



Gatton
COLLEGE OF BUSINESS & ECONOMICS
UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

MEMORANDUM

TO: Provost Kumble Subbaswamy
Professor Hollie Swanson, Chair University Senate

FROM: Interim Dean Merl Hackbart 

Interim Senior Associate Dean Kenneth Troske 

DATE: December 5, 2011

RE: Restructuring and Departmentalization of Gatton College's School of Management

After considerable deliberation and discussion, the faculties of Gatton College's School of Management, Interim Dean Hackbart, Provost Subbaswamy and Gatton College's faculty have concluded that the School's programs, majors and faculty would strongly benefit from the restructuring of the School of Management into three departments. The decision was also based on the belief that the goals and regional and national stature of the academic disciplines currently housed within the School would benefit from the departmentalization of the School. This memo summarizes the background and justification for the restructuring of the School as well as a recap of the process followed in arriving at the School and College's decisions to restructure. Please consider this memo a request for University Senate and University approval of the restructuring of the School of Management.

Background: In 2010, Provost Subbaswamy contracted with the Pappas Group consulting firm to study the structure and functioning of the Gatton College to suggest organizational or operational changes that would enhance the College's ability to meet its full potential and mission. One of the major recommendations from their August 2010 report was that the College consider reorganizing the School of Management (SOM) into smaller more cohesive academic units. This recommendation was consistent with SOM faculty perceptions that the SOM was too large and diverse in terms of background and academic focus and that the School lacked effective faculty governance and a sense of direction. As such, the School faculty had developed apathy and a sense of indifference regarding the future of the SOM. Given the report's

recommendation, and the faculty perceptions that the SOM had become a dysfunctional academic unit, the SOM faculty held a meeting in November 2010 to discuss the Pappas Group recommendation and their views of the School and its future. Following that discussion, the SOM faculty voted to consider alternative organizational structures for the SOM so as to enhance its programs and the opportunity to establish academic units with a stronger sense of purpose, enhanced academic governance, and an invigorated vision for the future.

A faculty committee was formed and charged with developing a set of alternative organizational structures based on an analysis of the structures of our benchmark colleges and schools. This committee developed several options and forwarded the options to the Provost in February 2011 for his review and consideration. As is required by University Regulations, the faculty of the SOM were asked to discuss the merits of each option and express their preference in a vote, which was conducted in April 2011. The results of this vote indicated that the SOM faculty preferred dividing the SOM into three departments. Based on this vote, the Provost requested that Interim Dean Hackbart begin the process of re-organizing the SOM into three separate academic units.

Working with Interim Dean Hackbart, Interim Associate Dean Steve Skinner solicited input from faculty in the SOM regarding the tentative names and focus of the three new departments. They also solicited input regarding the alignment of the SOM faculty members to the three academic units, principally based on discipline and departmental focus. Dean Hackbart and Associate Dean Skinner also sought input from the Gatton Faculty Council during the restructuring and faculty alignment process. Based on faculty input, along with considering student and program needs and future opportunities for development, Interim Associate Dean Skinner and Interim Dean Hackbart recommended to the Provost the creation of the three new departments: the Department of Finance and Quantitative Methods, the Department of Management, and the Department of Marketing and Supply Chain, as well as the faculty's departmental assignment. Provost Subbaswamy approved their recommendations.

Since the formal reorganization of the School of Management involves administrative and academic changes, which require SOM and College faculty endorsements and approval, respectively, the SOM and the College faculty considered and voted on three proposals associated with the SOM reorganization. The proposals were developed by the Gatton College Operating Committee and the process for dealing with both the administrative and academic issues associated with the SOM reorganization was reviewed by the Gatton Faculty Council. Since the SOM faculty originally voted to reorganize into the three departments (the administrative change), it was not necessary to have them vote again on that proposal. However, SOM faculty needed to approve the proposed assignment of the SOM degree programs to the new departments (the academic program changes—see proposal 2 below). The Gatton College faculty needed to vote on endorsing the administrative change (the reorganization of the SOM) and to approve the academic program changes (the assignment of majors to the new Departments). These meetings and votes took place, first at the SOM faculty meeting on October

28, 2011 and then at a College-wide faculty meeting on November 18, 2011. The proposals that were voted on are as follows:

VOTE ON ENDORSEMENT by the faculty on the non-academic (administrative) merits of the following proposal:

PROPOSAL 1: The disciplinary areas that comprise the School of Management be reconfigured as three separate departments - Department of Finance and Quantitative Methods, Department of Management, and the Department of Marketing and Supply Chain - and that the School of Management, as an educational unit, be abolished. The faculty employees associated with the areas of the School shall have their current faculty appointments transferred to the appropriate proposed department.

VOTE ON APPROVAL by the faculty of the educational (academic) merits of the following proposal:

PROPOSAL 2: The four areas of concentration of the undergraduate degree program in Business Administration (BBA) shall move to the appropriate proposed department: The BBA in Finance to the Department of Finance and Quantitative Methods, the BBA in Analytics to the Department of Finance and Quantitative Methods, the BBA in Management to the Department of Management, and the BBA in Marketing to the Department of Marketing and Supply Chain.

At the SOM meeting earlier this fall, the faculty voted to approval proposal 2 by a vote of 24-3. (The SOM faculty voted last spring in support proposal 1.) At the Gatton College faculty meeting the faculty were unanimous in their support of proposals 1 and 2

In a separate but related matter, the SOM faculty and the Gatton College faculty also discussed the future of one of the SOM undergraduate degree programs, the Bachelor of Business Administration in Analytics. There were significant reservations expressed in those discussions about the future viability of the BBA in Analytics. Given the significant administrative and academic changes in the College which include the relocation of the Analytics major in the Department of Finance and Quantitate Methods, the fact that the faculty teaching the major courses will be housed in all three new departments, and the fact that some Gatton faculty felt that there were questions about the material included in the new major (approved by the Board of Trustees in June, 2011) the College operating committee felt that it was a good time to study the major and its administration under the new organizational structure.

It was also noted that the Analytics major classes are the smallest in the College and the Analytics major has the fewest majors of any program in the College. The student-faculty ratio in the Gatton College is 33:1 while in the Analytics program the student-faculty ratio is 9:1. In the discussion, some faculty felt that given the significant changes in technology and analytic methods that have occurred in businesses in the past several years that now was an ideal time to

conduct a comprehensive review of the Analytics major with the intention of improving the quality and therefore the attractiveness of the program to students.

As a result, the faculties in SOM and in the Gatton College voted on a proposal (proposal 3 below) to suspend admissions into the BBA in Analytics for one academic year (2012-13). The temporary suspension will enable the Gatton College faculty to engage in comprehensive and thoughtful discussion on this matter before it admits another cohort of Analytics majors.

PROPOSAL 3: There shall be a one-year (temporary) suspension of admissions into the Bachelor of Business Administration in Analytics for the 2012-13 academic year.

The SOM faculty voted 13-11 against proposal 3, and the Gatton College faculty voted 30-11 to approve proposal 3. Interim Dean Hackbart plans on forming an ad-hoc committee consisting faculty from all academics units in the College to review the program.

As the next step in the reorganization process, we are seeking approval from the Senate Council and University Senate for proposals 1 and 2. *Given the timeliness of the issues attendant to proposal 3, we are requesting that the Senate Council approve proposal 3 on behalf of the full Senate so that we can begin planning and informing students of the temporary change.*

Thank you for your attention to this matter. Please contact either Interim Dean Hackbart or Interim Senior Associate Dean Troske if you have any question or need additional information.

School of Management	Rank	Academic Interest	New Department
BONAIME ALICE	Assistant Professor	finance	finance and quantitative methods
CLIFFORD CHRIS	Assistant Professor	finance	finance and quantitative methods
ELLIS SCOTT	Assistant Professor	supply chain	marketing and supply chain
HALGIN DANIEL	Assistant Professor	management	Management and information systems
HANKINS KRISTINE	Assistant Professor	finance	finance and quantitative methods
KIDWELL BLAIR	Assistant Professor	marketing	marketing and supply chain
LIU HUAN	Assistant Professor	finance	finance and quantitative methods
MENDE MARTIN	Assistant Professor	marketing	marketing and supply chain
MURTHA BRIAN	Assistant Professor	marketing	marketing and supply chain
SCOTT MAURA	Assistant Professor	marketing	marketing and supply chain
UZUEGBUNAM IKENNA	Assistant Professor	entrepreneursip	Management and information systems
VINCENT LESLIE	Assistant Professor	marketing	marketing and supply chain
SMITH JASON	Assistant Professor	finance	finance and quantitative methods
CHILDS PAUL	Associate Professor	finance	finance and quantitative methods
DINEEN BRIAN	Associate Professor	management	Management and information systems
FERRIER WALTER	Associate Professor	management	Management and information systems
HARDESTY DAVID	Associate Professor	marketing	marketing and supply chain
JOHNSON NANCY	Associate Professor	management	Management and information systems
JORDAN SUSAN	Associate Professor	finance	finance and quantitative methods
LABIANCA GIUSEPPE	Associate Professor	social networks	Management and information systems
LEE POST ANITA	Associate Professor	e-learning	marketing and supply chain
LIU DE	Associate Professor	knowledge networks, auctions	marketing and supply chain
MEHRA AJAY	Associate Professor	social networks	Management and information systems
OFFICER DENNIS	Associate Professor	finance	finance and quantitative methods
DAVIS REBECCA	Lecturer	management	Management and information systems
HAPKE HOLLY	Lecturer	marketing	marketing and supply chain
LEWIS THOMAS	Lecturer	marketing	marketing and supply chain
BORGATTI STEPHEN	Professor	social networks	Management and information systems
BRASS DANIEL	Professor	social networks	Management and information systems
CHUNG CHEN	Professor	operations management	Management and information systems
HOLSAPPLE CLYDE	Professor	decision science	finance and quantitative methods
JORDAN BRADFORD	Professor	finance	finance and quantitative methods
LEDERER ALBERT	Professor	systems engineering	Management and information systems

School of Management	Rank	Academic Interest	New Department
MULLINEAUX DONALD	Professor	finance	finance and quantitative methods
MURALIDHAR KRISHNAMURTY	Professor	data masking/analytics	finance and quantitative methods
PAKATH RAMAKRISHNAN	Professor	data mining/analytics	finance and quantitative methods
PEEK JOE	Professor	finance	finance and quantitative methods
SANTHANAM RADHIKA	Professor	management support systems	Management and information systems
HOLBEIN GORDON	Senior Lecturer	management	Management and information systems

**The University of Kentucky
Gatton College of Business and Economics**

I. INTRODUCTION

The Pappas Consulting Group Inc. was engaged “to assist in changing the organizational focus and the culture of the University of Kentucky’s Gatton College of Business and Economics”. We were asked to suggest ways to enhance a “collaborative and transparent approach to decision making”. In addition, the RFP indicated that “there is a significant need to improve the collegiality within the Gatton College” and asked “how best to establish a better organization structure that will improve communications between faculty and the Dean.” The RFP also indicated the need “to create an environment of trust” between the administration and the faculty and “amongst the faculty themselves”, so that “the culture could be shifted to help the University reach its “Top 20” ambitions. The University assumed that “an intervention approach is required to focus on organizational effectiveness through developing leadership in a coherent collaborative community”. This report has been developed in consultation with the Provost. While this report was being prepared, Dean Sudharshan announced his intention to step down at the end of the current academic year; as a result, suggestions intended for the Dean have not been included.

We met with the Provost, the Dean (multiple times), and the Associate Dean (multiple times). We read extensive documentation (See attachment 1). We conducted interviews and focus groups with a substantial number of the faculty and staff (See attachment 2). And we reviewed additional documentation that we requested. These extensive interactions and reviews provided us insights into a college experiencing some considerable challenges. We placed these insights into the context of our extensive knowledge and experience of other major public research universities. What follows are our findings and recommendations. These are expressed in a direct manner because we believe that the College can only improve if there are both individual and collective self-examinations with the assistance of this report that views the College through an external lens. There are many fine and talented individuals within the College. However, their abilities are underutilized currently because the College lacks any real sense of community. We would hope our recommendations can begin a process of sustained improvement.

II. FINDINGS

- **The Gatton College of Business and Economics lacks a coherent vision and a common purpose, contributing to a lack of cohesiveness in the College.**

Although the College has a Strategic Plan developed with faculty input, very few faculty and staff reference it or use it as a basis for decision making. The College’s

Strategic Planning Committee has barely met this academic year. The University of Kentucky's aspirational plan for "Top Twenty", however, is frequently referenced. Many newer faculty were drawn to the University of Kentucky by the ambitiousness and excitement of this plan and by the vision articulated by the President. Some disillusionment has begun to settle in, though, because of the budget cuts and some confusion about university and state priorities. For example, the College of Business recognizes that it must attract higher quality undergraduate students and strengthen its doctoral programs; however, the funding formula is believed to reward the number of undergraduates served. There is no consensus about the relative priority of the undergraduate program, the doctoral program, and the MBA program.

Without a shared vision for the College, or even a sense of where it stands in the University's priorities, too many faculty tend to focus on their own narrow areas. The more politically active faculty are trying to get budget information purportedly to try and figure out the priorities of the Dean and the University. This perceived absence of direction enables individual agendas to flourish and engenders an atmosphere of distrust.

- **The Gatton College of Business and Economics has structural issues, contributing to a lack of cohesiveness in the College.**

The current structure of one department (Economics) and two schools (Accountancy and Management) creates some challenges. In particular, the School of Management consists of four relatively diverse academic areas: decision sciences, finance, marketing, and management. Not only are these diverse areas, they also appear to be uneven in quality and success, causing some internal difficulties. At the same time, even though these units may have differences, they seem to come together as "a block" when College-wide issues arise. (For example, there is the perception that the four management representatives on the Promotion and Tenure Committee vote as a block.) The structure also creates some leadership ambiguities as there is one department chair and two division directors.

- **The Gatton College of Business and Economics does not consistently demonstrate an adherence to the stated values of the University of Kentucky.**

The stated values include:

- √ Integrity
- √ Mutual Respect for Human Dignity
- √ Diversity of Thought, Culture, Gender, and Ethnicity
- √ Personal and Institutional Responsibility and Accountability
- √ Shared Governance
- √ Sense of Community
- √ Sensitivity to Work Life Concerns
- √ Civic Responsibility

There is no sense of community in the Gatton College. There are divisions beyond the norm between faculty and administration and between faculty and staff. There are divisions between and among the academic units. The staff areas tend to be highly siloed, although some staff areas have a sense of community within that particular staff. On occasion, mutual respect for human dignity breaks down and a lack of civility ensues. While the lack of civility is exhibited by a few, it has largely been left unchallenged by the many. Shared governance is not effective in the College for a variety of reasons (see later finding), including a lack of trust and transparency. Diversity does not appear to be highly valued in the College, and it trails its benchmark institutions in terms of the diversity of its faculty and students. There also appear to be significant gender issues within the College. While there are a number of fine faculty and staff dedicated to the mission of the College and the University who consistently demonstrate personal and institutional responsibility and accountability, there are those who have individual issues and agendas that cause a lack of responsibility. Too often issues of compensation, workload, professional productivity, and professional jealousies trump any concern for the College or University.

- **The Gatton College of Business and Economics does not operate from a distributed leadership model.**

The department chair and directors have limited responsibility and authority. With the University's Provost emphasizing the importance of the academic unit in decision making (for example, merit review), the College's current leadership model (centralized) may not be well aligned. The budgetary authority (\$20,000-\$90,000) of the academic units is limited as is their curricular responsibility and, to some extent, their personnel role (the unit, for example, does not have a formal vote in the promotion and tenure process). The Dean spends an unusual amount of time on internal management compared to peer and aspirational colleges and their deans. (He has, for example, ten direct reports; an additional Associate Dean might have taken on some of these portfolios). The Area Coordinators have no real authority nor are their roles and responsibilities clearly defined.

- **The administrative and financial operations of the College are unduly bureaucratic and paper intensive.**

The Gatton College administrative operating environment appears to mirror that of the larger University. There is considerable frustration among the faculty and the staff of the College that basic financial management information is not readily available to them. It seems that although the Dean's staff appear open to sharing basic financial and other information, there are often significant time delays reported in fulfilling the information and data requests.

Consequently, many of the staff and the faculty appear to have developed alternative ways of managing their day-to-day business through automated or paper-intensive shadow systems and/or through utilizing their personal network of colleagues to jump-start the processing of travel requests, annual leave requests, and so on.

As the administrative and financial operations and processes of the College are not perceived to be transparent, there is a lack of trust about what to believe or not to believe when statements are made about the College's financial condition.

- **The Gatton College of Business and Economics does not have an effective shared governance model.**

A significant number of faculty expressed considerable frustration with committees, both standing committees and special committees. Some of the key ones (Strategic Planning and Review and Assessment) meet infrequently. Others meet but do not reportedly get much direction from the Dean. Special committees formed by the Dean, perhaps in response to the criticism that he does not get sufficient faculty input, have in many ways backfired. Many feel that the rationale for a special committee is usually not well communicated, and the charge is not clear nor formalized sufficiently. A number of faculty perceive that their work is often ignored and that there is rarely a sufficient feedback loop concerning their recommendations nor any explanation for why they have not been adopted. With this rather pervasive sense, as evidenced again by difficulty in forming a Research Committee, the College will find it increasingly difficult to fill committee slots with strong faculty.

Again perhaps in response to criticism, the College created a Faculty Council. A member of that Council now attends the Operating Committee (the Dean's Leadership group) meetings with the approval of the Dean. Many faculty themselves question the role and effectiveness of this Council. The addition of a member sitting on the Operating Committee, while perhaps well intentioned, occasionally inhibits what can be brainstormed at the meeting. Even the controversy over whether there are minutes (which is highly unusual for such a group) and who posts them is symptomatic of shared governance breakdowns.

It has reached a point where many would prefer for the Dean just to make a decision and not to use as many committees. However, the Dean has, understandably, become reticent of making decisions without input.

Another symptom of the shared governance challenge is reflected in the Promotion and Tenure Committee, arguably the most important faculty committee. Even with clear instructions from the University level, this College committee appears not to have a shared understanding of criteria. The Dean does not meet with the Committee; only the Associate Dean informs it of his expectations and to remind the group of the University's regulations. The departments do not formally vote on tenure and promotion cases, so their position must be inferred from the faculty letters submitted. In addition, the number of cases that reach the final tenure year and the number of split votes on those cases raise serious questions about the effectiveness of the pre-tenure review process and about the effectiveness of mentoring. Although the faculty helped set it up, even the way the committee is constituted is questionable. Economics has two seats, Accounting two seats, and Management four seats. Yet the

entire faculty in the College vote for those positions not just for the seats in their unit. This leads to a perception that the School of Management has disproportionate influence. The structure also sets up the possibility of tie votes, which have in fact happened.

- **The Dean of the Gatton College of Business and Economics faces communication challenges.**

Every college faces the challenge of communication in a fast-paced, information overload environment. However, the Gatton College seems outside the norm.

While most people praised the Dean's "drop by" style and thought it was relatively effective, virtually everyone was concerned about his formal presentations and "informal" meetings. Even though the Dean has a communications specialist, he appears to prefer to make his own remarks. Most thought these appeared to lack focus and preparation, with occasional surprise topics. Events planning also seems to be thrown off periodically by spontaneous surprises.

Some of the Dean's initiatives to improve informal communication appear not to have been particularly effective. The Dean appears not to be fully comfortable in certain settings (e.g., faculty meetings), and his discomfort has only grown as the environment has grown more and more unforgiving. Although his power point presentation and his sharing of data at faculty meetings seem clear on the face of it, for whatever reason, many do not assimilate his information.

- **The Dean of the Gatton College of Business and Economics has addressed, largely through a previous Associate Dean, a number of controversial issues that have had lingering consequences.**

In the Dean's tenure, faculty workload policies have been revisited; the MBA curriculum has been revamped; the summer compensation system changed; the merit review system has been changed and rechanged; and, most controversially, a journal rating system adopted, impacting promotion and tenure. Any one of these can cause problems for a Dean, let alone addressing them all in a relatively short period of time. Ironically, he does not even get much credit for taking on tough issues as very few of them were ultimately resolved. In addition, the Dean presented, early in his tenure, a strategic plan of considerable substance. However, it was perceived as an early indication of a top-down leadership style, even if that had not been the intent. Subsequently, decision making has become much more difficult, with some yearning for an autocratic past, others wanting a full democracy, and a few even wishing for academic anarchy.

- **The Dean of the Gatton College of Business and Economics can point to some significant progress under very difficult circumstances.**

The quality of students and faculty has improved. Fundraising, particularly for the building, has increased. Enrollment, retention, and graduates have all been increased.

Much of the curriculum has been revised and modernized. Research productivity has increased. The number of endowed chairs has risen. Salaries have improved, (although the budget situation has negatively impacted salaries more recently). All of this has been accomplished with declining budgets. Very few blame the Dean for not yet securing a new building, with even his harshest critics citing difficult circumstances and mixed messages from the University.

Yet collective success is overshadowed by individual issues, large egos, and considerable envy among faculty. The University is faulted by some for not making the College a higher priority; others recognize that other colleges view Gatton College as taking disproportionate resources, especially given its modest reputation. The College is certainly underfunded relative to its aspirants, which again creates frustration.

- **The Dean of the Gatton College of Business and Economics has more ideas than the College has the capacity to implement.**

The Dean has since his arrival generated lots of ideas of varying degrees of significance. He continues to do so, although not at quite the same dizzying pace. Again, that is what he thought was expected of him. Unfortunately, there are those who feel that the Dean's leadership style makes vigorous debate on ideas difficult. Many feel he views such debate as dissent and worry that his leadership team either is not encouraged or does not have the capacity to push back and kill bad ideas, reshape poorly formed ideas, and improve good ideas. From the Dean's perspective, his door is always open, and he welcomes input. These two very different perspectives are just one example of the disconnects that exist. All too often his ideas are viewed as creating more work without adding real value. Part of that reaction stems from a lack of communication and a failure to build a shared ownership. The College has some very bright and creative faculty and staff who want to innovate and build even greater quality. They have become reluctant to proffer their own ideas, which is unfortunate.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. **The Gatton College should engage in a highly inclusive strategic planning process, perhaps with external facilitation.**

It is time for a new strategic plan, especially given the new economic realities. Most importantly, it could be an effective vehicle for creating a shared purpose and vision. The process will need to be highly inclusive, with the composition of the Strategic Plan and Review Committee carefully considered. Stakeholder input must be actively sought during every phase of the plan's development. The Dean should provide the charge and context for the plan but should trust the process after that; the Provost should also meet with the planning group to provide a University perspective and to communicate University expectations. Because of the current divisions in the College and the range of strongly held views, external facilitation would probably be highly beneficial.

- 2. The Gatton College should be restructured, in an administrative cost neutral manner, to create separate departments (economics, accounting, decision science, finance, marketing, and management) each led by a traditional department chair.**

This restructuring would lead to a more recognizable form for a major college of business and would unbundle a current structure in the school of management that many consider not to have worked very well. While the financial climate is unfavorable for creating separate units, this restructuring can be accomplished by administrative reallocation, perhaps with some bridge funding from the Provost's office.

- 3. The Gatton College should be charged by the Provost with developing and implementing a plan of action that would place the College in compliance with UK's stated values.**

This plan must be specific about activities and initiatives aimed at building a sense of community in the College. The effort should be led by a small group of highly respected faculty and staff who have already demonstrated their adherence to these values. The plan must also include measures that restore civility within the College, respecting academic freedom but insisting on respect and dignity. The plan must also address the climate for women and minorities in the College and the need to increase diversity at all levels.

- 4. The Gatton College should consider implementing a distributed leadership model by increasing delegation of authority and responsibility while expanding accountability.**

The Dean needs to decrease his focus on internal management and increase his external engagement. More authority should be vested in the restructured department chairs and other senior officers in a more decentralized system of administration. The Dean should focus on the accreditation reaffirmation, fundraising, and seeking strategic partnership opportunities and should reexamine the number of his direct reports.

- 5. The Provost should charge an Administrative Redesign Working Group to determine how to make administrative and financial operations more streamlined and transparent.**

The Working Group should be comprised of College staff at the entry level as well as middle level managers and faculty. The College might want to consider utilizing an external facilitator to charter such an administrative and reporting redesign effort and provide the Working Group with technical assistance from time to time. While such an effort has been discussed previously, it is probably time to act now.

6. The Gatton College should reexamine its shared governance structure and the decision making processes.

Governance is in need of a reexamination. Committees should only be created when there is a genuine purpose for them. The number of standing and special committees could probably be reduced. In addition, the Dean's office should develop a standard template for: a charter for each committee; a formal written charge that includes the parameters and a definition of the deliverables; a standard format for recommendations; and a formal process (including a timeframe) for a response to the recommendations. A web presence should be created for each committee so as to make proceedings more transparent and to increase the effectiveness of communications.

This governance review (perhaps conducted by a special Task Force with some representation from outside the College) should also identify committees that need restructuring. The Promotion and Tenure Committee ought to have departmental representation voted on by each department; it should have an uneven number of members, perhaps adding an "at-large" seat; it ought to require departmental votes on tenure and promotion cases; and it ought to reexamine the effectiveness of the pre-tenure review processes.

The Dean should visit with each committee at the beginning of each academic year to communicate his expectations and to inform the committee of any relevant University expectations.

The role of the Faculty Council should also be reassessed, perhaps by polling the faculty at large about its effectiveness.

IV. CONCLUSION

We fully recognize that our findings and recommendations could be considered to have gone beyond the scope of our charge. However, we believe that the issues in the Gatton College are so intertwined as to become almost inseparable. Indeed, one could improve both decision making and communications yet still have a college that does not have a shared vision, purpose, or values. Until it does, the Gatton College will never realize its potential nor will it have any real sense of community. Some of the more vocal faculty believe a new Dean would solve all of the problems. We doubt it. Nor do we know any candidates who would jump at this Deanship in this economic climate and with this internal environment. There are historical, systemic, and cultural issues that need to be resolved.

Our recommendations are aimed at beginning the journey to transform the environment in the College to make it a better place for faculty, staff, and students and to accelerate the pace of improvement, so that the Gatton College can make a positive contribution to the University's aspiration. We do not diminish the effort it will take. Nor do we minimize the inherent challenges. Unless there is a good faith effort by a vast majority of the faculty and staff and zero tolerance for those who choose not to even try, there's little chance for success. These efforts must be matched by the Dean making adjustments to his leadership philosophy, his areas of focus, his communications approach, and his decision making processes.

We offer these candid comments in the hope they can contribute to significant improvements in the Gatton College.

ATTACHMENT 1

Listing of Documentation Reviewed

University of Kentucky – Gatton Background Information

1. University of Kentucky’s Strategic Plan 2007-2012
2. College’s documentation of strategic themes and initiatives
 - Gatton_strategicplan.pdf
 - llegeofBusinessandEconomics2003.doc
3. Organization chart
4. Policies and procedures/other governance material
 - ACC410CourseChangeDec2009.doc
 - welcome_packet09.pdf
 - AgendaDecember2009.doc
 - alternativeteachingloads.pdf
 - arReviewsUnderTenureRollbackCon.doc
 - CollegeCommittees2009-10.pdf
 - deansjournalrankings.pdf
 - DepartmentOperatingRulesand.pdf
 - DepartmentOperatingRulesandPoli.doc
 - DepartmentOperatingRulesandProc.doc
 - FacultyMeritReviewAppealsProces.doc
 - FARREPORT.doc
 - GattonCollegeChairSummerNonContr.doc
 - GattonCollegeFacultyREVISEDRese.doc
 - GattonCollegeOperatingRulesandP.doc
 - GattonCollegeTeachingloadpolicy.doc
 - InternationalizationTaskForceRe.doc
 - MinutesAugust2009.doc
 - SummerSchoolMemo.doc
 - TechnologyPolicy.doc
 - Thelonghardroadtomeritreview.doc
 - UniversityAR008PromotionandTenu.pdf
 - UniversitySabbaticalPolicyGRXX-.doc
5. Faculty and staffing level information (headcount, FTE counts by position and job classification)
 - Chair&ProfessorshipListI.xlsx
 - staff1.XLS
 - Faculty.xls
 - GattonProfessorshipCriteria.doc
6. Faculty handbook
7. Examples of written communication
 - Dec_Happenings.pdf
 - july07letter.pdf
8. Governance meeting calendar for a year
 - CollegeCommittees2009-10.pdf
 - GattonCollegeOperatingRulesandP.doc

9. Decision-making process flow maps (e.g., new academic program approvals; annual budget request/approval; College priority setting, etc.)
 - BudgetProcess.doc
 - RequestReallocationofRecurringF.doc
 - ExecutiveSummaryofBudgetRequest.doc
 - FinalGradSchoolProposal.pdf
 - HumanResourceNeeds25non-faculty.doc
 - ProposedRelocationoftheMartinSc.doc
10. Documentation articulating organizational performance metrics
 - ChairStandardsandFAR2007.doc
 - self_evaluation_form.doc
 - deansjournalrankings.pdf
 - FARREPORT.doc
 - MeritReviewReferentsForm.doc
 - pe_form.doc
11. Copies of recently completed operational/organizational diagnostics that were performed either internally or by external contractors
 - CLEARMemotoFacultyandStaff.doc
 - Self-StudyAppendix.pdf
 - Gatton--finalreporttoprovost--.pdf
 - GattonSelfStudyFINAL.pdf
 - ImplementationPlanletterB&EFeb2.doc
12. Enrollment data by department, and by the three academic units
 - Copyof2009-10UndergraduateSchol.xls
 - SEAMstudentGraphs_allstudents.xls
 - GattonCollege'sUndergraduateDat.xls
 - GlobalScholarsGraphs.xlsx
 - SEAMbusinessstudentgraphs.xlsx
13. Available Dean evaluation documents
 - BEDeanReviewCommitteeReport2009.pdf
 - V.Exhibit6ProgressReportPresent.ppt
 - Exhibit4SummaryofProgress2003-2.doc
 - GattonCollegeYearEndReview2008.ppt
 - I.DeanSudharshanSelfAssessmentA.doc
 - II.Exhibit1PresentationtoFacult.ppt
14. Position Descriptions
 - Dean, Gatton College of Business and Economics
 - Associate Dean for Administration, Academic Affairs, Research and Graduate Programs
 - Associate Dean for Undergraduate Affairs

ATTACHMENT 2

Listing of Interviewees

March 23-25, 2010
SCHEDULE FOR PAPPAS VISIT

Tuesday, March 23, 2010

6:30 pm Dinner with Dean Sudharshan and Associate Dean, Merl Hackbart

8:00 pm After dinner meeting with Sudharshan

Wednesday, March 24, 2010

8:00 am Associate Dean Merl Hackbart

9:00 am Provost Subbaswamy

10:00am MBA Policy Committee

11:15am The Gatton Faculty Senators

12:30pm **LUNCH**

1:30 pm Scott Kelley, Director, School of Management

2:30 pm The Gatton Faculty Council

4:00 pm The Strategic Planning Committee

5:30 pm Recap with Dean and Associate Dean (if needed)

Thursday, March 25, 2010

8:30 am Dave Ziebart, Director, Von Allmen School of Accountancy

9:30 am Sudharshan, Dean

10:30am Graduate Studies Committee

12:00pm **LUNCH**

1:00 pm The Area Coordinators, School of Management

2:30 pm Ken Troske, Chair, Department of Economics

3:30 pm The Operating Committee

5:00 pm Dinner, Debriefing and Summary with Dean and Associate Dean

April 26-28, 2010
SCHEDULE FOR PAPPAS VISIT

Monday, April 26, 2010 ***Schedule for Stephen Portch***

8:30 am	Dean Sudharshan, Associate Dean Merl Hackbart and Debbie O'Daniel Business Officer
9:30 am	Undergraduate Resource Center Staff I
10:30am	Promotion & Tenure Committee
11:30am	John Smigla, Director, MS in Accountancy
12:00pm	LUNCH
1:00 pm	MBA Center Staff
2:00 pm	Professor Linda McDaniel, Von Allmen Endowed Chair in Accountancy
3:00 pm	Nancy Johnson, Associate Dean of the Undergraduate Resource Center
7:00 pm	Alceste, Dinner with Sudharshan and Associate Dean Merl Hackbart

Tuesday, April 27, 2010 ***Schedule for Alceste Pappas***

8:30 am	Debbie O'Daniel, Business officer
9:30 am	The Graduate Center and Executive Education Center Staff
10:30am	Liz Doss, Dean's Assistant
11:00am	Department of Technology Staff
12:00pm	LUNCH
1:00 pm	Communications Staff
2:00 pm	Staff: School of Management, Accounting and Department of Economics
3:00 pm	Faculty Forum for those who have not had a chance to meet with the Pappas Group

Wednesday, April 27, 2010 Schedule for Alceste Pappas

8:00 am	Faculty Forum for those who have not had a chance to meet with the Pappas Group
9:30 am	Dean's Office Staff
10:30am	Development Office Staff
11:30am	Merl Hackbart
12:00 Noon	LUNCH
1:00 pm	Professor Glenn Blomquist, Pollard Endowed Professor of Economics
2:00 pm	Undergraduate Resource Center Staff II
3:00 pm	Sudharshan & Merl, next steps

Observations about the benchmark structures relative to Gatton structure

Here, “benchmark” comments refer only to the business school components of UK’s benchmark universities.

- Organizational units in a benchmark college are distinct from its degree programs (e.g., every department does not necessarily have an associated undergrad major; every major is not necessarily tied to a single department)
- The focus here is solely on structures, not programs
- The benchmark structures are quite varied, with no two being the same
- Each might be thought of as a potential model for Gatton structure going forward
- In one-half of the benchmark cases, Economics it is not part of the business college
- One-fourth of the benchmark colleges have 4 or fewer departments
 - North Carolina State (accounting, economics, business management, management/innovation/entrepreneurship)
 - Illinois(accountancy, business administration, finance)
 - Purdue (economics, management)
 - UCLA (none)
 - Virginia(none)
- One-half of the benchmark colleges have 5 or 6 departments
- One-fourth of the benchmark colleges have 7 or more departments
 - Michigan (9)
 - Georgia (8 + a “School of Accounting”)
 - Minnesota, North Carolina, Wisconsin (7)
- Among departmentalized benchmark colleges that include *Economics*, it typically stands as its own department, but with a couple of variations: Economics and Finance are combined as a single department (Washington), Urban Land Economics is combined with Real Estate (Wisconsin).
- Among departmentalized benchmark colleges, *Accounting* typically stands as its own department (or school), but there are a couple variations: it is part of a single department that includes all disciplines found in the Gatton SOM (Purdue), it is combined with information systems (Michigan State, plus two other token cases).
- Among departmentalized benchmark colleges, *Finance* typically stands as its own department, but is sometimes combined: it is combined with Marketing, Information Systems, Supply Chain and Operations Management to form a Business Management department (North Carolina State), combined with all disciplines found in the Gatton SOM to form a Management department (Purdue), combined with Economics into a single department (Washington), combined into a department with Insurance and Real Estate (Florida).
- Among departmentalized benchmark colleges, *Marketing* mostly stands as its own department, but is sometimes combined: it is combined with Finance, Information Systems, Supply Chain and Operations Management to form a Business Management department (North Carolina State), combined with all disciplines found in the Gatton SOM to form a Management department (Purdue), combined with all disciplines found in the Gatton SOM – except finance – to form a Business Administration department (Illinois), combined with International Business into a single department (Washington), combined into a department with Supply Chain Management (Ohio State).

- The main disciplines covered in the Gatton DSIS area are: Information Systems, Operations Management, Supply Chain Management, and Quantitative Methods. Among benchmark colleges, there is great diversity in the mapping of these disciplines into organizational structures. It appears that there are three basic ways in which benchmarks do the mapping for these four disciplines into their organization structures.
 - The discipline is explicitly identified as being its own department
 - The discipline name is explicitly combined with another discipline(s) in the name of a department
 - The discipline faculty are tucked into a department that goes by some other name
- Among departmentalized benchmark colleges, *Information Systems* is
 - named as its own explicit department in 4 cases (Arizona, Georgia, Michigan, Minnesota)
 - named in a combined department with Operations Management in 6 cases (Florida, Maryland, Texas, Texas A&M, Washington, Wisconsin)
 - named in a combined department with Accounting in 3 cases (Michigan State, Ohio State, Wisconsin – the latter two being token, with less than 10% of departmental faculty doing IS research)
 - named in a combined department with Supply Chain Management in 1 case (Penn State)
 - named in a combined department with Strategy in 1 case (North Carolina)
 - tucked into departments with at least three other disciplines in 4 cases (Business Administration department at Illinois, Management Science department at Iowa, Business Management department at North Carolina State, Management department at Purdue)
 - named as/in an “academic area” for benchmark colleges in the 2 cases where there are no departments (UCLA, Virginia)
- Among departmentalized benchmark colleges, *Supply Chain Management* is
 - named as its own explicit department in 1 case (Michigan State)
 - named in a combined department with Information Systems in 2 cases (Penn State, Texas A&M)
 - named in a combined department with Marketing in 1 case (Ohio State)
 - named in a combined department with Business and Public Policy in 1 case (Maryland)
 - tucked into departments with multiple other disciplines in 10 cases
 - named as an “academic area” for 1 benchmark college that has no department (UCLA)
- Among departmentalized benchmark colleges, *Operations Management* is
 - named as its own explicit department in no case
 - named in a combined department with Information Systems in 6 cases (Florida, Maryland, Texas, Texas A&M, Washington, Wisconsin)
 - named in a combined department with Management Science in 2 cases (Michigan, Minnesota)
 - tucked into departments with multiple other disciplines in 9 cases
 - named as/in an “academic area” for the 2 benchmark college that have no departments (UCLA, Virginia)
- Among departmentalized benchmark colleges, *Quantitative Methods* is
 - named as its own explicit department in no case
 - named in a combined department in no case
 - tucked into departments with multiple other disciplines in 11 cases, with 6 of these being in departments named as a combination of information systems and operations management
 - named as an “academic area” for the 1 benchmark college that has no departments (Virginia)

- Among departmentalized benchmark colleges, *Management* (aka *Management and Organizations*) sometimes stands as its own department (perhaps subsuming other disciplines), is sometimes partitioned into multiple departments, and is sometimes tucked into larger departments. This leads to quite a few combinations for the benchmarks:
 - named as a distinct department in 14 cases; of these, the department:
 - subsumes Operations and Supply Chain Management in 1 case (Georgia)
 - subsumes Accounting and all Gatton SOM areas in 1 case (Purdue)
 - is supplemented with other allied departments in 3 cases (Management and Strategy departments at Michigan, Management and Human Resources departments at Ohio State, Management and Policy departments at Maryland)
 - is a compound in 2 cases (the Management & Human Resources department at Wisconsin, the Management, Innovation & Entrepreneurship department at North Carolina State)
 - not named as a department, but partitioned into multiple departments in 2 cases (Strategy&Entrepreneurship and Organizational Behavior departments at North Carolina, Human Resource and Strategy departments at Minnesota)
 - not named as a department, partitions tucked into larger departments in 2 cases (the Business Administration department at Illinois contains both Organizational Behavior and Strategy, the Business and Public Policy department at Maryland contains both Policy and International Business)
 - not named as an academic area in the 2 colleges without departments, but some partitions are treated as areas: the human resource & organizational behavior area and the policy area (UCLA), the leadership & organizational behavior area and the strategy/entrepreneurship/ethics area (Virginia).
- The benchmark colleges have some department (or area) names that appear to have no counterparts in the UK College of Business, including
 - Risk management
 - Communications
 - Insurance
 - International business
 - Real estate
 - Business law

Going forward, the Gatton College can adopt, adapt, or ignore structures at benchmark business colleges. As for the present SOM structure, in particular, some of the benchmark structures are quite similar to it (see Purdue, Illinois, Virginia, North Carolina State, or UCLA). Many others are not – having departments that largely correspond to SOM areas, or having departments that structure disciplines in ways that notably differ from SOM areas (see Georgia, Michigan, Minnesota, or North Carolina). Clearly, there are no generalizable “best practice” structures.

In any case, a prelude to making a decision about whether or not to investigate a possible change in SOM structure must be a clear and specific understanding of today’s perceived problems that can be attributed to the current structure of the Gatton College. We must also understand that some perceived problems may not be structural. For instance, some perceived problems may be behavioral, cultural, contextual, and so forth. It is not clear that these kinds of problems can be resolved by structural means.

School	Departments									
Wisconsin	Accounting & Information Systems	Actuaial Science, Risk Management, and Insurance	Finance, Investment, and Banking	Management and Human Resources	Marketing	Operations and Information Management	Real Estate and Urban Land Economics			
Georgia Institute of Technology	Accounting	Finance	Information Technology Management	Marketing	Operations Management	Organizational Behavior	Strategic Management	Law and Ethics		
Rutgers	Accounting, Business Ethics & Information Systems	Finance & Economics	Management & Global Business	Management Science & Information Systems	Marketing	Supply Chain Management & Marketing Sciences				
Texas	Accounting	Business, Government & Society	Finance	Information, Risk & Operations Management	Management	Marketing				
UC - Berkeley	Accounting	Business and Public Policy	Economic Analysis and Policy	Finance	Manangement & Organization	Marketing	Operations and Information Technology Management	Real Estate		
UC - Davis	Accounting	Finance	Economics	Information Technology	Marketing	Operations Management	Organizational Behavior	Statistics	Technology Management	
UC - San Diego	Financial Markets	Innovation, Technology, and Operations	Markets & Marketing	Management & Strategy						
Pittsburgh	Accounting	Decision, Operations & Information Technology	Finance	Organization and Entrepren.	Marketing and Business Economics					

TO: Interim Dean Merl Hackbart, Interim Senior Associate Dean Kenneth Troske
CC: Dean David W. Blackwell, Senate Council Chair Hollie Swanson, Incoming Senate Council Chair, Lee Blonder
FROM: Herman Farrell, Chair, Senate Academic Organization & Structure Committee
DATE: Saturday, March 10, 2012, Revised Thursday, March 15, 2012
RE: School of Management Re-Structuring Proposal

I have been asked by the Senate Academic Organization & Structure Committee ("SAOSC") to follow-up with some questions and requests for documents regarding the restructuring of the Gatton College School of Management proposal. Part of our responsibility as a committee is to understand the nature of and the reasons for academic structure changes at the University of Kentucky before making a recommendation concerning any proposal. Therefore, we have reviewed the December 5, 2011 Memorandum to the Provost and Senate Council Chair, the Pappas Group report on the Gatton College of Business and Economics and the written responses (received on February 21, 2012) to a set of written questions that I forwarded to you from the SAOSC on February 9, 2012. We still have some questions based on the documents provided and the meeting with the committee that would help us better understand the proposal. These questions primarily but not exclusively pertain to the sequence and outcomes of discussion and votes leading to the proposal before this committee.

1. In the December 5, 2011 Memorandum to the Provost and Senate Council Chair, it is stated: "One of the major recommendations from their [Pappas Group] August 2010 report was that the College consider reorganizing the School of Management (SOM) into smaller more cohesive academic units." We have identified a Finding on Page 2 of the Report that states: "The current structure of one department (Economics) and two schools (Accountancy and Management) creates some challenges. In particular, the School of Management consists of four relatively diverse academic areas: decision sciences, finance, marketing and management. Not only are these diverse areas, they also appear to be uneven in quality and success, causing some internal difficulties." We have identified Recommendation #2 on page 7 that states: "The Gatton College should be restructured, in an administrative cost neutral manner, to create separate departments (economics, accounting, decision science, finance, marketing, and management) each lead by a traditional department chair." But we have not been able to locate the "major recommendation" that the College consider reorganizing the SOM into smaller more cohesive academic units.

Question: Where in the Pappas Group report is this "major recommendation" expressed or implied?

2. In the December 5, 2011 Memorandum to the Provost and Senate Council Chair, it is stated: "As is required by University Regulations, the faculty of the SOM were asked to discuss the merits of each option and express their preference in a vote which was conducted in April 2011. The results of this vote indicated that the SOM faculty preferred dividing the SOM into three departments." In the Response to

SAOSC questions emailed to me on February 21, 2012, it is stated: "The SOM vote was help (*sic*) from April 4-April 6, 2011. The (*sic*) actually considered several alternatives -- dividing the SOM into 4 separate academic units; dividing the SOM into 3 separate academic units; an organic reorganization of the SOM; and making no change in the organizational structure. 27 faculty voted with 13 voting for reorganizing into 2 (*sic?*) departments, 7 voting to reorganize into 4 departments, and 5 voting to keep the existing structure."

Question A: Please clear up an issue that very well might involve a typo: Did 13 SOM faculty vote to reorganize into 2 -- or 3 departments?

Question B: If 27 SOM faculty voted overall, and 13 voted for 2 (or 3) departments, 7 voted for 4 departments and 5 voted for the existing structure, a total of 25 votes -- how did the other 2 SOM faculty vote or did they abstain?

Question C: It appears that only 13 out of 42 SOM faculty indicated a preference for a 3 department re-structuring. Yet the December 5, Memorandum states: "The results of this vote indicated that the SOM faculty preferred dividing the SOM into three departments." Please explain the apparent discrepancy between the actual results of the vote and the characterization of the vote in the Memorandum. In addition, please also forward to the SAOSC the following documents: the emails sent out to SOM faculty laying out the options for the voting that was conducted on April 4-6, 2011 (the February 21 Response states that emails regarding voting were sent out on April 1 and April 4); and emails and other correspondence sent to the Provost and the SOM faculty reporting on the results of the April 4-6 vote.

3. In the December 5, 2011 Memorandum to the Provost and Senate Council Chair, it is stated: "At the SOM meeting earlier this fall, the faculty voted to approve proposal 2 by a vote of 24-3. (The SOM faculty voted last spring in support proposal 1.)"

Question A: Please provide a brief summary of the rationale of the 3 faculty members who voted against Proposal 2.

Question B: Did the SOM faculty vote to abolish the School of Management in the April 4-6, 2011 vote?

Question C: When stating: "The SOM faculty voted last spring in support proposal 1" -- is this referring to the April 4-6 vote that resulted in 13 out of 42 members of the SOM voting to re-structure the SOM into 3 departments?

4. In the set of follow-up questions sent out on February 9, 2012, SAOSC asked for the stated rationale of the 13 faculty members who voted against Proposal 3 and to provide a brief summary. In the Response dated February 21, 2012, it is stated that "Since proposal 3 has already been approved by the University Senate it is not a matter for discussion." This statement is in error. The Senate Council granted a one year temporary suspension of admissions into the BBA in Analytics in December of

2011, a longer suspension of the program will require Senate approval through normal Senate procedures. Regardless of the status of Proposal 3, the SAOSC in its review process (as stated in our University Senate-approved guidelines) is interested in hearing from dissenting voices and would therefore like a response to its initial question so that we can better understand the proposal. In addition, please provide the SAOSC with any indication of dissent with regard to the School of Management re-structuring that you have received orally or in writing.

5. What are the benefits and weaknesses of the re-structuring with specific emphasis on the academic merits for the proposed change? And how does this change better position Gatton College of Business & Economics relative to state and national peers, as well as University Benchmark Institutions? How does the change help UK meet the Top 20 Goal?

Interim Dean Hackbart and Interim Senior Associate Dean Troske:

Thank you for attending the SAOSC meeting on Monday and responding to our questions. As noted in the meeting, the committee members have some additional questions that require additional responses. Please respond in writing, at your earliest convenience.

1. How many SOM faculty members attended the April 4, 2011 faculty meeting to discuss the SOM committee report? What was the total number of SOM faculty members as of that date?

In my previous timeline I made a mistake. The SOM faculty meeting was held on March 31, 2011. I did not attend the meeting. However, I have spoken to people who did and the estimate is that over 30 SOM faculty attended the meeting. There were 42 SOM faculty (including lecturers) on this date.

2. How many SOM faculty members voted by email on April 5-6, 2011 for and against the proposal to divide the SOM into three independent academic units? Please provide a brief summary of the stated rationale of those who opposed the proposal.

The SOM vote was held from April 4-April 6, 2011. The actually considered several alternatives-- dividing the SOM into 4 separate academic units; dividing the SOM into 3 separate academic units; an organic reorganization of the SOM; and making no change in the organizational structure. 27 faculty voted with 13 voting for reorganizing into 2 departments, 7 voting to reorganize into 4 departments, and 5 voting to keep the existing structure.

Throughout this entire process, we have always strived to have faculty votes kept confidential. I have never known who voted for or against any of the proposal. Therefore, to speculate on the rationale of those who voted for the alternative structures would be just that, pure speculation; something that would be inadvisable and inappropriate for me to do, I am afraid the Senate will simply have to rely on the preponderance of evidence and trust that their faculty colleagues in the Gatton College of Business know what they are doing.

3. At the October 28, 2011 SOM faculty meeting, what was the stated rationale of the 3 faculty members who voted against endorsing Proposal 2 and the 13 faculty members who voted against approval of Proposal 3? Please provide a brief summary.

See above. Since proposal 3 has already been approved by the University Senate it is not a matter for discussion.

4. At the November 18, 2011 Gatton College of Business and Economics faculty meeting what was the stated rationale of the 11 faculty members who voted against

approval of Proposal 3? Please provide a brief summary. What was the total number of Gatton College faculty members as of that date?

See above. There were 74 faculty in the College as on the November 2011 meeting.

5. With regard to each of the formal votes conducted during this process of approval and endorsement of the 3 proposals, please provide a brief description of the notice that was provided to faculty members prior to each vote (ie, how many days notice was provided, how was notice given (email, etc.)).

An email was sent to all SOM faculty on April 1 notifying them that they would be receiving a ballot by email on April 4th. The email ballot was then sent to all SOL faculty on April 4 and faculty were given until 6:00pm on April 6 to respond.

An email was sent to all SOM faculty on October 20, 2011 informing them that a faculty meeting was going to be held on October 28, 2011. The email informed them that the purpose of the meeting was to discuss and vote on the two proposals regarding the reorganization of the SOM—which units would house the undergraduate programs and suspending admissions to the analytics major for a year.

An email was sent to all Gatton College faculty on November 1 announcing that a faculty meeting would be held on November 18, 2011 where we would discuss and then vote on the 3 proposals.

6. Please provide us with a list of the faculty of the SOM (including a description of their teaching emphasis (i.e., Analytics or Supply Chain)) prior to this change in organization and structure and please create another list that indicates where each faculty member will be housed under the proposed three-department structure. Also please provide a description of the impact on faculty if the BBA in Analytics is abolished at some future date.

I have attached a list of SOM faculty, their academic interests and the new academic unit where they will be located.

We have a committee currently studying the BBA in Analytics. I cannot speculate at this time on what the committee will recommend, therefore I have no idea how any proposed changes will impact the College faculty.

7. Please provide a timeline of major milestone events (similar to the timeline that you already provided) that you anticipate will occur over the next 1-3 years as a result of the organizational and structural changes (including the anticipated timeline of events regarding the future disposition of the BBA in Analytics).

*May 2012—Board of Trustees will approve the reorganization of the SOM
June 2012—Committee studying analytics major will issue its report.*

July-August 2012—Faculty in the new academic units will chose permanent chairs. They will also write rules and procedures for the new departments and statements of evidence for promotion and tenure.

Fall 2012—Gatton College faculty will decide on any changes in the Analytics major and we will begin the process of seeking approval for any changes from the University Senate and the Board of Trustees.

8. How will the administrative costs of maintaining 3 separate departments compare to the administrative costs of maintaining one school? Did the Pappas Group consulting firm consider issues of additional administrative costs in its study? Please provide us with a copy of their August 2010 report.

The new departments will make use of shared staff and administrative resources, so the cost of maintaining 3 separate departments will be largely the same as the cost of administering one school. The Pappas group report recommended that we divide the SOM in this fashion with little additional administrative overhead and we have largely followed their suggestions. I have attached a copy of the report.

9. It was indicated in the meeting on Monday that this proposal does not involve a major change that would significantly impact graduate and undergraduate students. Please provide us with a formal statement to that effect.

The reorganization of the School of Management into three separate academic units will not have a significant impact on graduate or undergraduate students.

10. Please provide us with letters of support for the proposed SOM re-structuring from the incoming dean of Gatton College of Business & Economics, other Gatton College school directors, the interim chairs of the three proposed departments and members of the faculty of the former School of Management.

I have attached a letter from incoming Dean Blackwell. The faculty in the SOM overwhelmingly voted to reorganize and approved proposal 2 at their faculty meetings. Clearly they support these efforts, so letters attesting to this support are superfluous. The faculty have already spoken.

Brothers, Sheila C

From: Farrell III, Herman D
Sent: Thursday, March 29, 2012 6:18 PM
To: Brothers, Sheila C
Cc: Swanson, Hollie
Subject: FW: SAOSC mtg to discuss SOM Re-structuring
Attachments: SOM list 11-04-10.pdf; SOM matrix 11-04-10.pdf

Sheila, here is the 2nd response from Gatton. Please post.

From: Troske, Kenneth
Sent: Thursday, March 22, 2012 9:32 AM
To: Farrell III, Herman D; Hackbart, M
Cc: Swanson, Hollie; Greissman, Richard; Blackwell, David; Blonder, Lee
Subject: RE: SAOSC mtg to discuss SOM Re-structuring

Below are the answers to your questions:

Question 1: Where in the Pappas Group report is this "major recommendation" expressed or implied?

You have correctly identified the locations of this recommendation, Recommendation #2 on page 7.

Question 2A. Yes, 13 faculty in the SOM voted to reorganize the SOM into 3 departments.

Question 2B: 1 person abstained and 1 voted for an "organic Reorganization." Note, at the Gatton College faculty meeting in the Fall the proposal to reorganize the SOM into three academic units passed unanimously with almost no discussion and no dissent. The SOM faculty were part of this meeting.

Question 2C: A plurality of the SOM faculty expressed a preference for the three academic unit choice in the April 2011 vote, with 21 SOM voting for some change. At the November faculty meeting the proposal to reorganize the SOM into three academic units passed unanimously. Hence the characterization that the faculty of the SOM preferred dividing the SOM into three departments.

Question 3A: At the November faculty meeting there was very little discussion of proposals 1 or 2 given since both proposals clearly enjoyed overwhelming support of the faculty. At the faculty meeting all ballots were secret. Since I do not know who voted against the proposal I will not speculate why these unknown people voted against the proposal.

Question 3B: In the April 4-6 vote 5 faculty voted to keep the existing structure of the SOM, 21 voted to adopt a different structure and 1 person abstained.

Question 3C: Yes.

Question 4: There is currently a committee in the Gatton College studying the Analytics program and how we might change this program going forward to ensure its success. Once the committee issues its report the faculty in the Gatton will review their recommendations and they decide how to proceed. Any changes that we chose will be forwarded to the University Senate at that time.

Question 5. Please see the first paragraph of the Dec. 5th memo to Provost Subbaswamy and University President Hollie Swanson. Also please see the discussion of the in the Pappas Group report. Finally, I have attached two documents prepared by the faculty in the SOM showing the academic structure of benchmark institutions.

Kenneth Troske

School	Departments								
Michigan State	Accounting & Information Systems	Finance	Management	Marketing	Supply Chain Management				
NC State	Accounting	Business Management	Mangement, Innovation & Entre.	Economics	Business Management includes (Finance, Information Technology, Marketing, Supply Chain & Operations)				
Ohio State	Accounting & MIS	Finance	Management Science	Management and Human Resources	Marketing & Logistics				
Penn State	Accounting	Finance	Insurance & Real Estate	Management & Organization	Marketing	Supply Chain & Information Systems			
Purdue	Economics	Management	(Within Mangement: Accounting, Business Law, Ebusiness, Finance, MIS, Marketing, Operations, OB & HR, QM & Strategic Management)						
Texas A&M	Accounting	Finance	Information and Operations Management	Management	Marketing				
Arizona	Accounting	Business Communication	Economics	Finance	Management and Organizations	Management Information Systems	Marketing		
UCLA	Accounting	Decisions, Operations & Technology Management	Finance	Global Economics and Management	HR and Organizational Behavior	Information Systems	Marketing	Policy	
Florida	Accounting	Economics	Finance	Information Systems & Operations Management	Management	Marketing			

School	Departments									
Georgia	Accounting	Banking & Finance	Economics	Legal Studies	Management	Management Information Systems	Marketing	Real Estate	Risk Management & Insurance	
Illinois	Accountancy	Finance	Business Administration							
Iowa	Accounting	Economics	Finance	Management & Organization	Management Science	Marketing				
Maryland	Accounting & Information Assurance	Decision, Operations & Information Technologies	Finance	Logistics, Business & Public Policy	Management & Organization	Marketing				
Michigan	Accounting	Business Economics	Information Technology	Entrepreneurial Studies	Finance	Law, History, and Communications	Management & Organizations	Operations & Management Science	Marketing	Strategy
Minnesota	Accounting	Finance	Human Resources & Industrial Relations	Information & Decision Sciences	Marketing & Logistics Management	Operations & Management Science	Strategic Management & Organization			
North Carolina	Accounting	Communication	Strategy & Entrepreneurship	Finance	Marketing	Operations	Organizational Behavior			
Virginia - Darden	Accounting	Finance	Global Economies and Markets	Leadership & Organizational Behavior	Management	Marketing	Technology & Operations Management	Quantitative Methods	Strategy, Entrepreneurship and Ethics	
Virginia - McIntire	Accounting	Finance	Information Technology	Management	Marketing					
Washington	Accounting	Finance & Business Economics	Management & Organization	Information Systems & Operations	Management	Marketing & International Business				

Organizational structures for business colleges of UK benchmarks

October 25, 2010

The UK benchmark universities (stipulated by Kentucky's Council on Post-secondary Education) have business schools representative of those that are widely-known and highly-regarded in the U.S. (<http://www.gradschool.uky.edu/GraduateSchoolReports/OtherGraduateSchools.html>). The stature of the 19 universities in the Council's benchmark set is considered to be at a level to which UK should aspire. Accordingly, this report examines UK benchmarks, rather than a set of business colleges listed in magazines such as *Business Week* or *US News & World Report*. The benchmarks' structures, as described in their respective business college Web sites, are shown below, followed by some summary observations. The structures are diverse, ranging from 0 to 9 departments.

Arizona

Eller College of Management

6 Departments

- 1.Accounting
- 2.Economics
- 3.Finance
- 4.Management and Organizations
- 5.Management Information Systems
also includes faculty working in
operations management
supply chain management
- 6.Marketing

UCLA

Anderson School of Management

0 Departments: "Anderson faculty is organized into nine academic areas:"

- Accounting
- Behavioral Decision Making (interdisciplinary group)
- Decisions, Operations & Technology Management
comprised of faculty working in
manufacturing technology/strategy
operations management
quantitative methods
supply chain management
- Finance
- Global Economics & Management
- HR & Organizational Behavior
- Information Systems
- Marketing
- Policy

Florida

Warrington College of Business Administration

5 Departments + 1 School

1. Economics
2. Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate
3. Information Systems & Operations Management
also includes faculty working in
supply chain management
4. Management
5. Marketing

Fisher School of Accounting

Georgia

Terry College of Business

8 Departments + 1 School

1. Banking & Finance
2. Economics
3. Legal Studies
4. Management
also includes faculty working in
operations management
supply chain management
5. Management Information Systems
6. Marketing
7. Real Estate
8. Risk Management & Insurance

J.M. Tull School of Accounting

Illinois

College of Business

3 Departments

1. Accountancy
2. Business Administration
"organized into eight academic areas, with each representing a unique business discipline"
 - organizational behavior
 - business law
 - information systems
 - international business
 - marketing
 - strategy & entrepreneurship
 - process management & management science
(i.e., operations management & quantitative methods)
 - supply chain management
3. Finance

No Economics

Iowa

Tippie College of Business

6 Departments

- 1.Accounting
- 2.Economics
- 3.Finance
- 4.Management and Organizations
- 5.Management Sciences
comprised of faculty working in
information systems
operations management
quantitative methods
supply chain management
- 6.Marketing

Maryland

Smith School of Business

6 Departments

- 1.Accounting & Information Assurance
- 2.Decision, Operation & Information Technologies
comprised of faculty working in
information systems
operations management
quantitative methods
- 3.Finance
- 4.Logistics, Business & Public Policy
comprised of three faculty "areas"
business & public policy
international business
supply chain management
- 5.Management & Organization
- 6.Marketing

No Economics

Michigan

Ross School of Business

9 Departments

- 1.Accounting
- 2.Business Economics & Public Policy
- 3.Business Information Technology
- 4.Finance
- 5.Law, History, Communication
- 6.Management & Organizations
- 7.Marketing
- 8.Operations & Management Science
comprised of faculty working in
operations management
supply chain management
- 9.Strategy

Michigan State

Broad College of Business

5 Departments

- 1.Accounting & Information Systems
- 2.Finance
- 3.Management
- 4.Marketing
- 5.Supply Chain Management
also includes faculty working in
operations management

No Economics

Minnesota

Carlson School of Management

7 Departments

- 1.Accounting
- 2.Finance
- 3.Human Resources & Industrial Relations
- 4.Information and Decision Sciences
comprised of faculty working in
information systems
- 5.Marketing & Logistics Management
comprised of faculty working in
marketing
- 6.Operations & Management Science
comprised of faculty working in
operations management
supply chain management
- 7.Strategic Management & Organization

No Economics

North Carolina

Kenan-Flagler Business School

7 Departments (called "Areas" but seem to function as departments)

- 1.Accounting
- 2.Communication
- 3.Strategy & Entrepreneurship
also includes faculty working in
information systems
- 4.Finance
- 5.Marketing
- 6.Operations, Technology & Innovation Management
comprised of faculty working in
operations management
quantitative methods
supply chain management
- 7.Organizational Behavior

No Economics

North Carolina State

College of Management

4 Departments

- 1.Accounting
- 2.Business Management
comprised of faculty working in 4 areas (each with an "area coordinator"):
 - finance
 - information systems
 - marketing
 - supply chain operations (i.e., supply chain management & operations management)
- 3.Management, Innovation & Entrepreneurship
- 4.Economics

Ohio State

Fisher College of Business

5 Departments

- 1.Accounting & MIS (1 of 25 professors in this department does IS research)
- 2.Finance
- 3.Management & Human Resources
- 4.Management Sciences
comprised of faculty working in
 - operations management
 - quantitative methods
- 5.Marketing and Logistics
comprised of faculty working in
 - marketing
 - supply chain management

No Economics

Penn State

Smeal College of Business

6 Departments

- 1.Accounting
- 2.Finance
- 3.Insurance & Real Estate
- 4.Management & Organization
- 5.Marketing
- 6.Supply Chain & Information Systems
also includes faculty working in
 - operations management
 - quantitative methods

No Economics

Purdue

Krannert School of Management

2 Departments

1.Economics

2.Management

comprised of faculty working in

accounting

finance

information systems

marketing

operations management

organizational behavior & human resource management

quantitative methods

strategy

Texas (former UK benchmark, but information about it also included here)

McCombs School of Business

6 Departments

1.Accounting

2.Business, Government & Society

3.Finance

4.Information, Risk & Operations Management

comprised of faculty working in

business law

information systems

operations management

risk management (incl. quantitative methods)

5.Management

6.Marketing

No Economics

Texas A&M

Mays Business School

5 Departments

1.Accounting

2.Finance

3.Information Systems and Operations Management

also includes faculty working in

supply chain management

quantitative methods

4.Management

5.Marketing

No Economics

Virginia

Darden School of Business

(note: the McIntire School has traditionally not been considered a benchmark)

0 Departments. The School has nine "academic areas" and each has an "area coordinator"

- Accounting
- Finance
- Global Economies & Markets
- Leadership & Organizational Behavior
- Management Communication
- Marketing
- Quantitative Analysis
- Strategy, Entrepreneurship & Ethics
- Technology and Operations Management
 - comprised of faculty working in
 - operations management
 - supply chain management

Washington

Foster School of Business

5 Departments

- 1.Accounting
- 2.Finance & Economics
- 3.Management & Organization
- 4.Information Systems & Operations Management
 - comprised of faculty working in
 - information systems
 - operations management
 - quantitative methods
 - supply chain management
- 5.Marketing & International Business

Wisconsin

School of Business

7 Departments

- 1.Accounting & Information Systems (but 0 faculty members working in IS, see dept 6 below)
- 2.Actuarial Science, Risk Management and Insurance
- 3.Finance, Investment & Banking
- 4.Management & Human Resources
- 5.Marketing
 - also includes faculty working in
 - supply chain management
- 6.Operations & Information Management
 - comprised of faculty working in
 - information systems
 - operations management
 - quantitative methods
- 7.Real Estate & Urban Land Economics

No Economics



MAYS BUSINESS SCHOOL
T E X A S A & M U N I V E R S I T Y

February 19, 2012

University Senate
University of Kentucky

Re: Reorganization of the School of Management

Dear Members of the University Senate:

In December 2011 I was approved by the Board of Trustees as Dean of the Gatton College of Business and Economics. My start date will be March 1, 2012. I currently serve at Texas A&M University.

Since my designation, I have been in close consultation with the current leadership team of the Gatton College of Business and Economics regarding the reorganization of the School of Management into three separate academic units. I am aware of and strongly support the reorganization effort.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "David W. Blackwell".

David W. Blackwell
Dean-Designate
Gatton College of Business and Economics