



UNIVERSITY of HAWAII®

MĀNOA

DRAFT as of October 15, 2007

Summary of Input Received on Arts and Sciences Organization

This is a compilation of the input we have received at comments@hawaii.edu, and is current up to October 15, 2003. We will continue to summarize the input we receive and post it regularly. Thanks to everyone

Themes Found Consistently

Some comments were found many places, here are a few themes:

- **Faculty desire the flexibility to work in interdisciplinary arenas.** There is a desire for a structure that is flexible and encourages faculty to make interdisciplinary connections.
- **Faculty want access to the administrator that makes day to day decisions.** There is value in the Deans having personal relationships with Chairs, they are able to develop a (sometimes critical) understanding of the units under his/her supervision. Accessibility to policy and the administration is the number one issue for us plus a bigger voice to speak as the Arts & Sciences within the over all University Structure and Administration.
- **No Senior administrator owns or fosters interdisciplinary work.** Units have trouble receiving even basic support for interdisciplinary work because no one owns the program.
- **Deans should have a reasonable scope** The number of colleges should be selected to keep the number of direct reports to the dean reasonable. With 32 departments in A&S and 6-8 direct reports typically considered reasonable, 4 colleges is about the right size. Consolidating some departments (always a very tricky proposition) might make 3 colleges reasonable from a reporting viewpoint. In contrast, one dean with 32 department chairs vying for his/her time spells disaster.
- **There is significant frustration with the Interim status of the current leadership.** Faculty want to have Deans selected competitively that can express vision and hope. There are split comments on whether these appointments should be internal vs. national.
- **Arts and Humanities is not a cohesive unit.** The composition of the current College of Arts and Humanities seems arbitrary to most, and results in a unclear purpose, mission, or vision. Units from Arts and Humanities report much greater intersections and connections with units outside their College than units within the College.
- **There is some value to established identities in LLL (and to a lesser extent SPAS).** The identity in LLL is important, especially to Linguistics. They see it as a plus in presenting themselves externally for grants, etc. They also note that it is a construct often found in Europe and in traditional academic divisions (i.e. Letters).

***DRAFT Summary of Input Received on Arts and Sciences Organization
October 15, 2007***

- **How would reorganization impact units financially?** More resources at the college level will genuinely improve undergraduate and graduate education because that is where the teaching is done. Most departments took a substantial budget cut (>50%) over 10 years ago and budgets have remained flat ever since despite changes in faculty size, teaching responsibilities and the steadily rising costs of doing business. Administration size and costs, on the other hand, have increased markedly. Many report that resources, rather than organization, should be our primary concern.
- **The shortcomings of the current system aren't obvious to faculty.** The reasons given for any reorganization of CAS do not justify a massive reorganization. If we are to take the time and effort to reorganize CAS, we need to know what is wrong or what is not working with the current organization in order to correct it.
- **We have a lot of work to do on the Undergraduate Experience.** Compared to other institutions, we pay remarkably little systematic attention to nurturing our incoming students, whether freshmen or transfers, and to making sure that they have acquired the skills they will need to be able to get the most out of an education at a research extensive institution.

Other General Comments on Reorganization

- **The health of research is a concern in all of the models.** The college structure has traditionally not been hospitable to research, most of which has gone to institutes, although research has generated much of the discretionary funding for the colleges through RTRF. We should consider appointing someone to lead on graduate education and research to assure that we continue to build on advantages that are conferred by location and do not lose, through retirements, what edge we currently have in those areas.
- **Fundraising needs to be a priority.** UH has a past history of top down, non-responsive admin and administrators who took their role models more from plantations than from universities. Few deans were aggressive fundraisers, even fewer chairs (which is derigeur elsewhere). Units were passive, waiting for the dole. Even today fundraising from foundations is discouraged by the UH Foundation. Faculty often have close contacts with foundations that could be mutually beneficial.
- **We must build on our strengths and what makes us uniquely Hawai'i.** These are many of the things that UH has built its reputation on and that can give us an "edge", hence we clearly want to make sure that structures we put in place allow us to maximize the ways in which we can take advantage of the uniqueness of our location to provide undergraduate and graduate students with a kind of education they could not get anywhere else, but at the same time equips them with tools to be able to continue to build on what they have learnt.
- **We should collect the data first** We should survey A&S and SPAS faculty to discover with whom they currently interact in research and teaching now and in the future. We can then look for natural clusters of departments (those with large numbers of cross-department faculty interactions) to determine which ones might best be aggregated into colleges. It may turn out that we will find a spider-web of interactions where departments interact evenly with large numbers of other departments, thus making cluster analysis inappropriate for aggregation of departments into colleges.
- **Other Units could be included in the discussion:** We've had suggestions to include ACM, SOEST, CTAHR, Architecture in the mix as we discuss the future of Arts and Sciences.

Comments on Specific Models

Model 1: No Change

Many people do favor the current model, they think it has worked for them as faculty, the immediate reasons for reorganization aren't obvious to them, or they fear that we have had so much turnover in administration that this isn't the time to engage, or that this will take resources away from the front line. Others recognize shortcomings such as the rotating reporting structure, barriers to interdisciplinary work, or narrowly focused curriculum that serves colleges rather than the university. Here are some comments related to the first model:

- Rotating upward-reporting structure creates problems with reporting and stable resource allocation.
- The big picture of Arts and Sciences has not been well served with this model, growth, shrinkage and slippage have occurred with very little regard to the "big picture."
- While there is some support of the current weak dean/five college model, this model has not worked well for most faculty and students. Frequently I have heard that the current model is popular because individuals "know" their dean, and can just call him on the phone to get a quick answer. I find this irrelevant. I want a dean who is a scholar, a leading scholar, who understands what professors really do for a living, who can bring international attention to the school, who can communicate a shared vision for the Liberal Arts at Manoa, and can communicate with faculty with a high level of intellectual sophistication on issues other than just money. The current model has not produced such a leader.
- Language programs have developed with a narrow focus and do not always meet the needs of all students. For example: there are different needs between language majors, graduate students in various disciplines, who need reading skills, and sometimes specific oral language skills (e.g., interviewing), and undergrads on professional tracks or with clearly-defined language-learning needs. The current structure puts them all into the same track, focusing on the major, a structure should encourage the development of language tracks responsive to a variety of needs.
- LLL as a college makes no coherent sense. But what's worse, the separation of languages from the rest of humanities has fostered a culture in the languages that is less humanities-focused, and more focused on narrowly training future language instructors for high-school and community college teaching (and also to be hired by UHM in lieu of tenure-track professors trained elsewhere). This means that languages are not offered in a way that meets the needs of humanities students. Graduate students in humanities complain bitterly that the languages that they need are not offered, languages are taught at such a basic level that they cannot learn languages fast enough to become proficient during their years here, and that faculty in AH (who use the languages for research and often know them better than the language faculty) cannot teach them because of the separate college structure. It is not difficult to see how the separation of LLL from the rest of the humanities has diminished quality, and to ignore the instructional needs of the students who are training in humanities and social science fields and not training to teach high school Spanish, for example.
- Reorganization of the present set of Arts and Sciences Colleges is far overdue. The current structure is archaic in some ways, both at the college and departmental levels. The current structure is also anomalous in its LLL configuration. It isn't seen in any of our peer or benchmark campuses. LLL should be reconfigured in whatever model is adopted.

***DRAFT Summary of Input Received on Arts and Sciences Organization
October 15, 2007***

- The system of four deans has worked well and attempting to reorganize A&S now would take time and money that the university can ill afford. The previous practice of the administration of keeping people in an interim position for years is unacceptable. This practice has all the appearance of being done merely to save money without regard to educational excellence or the rights of the people filling these positions. If the administration were now to fill the positions permanently without giving special regard to the people who have worked in these positions so ably for so long, I would have to say with Victor Chernomyrdin, a former prime minister of Russia and now that country's ambassador to Ukraine, "We wanted only the best, but it turned out like it always does", (i.e. badly).
- The College of Social Sciences is generally happy with their configuration. It is close/small enough for them to know the other departments and programs and colleagues, it is distant/large enough to give them a big picture but also requiring us to rely on our own chair and department committees for practical academic decisions). They feel a positive academic climate has been fostered with a participatory and transparent style of governance which has resulted high morale and a sense of collegiality across department boundaries.
- The current structure is dysfunctional. It serves as an insurmountable obstacle to fruitful cross-disciplinary work in Arts and Sciences. The four colleges have varying degrees of internal coherence. Arts and Humanities has no rhyme nor reason, let alone synergy.
- There is a great deal of needless duplication within and beyond A&S. Prune and consolidate for efficiency. At the same time there is a lack of integration, enhanced silo effect, and deans end up in competition at the legislature for resources.
- The current structure does not look as neat on an organizational chart as the other plans, but is that a problem? If the problem is meeting with too many people at one time could there not be meetings with just the Deans and another for institute and program directors whose concerns are not immediately curricular?
- In recent history there has been much change in the administration, and many interim administrators. We're long overdue for some stability. Unless there are compelling reasons for change, I think it's time to continue with the current organization and make permanent hires.
- The organization works on the local level. There is a given distancing--perhaps barrier?--between the rank and file (faculty) and the higher administration. I think this reorganization will be costly, given the studies that have to be done/that have been done/personnel to be specifically reassigned or hired, etc., money which would be better off in building better student services, providing better faculty retention and recruitment, providing for more research support, hiring more faculty/administrators of color, and other matters. UHM has a lot of strengths, some of which are unique and not even represented in other peer institutions, etc. We need to continue to build upon these and also support other disciplines.
- The weak dean/five college model has also enabled the persistence of starkly different standards for faculty hiring/promotion among the humanities disciplines. In AH departments (philosophy, history, religion) tenure standards are rigorous and generally in line with peer institutions. The general rule is that a peer-reviewed book is the absolute minimum for tenure (but in practice much more is expected), in addition to quality teaching. The humanities departments in LLL are a different matter. Research expectations in some LLL departments are significantly less, and spiraling downward.
- This model has worked well. The original model included an associate dean for academic affairs. This was critical to maintaining the academic cohesiveness and integrity of the four Colleges. The first

***DRAFT Summary of Input Received on Arts and Sciences Organization
October 15, 2007***

associate dean, Charles Lameroux, often referred to his office as the glue that held the four colleges together. Unfortunately, this position has fallen by the wayside.

- Pulling down college boundaries is not necessarily the way to foster interdisciplinary work. A stance favoring the creation of adhocracies would be good, as well as recognizing the blurring of disciplinary boundaries already happening.

Model 2: Single College with Divisions

There is some support for a single College of Arts and Sciences, with benefits in achieving more interdisciplinary work and helping students meet learning outcomes. Some noted the fact that this model retains disciplinary boundaries that have been barriers to the goals stated. Many feared that a single College was too big to be accessible to faculty. Here are some comments on Model 2:

- Given the goals you outlined, including improved student performance, better research, more interdisciplinarity, any structure that places significant authority in Deans or Associate Deans that are discipline-based is likely to create impediments to success. That type of structure declares that certain departments/program belong together and only serves to strengthen existing identities.
- One way to allow a single Dean to manage the College of Arts and Sciences would be to significantly elevate the role of the Department Chair/Head. Chairs should be appointed with a significant reduction of their teaching duties, to give them more time to devote to their administrative tasks. This is also an invaluable way to begin to grow our own administrative leadership.
- This model would give Arts and Sciences a single voice within the university, the system, and the legislature. We could also consider that A&S Dean would incorporate the functions of the present Vice-Chancellor for Academic Affairs in order to avoid another layer of administration between the faculty and their academic and resource allocation decision-makers.
- A&S was divided into four because the number of faculty members was too large for one Dean. The division made the deans accessible and to a certain extent weakened their authority. The Wizard of OZ stayed behind a curtain so that he could not be seen. I know that everyone wants a "faculty" driven institution, but often individual faculty members see only one point of view, whereas the much derided administration sees the bigger picture and must make harder decisions.
- Support for prefer this model as long as the divisional "deans" have the power of everyday decisions connected with the running of a department. There is concern that departments retain access to administration. The single Dean should serve as the face of Arts and Sciences, promoting stature, raising money, etc. While the divisional deans work on the everyday issues. As structured now, immediate administration is accessible.
- "Dean" means a chief of ten ("decanus"). At each level of administration, if authority scope is in the range of maybe half a dozen to a score, things work well. Less than five it become inefficient; more than say 15 or 20 it becomes cumbersome. Following etymology, there would be departments of ten faculty reporting to deans with ten departments, reporting to Vice Chancellors with no more than 10 deans.
- Outside the mainland North America, it's rare (nonexistent?) to find a mega-college of "arts and sciences," especially any organization which puts philology/letters and the natural sciences into a single college-level unit.

***DRAFT Summary of Input Received on Arts and Sciences Organization
October 15, 2007***

- The more interdisciplinary we want to be, the more attractive a "czar-like" dean seems. Someone who will make sure that team-teaching, for example, can occur across units with a minimum of fuss... But then, maybe the VCAA's office can perform that role... It is true that the closer a dean is to her/his faculty, the more empowered faculty feel.
- A structure that crosses current boundaries would better help students meet our learning goals.
- I am wary of any organizational scheme which does not have a direct reporting line from Natural Sciences to the Chancellor. A College of Arts and Sciences with a "Super Dean" is OK conceptually, but in practice if that Super Dean is not a scientist, scientists needs will not be voiced adequately.
- In practice, the natural sciences, as presently organized, have modest interactions with social sciences and less with humanities and languages. Certainly all would benefit from increased collaboration and collegiality, but the day-to-day operations are weakly communicated within natural sciences as it is..
- Reducing our voice to one top administrator will make our concerns even more distant from the source than they are now because it will add yet another layer of bureaucracy. And it will take yet more resources from the colleges and put them into administration.
- We should design such that we keep input in from the bottom up rather than top down. Faculty in the trenches know what we need and very often how to do it, their voices need to be heard.
- A big top-down structure hasn't been fundable at UH for a decade. We all have horror stories. If we are going to have a big college, UH has to be comfortable with a bottom-up process where units are encouraged to be entrepreneurial, a bit messy, and independent, but accountable. For this model to work, deans and chairs also have to be openly accountable, reporting each year what they have done and have achieved to improve support for 1. teaching, 2. advising, 3 infrastructure, 4. research, 5. recruitment of minority students, and 6. retention of (young) faculty. The dean then is an arch facilitator and perhaps traffic cop when departments collide. S/he also would find ways to increase resources for departments and find ways to fix departments unable or unwilling to help themselves or possessed of a sense of entitlement.
- The unwieldiness can come out in many ways, however. For example, suppose the dean is from a particular division and perhaps does not listen well to the associate or divisional deans, and so one division (or more) feels shortchanged. The key here will be not just having a very good dean, but having very good divisional deans ready to represent their division. Here I would echo my colleagues that in this model, Manoa would be best served to have the divisional deans come from within the present faculty ranks. In any case, the real challenge in this model will be how to arrange the divisions, particularly if the SPAS's units are added to the mix.

Model 3: Two Colleges

There was not a lot of interest in the 2 College model, but there was support here (and in the new models, below) for a 3 College system, that would essentially merge A&H, SPAS, and LLL. The two comments were:

- This model allows smaller colleges like LLL and A&H to join a larger structure and potentially get more clout, at the same time it isn't unwieldy.
- Could modify to give "social sciences" a separate dean. The present CAS organization could be streamlined by merging languages with humanities and embracing SPAS in some fashion.

***DRAFT Summary of Input Received on Arts and Sciences Organization
October 15, 2007***

- There are considerable reservations that putting the Humanities into a school all by themselves would isolate them from resources. The Humanities are the poor cousin to the Sciences, the fear is that the budget could be cut into nothing. Grants and money come easily with the sciences but humanities give the University exposure and vision. The Humanities really reach out to the fund raising effort of the University as well as to the general public at large. Music, Art, etc. are at the Chancellor's pleasure to help her explore her vision of the University and translate it to all of Hawaii. To be alone seems dangerous and not in the University's best interest.
- While this model would separate the units that have high extramural funding opportunities from those that do not is not necessarily a bad thing, a separation would allow for a focus on the relatively different ways that science and humanities pursue their research endeavors. The main problem could be that that this division encourages a separation of cultures between the sciences and the humanities at a time when an understanding of the links between science and public policy is more crucial than ever. To go in this direction we would need to redouble efforts to create a curriculum that bridges the sciences and the humanities, rather than having one that creates enclaves.

Model 4: Single College with Function Based Support

There were not a lot of comments about this, but there was one suggestion on what the functions could be:

- Arts and Sciences would be best served by a strong, centralized Dean with some organization of subject area and functional Associate Deans.
- The single A&S college model would be so large as to almost replicate the administrative structure of Mānoa writ large. This is particularly evident in model 4 (and to a lesser extent 5), which seems to duplicate the Vice Chancellor structure at the campus level. Better to set up manageable units in which Deans still have a personal relationship to chairs and even rank-and-file faculty members.
- Removes the territorial barriers to improved student performance, better research, and more interdisciplinarity,
- New functional divisions to consider could be: a. undergraduate advising ("student affairs") b. program and curriculum coordination and c. research and outreach
- This model looks like a very organized "web-site" where you go to what you need at the moment as with a "computer bookmark", but, could harbor little or no communication.
- The best organization would have a single (super) dean, because it is most likely to create something that can develop fruitfully as the year of the large turnover (2011) approaches.

Model 5: A Single College with Function Based Support

Several people made the observation that there are overlaps between what the disciplinary Associate Deans would do versus the Functional ones. There are suggestions for new ways to organize the functional Associate Deans, presuming the Divisional Deans retain close to their current authorities. The specific comments are:

- The divisions of administration depends on what sorts of authority is retained by the disciplinary deans

***DRAFT Summary of Input Received on Arts and Sciences Organization
October 15, 2007***

- There is a resentment that this model would put more resources into administration and away from instruction.
- An Associate Dean for Academics and Assessment, as a part of Model 5, could have as one of its purposes the function of making the connection between student success and academics through the current work of the Program and Curriculum Committee know as the PCC. If the PCC required that all courses proposed include not only student learning objectives (SLO's) but also an assessment plan, as well as an explanation of how the new course would fit into the current program and correspond to its objectives, I believe that student satisfaction and success can be monitored and raised. I know that I am going into the minutiae of the connection, but after attending the workshop on program assessment the other day, I can see how an administrative initiative can make it happen. Another function of the ADAA would be articulation with the other Colleges of UHM, the Business school, etc. Of course, the DEAN of A&S would be a natural articulation point, but on matters of curricula, like counterparts of each college can also communicate.
- An Associate Dean of Students would deal with advising and the minutiae of language waivers, back credits, transfer credits, admissions, student complaints, and scholarships.
- Instead of a separate Administrative Associate Dean, the Associate Deans of Arts and Humanities, LLL, Natural Sciences, and Social Sciences would deal with the personnel and fiscal matters.
- This model looks big, while it corrects some of the problems it has the potential for lots of bureaucracy.
- Having all the Department Chairs report to a single dean would spell chaos. With only one dean, a faculty member with a good idea that needs the dean's support would have a very hard time getting a piece of his/her time. This would tend to stifle innovation.

New Models Presented by Faculty for Consideration

We did receive many suggestions for a “Model 6” Some are more tweaks on a bigger model, advocating for more central services, some advocate for reorganization in the sciences to play up our strengths there, and one comment asked us to look at other units that could be a part of Arts and Sciences.

1. **VCAA/ Dean:** Combine the Dean of Arts and Sciences with the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.
2. **3 Colleges:** Create 3 colleges: social sciences, natural sciences, and humanities. This wouldn't portend much change for NS and SS, but it would at least aggregate the smallest and least effective administration units in the humanities. The advantage to this model would be simplicity of implementation: less effort, fewer fights, fewer headaches, and more time for the administration to tackle other challenges. Another advantage would be the preservation of the unique qualities of the social sciences, which don't fit easily under either the humanities or sciences rubric.
3. **Create a School of Creative and Performing Arts:** Many places have the Arts as a separate college – and this might be one thing we should consider – a college of the Creative and Performing Arts (Art, Music, Theater and Dance, Architecture, Creative Media Studies). One reason for this is that

***DRAFT Summary of Input Received on Arts and Sciences Organization
October 15, 2007***

their funding base, tenure and promotion criteria etc. are distinctively different from other academic units.

4. **Create an interdisciplinary center for the Humanities.** UHM It has many centers set up on an Area Studies model, but most flagship campuses have something like a Center for Humanities or Center for Critical Theory or Center for Research into Society and Culture, an entity that brings together faculty in the Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences in an interdisciplinary way. Without such a connector many collaborations amongst faculty remain still-born.
5. **Look at other units to bring into Arts and Sciences:** Significant attention should be paid to schools/colleges/departments outside A&S that actually make sense being inside A&S. Hawaiian Studies, SOEST and many others would strengthen Arts and Sciences as the core of the University.
6. **Build A Support Services Unit:** Retain current four-college system and build (and provide generous resources to) a shared A&S support unit that (a) advises undergrad A&S student academic services (b) program and curriculum coordination. This unit might well be located in the VCAA Office, perhaps under an Associate Vice Chancellor for Arts and Sciences. This would provide it with a clear home, identity, and locus of support/resources and reporting that it would lack if it's just hanging out there on a branch of the org chart as a quasi college.
7. **Life Sciences Merger:** At a limited level this would make a unit out of Biology, Micro, Botany and Zoology. At a more visionary level (leaving the medical school out of it), it could also bring in parts of CTAHR such as MBBE and NREM. There's probably too much turf involved for the latter to be a realistic hope.
8. **School of the Pacific Environment:** It's a new century for Manoa and as a university we have to help face challenges such as loss of biodiversity, climate change and sealevel rise. The world is flattening and Hawai'i is becoming less of an island which is all the more reason to focus on what makes us distinct. Three things make us special: our Pacific location, we are the only tropical U.S. university, and we are situated in an area of high, but endangered biodiversity. We should consider a School of the Pacific Environment that would merge and focus our considerable but diffused assets concerning the terrestrial environment, just as SOEST did for the marine and atmospheric sciences. This is consistent with the vision set out in the strategic plan. This school could bring together the scattered elements on campus so they reach critical mass and can interact in interdisciplinary research that is becoming the trademark of environmental science. The new school would allow us to craft creative new undergraduate degrees focusing on the needs of islands, Hawai'i and the Pacific, including climate change and how humans interact and are part of the environment. Universities on the mainland can talk about tropical ecosystems, we can teach classes in them and our undergraduates can cut their teeth on research in tropical forests and coral reefs. We can offer masters in applied studies for students from around the Pacific Rim in ecological restoration and resource management in environments that resemble their own. For graduate students in basic research, again we have habitats in some cases ten minutes away at Lyon Arboretum and we have exciting new research initiatives such as the U.S. Forest Service experimental forest on Big Island or NSF's 30 year NEON.
9. **Dean of Undergraduate Education:** We need a Dean of General Education, indeed an identifiable general education program, which could be called Manoa College, led by a person who actually meets with the students and faculty and inspires us with the general education mission. This should be a program covering the entire undergraduate career, from freshman seminars to senior capstones and then propelling students into graduate, professional, and continuing life-long education. The dean should have the status and resources of the existing deanships. The Faculty Senate had a long, serious discussion of the reorganization of the general education requirements some years back, but only half

**DRAFT Summary of Input Received on Arts and Sciences Organization
October 15, 2007**

of it was implemented (all courses now fulfill the very vague distribution categories), but with very little gen ed advising or leadership (so students are pretty much 'free' to create the worst version of education that is convenient to themselves as individuals).

10. **Create a College of International Studies:** Such a college would house the language departments and areas studies programs of LLL and SPAS. The Modern Language Association has recently reported on the need to remodel language undergraduate and graduate programs to include “more study of history, culture, economics, and society-in some respects turning language programs into area studies programs”. A closer connection between language and cultural studies would support the goals of the UH Strategic Plan that seeks “to establish the University of Hawai‘i and the state of Hawai‘i as the research, service, and training hub of Oceania, with bridges to the Asia-Pacific region, the Americas, and the rest of the world”.
- 11.

Identity Issues for Existing Units

Concerns about identity came out of primarily LLL, and to a lesser degree SPAS. Here are examples of what we heard:

- There is some value of an "identity," but it hasn't fostered excellence. The LLL "brand" is often leveraged in funding competitions. But if that unit is not given meaningful support w/in the university (for example, I don't think the quality of the language programs themselves anywhere approach the quality of the SLS and Linguistics Dept., and the NFLRC), the "identity" loses some of its sheen. And this particular "identity" is a little schizophrenic. (Why the English Dept.? Or even why "literature"?)
- Colleagues at other universities are impressed that UH has a College of Languages, Linguistics and Literature. Indeed, one of the reasons that UH enjoys an excellent reputation in this area is because there is an academic unit at a high level in the hierarchy whose mission is concerned with languages and linguistics.
- English has already determined and has developed its identity, given the Asia/Pacific concerns, creative writing, etc., and this is a strong one that has given our dept a distinction, if you want to compare it with other institutions. (But why do we need to compare? Why do we need to read/to get rated in the Princeton Review or the U.S. News and World Report?)

How The School of Pacific and Asian Studies Organizationally Fits

The recommendations and observations on SPAS are very diverse.

- A structure that highlights "international education" in some way is desirable, but do not conflate service (e.g., ISS) and learning (e.g., colleges, depts.). We need to continue to make that what makes us unique, and what we have already established firmly -- Asia and Pacific -- visible.
- It seems like SPAS is completely disconnected and it should go into some college.
- The various area studies centers (Chinese, Japanese...) are important but their identity is unclear – are they really transdisciplinary centers aiming for integrative scope beyond A&S, or are they primarily

***DRAFT Summary of Input Received on Arts and Sciences Organization
October 15, 2007***

centers for the study of literature and culture? If the latter perhaps we should have some overarching cluster of literature a cultural studies and include the English Department.

- Spanish/LAIS would like to be included in a College of International Studies or a School of International and Area Studies. The program has a new and growing Certificate in Latin American & Iberian Studies, which would be a fitting new name for us within a new college.
- SPAS should be split up into their disciplines, but could exist not as a separate entity from the A&S but part of it much like the NFLRC and the Center for Biographical Research are part of LLL (the faculty are located in one of the departments of LLL), as a Center within the A&S with the faculty as members of the departments of their own disciplines. These different departments may not all be in the same “sub” college. These “sub-colleges” should be seen as “housing” for personnel, bureaucratic reasons; there should be more interaction among the faculty of the different colleges. The centers within SPAS can be divided among the A&S colleges depending on emphasis: A&S, LLL, SS or floating within the sphere of A&S.
- The merger of SPAS with other academic units is a threat to the future wellbeing of the school. Many reasons argue for keeping the school as a separate entity, in its current form. The school serves as a beacon that UH values the study of Asia and the Pacific, and that the region is a core focus for both our teaching and research activities. Academically, the school in its current form represents a clear synthesis of the social sciences and humanities, and, as such, would suffer by a merger with any other unit that does not share such an interdisciplinary approach. The Asian Studies Program (ASP), as a core academic unit within SPAS, has succeeded in developing a comprehensive integration of both social science and humanities approaches to teaching and research, and should not be merged with LLL. Our department includes political scientists (such as myself), anthropologists, historians, and even one ethnomusicologist, that would not fit well with languages. Our most popular undergraduate courses are in fact ones taught by our social scientists.
- A merger with a much larger unit of the LLL College could seriously undermine our ASP's interdisciplinary approach, and in the coming years our focus would likely drift far away from a blend of social and humanities approaches. The financial and academic demands of the language divisions would weaken the program, and leave us with just a shell of interdisciplinarity.
- In the recent Asian Studies faculty meetings, as well as at a SPAS-wide faculty and staff session, the consensus has clearly been to retain the status quo.

Other Ideas Captured:

1. How about capstone courses at the major and college level?
2. There are innovative ways to encourage extramural support for the humanities and social sciences, but we need an attitude adjustment.