

realized by significant reorganization. For the NSEI, it seems more likely that broad campus participation would occur if the unit became a Big-C research center, probably located physically at MURR. Here collaborative work can be done that would involve faculty from a broad range of units. It would provide a rich resource for graduate student research, but the graduate program would take a very different shape. On the one hand, we would continue to have disciplinary graduate education—e.g., radiochemistry, nuclear physics, nuclear engineering,—located in the disciplinary units. But in addition, an interdisciplinary program in Nuclear Science would be housed in the graduate school, structured as outlined above, and including Medical Physics and Health Physics as well as interdisciplinary nuclear science.

The reorganization of the Truman School will take a different shape. As one of the few “presidential colleges” in the country, it has a special kind of recognition. In its ten-year history, it has built a solid base for both graduate education in public policy and public administration, and it has built significant policy research in its Institute of Public Policy, which has conducted over 60 funded projects that brought in \$4 million. Currently there are 16 faculty with formal appointments in the Truman School—13 at 100% FTE and 3 at smaller amounts. There are also 10 faculty members with formal appointments elsewhere but with a formal status in the Truman School. We believe there are at least thirty other faculty on campus who would potentially affiliate as faculty, and a main goal of this reorganization will be to encourage a large proportion of them to join the faculty and increase the scale and visibility of the School. The Harry S Truman School of Public Affairs will become free-standing school with a dean, reporting to the provost, much like the MU Law School or the Sinclair School of Nursing.

We are optimistic that the reorganization of these units will significantly enhance their stature, national recognition, and research productivity. At the same time, it will allow the Graduate School to focus on the kinds of support and academic programs for which it is best suited.

Subject:

FW: Reorg memo updated

From: Foster, Brian L. (Provost)
Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2012 9:01 PM
To: Justice, George; Dean, Kenneth D.
Subject: RE: Reorg memo updated

Let's the three of us talk about this. We need to have some kind of communication with the NSEI people, I'm afraid, before this all goes public (that will be nasty, but I think it may be more nasty if we don't.) I guess I'm just saying that the coordination/alignment/timing of these three matters (NSEI, Truman, Grad School) has to be very well thought out.
Brian

From: Justice, George
Sent: Tuesday, January 24, 2012 9:14 AM
To: Dean, Kenneth D.; Foster, Brian L. (Provost)
Subject: Reorg memo updated

Brian (copying Ken),

I've updated the Grad School reorganization memo. Most of this involved minor word tinkering, but I also changed the date of the effective reorganization from July 1 to March 1. I took away from the meeting with the chancellor last week that we should move forward on this as quickly as possible. Please read this carefully and let me know what you think.

Along these lines, I think there are a few steps we need to take prior to releasing this to the campus.

- a) We need to write a letter of offer to Bart Wechsler to be dean of the Truman School for the period covering March 1, 2012 until August 1, 2014.
- b) We need to prepare staff in both our offices (I'm taking that on for Mannie Liscum and Bev Vaughn, particularly, next week since they're likely to field many questions. I think Kirsten and Teresa need to understand what's going on, and maybe others, including people in the chancellor's office).
- c) We need to work with the News Bureau--I think this memo can serve as a news release, but we'll want Mary Jo and Christian not only to format the actual press release but to understand what we're doing.

At the same time, we need to keep a careful lid on this. I've only told Mannie and Bev in my office--I don't think anybody else needs to know beforehand.

I'll be working also on the constituent pieces--the cover memo for Bart's vision statement and our specific release on the details of NSEI. That one might take a bit of work--we need to make sure that current students feel "safe" with the transition. Redacted 610.021(13)

Redacted 610.021(13) (We'll also have to work on a name change for the degree, but I think that can wait until later in the spring).

And there will be more--I'm trying to think through all the complexities. In the meantime, please do look closely at this version of the memo.

From: Justice, George
Sent: Wednesday, February 01, 2012 9:23 PM
To: Dean, Kenneth D.; Foster, Brian L. (Provost)
Subject: NSEI
Attachments: NSEI wallace and rooney docs.pdf

Importance: High

Ken and Brian,

Before I send a memo to Chris Koukola with all the documents, etc., I wanted to run one final thing by you.

Ken and I discussed some of the faculty issues related to NSEI. When we were talking, we (the two of us) determined that there would be no thought that the discontinuance of NSEI "would result in the termination of continuous appointments or term appointments before their expiration" (from Collected Rules 320.150 A) (http://www.umsystem.edu/ums/rules/collected_rules/faculty/ch320/320.150_discontinuance_of_programs_or_departments_of_instruction).

In our discussion today, instead, we determined that since a) the graduate program was continuing (albeit in a different structure) and b) the faculty jobs weren't in jeopardy, that we didn't have to follow 320.150.

And I think that's correct.

EXCEPT, as you will see from Chancellor Wallace's memo (attached), he specifically mentions 320.150 as the process that will be used to end the program.

So I worry that even if we don't need to follow 320.150 B. 4-7 (which deals with ending tenured appointments) the faculty will still insist that the campus follow 320 B. 1-3, which involves setting up a faculty panel to listen to the case and provide a recommendation to the Chancellor, who can still discontinue the program. (Even if we're not actually "discontinuing" the program.)

Another problem: 320.150 B. 8 says that we can't start up another program within three years without reinstating the faculty. Of course I don't think this applies because we're not actually terminating the program in the ways that 320.150 expects.

All of this goes to say that because Chancellor Wallace specified this section of the Collected Rules, we may be forced to follow procedures that aren't actually relevant to the more subtle transformations that we're trying to undertake. And this might end up derailing what would be right for the campus.

Or am I overreacting? Ken, do you follow me here? What do both of you think?

George

