact, existing plans, reports, and data were ignored when the overall plan was devised. Major changes such as those outlined in this program change proposal should serve as "the means to an end". The basic features of the reorganization, including the dissolution of discipline specific departments, are merely a "means". While these features have remained, the supposed "ends" have been inconsistent. The hypothesis that this program change plan will "revitalize" our programs is not falsifiable when what revitalization means and how it will be achieved by these changes is so ill-defined.
3. **Too Many Unknowns.** Given the lack of details regarding implementation of the proposed program changes, their impact cannot be adequately assessed. For instance, in the proposal section entitled, "Impact on Faculty Lines and Workload", potential changes in workload assignments are not actually addressed. Operating papers that do not yet exist will determine the procedures that define faculty workload. Acceptance of the proposal will completely invalidate existing operating papers without any information on what will replace them. The affected faculty should not blindly trust that operating papers written to meet their needs will be crafted or approved. Other important features of implementation have not been clarified or determined. Potential changes to space, how future faculty lines will be determined, which programs will be the "high demand areas" marked for investment (or even the metrics by which this demand will be assessed), and other numerous details have not been specified by the proposal or upper administration. Further, how this specific proposal relates to the numerous Article 9 proposals in consideration across the University remains unaddressed. Affected faculty do not know what other organizational changes will occur across campus and have not been told whether approval of this program change is independent of the approval of other program changes or the implementation of the Chancellor's reorganization plan as whole. Because consensus has not emerged on campus regarding the need for academic reorganization, collegiality dictates consideration of how acceptance of our proposal will affect other units.
4. **High Economic and Opportunity Costs.** The section of the proposal entitled "Estimated Financial Costs or Savings, Including Source(s)" states that "significant financial costs or savings" are not "anticipate[d]" by upper administration. This determination ignores many direct and indirect costs. The monetary cost of changing a unit's name alone is considerable. More importantly, the time and effort spent creating a college and school operational structure would be far more substantial than implied. With no anticipated savings, investing resources into a plan without an evidentiary basis is irresponsible. Given the amount of work required to fill in the skeletal structure provided by this proposal, the opportunity costs of these program changes must be considered. The time

consumed by implementing the proposed changes could be spent on pedagogical innovation, student mentorship, conducting and publishing research, and other professional development. Such exercises are far more likely to improve the reputation and quality of our programs. Further, discussion of alternatives to the plan that do not subscribe to the universal structural changes advocated by the administration has not occurred. We should not divert human and economic resources to a reorganization enterprise without considering alternatives that may prove more beneficial and relevant to the goals of our programs and institution.

5. **Negative Impact on Students.** In the section entitled “Impact on Students and Ability to maintain curricula”, the proposal states that the changes will have “no negative impact on students”. Instead, the authors anticipate student experience will be enhanced by the proposed changes. Because no student feedback has not been solicited or discussed, the assumption of positive impact is based entirely on conjecture. What “new opportunities” Psychology students will be afforded are unclear, and current opportunities tied to the existing departmental structure or the College of Liberal Arts may be lost without replacement. Additionally, the Psychology Department is already unable to responsibly maintain our undergraduate curricula. This fact is entirely ignored by the proposal and presents a more pressing issue than any (thus far unspecified) problems tied our organizational structure.

Additionally, student reactions to the Chancellor’s reorganization plan within our department and across campus suggest a rather negative impact of the proposed changes. Faculty and administrative aims to protect students from this chaotic situation have led to confusion, uncertainty, and dissent among the student body. Some students have begun looking to other institutions to complete their degrees. Likewise, faculty across campus are applying to external jobs, acceptance of which will further thin our already limited ranks. Recruitment for the programs in Psychology is already suffering from the uncertainty and indignation pervading campus and making national news. Unfortunately, acceptance of this proposal neither resolves this uncertainty nor gives us the ability to assure current and future students that they will be supported and given the quality education that they deserve.

6. **Rushed Decision Making:** Consideration and discussion of this program change proposal has not been sufficient given its extensive (and unclear) implications. A faculty vote for the proposal to move forward from the dialogue process was held a week after receipt of the proposal. Voting occurred immediately after a meeting with the Chancellor without advanced notification. The purpose of the 90-day period detailed in Article 9 is to allow for careful consideration of the proposal by affected faculty. Time to reflect and prepare arguments for and against terminating the 90 days was not given, nor was accommodation for anonymous feedback or further proposal development. Importantly, this vote, and the meeting that preceded it, occurred in a forum hostile to criticism and discussion. The public vote that was held may not reflect the true feelings of the faculty present, especially since the environment was demonstrated to be one in which critical voices would be silenced. Now that the program change proposal is moving forward, confusion as to what that even means abounds. Faculty in the proposed school, myself

included, do not know what will be in the final proposal or what documents the program change plan can or will contain.

In conclusion, the Program Change Proposal for Establishing School of Psychological and Behavioral Science does not provide the information either required of the contract or necessary to make an informed decision regarding the changes it proposes. Many possible costs and consequences have been ignored while no real justification has been given beyond implied favor from the administration. Stating that positive outcomes will occur is not providing evidence of, or mechanisms for, those outcomes. The claim that we need to first approve this proposal before establishing its substance or implementation plan is false. Perhaps determining these details would have allowed the affected faculty to make a well-reasoned decision to accept the proposal. As it currently exists, however, the plan must be rejected to preserve the integrity and quality of the programs that it impacts.