

## **Memorandum**

November 3, 2008

To: Meredith Hay, Executive Vice President and Provost

From: SPBAC Transformation Subcommittee

Re: Recommendations on White Papers

The SPBAC Transformation Subcommittee has reviewed the white papers submitted to the Provost as contributions to the UA Transformation Plan. In assessing these white papers, we took into consideration the likely effect of the proposed changes relative to the following criteria:

- Centrality to Mission and Priorities
- Quality of teaching, outreach/service and research/scholarship/creative activities
- Productivity/Quantity of teaching, outreach/service and research/scholarship/creative activities
- Cost Efficiency
- Internal/External Demand
- Rankings and Reputation of the Unit and University

We also considered the extent to which the white papers reflected consultation with and support from those who would be affected by the changes.

Our discussions were informed by comments provided through the Provost's website and/or to us directly.

Our recommendations are attached here. Due to the diversity of kinds of proposals made in the white papers and the numerous groups of overlapping, conflicting and/or interdependent proposals, we have made a range of different kinds of recommendations. In some cases, we recommend that the white paper proceed to the next stage of the Transformation process, that is, Full Proposal development. In other cases, we have recommended that further study be undertaken regarding the impacts of proposed changes or that the proposers of overlapping and/or conflicting proposals work together to develop a common approach to the given area. In some cases we recommend that no further action be taken. Some white papers do not propose a specific reorganization but rather provide a commentary on various policies and activities; in most of these cases, we did not develop recommendations but do appreciate the input.

In order to meet the November 3<sup>rd</sup> deadline, we have in many cases provided general recommendations for groups of proposals. We would be happy to provide more detailed feedback on particular white papers at your request.

We want to thank the campus community as a whole for its constructive participation in the Transformation process.

## **SPBAC TRANSFORMATION SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION ON WHITE PAPERS**

- #112 Graduate Program in Integrative Insect Science**
  - #115 School of Geography and Development**
  - #118 Umbrella Program for Graduate Training in Molecular Life Science**
  - #125 School of Information Science, Technology and Arts**
  - #127 Literary Arts Emphasis**
  - #129 Future of Science and Mathematics Teacher Development**
  - #137 Department of Mexican American and Raza Studies**
  - #140 School of Animal Systems**
  - #141 Institute for Mineral Resources**
  - #146 Consortium for Critical Analysis and Social Change**
  - #147 Research Institute for Arts in the Americas**
  - #149 Disability Studies**
  - #151 Arizona Center for Educational Success**
  - #153 Educational Studies or Teaching and Learning**
  - #154 Leadership, Higher Education and Policy**
  - #158 School of Anthropology**
  - #159 School of Plant Sciences**
  - #162 Institute for the Study of Religion and Culture**
  - #164 Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry**
  - #185 Near Eastern Studies**
- 

We recommend that these white papers proceed to the next step of the Transformation process. In most cases, this would be the development of a “Full Proposal” and would thus include expanded consultation and documentation of the views of those affected. (There may be some exceptions in which the proposed changes do not actually require reorganization of academic units.) We recognize that a number of these proposals do not promise significant short-term cost-savings but rather are strategies for longer-term efficiencies through curricular transformation, or for improved intellectual synergies, revenue generation or institutional reputation. A few actually ask for new investments. In developing Full Proposals, we urge the relevant units to find ways to move forward without new investments, at least in the short-term. We also recognize that in some cases the location of the reorganized unit is contingent on decisions yet to be made about college structures. However, we believe that these unit-level proposals can and should proceed as described regardless of their ultimate college location.

**SPBAC TRANSFORMATION SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION ON  
WHITE PAPERS REGARDING THE SCHOOL OF PUBLIC  
ADMINISTRATION AND POLICY:**

**#138 School of Government and Public Affairs**

**#150 Eller College of Management's School of Public Administration and Policy and  
Other Departments**

---

The merger proposed in #138 has positive potential and the support of the affected units. Therefore, we recommend development of a Full Proposal. We suggest that the proposers explore possible collaboration between the proposed School of Government and Public Affairs and the Udall Center and, likewise, that they explore collaborations with UA South, particularly with regard to the Criminal Justice program.

We recommend that no further action be taken at this time on #150, pending the outcome of #138.

**SPBAC TRANSFORMATION SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION ON  
WHITE PAPER**

**#122 Department of Molecular, Cellular and Developmental Biology**

---

The changes proposed in this white paper are largely positive. However, we are concerned about the costs involved in shifting the labs of so many people and the disposition of the vacated space. We recommend that this proposal be further developed, with particular attention to providing details about these issues.

**SPBAC TRANSFORMATION SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION ON  
WHITE PAPER  
#163 New Configuration of the Department of Classics**

---

This white paper is well-considered; it has been discussed with, and has the support of, the primary stakeholders. Therefore, we recommend development of a Full Proposal. We recognize that some details may be contingent upon the college structures that emerge from the University transformation process and thus completion of the full proposal may need to be delayed. We also note the need for all current members of the Classics program to participate in addressing in detail plans concerning curricula and degree programs. In particular, fuller development of this proposal must specify how undergraduate majors, minors, and M.A. students in the program, now and in the future, will be served and advised about their courses of study once the new configuration is implemented.

## **SPBAC RECOMMENDATION ON WHITE PAPER #131 Transforming IT Support Services**

---

The Strategic Planning & Budget Advisory Committee's Transformation Subcommittee and SPBAC as a whole have reviewed this proposal to centralize IT services and support, taking into account the substantial commentary provided through the Provost's website as well as numerous comments sent to us directly. On the basis of our own concerns and those expressed to us, we recommend that implementation (proposed in the white paper for January 1, 2009) be delayed and that additional study and refinement take place. SPBAC recognizes the importance of information security, adherence to policy and laws, and that centralization of certain services may produce cost savings and improved quality. However, given the enormous potential impact on extremely diverse users of IT services, substantial consultation with those users is necessary to develop a workable plan (which ultimately may be more limited in scope than proposed in the white paper). The white paper as submitted and the response of so many across campus indicate that such consultation has not yet occurred.

We recommend that a committee be formed that would include representatives from currently constituted IT advisory committees as well as representatives reflecting the diversity of users. This committee should be charged to identify which, if any, services should be provided centrally, assess the differential impact of the centralization of particular functions on diverse units and activities, and assess where and whether significant cost savings and/or service improvements could be realized. But most importantly, this committee must be a mechanism for working with all potentially affected campus constituencies.

SPBAC will review a revised proposal reflecting the input of the campus and the analyses performed by the committee.

**SPBAC TRANSFORMATION SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION ON  
WHITE PAPERS FROM THE ARIZONA HEALTH SCIENCE CENTER:**

**#119 Department of Pharmacology and Toxicology (John Murphy, Assoc Dean,  
College of Pharmacy)**

**#121 Tripartite Reorganization of College Of Medicine (Carol Bernstein, Dept Cell  
Biology and Anatomy)**

**#143 Sarver Heart Center (Carol Gregorio, Co-Director Sarver Heart Center)**

**#152 College of Public Health (COPH Dean, Iman Hakim)**

**#166 College of Medicine (Interim Dean, Steve Goldschmid)**

**#187 College of Nursing (Interim Dean, Carolyn Murdaugh)**

---

Proposals #152, 166 and 187 each propose modest internal streamlining of administrative activities. We recommend that each college move forward with the cost cutting measures they describe.

Proposals #119, 121, 143, and some aspects of 166, are more controversial or conflicting and need much more consultation and consensus to move forward. We note, however, that there does seem to be agreement between #121 and #166 with regard to the need for an institutional structure that would support translational research in the College of Medicine. We recommend further development of this idea.

More generally, the SPBAC Transformation Subcommittee is concerned that the Arizona Health Sciences Center (AHSC) colleges and units have not fully utilized the White Paper process to explore the opportunities for improvements and innovations. We recognize that this is likely due to the fact that the Arizona Health Sciences Center is in a transition period with new Vice President for Health Affairs, Dr. William Crist, just beginning in this position as we write.

**Therefore, our overall and strongest recommendation is that the “Transformation” process for AHSC be re-started under the leadership of the new VPHA.** We recommend that Vice President Crist bring together the Deans and Faculty of the four colleges to explore possibilities for cross-college collaborations, mergers and other forms of restructuring to achieve collective and individual prominence and success.

Opportunities to strengthen all aspects of the AHSC core mission and activities need to be examined, including administrative organization; academic support services and structures; instructional and curricular design, delivery and administration; and the climate for productivity and success of faculty, staff, appointed professionals and students.

**SPBAC TRANSFORMATION SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION ON COLLEGE-LEVEL STRUCTURES INCLUDING WHITE PAPERS:**

**Regarding Science, Engineering and Optical Sciences:**

- #128 School of Physical Sciences
- #135 College of Engineering and Applied Science
- #139 Optical Sciences
- #142 School of Biological and Biomedical Engineering
- #145 Decision Sciences and Engineering Systems
- #155 College of Science and Engineering
- #177 College of Engineering
- #204 College of Engineering Consolidated Proposal

**Regarding Humanities and Social and Behavioral Sciences:**

- #113 School of English and American Studies
- #161 College of Social and Behavioral Sciences
- #165 College of World Cultures, Literatures and Languages
- #180 School of International, Area and Language Studies

**Regarding College of Fine Arts and College of Architecture and Landscape Architecture**

- #172 Thematic Interdisciplinary Schools
  - #181 College for Design and the Sustainable Environment (Revised)
  - #186 College of Fine Arts
- 

The SPBAC Transformation Subcommittee has reviewed the numerous and conflicting proposals regarding A) the potential merger of the Colleges of Humanities and SBS and B) the potential merger of the Colleges of Science, Engineering and Optical Sciences.

Based on our own assessment and the input provided through the Provost's website, we recommend that the College of Optical Sciences remain an independent college and make additional contributions to teaching as proposed in #139.

With regard to the proposed mergers of Science with Engineering and Humanities with Social and Behavioral Sciences, we do not feel that we have adequate information to make a determination of the correct course of action at this time. Specifically, it is unclear to us whether these mergers would:

- 1) increase or decrease administrative staff and related costs
- 2) improve or diminish the rankings, reputation and potential for revenue generation (sponsored research and private support) in the affected areas

**We recommend that a careful analysis be made of the pros and cons of various options concerning these College-level structures.** This analysis should consider the administrative arrangements and costs each option would entail, the impact on rankings, reputation and revenue generation, and the synergies made possible. It should also

consider the costs associated with changing existing structures, and any collateral consequences that might be foreseen. We emphasize the critical importance of detailing the administrative benefits and costs of each arrangement. Since many of the intellectual gains to be achieved by combining Colleges could be achieved in other ways (Centers, Institutes, GIDPs), the main argument for combining (and incurring the transitional and cultural costs) must be that significant cost savings can be realized, without loss of quality.

We also recommend that we obtain, as soon as possible, data from our AAU peers concerning administrative costs in general. We need to understand if our administrative costs both at the central level and at the college level are within the norm.

We recommend that the Deans of the relevant colleges should work together to produce these analyses (in consultation with their department heads and faculty). They should have whatever support they might need from OIRPS and the Budget Office in gathering necessary data.

We recommend that the College of Fine Arts and the College of Architecture and Landscape Architecture each be encouraged to develop ways that they might serve as hubs for interdisciplinary activity with units remaining in other colleges. Specifically, with regard to #181, we recommend participation in the larger discussion of developing structures to support the study of Earth and Environmental Sciences that we are recommending. We note that #172 has been largely superseded by more specific and fully developed proposals emerging from the relevant units and recommend that no further action be taken on this proposal.

## **OPTIONS FOR COLLEGE-LEVEL STRUCTURES:**

### **I. Concerning the Current Colleges of Science and Engineering**

Option A: Create a College of Science and Engineering, combining the current Colleges of Science and Engineering (along the lines suggested in #155, modified to exclude the College of Optical Sciences).

Option B: Leave both Colleges as freestanding entities with internal or cross-college reorganizations as proposed in numerous white papers (such as #204, #135, and #177) or as might be developed through further discussion.

### **II. Concerning the Current Colleges of Humanities and SBS**

Option A: Keep SBS and Humanities distinct with some internal reorganization of units as proposed in:

#161 College of SBS

#165 College of World Cultures, Literatures and Languages

Option B: Create a new College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences (CLASS), combining units currently in COH and SBS, perhaps along the lines suggested in #113.

Option C: Hybrid model as proposed in #165, in which Colleges of SBS and WCLL would be part of a larger “Colleges of <name to be determined>”.

In the context of these discussions, attention must be paid to the identification of appropriate and supportive placement of the Title VI Centers (Center for Middle East Studies, Center for Latin American Studies, and Center for Education Resources in Culture, Language and Literacy). We also recommend that the proposers of #180 be included in the discussions of the appropriate structure for SBS and Humanities.

**SPBAC TRANSFORMATION SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION ON  
WHITE PAPER  
#123 The Honors College**

---

The SPBAC Transformation Subcommittee supports this proposal's view that the Honors College is a very important contributor to the quality and reputation of the University of Arizona and that it fosters a culture here that highlights academic excellence in undergraduate education.

We agree that limited availability of Honors courses is a real concern, and that alleviating this limitation is very important. And we agree that Honors education should be coordinated and curricula developed or further developed to provide consistency across campus; however, we do not support the suggested solution of centralizing Honors courses along with general education under the VPI (see recommendation regarding the VPI white paper). We also recognize the importance of adequate advising for Honors students.

The committee encourages the Honors College to be as creative as possible in developing solutions; at the same time, we acknowledge that additional funding, or a redistribution of resources, might be needed to support and build on the excellence represented and advanced by the Honors College. The strengthening of the Honors College is a priority, which should not be lost sight of during this time of transformation.

**SPBAC TRANSFORMATION SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION ON  
WHITE PAPERS REGARDING UA SOUTH:**

**#169 Arizona Outreach College and UA@**

**#184 The University of Arizona South**

---

We find positive value in the changes proposed in both of these white papers, recognizing that #169 proposes far more substantial changes to the current organization. Given the demands of the Arizona Board of Regents and the needs of the state for substantially increased degree production, we recommend that the proposals be combined and developed into one cohesive plan for increasing the service UA South and the Arizona Outreach College provide to the University and the State.

We recommend that the following team be charged to undertake this task:

Gail Burd, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs

Eugene Sander, Vice President for Outreach

Mike Proctor, Senior Associate Vice President for Outreach

Gerald L. Jubb, Jr., Associate Vice President and Dean

J.C. Mutchler, Interim President, UA South Faculty Forum

**SPBAC TRANSFORMATION SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION ON  
WHITE PAPERS REGARDING UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION:**

**#126 Undergraduate Writing Instruction**

**#201 ASUA**

**#203 Vice President for Instruction (General Education)**

---

SPBAC has reviewed these proposals, all of which address fundamental issues regarding the design and delivery of undergraduate education, especially Foundations and General Education:

#126 raises legitimate concerns about the writing skills of our undergraduates. However, we do not believe that the proposed solution, which would be to dismantle the Writing Program and relocate writing instruction to the disciplines, has been properly informed by expertise regarding writing instruction. Nor is it clear that it would cut costs as claimed.

#203 raises important questions about how General Education is delivered. However, it proposes a profound reorganization of General Education instruction the implications of which do not appear to have been fully considered. We do not support the idea of creating a distinct group of teaching-intensive faculty who are independent of academic units and assigned, even temporarily, to University College. While we recognize the need for differentiated workloads, this separates teaching and research to an extent that would be detrimental to the quality of instruction. We do agree that continuing professional development in the art and craft of teaching should be enhanced.

#201 also addresses the issue of General Education, suggesting, in significant conflict with #203, that Gen Ed should be “re-aligned with the degree-based 100 and 200 level courses.”

While these proposals raise important and legitimate issues, we do not support moving forward on the specific changes proposed at this time. However, **we recommend that the Provost appoint a committee, on the model of an Academic Program Review (and thus including external reviewers with expertise in the relevant areas), to provide an authoritative and independent review of Foundations (to include not only writing skills but also mathematics) and General Education.**

**SPBAC TRANSFORMATION SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION ON  
WHITE PAPERS RELATED TO UNIVERSITY COLLEGE AND  
UNDERGRADUATE ADVISING**

**#116 School of Mathematical Sciences**

**#130 Undergraduate Academic Advising Council**

**#201 ASUA**

**#202 University College**

---

These white papers all address the question of how to provide appropriate advising and support for students who are undecided regarding a major, students in transition between majors, as well as interdisciplinary and pre-professional students. The University College and ASUA white papers suggest diametrically opposed directions as the University College proposal would scale up their operations while ASUA recommends reducing University College to a Student Support Center. #116 (see separate recommendation) proposes a substantial reorganization of Math tutoring. #130 simply requests that the UAAC be consulted regarding any changes to student advising.

We recommend that a Task Force be formed to explore the crucial and fundamental questions that would have to be examined in order to determine the proper restructuring of University College:

- 1) What is the best way to provide adequate and high quality support and advising for undecided and at-risk students?
- 2) When should students be required to decide on a major?
- 3) Do we need to develop new majors to accommodate some of the students currently served by University College?

Per the request in #130, we recommend that the UAAC be represented on this Task Force. In addition, we recommend that the proposers of #116 be included in discussions regarding the structure of tutoring services.

**SPBAC TRANSFORMATION SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION ON  
WHITE PAPER  
#116 School of Mathematical Sciences**

---

This white paper proposes to merge the Department of Mathematics, the GIDP Program in Applied Mathematics, the GIDP Program in Statistics, and mathematics tutoring. It also proposes closer coordination between five Centers (Undergraduate Math Center, Center for Mathematics Education of Latinos/as, Arizona Center for Mathematical Sciences, Southwest Center for Arithmetical Algebraic Geometry, and the Center for Recruitment and Retention) and one Institute (Institute for Mathematics and Education).

Mathematics tutoring takes place under the direction of the University Learning Center, MASTR, and CATS Academics, which are not under the control of the Department of Mathematics and have not been consulted regarding this proposal. As noted in our recommendation regarding University College and undergraduate advising, we recommend that the authors of this proposal be included in larger discussions about the organization of tutoring services, but we do not recommend proceeding with the merger of these tutoring activities into a School of Mathematics at this time.

In addition, while we support some streamlining and coordination of undergraduate statistics courses, we do not recommend further action on the proposal here to consolidate all introductory statistics courses under the proposed School of Mathematics. Any further efforts to coordinate statistics instruction must include all major providers of such courses.

We do, however, recommend that the proposers proceed with the development of a Full Proposal including only the Department of Mathematics, the GIDP Program in Applied Mathematics, the GIDP Program in Statistics, the Undergraduate Math Center, the Center for Mathematics Education of Latinos/as, the Arizona Center for Mathematical Sciences, the Southwest Center for Arithmetical Algebraic Geometry, the Center for Recruitment and Retention, and the Institute for Mathematics and Education. We note that the Institute for Mathematics and Education is also included in white paper #129 and recommend discussions between the proposers of #116 and #129. Further, the proposers will need to identify and secure external funding for the development of “virtual” classrooms and for a Center in Transitional Mathematics since central funds are not available for these purposes at this time.

**SPBAC TRANSFORMATION SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION ON  
EARTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES WHITE PAPERS:**

**#124 Unit of Environmental Engineering & Science**

**#132 School of Sustainability for Energy Water and Materials**

**#134 School of Geological, Atmospheric, Hydrologic and Environmental Sciences**

**#141 Institute for Mineral Resources**

**#144 School of Soil Water Environment and Natural Resources**

**#156 Arid Lands Resource Sciences GDP and the Transformation Process**

**#157 School of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology**

**#167 A Campus-Wide School Devoted to Earth and Environmental Science**

**#170 Earth and Environmental Consortium**

**#178 Chemical and Environmental Engineering**

**#181 College of Design and the Sustainable Environment (Revised)**

**#183 Hydrology and Water Resources**

---

The SPBAC Transformation Subcommittee identified and reviewed 12 white papers that were focused on issues related to Earth and Environmental Sciences. These proposals were in many cases overlapping and evidenced varied levels of consultation with and support from proposed collaborators. (See details below.)

**We recommend that the proposers of these white papers meet to discuss the best approach(es) for reorganizing units focused on earth and environmental sciences** and develop a common proposal or proposals to provide the strongest opportunities for research and teaching collaborations. Meanwhile, we recommend that white paper #141 proceed; this proposal outlines the formation of the Institute for Mineral Resources that will serve faculty housed in many units; we also note that this Institute has already generated \$17 million in funding.

We noted in particular that:

# 170 proposes a consortium (not merger) primarily to assist with instruction in the fields of earth and environmental sciences. This is an excellent idea; however, given the need for a larger discussion on the organization of earth and environmental sciences research and teaching, we recommend that the proposers participate in that discussion.

#124, #132, #134, #167, and #183 included mergers of academic units, but appeared not to have yet undertaken significant consultation with all the affected units. In addition, some of the same units appeared in multiple white papers, including the units merged in #144 (School of Soil, Water, and Environment and Natural Resources). Thus, it was difficult to determine which of the mergers might be likely to succeed.

#181 included thirteen units from seven colleges. Consultation is reported with individuals from multiple colleges, yet the white paper team only included individuals from one college. The lack of participation and the broad reorganization proposed here do not provide confidence that this new College will be formed successfully. Thus, we recommend that no further action be taken on this proposal; however, we do recommend that the proposer participate in the discussion recommended here.

While no white paper was submitted by the Toxicology Center in the College of Pharmacy, the director submitted a note to SPBAC to outline their work on environmental science and environmental health. Faculty from this center should be included in future conversations on environmental science.

**SPBAC TRANSFORMATION SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION ON  
WHITE PAPERS**

**#128 Physical Sciences**

**#173 Steward Observatory/Department of Astronomy/School of Physics**

---

The primary changes proposed in these white papers involve reorganizing the teaching of Physics and other physical sciences. We support the idea of improving the deployment of faculty and streamlining the teaching of physical sciences through collaboration among units. Therefore, we recommend that the proposers and the Deans of the Colleges of Science and Optical Sciences work together to develop a common plan.

**SPBAC TRANSFORMATION SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION ON  
WHITE PAPERS**

**#114 School of Mind, Brain, and Behavior**

**#117 Department of Neurobiology**

**#136 School of Neuroscience**

---

These three white papers propose related and interdependent approaches. The appropriate direction will depend to a significant extent on the college structures that emerge from this Transformation process. We therefore recommend that after the college structures have been determined, representatives of the relevant units work together to develop a common proposal consistent with the emerging structures.

**SPBAC TRANSFORMATION SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION ON  
WHITE PAPER**

**#174 Border, Transnational and Cross-Cultural Studies**

---

This white paper proposes the development of structures (including a Center and GIDP) to enhance interdisciplinary research and teaching in the area of Border, Transnational and Cross-Cultural Studies. As this field is central to the UA Strategic Plan and is an area in which the UA should and could enhance its distinctiveness and reputation, we strongly support further development of this proposal. However, given the current financial circumstances of the university, we recommend that the proposers take responsibility for identifying and obtaining funding in support of their proposal.

**SPBAC TRANSFORMATION SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION ON  
WHITE PAPER  
#179 Southwest Institute for Research on Women and Center of Excellence in  
Women's Health**

---

This proposal to merge two units appears to have merit. However, due to the cross-college nature of the proposed merger, we recommend that further development of this proposal be deferred until the college structures have been determined.

**SPBAC TRANSFORMATION SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION ON  
WHITE PAPER**

**#205 Aerospace and Mechanical Engineering**

---

#205 proposes to sustain AME in its current form, with possible changes to the salary structure. We recommend that the organizational and salary structure of AME be considered after the college structures have been determined and in relation to other potential reorganizations of units currently in the Colleges of Engineering and Science.

**SPBAC TRANSFORMATION SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION ON  
#176 The University of Arizona and the World's Land-Grant University**

---

We appreciate the ambition of this white paper. However, we note that it is primarily a request for additional resources. It is also unclear to us precisely what structural reorganizations would be necessary for the realignment proposed here.

Therefore, we recommend that this white paper be further developed to detail the changes proposed, to explain how the new organization might generate the resources it would need to accomplish the goals described, and make a more detailed argument for the payoff that would follow from the requested additional investment, should that investment be possible at some time in the future.

**SPBAC TRANSFORMATION SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION ON  
#148 Eller College of Management Student Support Services**

---

#148 includes a proposal to reorganize undergraduate advising in the Eller College. This change may require renegotiation of the compact between the College and the Provost regarding advising; therefore, we do not recommend further action on this aspect of the proposal without clarification of this issue. Other aspects of this white paper, regarding administration and delivery of Business Communications classes, MBA program functions, and the Doctoral Program Coordinator position involve internal streamlining of administrative functions within the College and should proceed if deemed appropriate by the College.

**SPBAC TRANSFORMATION SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION ON  
WHITE PAPERS**

**#120 Incentives to Retain Untenured Faculty**

**#171 Arizona Pest Management Center**

**#175 General Policy Input**

---

#120 would require substantial funding and proposes to acquire that funding by redistributing ICR. This proposal does not seem viable at this time.

#171 is a request for additional resources and the scaling up of current activities. We recommend that this proposal should not proceed at this time unless ongoing external funding is identified and secured.

#175 makes a wide variety of recommendations for policy changes and other actions that cannot be properly addressed in the context of our white paper review. We thank the author for this input.

**SPBAC TRANSFORMATION SUBCOMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION ON  
WHITE PAPERS**

**#133 Arizona Research Laboratories**

**#156 Arid Lands Resources Sciences GIDP**

**#160 Cancer Biology GIDP**

---

These white papers do not propose the reorganization of academic units but, rather, argue that the proposing units should remain as they are. We are persuaded that these units should in fact remain in their current form. Therefore, no further action is needed on these proposals.