

**UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY  
COLLEGE OF PHARMACY**

**Proposal for Academic Reorganization**

Submitted to  
University Senate Committee on Academic Organization and Structure  
2003

UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY  
COLLEGE OF PHARMACY

**Proposal for Academic Reorganization**

**Table of Contents**

|   |    |
|---|----|
| <i>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</i>  | 4  |
| <i>RATIONALE FOR REORGANIZATION</i>   | 5  |
| <i>IMPACT OF PROPOSED REORGANIZATION ON PROGRAMS OF THE COLLEGE OF PHARMACY</i>   | 7  |
| <i>Impact on Authority and Responsibility</i>   | 7  |
| <i>Impact on Other Models and Accreditation Process</i>   | 7  |
| <i>Impact on Structure</i>  | 8  |
| <i>IMPACT ON INDIVIDUAL INTERNAL CONSIDERATIONS</i>   | 9  |
| <i>Impact on Collegiality and Collaboration</i>   | 9  |
| <i>Impact on Budgetary Matters</i>  | 9  |
| <i>Impact on Professional Degree Programs</i>   | 9  |
| <i>Impact on Graduate Programs</i>  | 10 |
| <i>Impact on Promotion and Tenure</i>   | 10 |
| <i>Impact on Staff</i>  | 10 |
| <i>APPENDIX A:</i>  | 11 |
| <i>COLLEGE OF PHARMACY'S HISTORY OF REORGANIZING</i>  |    |
| <i>APPENDIX B:</i>  | 12 |
| <i>RECOMMENDATIONS FROM AD HOC COMMITTEE ON DEPARTMENTALIZATION- UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY COLLEGE OF PHARMACY - SPRING 2003</i> |    |
| <i>APPENDIX C:</i>  | 17 |
| <i>LETTERS FROM COLLEGE OF PHARMACY CONSTITUENTS</i>  |    |
| C.1 <i>Faculty within Division Pharmacy Practice Sciences</i>   | 18 |
| C.2 <i>Faculty within Division Pharmaceutical Sciences</i>  | 19 |
| C.3 <i>Staff</i>  | 20 |
| C.4 <i>Professional Students</i>  | 21 |
| C.5 <i>Graduate Students</i>  | 22 |
| C.6 <i>Chair, PPS Division</i>  | 23 |
| C.7 <i>Chair, PS Division</i>   | 25 |
| C.8 <i>Dean</i>   | 27 |

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>APPENDIX D:</b>   | <b>29</b> |
| <b><i>SUMMARY OF QUESTIONNAIRE TO DEANS AT PHARMACY COLLEGES/SCHOOLS AT OTHER UNIVERSITIES - SUMMER 2003</i></b>                                 |           |
| <b>APPENDIX E:</b>   | <b>38</b> |
| <b><i>ACPE REPORT: THE EVALUATION TEAM REPORT OF THE PROFESSIONAL PROGRAM LEADING TO THE DOCTOR OF PHARMACY DEGREE September 16-18, 1997</i></b> |           |

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Faculty members within the College of Pharmacy of the University of Kentucky have expressed the belief that the College should formally be organized into departments rather than divisions. Numerous discussions regarding establishing a two-department structure have occurred within the College of Pharmacy for a number of years; this history is explained in **Appendix A**.

Recent discussions with the faculty led the Dean to appoint a committee to re-evaluate this organizational structure in February 2003. After several meetings, the committee presented its report to the faculty with this recommendation: "It is the unanimous opinion of the committee that the College of Pharmacy should move expeditiously toward the implementation of a departmental structure" (**Appendix B**). The faculty unanimously accepted this report at the April 2003 faculty meeting and urged approval to pursue a department-structure model. Following this meeting, the Dean appointed another committee (Committee to Implement Departmentalization) to prepare the necessary documentation for this re-organization process and submission to the University Senate Committee on Academic Organization and Structure.

The College of Pharmacy proposes to create a departmental structure to replace the current divisional structure. Presently, the College is divided into two units (i.e. divisions), the Division of Pharmaceutical Sciences and the Division of Pharmacy Practice and Science. The new departmental structure would more effectively link authority and responsibility by formalizing transfer of the day-to-day operational control of the College from the Dean to the unit level. This proposal to establish two departments within the College of Pharmacy, the Department of Pharmaceutical Sciences and the Department of Pharmacy Practice and Science, reflects substantial changes towards more efficiently aligning authority, responsibility and accountability with department chairs. The reorganization proposed in this document is entirely consistent with the Administrative and Governing Regulations of the University of Kentucky. The department structure is a well recognized academic unit both at the University of Kentucky and nationally (**Appendix D**). Faculty and administration endorse this new structure, believing it will enhance the long-term competitiveness of the College at the national level.

The potential impact of reorganization on the program and individuals is explained throughout this proposal. The documents attached corroborate that this transition has been studied and contemplated for a substantial period of time and is endorsed by the faculty, staff and students of the College of Pharmacy.

The Implementation Committee presented this proposal to the faculty, staff, professional students and graduate students during May-July, 2003. All individuals in the College have been given time to review the proposal, and a representative from each group has been given the authority to comment in writing for his/her respective constituency (**Appendix C**). Also, faculty in each division indicated their support by secret ballot, and outcome of their votes is included in the letters in **Appendix C**.

Finally, another committee was appointed by the Dean to revise the governing documents within the College of Pharmacy to reflect reorganization from the division structure to a department structure.

We strongly urge your support and endorsement of this reorganization within the College of Pharmacy.

## **RATIONALE FOR REORGANIZATION**

The College of Pharmacy faculty, with the concurrence of the administration, initiated a process to study the current administrative structure based on belief that the current divisional structure is no longer optimal for the long-term management and further development of the College's academic programs. Consequently, two faculty committees were named and charged with examining various academic models, with the intention of selecting a structure that would significantly enhance organizational function and create future opportunities for growth in professional and graduate teaching and research programs.

This College of Pharmacy is recognized as a leader in national and international pharmaceutical education and research. This favorable reputation and ranking has not come easily. The growth and development of our programs have had a major impact on the local, regional, and national scene. New, important initiatives have emerged in basic sciences, clinical pharmaceutical sciences, nontraditional professional education, continuing education, and managed care. The profession of pharmacy has totally reformed its practice model with the adoption of pharmaceutical care as the new national standard for pharmacy practice. This college has played a leadership role in that evolution, resulting in a complete overhauling of our professional curriculum and experiential programs. The movement away from institutional and toward ambulatory care practice has changed drastically how and where we educate our students. To keep pace with these changes, this college has been establishing new practice and research alliances. For example, our research programs have created new and important collaborations with both established and emerging pharmaceutical companies. Although we are presently positioned to facilitate drug discovery, development, and evaluation within our current facilities, expansion of these programs will be necessary if this college is to realize its true potential in the area of pharmaceutical science and technology. In order to maintain and support the continued growth of these programs, the Dean has increased his activities outside the college and must spend considerable time developing strategy, identifying resources, and facilitating the college's future role. Engaging successfully in such external endeavors makes it difficult for one individual to function as both Dean and Department Chair.

This faculty is proud of what it has been able to accomplish within the framework of its existing administrative structure and budgetary constraints and believes that change is needed in order to maintain a national leadership position in pharmacy education. It was the unanimous recommendation of both committees to reorganize our college into two departments, the Department of Pharmaceutical Sciences and the Department of Pharmacy Practice and Science. It is expected that this new structure will optimize the utilization of College resources and provide a governance model that is more appropriate for its function, thereby enhancing our ability to continue success in teaching, research, and service.

In many ways, the divisions of this college (Divisions of Pharmaceutical Sciences, and Pharmacy Practice and Science) have been operating as departments but

without the fiscal management and faculty governance granted to Departments. It is the opinion of this faculty that continuing to operate in the present administrative structure will place our college at a competitive disadvantage in maintaining our leadership position in this new century. In keeping with the recent university-wide change to a Provost model of administration, it seems appropriate to create a system in the College of Pharmacy that encourages greater flexibility, accountability, and responsibility in the decisions which are made by units. Increased autonomy and self governance of these units will be essential as the Dean continues to successfully expand his involvement in strategic external endeavors. This reorganization will free the Dean from the dual obligations of Department Chair and Dean.

Further, within the University of Kentucky the department is a well defined academic unit. The Department Chairperson is a well established leadership position with appropriate roles, authority and responsibilities as explained in the Administrative and Governing Regulations of the University of Kentucky, whereas the responsibilities and authority of a Division Chairperson vary considerably among programs. In departments the authority and responsibility for management is placed closer to the faculty and staff, empowering Department Chairs to expeditiously and effectively deal with personnel, space and budgetary issues.

We believe that this college has surpassed the usefulness of a divisional structure that provided us tremendous flexibility over the years and enabled it to evolve into a highly competitive pharmacy organization. Numerous changes have occurred that make this system less than optimal. If we are to effectively position ourselves for the challenges in pharmaceutical education and research that lie ahead as we enter the 21<sup>st</sup> century, timely change is imperative. We strongly encourage your support and approval of this request to reorganize the College of Pharmacy as two Departments.

## **IMPACT OF PROPOSED REORGANIZATION ON PROGRAMS OF THE COLLEGE OF PHARMACY**

### ***Impact on Authority and Responsibility.***

The reorganization into departments will allow improved efficiency by aligning authority, responsibility and accountability with the department chairs in accordance with University Administrative Regulations. Since the College presently has divisions, the accountability in the College lies with the Dean who is the department chair as defined by University Regulations. The University does not recognize division chairs, therefore there has been no official accountability at the division level. Under the leadership of the current Dean, there has been a tacit transfer of responsibility from the Dean's office down to the division chairs, but this has not been linked with a corresponding transfer of accountability. Presently the division chairs have the responsibilities of a department chair without accountability and official authority to execute those responsibilities.

Programs for teaching, research, and service that formerly were administered through the Dean's office are now managed by the division chairs. Functions that were centralized, such as staff personnel records, account documentation, and budget control, have also been decentralized to the division units. However, there has been a "disconnect" between the obligations of a division chair and the responsibilities of that position as defined by the University Administrative Regulations. Under a departmental organizational structure, the University Administrative Regulations clearly recognize department chairs, assign responsibilities to them and define their authority and accountability. The current "division/department mixed model" depends to a great extent upon individual agreements and arbitrary definitions regarding lines of responsibility and authority. Reorganizing the College into the Department of Pharmaceutical Sciences and the Department of Pharmacy Practice and Science will clarify the governance, responsibilities and accountability within the College. Further, the new departmental structure will empower the chairs and faculty to fulfill these obligations and at the same time hold them managerially accountable for these functions.

### ***Impact on Other Models and Accreditation Process.***

Many of our competitive Colleges of Pharmacy are organized under departmental structures; it is the predominant model across the country (Appendix D). The proposal also complies with the previous accreditation visit by the American Council on Pharmaceutical Education (ACPE) in September 1997. The report (Appendix E – 1997 Report, page 8) from that visit stated:

“With respect to organizational structure, the evaluation team views approval and implementation of the College's proposal to restructure into two departments to be critical to future success and the maintenance of a quality professional program. The proposal presents a variety of factors, which justify such a move from philosophical,

pragmatic, and programmatic points of view. Moreover, the proposal for departmentalization enjoys the unanimous support of the faculty, and is consistent with recommendations made following a 1989 internal University review and the 1990 accreditation review. Key factors, which, in the view of the evaluation team have direct linkages to the quality of the professional program, include: faculty governance to balance responsibilities with commensurate authorities for managing budgets and programs; providing operational support to enable the Dean to continue to participate in matters external to the College, such as issues related to managed care and its impact on the College and the Medical Center, fund raising, and development; and bolstering faculty morale and supporting effective faculty recruitment and retention efforts, by providing a consolidated home for the graduate program, facilitating collaboration and thereby enhancing research activities, providing consistency of structure to enhance collaboration with other Medical Center and University academic departments, and developing leadership for the future. In view of the unanimous support demonstrated by the faculty, and the strength of their opinion, the evaluation team views the approval of the proposal to be an efficient and effective means of addressing one of the College's most pressing needs."

***Impact on Structure.***

In terms of administrative structure, the College of Pharmacy will consist of two departments. They will be the Department of Pharmaceutical Sciences (PS) and the Department of Pharmacy Practice and Science (PPS) to replace the Division of Pharmaceutical Sciences and the Division of Pharmacy Practice and Science. The professional degree program within this College will not be changed as a result of this proposal. The graduate program within this College may undergo changes as a result of this proposal; however, we do not anticipate any major impact on the graduate students. There may be a change in the reporting relationship between the Associate Dean for Research and Graduate Education, Director for Graduate Studies and the Department Chairs. It is the opinion of the faculty and administration that both the Division of Pharmaceutical Sciences and the Division of Pharmacy Practice and Science will be enhanced as a consequence of these changes.

## **IMPACT ON INDIVIDUAL INTERNAL CONSIDERATIONS**

### ***Impact on Collegiality and Collaboration.***

Relationships among the College leadership and faculty are cordial and collegial. There is mutual understanding of the College's vision, mission and goals. Currently each division has an executive committee composed of 4-6 faculty who advise the chair on critical issues and assist with the administrative functions of the Division. This structure would not change under the new department structure. Presently faculty in the two divisions collaborate in teaching and research activities. There is a strong desire to maintain and preserve that cooperative, collegial academic environment between the two academic units. A concern was raised that as departments negotiate for limited resources, an unhealthy competitive environment could arise. Faculty and administrators have envisioned and discussed safeguards that will be built into the departments' and College's governance documents addressing this concern.

### ***Impact on Budgetary Matters.***

Presently, the College has decentralized the management of fiscal affairs to the divisions. In fact, the divisions have created an internal structure and procedures to assist them in managing fiscal affairs, and each division has a division administrator and at least one account clerk. The new departmental structure would not significantly impact these division administrators or accounting clerks. It is expected under the new structure that the department chairs would continue to collaborate and negotiate budgetary matters with the faculty and with the Dean. The new departmental structure would, however, clearly delineate each department's budget, allow the appropriate level of fiscal management, and provide stability and accountability in the budget process.

### ***Impact on the Professional Degree Program.***

Departments tend to be responsible for individual courses. The new organizational structure will allow both departments to take formal ownership of the professional curriculum by identifying course responsibilities based on curricular focus. It is believed to be in the best interest of the faculty and the College that this new arrangement should not inhibit cooperation in meeting the teaching needs of the College. This consensus will be duly noted in the governance documents for each Department. Presently the College has a strong interdisciplinary curricular structure endorsed and supported by the College's accrediting body, the American Council on Pharmaceutical Education as described in its Standards. It is imperative that this model continues under the new organizational structure. Faculty and administrators have discussed safeguards to build into the new structure guarding against diminishing this interdisciplinary curricular model.

***Impact on the Graduate Degree Program.***

Departments traditionally support graduate programs, both intellectually and fiscally. The College must be sufficiently flexible to encourage and nurture responsible growth. The Graduate School expects modernization of graduate programs to keep pace with science and industry by: (1) identifying within an academic discipline a core body of knowledge that is not already offered; and (2) identifying a critical mass of scientists to provide intellectual support (teaching courses, mentoring students, etc.). Under the new departmental structure, the Department of Pharmaceutical Sciences will continue to maintain its high quality graduate program and monitor the environment for issues that may need to be addressed. It is the intent of the Department of Pharmacy Practice and Science to carefully study and eventually implement the development of a graduate program. Both departments will work to maintain the high quality of the College's graduate program(s).

***Impact on Promotion and Tenure.***

The divisions have been functioning as departments in matters of promotion and tenure, and it appears that this process would not significantly change under the new departmental structure.

***Impact on Staff.***

Responsibilities and duties of current staff would not significantly change under the new departmental structure. However, there may be some redefinition of roles and position descriptions in line with the reorganization.

## ACADEMIC ORGANIZATION AND STRUCTURE COMMITTEE REVIEW AND CONSULTATION SUMMARY SHEET

**Proposal Title:** Proposal to Create Departmental Structure within the University of Kentucky, College of Pharmacy

Contact Person: Heidi Milia Anderson, Ph.D.; [hande2@uky.edu](mailto:hande2@uky.edu); 257-5802

Instruction: To facilitate the processing of this proposal please identify the groups or individuals reviewing the proposal, identify a contact person for each entry, provide the consequences of the review (specifically, approval, rejection, no decision and vote outcome, if any) and please attach a copy of any report or memorandum developed with comments on this proposal.

| <b>Review by: (Chairs, Directors, Faculty Groups, Faculty Councils, Committees, etc)</b> | <b>Contact Person Name (phone/email)</b>   | <b>Consequences of Review:</b>  | <b>Date of Proposal Review</b>   | <b>Review Summary Attached? (yes or no)</b>   |
|--|--|---|--|---|
| College of Pharmacy Faculty  | Dr. Liter, Chair of Faculty/<br><br>Dr. Karen Blumenschein (PPS Division)<br><br>Dr. Jurgen Rohr (PS Division) | Unanimous Vote to move towards implementing process; Dean appointed Ad Hoc Committee on Departmentalization | April 23, 2003 (full faculty meeting)<br><br>June 18, 2003 Secret ballot vote<br><br>June 4, 2003 Secret ballot vote | (see attached report from Ad Hoc Committee)<br><br>PPS Division letter Sept. 22, 2003<br><br>PS Division letter June 20, 2003 |
| Chair Division of Pharmaceutical Sciences  | Dr. McNamara, 7-8656/  | 20 Yes<br>2 did not vote  | June 4, 2003 Secret ballot vote  | Yes (letter from division faculty)  |
| Chair Division of Pharmacy Practice Sciences   | Dr. Perrier, 3-2769  | 17 Yes<br>2 No  | June 18, 2003 Secret ballot vote   | Yes (letter from division faculty)  |
| College Staff  | Ms. Angie Ritchie  | Support   | May 15, 2003   | Yes (letter from Staff Council Chair)   |
| College Professional Student Leaders   | Matt Martin  | Unanimously approved by student leaders   | June, 2003   | Yes, letter from Student Senator  |

| <b>Review by: (Chairs, Directors, Faculty Groups, Faculty Councils, Committees, etc)</b> | <b>Contact Person Name (phone/email)</b> | <b>Consequences of Review:</b> | <b>Date of Proposal Review</b> | <b>Review Summary Attached? (yes or no)</b> |
|--|--|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|---|
| College Graduate Student Leaders   | Joanna Koziara, Ph.D.<br>Candidate       | Support                        | July 15, 2003                  | Yes, letter from Student President          |
| Dean of College of Pharmacy  | Kenneth Roberts, Ph.D.                   | Support                        | September 18, 2003             | Yes   |
| Senate Committee on Academic Organization and Structure                                  | Kate Chard, Ph.D.                        |                                |                                |   |