

Raw Survey Data:

Texas A&M University at Galveston survey responses organized by respondent type within each survey question.

Assembled April 14, 2023, by DataWorks Partners LLC



## Table of Contents

<b>Organizational Structure</b>	<b>3 – 45</b>
Current / Former Student	3 – 9
Faculty / Staff	9 – 34
Industry/Affiliate Partner	34 – 45
<b>Aggie Student Experience</b>	<b>46 – 93</b>
Current / Former Student	46 – 61
Faculty / Staff	62 – 84
Industry/Affiliate Partner	85 – 93
<b>Communications</b>	<b>94 – 119</b>
Current / Former Student	94 – 100
Faculty / Staff	101 – 113
Industry/Affiliate Partner	114 – 119
<b>Student Affairs</b>	<b>120 – 137</b>
Current / Former Student	120 – 125
Faculty / Staff	126 – 134
Industry/Affiliate Partner	135 – 137
<b>Diversity, Equity and Inclusion</b>	<b>138 – 156</b>
Current / Former Student	138 – 142
Faculty / Staff	143 – 152
Industry/Affiliate Partner	153 – 156
<b>Academic Programs</b>	<b>157 – 211</b>
Current / Former Student	157 – 166
Faculty / Staff	167 – 199
Industry/Affiliate Partner	200 – 211
<b>The Sea Grant Mission</b>	<b>212 – 256</b>
Current / Former Student	212 – 219
Faculty / Staff	220 – 252
Industry/Affiliate Partner	253 – 256

**Please provide any feedback, comments, concerns or questions in the fields provided for each set of recommendations.**

### **Organizational Structure**

- Continue to refer to the campus leader as Vice President, Chief Operating Officer, and Maritime Academy Superintendent to continue to align with the organizational structure of Texas A&M Health.
- Create a Chief of Staff position to assist with and lead the day-to-day operations of the Galveston Campus.
- Reorganize the Galveston leadership to align with College Station centralization and clarify roles.
- Reorganize Human Resources as part of the larger reorganization at College Station and conduct a compensation and classification study to ensure salary and position alignment with College Station, to address competitive salaries of other higher education institutions in the Galveston area, and to be well positioned to address necessary succession planning given that numerous leaders have served the campus for more than 30 years.
- Technology Services should report to the AVP for Operations and align with the new model in College Station.
- Develop onboarding to support the engagement of new employees.

### **Current / Former Student**

After seeing the salaries of staff here posted online, I can agree that salaries need to be more competitive. It seems that many staff end up leaving simply because another school is offering a better salary.

All good

"Col. Fossum does a fine job. I witness mess that up by trying to make it like the big campus. TAMUG has its own culture - a maritime culture. Stop sending main campus engineering students there and ruining the culture."

Colonel is so great with engaging with the students.

Create a Chief of Staff position to assist with and lead the day-to-day operations of the Galveston Campus.

Galveston should be autonomous and the new implements shall not impede the autonomy. Further more the budget is limited as currently funding should be put on the ground rather than the office.

Have a more direct line of communication between campus and corps positions (ie. Chief of Staff of corps communicate with new Chief of Staff in campus management)

Have a qualified VSO representative on campus to answer all veteran's related questions in-person as opposed to writing an email.

I agree with all of these recommendations as I believe communication is a killer for a lot of opportunities on campus.

I agree with all of these recommendations, particularly to how the leadership in Galveston needs to align with College Station.

I believe that ensuring salaries are equal is the best part of this proposal. I believe that a restructuring with clearer roles and better communication will benefit the campus and faculty. However, I think a dependence on the College Station Campus for IT and HR makes it difficult for students to know who they should contact.

I believe these recommendations are vital to the growth of TAMUG. As a part of the A&M system, I believe it is of the utmost importance to have competitive salaries to hire and retain quality educators and support staff

I do not think that the leadership at Galveston should be reorganized to align with College station, for those in the leadership positions know the campus and student body. If the idea is to reorganize the and redefine who has what role is fine, but not remove those in their current position.

I like this

I support the organizational structural changes.

I think the campus has plenty of resources.

I think the pay discrepancy is a huge issue between departments. I am an Oceanography student in Galveston, so I am paid by the Galveston departments. My colleagues in College Station are currently paid \$2100/month and are getting a raise to \$2300 a month. As a GAR, I currently am paid \$1850/month in Galveston and have not heard news of a raise. A \$450/month discrepancy between departments is very inappropriate, especially considering the cost of living in Galveston. I currently have 2 extra jobs to keep up with my bills and living expenses. Increasing the pay for graduate students in Galveston would be a huge step in improving the quality of living for us.

im not knowledgeable enough to comment on the organizational structure of a university. MAST (Liberal Studies/Maritime Studies) does not need to be dissolved or merged into another major or category. Other small departments within Liberal Studies are already being changed by name or merged with others as they are smaller, Maritime Studies is not one of them that needs it.

N/a

No comment.

No comments.

No opinion.

None

"Odd things have changed at TAMUG was re-alignment with College Station has already been taking place. Should some things remain unique to come system universities and branch campuses?"

Yes, succession planning is a wise idea, but multiple persons should, could be trained so TAMUG would have a wide ""bench"" to select from.

At TAMUG the main library in b. 3010/WILL is just a study hall. I signed up for on-line questions, but the person apologized for not showing up at the appointed time. Could any real librarian be at a walk-up room or desk to answer questions or help students with research questions and using computer tools?

Note: In the report, in the second paragraph under fig 1, McAllen and Fort Worth are not listed, or obvious as one of the campuses."

Organizational Structure and the proposed changes sound great. I have no experience with this subject.

"PAY US THE SAME AS CSTAT.

An anecdote. My friend is an oceanography student who is located at the Galveston campus. She makes \$1770 a month. The members of her cohort in College Station, after a recent raise, make \$2300 a month. A \$530 disparity is insane. Graduate students performing the same function in the same department should not be making 26% more than their counterparts based solely on location. This differential doesn't even make sense when you consider that the cost of living in Galveston is higher than it is in College Station.  
"

Provide PD on customer service

Reorganize the Galveston

Reorganize the Galveston leadership to align with College Station centralization and clarify roles.

Restructure the MARA business degree. I love this campuses CAO please have Dr. Thomas look into the business degree. As a logistics degree most of the logistics classes are electives that can be ignored and we are required to take three HR classes that are essentially all the same.

Revamp the Maritime Academy Corps to reflect those of the Maritime Academies on the east coast. The academy at TAMUG seems to be in a weird middle ground between College Station virtues and values and the deep rooted heritage of the Maritime Industry. If the goal is to have TAMUG as a premier Maritime Academy on the Gulf leadership should push towards deep rooted Maritime values rather than the vision of the College Station Corps. Salary and position alignment from HR is good. Do not mix the pots with College Station. There is currently way too much work for the College Station offices, and it will only create more confusion.

Salary and position alignment is good

Sounds good to me.

The combination of Vice President, Chief Operating Officer, and Maritime Academy Superintendent is one large role to fill. In previous years the Maritime Academy Superintendent was a separate position that was assumed by a military figure from maritime industry. I believe it would benefit the Maritime Academy student body greater if the positions were split.

The recommendations for Organizational Structure appear to be adequate. Hopefully, this reorganization will lead to greater access to College Station resources for Galveston students, faculty, and staff.

There is little to no point in moving HR from Galveston to College Station and or trying to combine the two. We have our own so that no one has to make the commute, no one is going through phone tag attempting to contact the right person in order to help them and also due to disasters that TAMUG faces that College Station does not. I think continuing to refer to the Vice President of COO would be a good idea as this is what we are accustomed to and make life

This all seems reasonable.

This analysis could be okay, however, as a student at A&M galveston. I would like to not see any significant changes. I enjoy campus as it is and feel it doesn't need to be changed.

Many of my fellow students agree with me that these changes seem unnecessary.

This sounds good, the organizational changes sound like they should streamline some of the operational processes.

We need engineering advisors!

We really need engineering advisors. I feel as though there is no one in charge of engineering here. As an ocean engineer I am confused on who to go to for questions and I hate having to play "email tag" with the advisor in college station

Within organizational structure, a permanent dean of graduate students WITHOUT personal research responsibilities must be appointed to ensure that graduate students have clarity about structure as it relates to administrative duties and can raise concerns about faculty or staff without fear of direct and indirect retaliation. There is a plague of "its not my job" on many issues relating to graduate students and absolutely no clarity on where the buck stops.

Former Student

A Chief of Staff position? At what taxpayer salary cost would this unnecessary position be? I would bet it's in the six-figure range, and its inclusion here is because there is a political friend already posed to move into it. Most of the people reading this report are not stupid, you know. And, "reorganize" something that already works, merely for the purpose of upending things. . .well, that's a sure path to failure.

Agree

All of these recommendations will benefit the Galveston Campus as well as the university as a whole.

don't create another C-level position. TANUG should follow the college Station structure.

"End the practice of classifying former employees as terminated, regardless of their reason for leaving (retirement, quitting, and being fired are all classified as terminated)

Let A&M Galveston keep the tuition coming from engineering students rather than that money going to Main campus"

Galveston campus, leaders and staff should be treated with the same level of respect, benefits and pay as their College Station peers. Galveston needs to have the autonomy and

resources to better service the Galveston staff and students without being dependent on the CS campus. Galveston is not subservient - it is equal.

Great!

I agree Galveston needs competitive salaries in order to stay cutting edge in producing top talent. I disagree with moving marketing and development to College Station as they do not understand the uniqueness of the campus to fully develop a campaign. Let the new computer science degree students create, design, and run the backend development of the website as part of a class in the curriculum.

I agree with all statements

"I believe that TAMUG needs a bit more autonomy. I understand they are part of TAMU, but there should be a little flexibility for them to make best decisions for them. I also think the relationship between TAMUG and the Maritime Academy needs LOTS of review and improvement. There is nothing wrong with a little military and/or regimental organization, but for the students that are going to work on commercial vessels, so much of what they are doing does not apply to their future careers.

TMA does not have a great reputation in the industry! Faculty have no close ties to industry- they have been educators for too long! TMA needs mariners in order to train mariners. Folks within TAMUG MART department and TMA need to work better together. Currently they act as if they are on different teams completely! They all need to get out and involved in the maritime industry! "

I see financial resources being the largest challenge you will face, while centralizing under BCS verticals should improve communication and decision making, not being in the same office will create challenges unless travel budgets are expanded to ensure weekly f2f meetings are held, likewise synergistic watercooler decisions will be a perennial problem unless you provide for and require travel on a frequent bases, which raises WorkLife challenges for the employee/staff. On balance I support, so long as the financial commitment is also attached from BCS.

"I think its great to make sure we have a Chief of Staff to help with the staff communication between departments. This is will the campus run as a whole uniformed team.

I worry that centralizing everything to college station will not reflect the culture and community of the small campus. I feel someone need to be in Galveston to understand that this campus needs, as it is a different atmosphere than college station. "

I would consider renaming the Chief of Staff as Chief Operating Officer since that seems to be the function. The current leader's title should simply reflect his/her purview. If you have a COO normally the leader is president/CEO, director or managing director. I don't have a view of alignment but simple is usually best. Director would be my choice for the leadership title.

Looks and sounds logical.

"Merchant Mariner professionals, who are qualified to teach, cannot be compared with professors/adjunct professors in the BCS or Galveston area. The lack of continuity in maritime studies has degraded the quality of the graduates from those majors who are entering the Maritime industry. There has been a noted steady decline the skills, abilities,

and knowledge of new graduates. The turnover in staff has, without doubt, contributed to this degradation in producing quality mates and engineers.

I wholeheartedly agree with bringing the Galveston campus more in line with the College Station campus, where it makes sense. Changes that will not contribute to academic or professional success of the students should be thoroughly examined before implementation. Making changes to increase the ease of administrators, or changes because, ""that's how it done in College Station"", would likely prove odious.

Perhaps studying the other state academies would be helpful before making major structural changes?"

no comments

Quit lying to students saying they ate welcome back on campus, when in reality, they are threatened with trespassing.

The ceo should have final say on all matters

"The new chief of staff position will help spread the load of running a campus. Right now it is about the size of my high school which has one principal (Fossum) and 6 assistant principals which as of now the galveston campus has no similar position.

The reorginazition also needs to take into account the fact that the majority of engineering students there are only there for one year before they transfer to College station."

The purpose of the corps in Galveston is different than the corps in College Station. License Option students are REQUIRED to participate in the corps in order to obtain their degree and license in order to sail. Therefore, Corps leadership in Galveston may not align with corps leadership in College Station. There is altogether too much alignment with College Station currently, therefore, increasing alignment concerns me as a Former Student. The Maritime Academy should be focused on EDUCATION and the leadership style that occurs in the Maritime Industry.

The staff should, I believe be paid the same as the staff in College Station. They are performing the same roles of education and should be compensated equally. Having graduated from A&M in the 90's and having my child graduate in May from Galveston, I am proud for all of us to be Aggies. (My husband graduated from A&M in the 90's also.) may all of the professors be viewed as such. All leaders in education. All meeting the educational needs of the students.

There is altogether too much alignment with College Station currently. For a program that is completely different and unrelated to military aims, the "Regiment of Midshipment" (correct name for the Texas Maritime Academy Corps of Cadets) is linked with College Station altogether too much.

These recommendations seem reasonable.

This is a bad idea

Very unorganized and made me lose a semester because of its mess

What about Corpus Christi?

You have a maritime academy that is built for the sole purpose to produce merchant mariners. Yet, they are ruled and disciplined by those with no commercial sea time. There



is no sense in having those in powerful positions who try to discipline cadets to become something that those in power don't exactly know what they are. The departments between academy and the MART/MARR LO are polar opposites and all tasks end up becoming an unorganized tornado of events due to Allan Post, degree majors, and academy heads all having different plans on how to spend cadets times.

## Faculty / Staff

I appreciate the emphasis in the report on staff and faculty turnover rates and associated pay inequities with College Station. I hope this is a priority for study so that this may be addressed soon.

"- I support creating a Chief of Staff position to act as a key mediator between TAMUG's staff and the centralized operational unit in College Station. As it stands now, communication between the two campuses can get quite dispersed, with many instances where Galveston's staff are left unsure who to contact in College Station to address certain operational concerns.

- Honestly, the salary discrepancies between the two campuses has been a persistent concern raised by almost every employee I meet in Galveston. I think working towards aligning Galveston's salaries with College Station will definitely raise the morale of Galveston's employees--leading to higher employee motivation, increased talent retention, lowered turnover rates, and a better sense of belonging with the Texas A&M system as a whole.

"

"ASAP" Create a Chief of Staff position to assist with and lead the day-to-day operations of the Galveston Campus. The current "top" administrator might have favored relations with Deputy Superintendent (TAMMA) and a faculty member (MARE Dept.) as their relations address concerns from others in terms of budget and technical-know-who.

Absolutely. Please create a Chief of Staff position to assist with and lead the day-to-day operations of the Galveston Campus. All staff members (no matter what titles), including academic departments should be under supervision of Chief of Staff.

Addressing salary discrepancies for others in the area, particularly staff, would go a long way in addressing some of the shortfalls of the Galveston Campus. The regular loss of institutional knowledge due to staff turnover is significant, and causes a downstream effect of all aspects of the university operations simply from the loss of time required to figure out who to talk to in order get something (like finding an available classroom) done, and how long it takes the new person to figure out the multiple systems they are required to know.

Agree

Agree with all the above.

Agreed. A third party organization should be contracted to look into staff and faculty compensation. This should be look at in terms of how they compare with peers in other institutions not just the Galveston area.

All I can say is the move of oceanography to Galveston is so wrong headed that it's hard to believe anyone could take it seriously. The whole idea treats the faculty as Legos; just blocks the can be moved around without any concern for the faculty families -- spouses working in the BCS having to find new jobs; children having to change schools and break friendships; houses having to be sold and new one purchased; and, finally, moving to a

very hurricane prone area. No amount of extra compensation can change the human disruption this will cause. This is insane, inhumane even, and that the move is seriously being considered should warrant President Banks being fired.

All recommendations given on the organizational structure sounds good. I must add that the salary disparity is a big issue. For instance, professors at Galveston will be held with the same standards as those at College Station but their colleagues at College Station are earning almost twice as much as them. This issue needs urgent attention and in my opinion, salary disparity between the campuses is going to be a critical factor if any succession planning program at TAMUG will succeed. Great talents might only end up using TAMUG as a revolving door to better paying positions elsewhere if salary disparities are not addressed. A holistic, transparent review is needed to draw parity with colleagues at College Station.

"As a faculty member, these changes mostly seem to affect operations that fall outside of my teaching/research arena. That being said, a couple of thoughts:

1. Reorganization of HR could help streamline hiring processes (which are currently quite slow, taking weeks even for standard hires like student workers). This could be especially beneficial if there is the potential for more dialogue between faculty/departmental staff and HR personnel during the hiring process.

2. Technology services is vital to the smooth operation of classes, so whoever they report to, they still need to be accessible for day-to-day- support of classroom operations (including Canvas). "

Centralized control has never worked properly for the outlying organization.

Competitive salaries for all staff and faculties, not just HR!

Completely agree that Col. Fossum's role should be less involved in daily operations and more focused on representing the entire campus (not just TAMMA and Engineering) in the broader community and with industry. Completely agree that a compensation study needs to be done. However, a cost of living adjustment could be done immediately to staunch the bleeding of staff and help with recruitment of new staff in badly needed areas. I also agree with more onboarding, and I hope that more training on diversity (instead of just doing the minimum with a brief module to cover the university's training obligation from a legal standpoint).

Creating a large bureaucracy in CS and taking away local control of our campus will not be beneficial. Our campus has a local administration and culture that is responsive to the faculty and students. Administering these function remotely will not be beneficial to our campus.

Engage actively with Galveston faculty to ensure these changes serve the interest of the campus.

Good

Great - whatever you say.

Great ideas. Having a Chief of Staff should great de-bottleneck process with the executive team on the Galveston Campus. I hope this is an individual with a PhD who understands academia.

HROE attends to a lot more than just salaries and placement. Have you talked with the OD specialists in that office?

"I agree that the COO should be able to face outward more. Having a Chief of Staff would enable that. The authority of the Chief of Staff would need to be clearly defined. TAMUG would also need to reevaluate its "top heaviness". We should not add a high-pay position to upper-level administration without addressing faculty salary inequities with the main campus.

The major issue with HR is not their organizational structure. Instead, the main issue is that HR limits what we can pay new hires, thus taking top applicants out of the applicant pool for staff positions. I've served on multiple hiring committees, each experienced top applicants withdrawing from the pool at the salary negotiation phase of the process as soon as they learn TAMUGs "best offers".

Regarding IT, I've heard nightmare stories on the main campus regarding lack of service. I cringe at the thought of it."

I agree that the Galveston leadership should be organized to align with the College Station centralization and roles. This will help unite the mission of the two campuses.

I agree with centralization,

I am ok with this.

I am strongly in agreement of the compensation/classification study to ensure salary alignment with College Station.

I am wondering if the recommendations or points made through this survey will be taken into account seriously? Will any of the recommendations made through the survey be considered for implementation, if at all? I hope the outcome of the survey will matter in the end.

I believe local access to HR is important. What about having an associate director located on the Galveston campus similar to what is proposed for student financial aid?

I believe that there is a risk to centralization of services. Even within TAMU college station, centralization of IT has been significantly detrimental to our operations. IT is now too slow to respond. Same with facilities.

I disagree with salary and position alignment with College Station as a generality - certainly Galveston employees should not be paid less, but for many positions, an adjustment due to potentially higher cost of living and other considerations should be included. Any other centralizations must not come at the cost of service to TAMUG faculty, staff, and students -- lessons should be learned from the frustration and difficulties experienced during the College Station transitions.

I have no objections.

I like the recommendation to "clarify roles." Clarifying and communicating roles and responsibilities, alongside good training, would solve more problems than adding additional administrators (e.g. Chief of Staff). Instead, raising salaries to retain those staff would be the best way to elevate Galveston.

I think it would be helpful to make Galveston its own campus rather than maintaining the confusing "it's part of us but also different" structure.

I think that making the Galveston campus (GC) a complete part of the A&M is important. Then, I do not understand why the GC needs COO & CAO. I have seen uncertainties for the roles of COO & CAO depending on who occupy the positions. The GC functions as a college, then I'd suggest to have Dean instead of COO/CAO removing the uncertainties and streamlining the chain of command. The Academy can be a stand-alone entity with its Superintendent reporting to (new) Dean or Provost.

I welcome the efforts to achieve salary parity with College Station for faculty and staff, as well as the proposed onboarding procedures for new employees, and leadership succession planning. I do not have any strong opinions on the other points.

I would also suggest a new position for a liaison that specifically works to communicate and collaborate with the College Station campus.

I would like to read under this Organization Structure the faculty and researchers on this campus in connection with other disciplines and how they are meeting or not meeting the expectations at TAMU as a Land Grant Institution.

If it's a part of TAMU (College Station), then it should be treated as any college of TAMU. Thus, the Galveston College of TAMU should have a Dean, who is closely supervised by an active and empowered Provost. The Maritime Academy should be treated as a separate entity. The separate funding from the Texas Legislature need not be an obstruction to such a normalization of the Galveston campus.

"In the ""Project Overview"", under ""Texas A&M Maritime Academy"", is found ""Each academy offers four-year degrees and pathways to become a commissioned officer and Merchant Marine...""

Although the term merchant marine is often, but erroneously, used to refer to an individual, more properly conceived, a merchant marine is an industry composed of the ships, port structure, and supporting workforce of a maritime nation. An individual who works in that industry, and is a professional seafarer, should be referred to as a merchant mariner.

I would also add ""in the uniformed services of the United States"" after ""commissioned officer""."

"It is important to have some local HR staff who can give the personal touch. Our people are now working for Hub 5, so it is now even more difficult to get them to respond to our questions. Of course we are now getting some help from HR people elsewhere, but it is hard to know who to call for any given problem.

Our IT people are great, and I hope that the new structure will not adversely affect their work for our campus. For example we are paying for our Galveston students to access iClickers for free, based upon TAMUG purchasing a campus-wide site license. This is managed by our local IT, but departments have contributed. I do not want to lose this more personal aspect of the smaller campus."

It is important while reorganizing HR to keep as a top priority the ongoing smooth functioning of HR during transition. For example, keeping a close eye on how quickly new hires are fully onboarded (across all systems of the university) will be a good metric to make sure that things are still working well as the procedures change.

"It seems to me that this is a way of getting rid of the administration at Galveston, and replacing them to align with President Banks, given the statement ""well positioned to address necessary succession planning given that numerous leaders have served the campus for more than 30 years."" I have no idea of the internal workings of the admin at G. and the stresses between G. and CS, and thus have no opinion. From the outside, this makes Galveston look like one of the satellite academies created for the CoE in McAllen.

What is missing is keeping a sense of independence at Galveston, and keeping its image as a small, vibrant, and agile part of TAMU. This is not the way to promote transformational activities. Almost all other maritime centers associated with universities have an impactful image to both the academic and local communities. This move seems to take away this sense. I hope that President Banks is as concerned about keeping Galveston dynamic rather than merely absorbing it into a campus that seems to want to grow to 100,000 students."

Looks good.

Looks like some useful streamlining

Love the idea of stronger onboarding structures!

Most of this sounds fine, though it is unclear why or how Technology Services should "align" with the new model in College Station.

N/a

No Comment

no commentCent

no comments

No comments

No concerns.

ok

"One of the highlight of the report is to provide salary parity with the main campus. The lower salary and lack of resources make it difficult for the Galveston campus to attract the best researchers and retain these people.

A reorganization of Human Resources would be good, but if everything is on the main campus, it may make it difficult for the Galveston people to have access to HR services. If the department is only in College Station, there would have to be someone specifically assigned to Galveston, as is the case with the Office of Sponsored Research so the Galveston people can easily contact their representative for questions and issues."

**"ORGANIZE TEXAS MARITIME ACADEMY AS A UNIQUE EDUCATIONAL, OPERATIONABLE, AND FUNDABLE ENTITY WITHIN THE TAMUG STRUCTURE.**

PROVIDE ADMIRAL LEADERSHIP WITH MARITIME MASTER EXPERIENCE AND THE POSITION FOR LINKAGE BETWEEN TAMUG ADMIN AND TEXAS MARITIME ACADEMY ON ALL ISSUES, INCLUDING TRAININGSHIP OPS AND MARAD COMMS.

ALLOW TERMINAL DEGREE FACULTY TENURE FOR MARITIME LICENSED USCG MASTER'S WITH MASTER'S DEGREES.

TO REDUCE MARITIME FACULTY TURNOVER PROVIDE FOR MARITIME OFFICERS TO ROTATE BETWEEN AT-SEA POSITIONS AND FACULTY POSITIONS.

REQUIRE/SUPPORT/ENCOURAGE MARITIME FACULTY TO RESEARCH/PUBLISH IN TECHNICAL PUBLICATIONS.

REQUIRE/SUPPORT/ENCOURAGE MIDDLE SUMMER AT-SEA CADET SAILING ON COMMERCIAL MARITIME VESSELS

PROVIDE/SUPPORT/ENCOURAGE STUDENT INTERNSHIPS IN LOCAL MARITIME FIRMS, PARTICULARLY AREA PORTS."

Reorganizations at the main campus have been very destructive and harmful. Do not do this to Galveston!

Salaries at Galveston need to reflect the dynamic economy of Houston and perhaps special housing considerations for staff and faculty should be pursued.

Similarly aligned will help stakeholders understand but must give lots of weight to local Galveston leadership

Sorry, I spent hours writing police reports this week at TAMUG and ran out of time to answer this question.

Sounds valid and logical

Streamlining these operations is a good next step. With these items completed, communication and collaboration between the two campus will be even more seamless. Texas A&M Galveston contains one of the six state merchant marine academies in the United States. Because of this, training cruises and commercial cruises, required by the US Coast Guard for the cadets to get their licenses may not correspond with the College Station Schedule. This must be kept into consideration. In 2019, the Galveston cadets suffered because they were still on their cruise when College Station began classes. There was some problem regarding unexcused absences.

The Chief of Staff is set up to fail. They are responsible to "lead the day-to-day operations of the Galveston Campus." but have no one reporting to or through them so the subsequently have no real ability to fulfill this role. It will either be a wasted position with the person providing no useful functions or it will cause great friction and confusion by inserting themselves into chains of command that they are not in. Burying Technology Services under the AV for Ops removes them from their critical consulting role to senior management. Every business is a technology business is the current refrain in the business world. Pushing the Technology Services leader down in the organization makes it impossible to effectively use technological knowledge to manage the business.

"The creation of a Chief of Staff is a waste of money. Most employees at TAMUG already respond to private companies (i.e., food services and physical plant) and thus creating a chief of staff does not make economic sense.

The proposal for salary parity with College Station is badly needed. Galveston has been experiencing rising costs in cost-of-living, due to increase in the prices of real state, property taxes, insurance, and other services. Faculty are assessed to the same standards in terms of performance evaluations and promotion. Why are we paid less?"

The proposed academic organizational chart show Faculty Affairs is under Assistant VP for Academic Affairs and FAOC. Faculty needs to have an input in selecting the person for this position.

"The proposed organizational structure is based on seemingly based on a misunderstanding of our current research activities and will be detrimental to the TAMU research mission. Specifically, the departure of the Oceanography department from main campus will be a crisis for my graduate students, and undergraduates. While seeking degrees in Atmospheric Sciences, they enjoy working in the labs of Oceanography department every week if not every day.

While the department does not say it outright, the report seems to suggest that Oceanography needs to move to be close to Sea Grant. This is flatly incorrect. Sea Grant funds a portion of research conducted in Oceanography, and yes, there a faculty member, Pam Plomppkin is also a Sea Grant program manager. However, members of the Oceanography also have funding and much more funding from from NSF, EPA, DOE, and TCEQ, yet the report does not suggest moving in Washington D.C. "

"The report provides some very interesting suggestions, but could have gone much further in transforming the organizational structure of the Galveston Campus through the creation (or re-creation, for those whose historical context extends far enough back...) of a School of Marine Science and Maritime Affairs. The majority of the branch campuses (with the exception of Qatar and McAllen) are distinguished as serving as the location of a School, and thus represent loci of specialized experiential learning. Creation of a comprehensive school focused on addressing the holistic and unique dimensions of the entire Blue Economy – from business and logistics, to the humanities, to social science, to STEM, and, of course, the Maritime Academy - would be a huge asset to TAMU. In this model, the CAO position might be converted to an Academic Dean who reports solidly to the Provost with a dotted line to the COO, with corresponding Associate Deans for Academic Affairs (currently the AVP for Academic Operations), Research and Graduate Studies (currently a SAVP), and Inclusive Excellence (a new position). This would distinguish the Galveston Campus as an experiential learning center that leverages the obvious and strategic value of its location on a vibrant and critical urban coast.

The TAMU School of Marine Science and Maritime Affairs would be nationally unique, and poised to lead in the comprehensive Blue Economy landscape through its peerless composition of academic units and programs: Maritime Humanities (a renaming of the current Liberal Studies Department, which more accurately describes their impact in scholarship and education), Maritime Transportation, Marine Engineering Technology, Maritime Business Administration, Marine Biology, Marine and Coastal Environmental Sciences (a school should have stand-alone units that are genetically distinct, rather than a merger of all the natural sciences), and Foundational Sciences. This school would be



complemented by the presence of the College of Engineering programs on campus, including the ETAM students, as well as the Department of Oceanography in College Station.

Regarding the organizational structure of the upper administration, creating both a new AVP of Operations and a Chief of Staff for the COO is somewhat redundant and not financially efficient, particularly if the proposed School model is adopted. Furthermore, expanding the upper administration is an unnecessary strain on the Galveston budget, and these precious state funds should be invested in the staff and faculty who directly serve our students.

"

"There are certain benefits to centralization we all want. But there are risks as well. This report does an excellent job of tracing out some of the benefits, but not those risks. This is a tricky balance of course, but the problem is that we seem to want centralization of resources and processes at the same time that we want a celebration of our individualism. These things don't always work in tandem.

For instance, the report clarifies that we need salary alignment with College Station. This is excellent – we are the same institution. It is also a matter of great urgency. While the report suggests doing another study, this would take an alarming amount of time and the issue of pay is, especially for our staff, very urgent. Furthermore, I would argue that even alignment with College Station on the exact salary isn't enough; we need to factor in cost of living. It is simply expensive to live on the island. If we are a special purpose institution, we want that connection to the island, and "place" is important. Therefore we need to account for the reality that it is simply more expensive to live here. Our staff, as it is, are paid an abysmal wage; until we can address this, it seems relatively pointless to talk about onboarding systems. We need to allot all the resources we can to staff retention, not turnover, because most staff here would be happy to stay if they could support themselves on the wage we pay. If they can't, turnover will always be high – it isn't an issue of onboarding faster. A rotating string of employees in something like IT or counseling can be devastating for campus morale and effectiveness. Indeed, if staff are worried about their ability to feed themselves, it seems hard to ask them to engage with students in meaningful ways.

This is not to say that pay equity among professors is not an issue too. We pay professors better than staff, but not nearly equitable to what they are paid in college station (despite the higher cost of living). While this affects faculty, it also affects our academic programs writ large; we are having trouble recruiting and maintaining talent when the pay scale is so disproportionate to the cost of relocating and living in the area.

Certain kinds of centralization seem to make sense – especially those in MARCOMM and HR. But Information Technology is a particularly poor place to centralize. First, IT here fulfills multiple roles – they service hardware in classrooms, supply and service offices, troubleshoot local internet problems, and set up Canvas classes. I've even been informed that they do not have the permissions to do much of the work that they need to do. While

it would be wonderful to pay them better and provide them with access, this does not solve the relationship between IT support and a physical campus. In short, faculty, staff, and students need to be able to call them when something goes wrong. In order for that to happen, it has to happen in person. Our campus has a great relationship with our IT staff. They are part of what makes working here more enjoyable than working on the mainland; and it would decrease morale dramatically if their autonomy was threatened."

"There are many excellent ideas found within the MGT report. The centralization of processes can benefit Galveston greatly. College Station MUST RECOGNIZE and cooperate with the Galveston campus if this is to be successful. The two campuses are the same organism and this means that both share the burden of developing and implementing policies/procedures. The custom of referring to Galveston as a ""customer"" MUST stop. We are your colleagues and should be thought of as such for collaboration.

Analysis of pay disparity MUST be addressed through the creation of an action plan. The differences in pay make it almost impossible to hire and retain staff/faculty. This complicates and prevents progress in other areas.

IT at Galveston does a fantastic job and needs to be given the authority access they need to serve the Galveston community. The current IT hierarchy serves Galveston poorly and will hinder the implementation of centralization in other areas."

These are very necessary changes. I highly support all of them.

These seem to be sensible suggestions.

this is a sound recommendation

"This is great suggestion. In addition I would suggest not only should compensation be compared to institutions in Galveston but also how each faculty or staff compare with others at College station and similar institutions.

Some of the departments need re-organization e.g the Maritime Business Administration department. Great news staff classification would take place. It would be great a third party organization undertake this exercise instead of internal.

There is huge opportunity but as it is right now there is no clarity on strategy, goals, how each faculty is evaluated and how each would rise in terms of career development.

"

This seems logical, however, it should be clear that College Station faculty and staff whose work is based more locally should not be forced to relocate to Galveston. This would greatly affect specific funding, lab equipment, and other resources unique to College Station faculty and staff.

To top heavy do not need all those executive level positions.

We need a faculty affairs person or office in Galveston that provides a direct line of communication and advocacy for the faculty at Galveston to resources in College Station. If I need to collaborate with someone in College Station, this person can help with that process. If I want to have a joint appointment, this person/office can assist with the process. They would be a resource for faculty to make connections, help with processes, and connect to the correct office/resource in College Station.

"Where to start? The authors of this report did not consult with any of the faculty at the College Station campus (and likely none or few at Galveston) and in no way provide any justification for moving the Department of Oceanography to the Galveston campus (as shown in the Fig. 9 diagram). This is a flawed report in a number of areas, but if ""restructuring"" is anything like what has happened in CS, it should be thoroughly planned and vetted to avoid all the problems that have occurred in CS (e.g., staff thrust into new responsibilities with little to no training).

Future planning should include stakeholders (i.e. FACULTY!!) and not rely on a questionable firm. The report was poorly written and internally inconsistent. We expect (demand) better from our students-- and we most often get thoughtful and logical responses, which the MGT report is not."  
Staff

Galveston campus has too many leaders and low to no leadership. Our campus has filled stakeholder positions with undereducated, unqualified people that clearly do not understand or choose not to operate as an organization. How can we sell Bachelor's diplomas in the first floor lobby and have the Vice-president and President's office on 4th floor stuffed with staff that have not earned a Bachelor's?

- I agree with the proposed elements here, except for the alignment of leadership with centralized roles in College Station. TAMUG is not TAMU. It needs to have its own style of leadership and organization to meet the unique needs and challenges of that campus. Yes, it is a branch of TAMU, but it has a different culture, a different campus feel, and a different focus of academic opportunities than the main campus.

"- I highly agree with developing an onboarding program for new employees. I started in 2021 (mid-pandemic) and didn't get any formal onboarding. I didn't meet any other staff members outside of my immediate department or know who to contact about certain things i.e. how to order research supplies, who to email to get invoices paid, or how to get an ID badge and keycard access. I'm not asking for staff party every time a new employee gets hired but a basic ""welcome to TAMUG"" and here is how you access your email and get an ID badge and where departments are located around campus would be great. A basic onboarding program would be better than my experience. I thought I was unique because I started mid-pandemic but talking to fellow staff members, I'm learning I was wrong.

- I have an example about not knowing procedures and/or who to contact about certain things. I never received any formal training about purchasing (which I do a lot for my job) so when I spent over 10K on 1 vendor, I (and my supervisors) received many emails from departments all over campus saying we had broken a rule. We ended up having to take an online training about purchasing, invoices, and outside services. The training was actually very helpful and explained the rules about purchasing and using outside services very well. This training would have been useful as an onboarding process rather than something I took after receiving a bunch of angry emails

- I highly agree that salaries at the Galveston campus should be the same as College Station salaries. The cost of living is about 5.5% higher in Galveston than in College Station and home cost is 4% higher in Galveston than College Station (according to bestplaces.net) and a Galveston employee salary is less than a College Station employee. A recent job for a business associate in Galveston wanted a Master's degree and was offering \$35k/year. At these salaries, it will be hard to get good candidates to even apply for the position much less, have them stick around for many years. If TAMUG wants to be a leading institution in education and research we need to pay our people like it.

"

"\*Classification study to ensure salary and position alignment with College Station, to address competitive salaries of other higher education institutions in the Galveston area. This is needed since community colleges in the area will have higher salaries for academic advising positions yet require less experience. It is almost \$10,000 more.

\*Technology Services should report to the AVP for Operations and align with the new model in College Station.

Could be helpful as IT in Galveston does not have access to administration functions on a College Station owned computer, it is frustrating when they are unable to help because they are locked out.

\*Liberal Studies department is no longer on the organizational chart from what I have been told. This should have been a bullet point here if this was truly a recommendation. "

A Chief of Staff would certainly be advantageous, but leadership should not just put someone in the position. The position needs to be posted on Workday for application from internal candidates only. The individual in this role should be someone who has been with TAMUG for at least 5 years full-time (either as faculty or staff) and has demonstrated extensive familiarity and understanding of the campus including academic affairs (TAMU and TAMUG), student affairs (TAMU and TAMUG), facilities, event/crisis management, admissions/recruiting TAMU and TAMUG), the Corps of Cadets (including License Option, NROTC, SSMP, and Drill & Ceremonies), the Texas A&M Maritime Academy, and the industry.

"Absolutely a Chief of Staff is needed to support of the COO given the breadth of responsibilities but there needs to be recognition and tangible support given to all staff members (across all levels) that similarly function in multiple roles given the small size of our campus. Many staff members perform the duties of what would amount to 3 - 5 positions at TAMU. This is a great strength as our staff are extremely knowledgeable regarding campus procedures, but it is untenable in regard to staff burnout nor are we appropriately compensated for the breadth of work completed by a single employee.

Compensation and classification study needs to be completed ASAP and publicly shared but the study will not address the funding limitations due to Galveston Campuses' status as a separate line item in the state budget. TAMU needs to commit funds (through whatever

viable mechanism is identified) to ensure that Galveston Campus recruits and retains faculty and staff and that we are compensated fairly and in line with TAMU and other remote locations. Promotions are often held up (especially within Academic Affairs, in some cases for years) because funding is not available to support the new salaries even for staff who have the required skills and experience and more than likely already completely the duties of a higher-level position without formal recognition or compensation.

The onboarding process for new hires at the Galveston Campus is severely lacking and does not sufficiently prepare new hires for a successful transition to their new role. Onboarding should include the appropriate access to systems/software/databases required for their job duties. Many employees report not having access to what they need months after being hired due to confusion or delay from TAMU counterparts who control access. "

"Agree completely that a thorough onboarding experience should be created, but with the understanding that the Galveston Campus only onboards one or a few at a time. The reorganization of HR has essentially been completed and, in general, seems to be working. Diligence must be maintained to ensure that other Hub 5 campuses do not consume the efforts of the hub team and detract from the needs of the Galveston Campus.

Reorganize the Galveston leadership to align with College Station centralization and clarify roles -- In general, good idea but please know that this recommendation could be challenging due to the variety of ""hats"" worn by Galveston leadership -- where do they actually ""fit."" As I am sure has been seen numerous time, the real reorganization will be based upon relationships between individuals on both campuses. How does the reorganization and its implementation ""live"" past the individuals currently in roles?

Continue to refer to the campus leader as Vice President, Chief Operating Officer, and Maritime Academy Superintendent to continue to align with the organizational structure of Texas A&M Health -- agree

Create a Chief of Staff position to assist with and lead the day-to-day operations of the Galveston Campus -- agree"

Agreed!

Aligns with others in Texas A&M System.

All suggestions are reasonable and logical. Given the current employment climate I would suggest emphasizing caution on alienation through lack of communication as the changes are employed. Employee buy in up front will save money in recruitment and training down the line.

As a graduate of the Galveston Campus, I never knew who to speak with or whose roles were what. The above seem like they will help.

As a new hire myself I feel developing effective onboarding processes to support the engagement of new employees is crucial for ensuring that new hires feel welcomed, valued, and are able to hit the ground running.

Communication and transparency is important. Employees want to do a good job to serve their customer base, but adequate training and resources should be improved.

Consider moving the JK Williams Library reporting line under the University Libraries at TAMU College Station. The University Libraries has recently taken steps to ensure consistency in the electronic journal and database access to the students at Galveston. There are more opportunities for the University Libraries to help the JK Williams Library support the students and faculty in Galveston. The JK Williams Library is a great library but has limited staff due to its budget. It is financially unable to provide the depth of services that could be offered if they were under the University Libraries' umbrella.

Create a Chief of Staff position; reorganize Galveston leadership to align with College Station centralization + clarify roles; better define what it means to be a "branch" campus and incorporate Galveston into university processes.

Do not support the idea of moving Departments/staff currently in College Station to the Galveston campus. No comments on the Organizational Structure.

"don't agree this: Create a Chief of Staff position to assist with and lead the day-to-day operations of the Galveston Campus.

the role of this position to-be can be taken by existing senior staff, which can save the budget that can be used to hire two assistant professors.

"

EHS should fall under College Station as it does our other remote campuses (Dallas, Kingsville, etc.).

Establishing the Chief of Staff position and VP of Operations position are desperately needed. My concern is the Chief of Staff and Operations overlap and changing the current mindset of the campus. As referenced, many in leadership have 30+ years on campus, and will need a strong leader to reestablish the communication and reporting structure.

Fair salaries are a must. A salary study should be conducted to include local salaries within Galveston county, not just other higher education institutions. This salary study should also be ongoing, perhaps every other year. The last time we had a true salary study and pay adjustment was in 2015.

Fully support!

Has any assessment been done on the movement of Galveston departments under College Station so far? Anecdotally from the front lines, it has not been a good experience.

Services that once could be taken care of locally (and quickly) are now required to go through College Station and take much longer. While this is simply a headache for me as a staff member, I worry that increasing the number of direct lines through College Station is going to inhibit our ability to serve students in an efficient and effective manner. One of the unique qualities of our campus is that we can provide services in a very personal manner and I feel some of these changes will take away this piece that makes us stand out. Specifically, the direct line to College Station within Student Affairs seems highly unnecessary. There is a long history of great relationships between Student Affairs at the two campuses and the majority of our processes/policies are identical. Moving our reporting through College Station seems to complicate our ability to serve our students in a way that fits our campus best.

HR does need to look at salaries for Galveston. We are being left behind.

I agree with the recommendations. One thing that concerned me and led to me leaving is who could you talk to about issues with a department head conduct. This was never addressed and became very stressful.

I agree with the reorganization of HR to become a part of College Station. What I don't agree with is HR Functions being removed from Galveston HR professionals in order to build a pyramid of approval processes that were not needed in order to process anything within our campus (HR functions). Our hiring managers and supervisors have begun expressing concern over failure to provide excellent quality of customer service, as well as time efficiency within our HR department because processes now require more time to complete. Onboarding will need to be addressed more in depth due to the changes in new hire orientation dates being definitive now in College Station.

I am also a parent of an Engineering student that just returned to TAMU main campus to pursue a BS in Biological and Agricultural Engineering. Both of us were very disappointed in the experience that Virgil had in Galveston. Under this area I will mention that getting access with Engineering advisors for class sign up/advising was an issue. We also struggled with communication about the Math Placement exam needing to be done on main campus vs. through the Galveston campus. I felt like there was way too many students for the available resources. Dr. Fossum is a great guy and called me personally when I emailed him about one of the issues, which I thought was going above and beyond. My son still talks fondly about him. I just think he needs alot more resources as he can only do so much! I appreciate the unification of the COO, VP, and Superintendent role. This enhances the position of TAMMA as an included part of TAMUG rather than a separate entity. I feel that the move of Technology Services under the AVP for Operations moves our campus into the 21st Century and acknowledges that Technology is critical to the campus's success as a whole and is not exclusive to Academics and the classroom. I feel validated with the recommendation to conduct a compensation study to ensure alignment with College Station.

I believe a Chief of Staff position can assist with communication and functionality of the university. With recent changes to HR, it is no harder than ever to accomplish anything through that office. Furthermore, the people in college station do not understand how we function and are not great help when we have to reach to them for help. Processes now take five times longer than before. Equity study needs to be completed asap. There also needs to be taken account into qualifications and pay. We have people with master degrees and bachelor degrees in the same positions getting paid the same.

I have no issue with the recommended organizational structure.

I have nothing to add.

I think it would benefit Galveston students to have the Career Services centralized to the Texas A&M Career Center at College Station and follow a similar structure to Higher Education Center at McAllen.

I think TAMUG really does need to adjust their pay here. I have a friend at a nearby community college who has lots of hesitations about applying to any jobs here since the pay is so low. 2 nearby local community colleges (ACC and COM) pay their academic

advisors at least 10k more as a starting salary comparatively (about \$45k starting there vs \$35k here at TAMUG). It can be hard to recruit or keep staff if TAMUG pays so much less for an equivalent job. I like the culture here, and I like my team, which is why I stay. But if finances get tight for my household, I also will need to look elsewhere.

I think these changes are necessary in order to promote the kind of growth that TAMUG is capable of.

"I think these recommendations create stronger leadership on the campus. I believe further clarification should be provided on the position between the COO and CAO vs. Chief of Staff. The onboarding process will be important. As a staff who did not attend TAMU as a student I was unaware and felt unwelcomed when I started at the university because of the difference in terms. I think have a common onboarding process can should help in introducing to the campus traditions as well as job responsibilities.

There seems to be duplication in the diversity initiatives position posted both under the Student Affairs and AVP for academic affairs. Clarification is needed between the 1973 Center/CLIDE which report to AVP of academic affairs and the student diversity initiatives which reports to the AVP of student affairs. Currently these programs serve similar initiatives and overlapping staff but are now shown to report within two different structures. "

I think this is a good idea, however, the cost of living in Galveston is significantly more than College Station which needs to be addressed. We are losing good people because of the pay.

I think we should continue to refer to the campus leader as VP, COO, and Superintendent. I don't think we need a Chief of Staff.

"If a chief of Staff role is created, they should oversee Staff training initiatives from start to finish.

Yes, HR should be a part of the larger reorganization at College Stato; a compensation and classification study should be done to ensure that positions align with College Station. Galveston Staff are often asked to perform more job roles and duties but are paid less while living in an area that has a higher cost of living. Currently, Galveston titles and compensation do not match colleges in College Station performing the same work-related tasks. For example, the current title of End-User Support Specialist III has been modified in the job description to fit the expectations of the position, but we are being asked to do more than the job description initially stated. The working job title should be Instructional Technologist, Learning Technology Consultant, or Client Technology Analyst IV. Those are all titles that are currently offered in College Station to people who perform similar tasks but are not offered here. There is no "path forward" for my current title at the Galveston Campus. We currently have two people who are meant to serve all departments on Campus with Canvas, while College Station counterparts have an established Director of Academic Technology and supervise multiple instructional designers helping the faculty set up and design their courses for each department.



No, Technology Services should not report to the new made-up title of AVP of operations. Yes, we should be aligned with College Station Technology Services because we share the offered enterprise systems with them. We should have more access to those systems, to gain that access alignment makes sense. If Technology Services is being streamlined under College Station, then we would need to be able to support our Faculty the way the Office of Academic innovation does for College Station.

Currently, we provide support to the Galveston Campus as a whole. In College Station, there are Technology Services dedicated to each Academic department. It makes sense that Technology Services reports to the Chief Academic Officer. We oversee the technology in all classrooms. The two Academic Liaison positions are currently under Technology Services and they support all Faculty with the Canvas LMS while also being asked to support staff through conducted training. In College Station, each Academic department has an Academic Liaison and several instructional designers that help the instructors set up their courses.

The onboarding process should be more streamlined for new employees. I went through an onboarding process that involved both Galveston and College Station but it took a long time to become onboarded properly. "

Introducing a Chief of Staff is a logical decision given the magnitude of responsibilities. Clarifying roles and aligning with College Station would help with communication difficulties. Onboarding procedures would be beneficial for new employees, as there is currently little to no training.

"It is difficult to know who to contact in Human Resources for work or personal reasons. Who to talk to about being sick and receiving help, retirement info and hiring student workers ???? It is better to talk to people you know vs somebody in College Station you have never met. Several of the buttons we had were randomly removed and we are unable to perform simple tasks such as moving a supervisor etc.

You took Admins working well together and providing service to a department and put one person as a lead making way more money than the rest and now adding several new dotted lines to supervisors other than your own supervisor is never a good idea.

"

It is very discouraging to see that someone with less responsibilities and/or the same title as me being better compensated. I've had several employees leave because they can have less responsibilities and better pay in College Station.

It would help if Global Engagement could have at least 1 staff member located at the Galveston campus to handle issues related to education abroad as well as international student and scholar advising that could then be relayed back to the respective offices in College Station for further review and follow-up. The students in Galveston would greatly benefit from having someone on site year-round rather than waiting for the in-person office visits that the College Station units coordinate each semester.

Most of these recommendations will be helpful in allowing Galveston to feel that they are part of the Greater A&M whole instead of an overlooked, neglected outpost. The only word of caution is to not allow the realignment with College Station to overwrite the sense of identity of the Galveston campus. The compensation and classification study is desperately needed here at TAMUG. Many staff members have been purposely overlooked for years and our salaries reflect that. There has been a system in place to keep staff from getting too much training so they do not qualify for better paying jobs elsewhere. Alternatively, if staff are trained and paid competitive salaries, most would be happier, more productive and proud to brag about their great jobs with A&M! Sadly, that has not been the experience for many here.

No comments.

"Organizational Structure.

I agree for the most part with the findings in this portion of the report. There were a couple of factual errors/inaccuracies, however.

1. There is no department, office, or designated person responsible for "Residence Halls Operation" under "Administration & Auxiliary Services" in any org chart I have seen. There is support for those activities through Pat Hebert under Grant Shallenberger, but Pat's responsibilities to the Residence Hall Operations is limited to occasional/ad-hoc support of specific projects (1-2 a year?) and even then, his involvement is minimal.

2. Student Conduct and Rules is a direct report to the Director of Campus Living & Learning

Centralization

1. Before we go all-in on continuing centralization, we MUST assess how well current/past centralization initiatives are going. HR and Financial Aid are stark examples of a lack of success that underscore the need tread carefully in that area.

2. Financial Aid – This was a confusing portion of the report. It seemed to list Financial Aid as an example of what should be a prime example of a department that could benefit from centralizing services with College Station. What is confusing, is that Financial Aid was “centralized” around 15 years ago, wasn't it? All Financial Aid packaging has been done by College Station for some time, and our students have largely lost out thanks to it. It is especially vexing because this is something we should have seen coming. And frankly, the case made by this is sort of damning. Reducing the footprint down in Galveston in the name of efficiency has essentially done little more than separate responsibility from accountability.

Allow me to explain: in any organization based on providing diverse services to a diverse customer base, success often comes down to how efficiently customers are able to interface with the support organization to meet their needs. This comes down to accountability -how well the organization is able to understand the needs of the consumer, and responsibility, how quickly the organization can respond to those needs once understood. Centralization splits these two. Last summer, I observed a backlog of Hazelwood Act applications and the stress it caused on the families awaiting the funds they were promised. The families were, understandably frustrated, and just as understandably, were expressing that frustration to the Financial Aid liaison on the Galveston Campus.

Specifically, I observed one very angry parent who called my office, and forwarded them to Financial Aid. Later that day, I was went by to check in on the Liaison and observed another student crying in their office as they left -they mentioned "hazelwood" as they passed me. I entered the office to see the liaison crying themselves as they felt powerless. They expressed they felt they were unable to do anything more than "shrug and point to College Station" and that they were "just there to answer the phones and be chewed on." Centralization sanitizes the complaints of those parents. The screaming parent and the crying student end up becoming emails to College Station, who have the responsibility and the ability to make change if they understood how pressing the matter was. The accountability is split from the responsibility.

3. Human Resources - The re-organization of Human Resources thus far has not gone well. Yes, we understand that the department has experienced some real turnover and some drop-off in responsiveness is to be expected. However, the situation has devolved and continued to get worse. It takes weeks to post open positions regardless of preparation. The process is unclear and it is exceptionally difficult to get guidance, and when that guidance comes, it is inconsistent and often contradictory. I cannot help but question the wisdom of putting a very new and unproven Executive Director over multiple campuses, with new staff and personnel, before they were fully in command of their original placement. Bottlenecks in HR affect everything the campus is trying to do: Positions are incredibly hard to post, much less fill, when people leave, new positions are even harder to fill, given they must go through the extra step of approval, and current positions are hard to promote and reconfigure -regardless of efficiency needs. These processes MUST be assessed for success. We need to measure the length of time from the first steps of the job posting process to the completion of the process for posting. We should also assess for satisfaction by those who use the processes. It has taken 6 weeks to repost current positions. It took nearly a full semester for us to fill a position that was occupied by essential personnel. HR pros themselves are frustrated as they are now "no longer to see the screens you can see" which is a problem because we often don't understand the buttons, switches, and toggles we have to manipulate with great specificity to move said process forward.

4. Student Business Services – This is one office that is a GREAT example of how centralization can be successful. Of course, this is because 1. The professionals on the TAMUG Campus, while technically TAMU employees, are incredibly capable and well-respected for their service to the TAMUG Campus. 2. The professionals are properly empowered to make decisions and tweaks to their processes to interface with the TAMUG Campus needs based on the resources they have available. And 3. Their leadership in College Station is exceptional -Jennifer Lightfoot is known for her responsiveness in supporting her personnel on the Galveston Campus.

"

"Our primary mission is to educate students but without a safe and secure environment, this is difficult to impossible. Other than the org chart, I did not see EHS or UPD mentioned in the report.

Our camera systems are not adequate and no one is ""responsible"" for the overall maintenance and operation. There are access control issues, lack of key control, and safety and security don't seem to be important. We are one major event from a disaster and unfortunately, it can happen anywhere. Examples are drugs laced with fentanyl, active shooters, domestic disturbances, and disgruntled employees. It is past time to take action.

I agree with most of the proposed changes including succession planning. There are quite a few staff members in key roles at TAMUG who could retire at any time. Replacements need to be given the opportunity to learn so TAMUG will be adequately positioned in the future.

EHS salaries are significantly below our counterparts in CS and other TAMUS members. The Director of EHS in CS has a salary of approximately \$160K and myself and Michael Phillips are in the \$65K range. Jeff Boyer (former HR Director) completed a salary survey at the request of Colonel Fossum and concluded EHS is underpaid. We have been compensated some but not even close to what we should be. This is systemic across the entire organization with the exception of ET members.

From an organizational perspective, shouldn't risk management be a function of EHS? We perform risk assessments for events and other operations and are most prepared by education and experience to do so. CS separated Health from EHS and are now ESS with Security included. We don't have a health clinic and this seems like a logical consideration.

The AVP of Administration has too many direct reports and is also responsible for interacting with many above, based on the provided organizational chart. Not sure how the duties could be divided, but it isn't fair to him or those who are underserved due to a lack of interaction.

Inability to keep and retain employees is directly related to our lack of competitive salaries. As a result, we are a training ground until another offer with more compensation becomes available.

General comment is that we as employees do not feel appreciated. There was no Christmas Party and the activities during staff appreciation week were almost non-existent. Employees are TAMUG's greatest asset and without us, the university doesn't succeed. The team, we are a family"" concepts have gone by the wayside.

I would be happy to discuss with ET. "

"President Katherine Banks,

In response to the high-level, comprehensive review of major functional areas, including organizational structure of Texas A&M Galveston, there was absolutely no benefit to our faculty and staff here at the Galveston campus. Furthermore, I stand by the statement that College Station campus is the only campus benefiting from these changes to the organizational structure. Not only has it deteriorated employee morale, trust, ability to

perform our job duties in our roles, but it has already been proven ineffective and inefficient.

How you ask?

Human Resources department is presently struggling now with the centralization process of our campuses because it has taken away our abilities to implement processes and changes in a timely manner and has also created frustration across the board with the hiring managers, supervisors, students, faculty, and staff. Job postings now take 7 days to post because our branch campus has to go through tons of approvals with College Station that is causing the delays. Also, this centralization process has caused our campus to feel as though we are bottom of the hierarchy now, and we aren't being heard.

Our staff here at the Galveston campus are more than capable of handling the very processes that have been taken from us and shifted to the College Station campus (due to auditing purposes, we get it) and has left our staff feeling like we aren't trusted or capable of taking on those processes that should have never left our campus to begin with.

Can you imagine trying to explain to someone in College Station how merchant mariner licensing even works for our boat positions? Only to receive a constructed response as to why our own job postings aren't getting posted for over a week because it has to go through millions of steps to get approved because they don't understand our basic credentials for our job openings. I can say that I am sick and tired of explaining how to read those basic positions that we as the Galveston campus staff already know how to read because maritime is in our aggie blood down here.

But back to my initial point, I hope you can see why the Galveston campus is pushing back on this centralization process based on the fact that is proving to be inefficient and ineffective.

This also leads me to my next point: Management. We have by far the worst managers representing our campus as they do not provide any support, communication, or basic information of this process and it has caused our Galveston personnel to be left in the dark. Want to improve our campus? Start by hiring decent management that fights for their team and their own campus, not against it. Since the centralization process began, I have been HIGHLY disappointed at the lack of support, encouragement, kudos, or any type of appreciation for having to battle to understand WHY THIS CENTRALIZATION PROCESS IS EVEN NECESSARY.

I project this process creating the following issues down the line if it hasn't already:

- High Turnover rate
- Low Employee Morale
- Communication
- Distrust in Management
- Silent Quitting
- Lack of AWL on this campus

Overall, Our voice here at Galveston campus matters. We may only be one small fraction of the overall university system, but what has been done with this centralization process is terrifying. I wanted to love my job and now that has been taken away from me and its

devastating. I am unable to recommend that anyone work here anymore because the aggie culture is gone and the ability to voice our concerns on the centralization process is being eliminated by the management here.

"

Regarding the plan to have entire student services department report to Gen Ramirez and become part of a unified Student services organization - This will create chain of command issues regarding the TAMMA Corps of Cadets (under TAMUG Student Affairs) and their role as part of Texas Maritime Academy. Will the Commandant report to one person for university discipline issues and another person for Corps support of the maritime academy program? Where in the Chain of Command will the Maritime Academy superintendent cross/coordinate with Student Affairs at College Station?

Staff needs to be paid a livable wage. salaries and cost of living need to be evaluated very closely. Staff in Galveston typically take on 2-3 positions of work while still being paid less than their counterparts at College Station. It is so difficult to help students struggling with food insecurity and financial hardship when I face the same thing.

TAMUG should also utilize the current salary pay grade structure to hire in the entire lower band allowed other campuses, not minimum on the lower band + up to 10%. Salaries are low for TAMUG resulting in lots of turnover due to low salaries and many reclassifications throughout the year. Most reclassifications should be done or reviewed during the budget cycle. Utilizing the entire lower band of the Pay Grade would allow more flexibility with hiring salaries.

TAMUG would benefit from the restructuring. They consistently consult with Main Campus in regard to guidance with their operations, then once guidance has been given, proceed to do things whichever way they see fit. Accountability would make their operations run more smoothly. TAMU HR standards on how to treat their people would do TAMUG some good as well. They suffer from high turnover rates.

"The best way to describe feedback on all points is to follow the following structure: First assess MGT's assessment of our campus currently, and then the recommendations.

Current: ""Texas A&M Galveston has the most integrated Maritime Academy as part of its organizational structure of any of the other Maritime Academies. All other Maritime Academies in the United States are separate entities from associated universities.""

This statement is interesting because I would argue it is not. There is a branch campus of ""other"" majors attached to a maritime academy. The 12-15% of students acquire so much direct consideration and attention at the expense of the rest of the campus. It feels as if the other majors and students are added to support the growth of an institution to support a maritime academy. This is highlighted by how forward marketing and funding efforts are geared to the small percentage of students, much less the amount of elevated payroll and positions included. The argument is constantly stated that these are the highest paying majors in the university. Development dollars, I get it. But that figure is skewed when at least half of the students are not interested in the academy being A&M, as they are attending the only school in the region that provides the license they desire. Many efforts

towards this student group have probably yielded a greater return of development dollars to Louisiana State University than back to Texas A&M Galveston.

""The organizational structure has continuously changed over the years, and stakeholders report the campus has struggled to find a clear relationship with College Station. Many individuals hold multiple positions and indicate that it can be challenging to keep up with the larger infrastructure of the College Station campus.""

Yes, College Station has more students, no arguments. But to create the same programs, same process, same procedure, same phone calls, creating a flyer and sending it digitally takes objectively the same amount of work, but 7 individuals to make 7 programs is the equivalent of 1 individual in Galveston to make 7 programs, is increasingly hard. Once you reach a certain point of growth, it is objectively not more work. Creating a presentation for 300 people vs 35 people requires the same amount of baseline effort, just in a bigger auditorium with a better microphone. The quality cannot be met without matching resources and to constantly be compared to the success of College Station while wearing the same logo is massively deflating.

""However, staff and faculty at Galveston often reported feeling forgotten about by College Station decision-makers at all levels and find the large size of College Station's systems and infrastructure unrelatable to the small size of services, staff, and day-to-day operations in Galveston.""

This cannot be more understated. Constantly being expected to keep up with College Station level results with community college resources while being treated as an unwanted leech that our main campus counterparts are forced to interact with, is why lately I find it impossible to be happy in my career because the increased expectations without matching resources is making it increasingly impossible to be proud of our work.

""Filling positions, both Galveston-hired or College Station-hired and placed in Galveston, were noted as challenges impacting day-to-day operations and the quality of service provided to students""

Are we paid strictly for the volume of students we support or the quality of work worthy of the Texas A&M name and student experience?

Recommendations: ""The current number of direct reports for the campus leader are well beyond the recommended 3-5 reports for such an executive role.""

The only question I have with this, is why is just the top structure regarding direct reports and consideration of balancing gaining external needs for direct reports and day-to-day administration of responsible areas ending at the top? If this is inappropriate for our highest level executive how is that any different for any further steps down including the next few from the VP/COO. If the ""best"" leader on our campus is not fit to be expected to meet these needs of our university how are we expecting efficient operation on down if the buck stops there? There are more than 3-5 direct reports per individual just the next step down.

""Reorganize Human Resources as part of the larger reorganization at College Station and conduct a compensation and classification study to ensure salary and position alignment with College Station, to address competitive salaries of other higher education institutions in the Galveston area""

We are currently involved with the centralization of Human Resources and many other areas. Specialization of some individuals needs to happen, and we are not the same structure as College Station has scaled. As referenced earlier, just strictly identifying direct contacts in College Station will not be as successful as having certain specialists down in Galveston to understand how to translate College Station master strategic planning and operations while translating the uniqueness we have in Galveston to meet the same expectations with less.

Overall, I agree with the recommendations and methodology for organizational restructure, I just want to make sure it is thought out and consistent across all areas, not just the executive top. We should understand that consistent understandings regarding needs and administration highlighted in this report do not stop at the titles ending in ""Officer"". Lastly who in College Station is going to enforce the accountability that we aren't being treated as another forced mouth to feed or an annoying leach to main campus that they are forced to adopt?

"

"The campus benefits from the amazing leadership of Col Fossum. We would never be where we are (and growing) without his vision. We have seen stormy seas over the past couple of years, and although it's smooth sailing right now, storms could be on the horizon. I say all of this because I believe we could benefit even more from a Chief of Staff to lead the operations of our campus. As far as organizational structure goes, I was wondering why there was a lack of leadership for inclusion on the executive team level. It seems that we are lacking behind other institutions, especially maritime academies. Our campus deserves to have leadership that will lead the campus in efforts for inclusion. We should have a leadership structure that serves the campus where we need the most help, so aligning with our strategic goals in creating a Senior Inclusion Officer is also needed.

I agree we need more organizational alignment with CSTAT. There are several facets of campus that would benefit from a change like this. Looking at the smallest offices/departments should be a priority as these leaders are often the ones wearing 4x the hats of others on this campus.

Staff Council, Faculty Senate, Advisors Council and CLIDE have all share similar feedback regarding Equity adjustments. There should be multiple considerations for this including the cost of living in Galveston, in Houston, and compared to College Station. We are losing talented people to GC, UHCL, UH, TAMU, & UTMB. We are hurting.



Onboarding is needed. Middle management is acting as pillars for institutional knowledge and if these supervisors are overtaxed already, they aren't sharing the knowledge in an equitable way. Civics and inclusion training should be mandatory in the onboarding process. There is no institutional standards for inclusion and it's negatively impacting the marginalized staff, faculty, and student success at TAMUG. "

"The centralization through College Station for the sections that have already done so, has been clumsy, caused confusion, and often restricted access that has added additional processing time that seemingly has no rhyme or reason and only hurts our campus and processes. If centralization is going to work or be a benefit, our campus needs the same level of access and training as our College Station counterparts.

I agree that Galveston Salaries need a massive compensation adjustment. Galveston is more expensive than College Station or Houston and as a small campus we have more varied responsibilities than our College Station counterparts. We have to be trained in multiple areas and often don't get any assistance from College Station when we reach out. I think even with our small campus each department needs an admin, a business person, and an advisor at the minimum. The duties and deadlines for these positions are too much to put on one or two people on our campus."

"-The current VP structure aligns well.

- The AVP for operations looks messy at best. There is a misalignment that requires more study.

-We are moving to a matrix organization, but the current structural models are bureaucratic. It is better to fully draw the matrix and look at alignment to TAMU. The AVP of Operations would liaison to at least six different TAMU VP positions. The breadth of campus knowledge to span this work would be considerable. Unfortunately, when there is a lack of campus knowledge there lacks the ability to steer or untangle processes.

-Systematic onboarding, training, and communication would create benefits for the remote site."

"The organizational chart that was in the MGT report was incorrect. Only 6 employees report to the COO. If a Chief of Staff is hired, then this would be the 7th employee reporting to the COO. Please check Workday for correct and recent organizational charts.

I agree with conducting a compensation and classification study for TAMUG employees' salaries. Galveston's cost of living is even higher than College Station, so it is very difficult to maintain a good living standard on TAMUG's salaries.

I think that more departments at TAMUG need to be centralized with College Station to make the employees' jobs more seamless and uniform."

There is an issue with continuing to have the COO serve as the Maritime Academy Superintendent while also having the Associate Vice President of Student Affairs report to the VPSA in College Station as a direct report. The issue is that the Associate Vice President for Student Affairs is also the Assistant Superintendent for Cadets. This means the person in this position would have two direct line supervisors (Assistant Superintendent of Cadets to Superintendent and Associate Vice President for Student Affairs to Vice President for Student Affairs in College Station. ) It makes much more sense to have the Chief Student Affairs Officer (the Associate Vice President for Student Affairs) report to the Galveston

COO with a dotted line to the VPSA in College Station. This is a better organizational structure not only from a positional standpoint but also from a personality standpoint as the current COO is very involved with and, quite frankly, beloved by the Galveston student body. With a dotted line reporting structure to College Station, student affairs program alignment and communication would continue successfully as it has been for the past two decades. Graduates from the Galveston campus leave the campus as strong proud Aggies due to the strong relationship between the campuses and would continue without a direct line reporting structure to College Station.

These recommendations seem reasonable and make sense.

We definitely need a salary equity study as many salaries have not been updated in some time. Need better program to welcome new employees and provide quick access to relevant systems and processed. If Tech services will report to College Station, then there should be a supervisor here that has the same level of access and authorization authority like in College Station. Getting things processed all the way to CStat often takes too long and causes major disruptions.

We keep losing good employees to other colleges that have a better pay scale for incoming young professionals. With the job requirements recommending a master's degree it is a slap in the face to start them out at less than the amount they spent to get their master's. When would they conduct the compensation and classification study? We have heard about this before but it has not happened and continue to be underpaid compared to our College Station counterparts. We have lost so many great employees due to low pay. Rising inflation here on the island and surrounding counties make it hard to support ourselves and our families.

### **Industry partner/affiliate**

"Administration grows over the years to exceed its utility. The Wall Street Journal reported that in the University of California school system (akin to the Texas A&M school system which incorporates numerous campuses) had 20 years ago about 1,000 faculty positions and 1,000 administration positions. More recently, the UC system reported that after 20 years there were about 1,000 faculty positions and 12,000 administration positions.

This is one of the neglectful reasons tuition, bureaucracy and waste increase.

The best thing TAMUG can do is scale back on the number of administrative positions. How much? 600% scaleback is necessary."

"Admissible process to TAMUG should have dedicated people for this campus regardless where it's located.

More financial aid and scholarships should be made available to TAMUG students, and administrators need to be dedicated to TAMUG. Seems like money tends to go to CSAT and cstat students.

TAMMA commandant has changed too often and needs to have accountability by students and administration-

TAMMA housing director needs be fired. He's not pro Corp, he doesn't do his job.

TAMUG Housing Neil Goleremo needs more resources, dehumidifiers etc and needs to be able to repair bulge on TAMUG campus on TAMUG. Should not have water leak or deep in or mold. TAMMA is youngest Dirk in TAMU system and it needs work.

Fossum and admin offices need more full time dedicated staff on site at TAMUG.

"

Chief of staff role is vital- day to day operations on TAMUG campus can be a nightmare to understand and know what's really happening and who to work with to get things orchestrated. Employee support and retention should be key as onboarding new employees to make them feel part of the community

"Create a new position for Project Manager to assist new chief of Staff to organize, coordinate, lead and drive all Departments to move faster to meet the Blue-(Green?) economy master plan instead of each department head doing their own thing.

College Station Development office should coordinate more and provide support to TAMUG Development office to get more Corporate Funding into the Marine Engineering and Maritime Business Administration Research and Development activities especially concerning Decarbonisation, Digitalisation and Autonomous Shipping in Maritime Industry to become the Leading Academic institution in Maritime. Too many Companies want to support College Station and do not consider TAMUG for large funding efforts. "

HR is terrible at TAMUG, and salaries are awful. So many good workers leave because they're asked to do everything and beyond, while not getting proper compensation. Run this place like it's Main Campus and not some off brand object.

No comments

Per an earlier survey that I completed - understand the need for a Chief of Staff position. But in the Organizational Review Final Report, the new Org. Chart shows the Chief of Staff having no direct reports. Seems counterintuitive that the Chief of Staff has no staff reporting to him/her. I worry that the position has no authority and therefore no support from the rest of the staff, and is not able to fulfill the functions that the COO has in mind. Somebody needs to be in charge of the whole campus! ie- who gets hired/fired , promoted/ demoted etc He or She should have final say on all matters, and can override any decisions made by anyone underneath them! (Obviously for good reasons)

The biggest challenge on the Galveston Campus is communication both up and down within the overall leadership. The Marketing/Communications effort on the Galveston Campus is not good, period.

Board of Visitors member

"- I believe the campus leader position title should be: President/COO. Having the title of President/COO will help the campus leader to be invited to more prestigious events to speak and represent Texas A&M Galveston. It would also make it a lot easier to set up meetings with industry CEOs. Having the President/COO title will add credibility to both the campus leader and A&M Galveston. Having this title would in no way effect or diminish the President of Texas A&M University's position. Corporations frequently have President's of subsidiary companies that report to the President of the Parent Company.

- I believe having the AVP of Operations having dual reporting could prove troublesome for the campus leader position. This reporting structure could lead to a political and power struggle atmosphere for the campus leader to deal with. Especially given the importance of the departments that will have dual reporting. These departments are vital to the operational success of the university. "

"1) Looking at the newly proposed org structure, the Chief of Staff Reports to the COO, but it is not clear (maybe intentionally so) who, if anybody, reports to the Chief of Staff. The Org Chart does not appear to give the Chief of Staff any organizational authority. This could be problematic for the holder of the position.

2) The report refers to COO currently having 10 subordinate reports. However, the current Org Structure isn't shown. It's not clear which positions currently report to the COO, that will no longer report to him - and how that transition will occur. The Chief of Staff Position does not appear to take away any of the COO reports."

"1) Rather than refer to the campus leader as Vice President, one might consider Executive Vice President, Chief Executive Officer or Dean: the other titles are fine.

2) Highly recommend creating a chief staff position.

3) Fully support salary alignment with College Station.

4) Technology Services reporting to AVP for Operations is fine, but requires a full buy in by College Station TAMUG cannot be left behind. "

Absolutely maintain the structure at the top for the leader of this campus as Vice President, Chief Operating Officer, and Maritime Academy Superintendent. Having engaged with the University from the industry perspective, additional resources must be placed to carryout the daily operations requirements so that the COO can better represent the opportunities for students and engage with the industry that needs talented graduates in many areas of the workforce. Continue to align with the main campus and ensure that TAMUG remains competitive in the hiring process.

Agree

Agree, but concerned that the "BIG picture view" from CS would wash-out the unique objectives of the Galveston campus. The mission statement and objectives of the Galveston campus need to be protected and supported by the CS leadership.

██████████, I have no personal experience with TAMUG's internal organizational structure. The proposals look good, but I cannot say more beyond that. This comment also applies to most of the other areas of inquiry below.

Continue with VP position

"Full support for providing a Chief of Staff to assist with day-to-day operations. In order to maintain a ""branch"" it is important to align as much as possible for a more cohesive and collaborative relationship. However, given the distinct differences between Main Campus and Galveston Campus with staff, students, and curriculum reorganization and centralization goals may not align with what is in the best interests of the students and Campus. Clarification of roles, responsibilities and reporting structure will greatly enhance the ability of the Campus to benchmark and provide for accountability and communications.

A compensation and classification study is long overdue and vital to maintain a first in class education for students.

Although there is mention of the importance of the Maritime Academy I would stress that this is one of six maritime academies and should be of great consideration in looking at structure and support.

"

I do believe that a "Chief of Staff" position would be a valuable addition to Campus leadership. I disagree with the title of the Campus leader - I think "3-titles-in-1" conveys confusion, signals a bit of professional "schizophrenia", and plays into the old narratives of leaders on the Campus having to wear multiple hats. Initially, I had intended on responding that the Maritime Academy Superintendent should be a separate title for a separate person; however, upon reflection, I believe that it is important for the Campus leader to also have the ultimate authority in this function. But, I do believe that it is very important for the Maritime Academy to have a strong leader reporting to the Campus leader, and for that leader of the Maritime Academy to have more jurisdiction over the totality of the Corps of Cadets in the Maritime Academy, as opposed to having various functional reporting lines (including to Student Affairs) coming out of the Maritime Academy.

"I'm a little confused that we would want to assign a Chief of Staff to Col. Fossum, while at the same time taking direct reports away from him?? I've been in business for over thirty years, most as either CEO or President of large companies, and I've found that having this amount of multiple reporting and dotted lines is unblemished by success. It will create confusion, will not allow Col. Fossum to truly run the campus and perhaps most importantly, will create a lack of accountability in his direct reports who have multiple masters to serve.

Completely agree with making sure the professors and staff are paid comparative with College Station. If we are teaching young men & women at the same quality as those working in College Station, then those doing the same work should be paid the same. " It doesn't matter what we have to say, you didn't even bother to read the feedback on the changes you made to college station. It's insulting that you would even attempt to try this again knowing full well you'll do whatever you want.

"Most significant in my mind is to get MF a Chief of Staff. Not even counting the demands on campus in real time, MF's travels to Austin and DC make this a must-do.

"

"Sorry but my response is a more focused at longer term strategic issues I think are deeply embedded in the Texas higher education system and less focused on the nearer term tactical challenges that are perceived between TAMU College Station and TAMU Galveston. I have expressed these same views over the years at TAMUG BoV meetings and other meeting with various UT and TAMU campus faculty and leaders. I doubt my perspective, including comparison to California will carry much weight, but I think there is a lot of merit and logic in my perspective so I will share it here.

My view is that both TAMU and UTex and the Texas Board of Higher Education have done a disservice in the past 100 plus years not allowing more fully independent campuses with full undergraduate and graduate education as Texas population and economy has grown. Holding TAMU Galveston captive under TAMU College Station would have been like Univeristy of California Bereley holding UC Santa Cruz captive. In fact UC San Diego and Scripps Institution mistakenly tried to prevent UC Santa Barbara and UC Santa Cruz from having independent marine science programs. UCSD and SIO failed and my view, being a UCSD SIO academic for 35 years, it is great that UCSB and UCSC were not prevented from growing independently.

NSF ranks 3 University of California in top 10 public funding universities  
<https://ncesdata.nsf.gov/profiles/site?method=rankingbysource&ds=herd>  
Texas has zero in top the 10. Why??

Seems a huge missed opportunity given the massive Texas Permanent Univerity Fund that California does not have. My view is UT and TAMU have tried to control higher education too much and hence suffer, despite the fact that the population and economy size of Texas and California are similar.

I should have expected with the PUF Texas would have several universiteis in the top 10 or 15, like California. What is wrong with the Texas system given massive funding in the PUF and a population and economy similar to California? I realize this survey is focused on nearer term tactics for TAMUCS and TAMUG and not the bigger strategic perspective of Texas higher education overall. But my gut feeling is that the Texas system remains stuck in a by-gone era with fighting over control of the Governing Board at state level between UT and TAMU with Austin and College station preventing Texas from being as excellent as it

can be in higher education. So this tactical issue under consideration is a symptom of long-term issues that I hope Texas will pay attention to. "

Unknown

#3 Bullet is definitely due but agree with all of the above acceptable

"Agree with bullet 1, "continue to refer to the campus leader s Vice President, Chief Operating Officer, and Maritime Academy Superintendent." The comparison to the Health Science Center is a plus in my opinion especially when it comes to selling the idea of a "lab campus" that provides hands on high impact practices for our students. I have heard chatter that this is being taken in a derogatory way so we need to elevate that story as to what a lab campus means and the direct comparison to the Health Science Center training the next generation of medical professionals can work in our favor. Medicine is learned hands on alongside licensed professionals. This fits both our marine related research efforts and the maritime professions here on our campus.

Agree with eliminating the External Relations position and creating a new Chief of Staff position to assist with and lead day to day operations for the campus.

Do not agree we need an AVP for Operations. If the goal is to reduce the number of direct reports for the VP, COO/Superintendent, first, we need to start with an organizational chart that shows who his direct reports are. The org chart used for this study, also has functionality/operational information that is not a "person" but was counted as a person when counting the number of boxes on the org chart. In addition, the Chief of Staff position can help the VP, COO/Superintendent with the direct reports as needed to handle day to day issues as they arise.

Agree with reorganizing the Galveston leadership to align with their respective counter parts in College Station, but they still need to remain accountable to our campus and VP, COO/Superintendent. This would be better reflected on a matrix organizational chart as opposed to a traditional organizational chart to better reflect the dotted line accountability to College Station counter parts. Should the College Station counter parts become the solid line, this presents Galveston with financial challenges as the person in CS has no idea of our budget limitations. Therefore, performance increases and merit will be determined without this consideration. It has already recently happened in our IT department under the Path Forward centralization of IT with a substantial increase for one employee, hurting moral for others as the word is out this has occurred. It has also occurred historically with our Chief Academic Officer position and the Provost Office granting a substantial performance increase without considering our budgetary limitations or the fact that our campus was on a limited 2% merit pool.

Our Human Resources department has already been reorganized under centralization. However, it is my understanding that Galveston is still paying the majority of the salaries in HR. Yet we have had delays in service to our campus due to our HR team also taking care of Hub 5 as a whole (other remote locations too). It is understood there are growing pains

with change. However, if services are truly centralized, payroll should be as well with the Galveston Campus paying an annual fee for HR, IT, and Marcom services, which should be less than the actual cost of having the employees on our payroll. If this were to occur in all the centralized units, this could create a substantial salary savings that could be distributed out among the remaining campus employees whose positions pay less than their CS counterparts.

Conducting a compensation and classification study to ensure salary alignment with College Station cannot happen soon enough. We are losing out on great applicants for our vacant positions due to the low starting salary that has not changed in the 12 years I have worked here (other than the small Price Waterhouse adjustments about 10 years ago). Both UTMB and Galveston College pay more to start than A&M Galveston.

A great example of low pay on campus is the \$70k starting salary for our Maritime Transportation (MART) faculty compared to their industry. It is understood that a teaching position would pay less than working in the actual industry, but the gap is just too wide. We simply cannot keep MART faculty long term due to the low pay and heavy workload. With the new ship coming, we need the best MART faculty for our students and it is going to cost. In fact, the \$70k start alone has caused angst on campus over the years with our scientists who were typically starting around \$60-65k and Liberal Studies starting around \$50-60K. Our scientists have often look down on or frown upon MART having only a BS the terminal degree but a higher starting salary.

Succession planning is of great concern on this campus, as pointed out in the MGT findings. Hopeful for a smart solution moving forward working with our HR partners. It is also a concern at the Director and Manager levels due to lack of depth of staff on campus. Centralization is helping address some of this, so I think we are moving in the right direction as a campus once we identify a plan for the high-level administrators who have been here 30+ years.

Although the MGT findings thought it was odd that Technology Services reported up through the Academic side of the organizational chart, there was originally a reason for this and it has worked really well. The director is an integral part of our academic leadership meetings under Dr. Thomas in addition to attending the Executive Team meetings with Col Fossum. However, centralizing IT does make sense once we get the right pay structure in place for the Galveston area. We constantly lose lower-level technicians for better opportunities. Again, do not feel we need an AVP of Operations and the director could report up through the Chief of Staff.

With respect to developing onboarding to support the engagement of new employees, I feel our HR team is moving in the right direction, developing procedures and processes that help provide a great onboarding experience. However, training new employees continues to be a challenge just due to the sheer amount of information to learn and no structured training programs specific to one's unique position. Centralization may also help



solve some of this as well for those areas that are centralizing. Linked In Learning is great for picking up a new skill or learning a new software, but our positions do not really have procedures manuals to follow and those of us with initiative end up writing our own to get by, especially for those tasks that are not routine and only happen once or twice per year. Those that take the time to create manuals/desk procedures will also help with succession.

"

All of this seems reasonable. I'm encouraged by the idea of reviewing compensation to ensure alignment with our counterparts in College station.

Centralization is making the university less efficient in our ability to get things done. Another level of bureaucracy is BAD, and increases the costs for students. Get unnecessary administrative positions.

Col. Fossum is always on students' side even when students commit wrongdoings. Some administrators expressed their concerns that COO might encourage students to cause problems against faculty. People are talking about distrust between faculty/staff on one side and administrators on the other side. Having an academic as a COO might help with the prevalent problems on Galveston campus. Texas Maritime Academy is home of offensive words. We used to have rear admirals serving as superintendents where students showed their respect towards faculty and other students. Galveston can benefit from new leadership and new department heads. Combining departments to cut administrative cost is a good one. Some people in HR have been discriminatory towards non-white folks or jews, hopefully HR gets to hire people who are ethical and non-discriminatory towards people of color.

"Concerning the Information Technology (IT) Department, the consultants found it was unexpected that the Director of Information Technology reported through the academic structure. According to data from Educause, between 2018 and 2021, 32% to 35% of Higher Education CIOs/Directors reported through the Chief Academic Officer (CAO). Having IT accountable to the Chief Academic Officer improves the support they provide faculty and students. IT would continue to provide excellent support to staff, being University staff themselves.

Having IT report directly to the Chief Operating Officer (COO) would be the other logical option as it gives IT a seat at the executive table.

The proposed reporting structure where IT is two to three levels below the COO/CAO, removes a valuable resource from the decision-making process. You are relying on a AVP for Operations to translate between the IT director and the COO, this is not a great communication strategy. The AVP for Operations is not going to have the answers when strategic information technology decisions are discussed.

"

"COO Col. Fossum appears to be a pleasant person, and he cares deeply about students on Galveston campus. He always support students no matter what even if he has to go against faculty or other administrators.

Some students expressed concern over improper languages used and disrespect shown in Texas Maritime Academy. TAMUG used to have a rear admiral serving as a superintendent of TMA.

Reorganizing TAMUG leadership sounds like a good idea. It may be helpful to eliminate some leadership roles or combine functions to cut cost as well as to be effective in reporting structure and avoid confusion due to too many administrators on Galveston campus.

Human Resources becoming part of College Station is a good idea. Hopefully, many errors and unethical practices within HR gets fixed this way.

"

**DON'T DO IT! CHAOS WILL ENSUE!**

I agree with the recommendation. It seems very disjointed between the 2 campuses.

Galveston is an after thought. My student had trouble trying to get help from the Engineering Advisor who ended up leaving and then just getting a random Advisor who didn't know Engineering specifics but was able to help with what was needed.

I support paying faculty and staff at the Galveston campus at the same level as their peers in College Station and/or their counterparts at our Vision 2020 sister schools.

I would suggest TAMUG keep their com team and coordinate back with main campus.

If the Chief of Staff position can really run the day to day operations without having to run everything by the COO for approval, then this position might be worthwhile. If not, then it is a waste of money. When will there be a climate survey sent to Campus about our COO?

It strikes me that the organizational structure is inconsistent. HR will be centralized in College Station but IT will remain decentralized in Galveston. This does not seem consistent with Path Forward initiatives such as HSC which is moving into College Station Technology Services. Shouldn't there be a consistent model that effectively leverages the scale and efficiencies of the main campus while facilitating innovation, discovery, and student success at the TAMUG level?

"Maritime Academy Superintendent should be a separate position. Superintendent should be senior licensed mariner with extensive seagoing, shoreside or USCG or USN experience. Texas A&M University Galveston Campus graduates should not have Texas A&M University Galveston on their degrees. Since Texas A&M University Galveston is considered part of Texas A&M University, it should only have College Station on the degree. This creates a separation of the schools, where there should not be any."

MGT was able to articulate the state of the Campus accurately. The VP and COO is dedicated to the University and success of students and should be "permitted" to focus on larger issues, not that he spends time on lessor issues. The Chief of Staff position will assist him with this.

Please provide easier access to advisors in the Galveston campus, especially for Engineering and specifically freshman.

where the bad ones at?

"The Galveston campus leader should continue to serve as Vice President, Chief Operating Officer, but STOP serving as Maritime Academy Superintendent. This is clear conflict both in terms of his time, the budget and attention to things going on with the other parts of campus. The Maritime Academy accounts for less than 1/3 of our students but consumes the major of the VPs time and effort. This only going to get worse as we wait for the new ship and once the new ship arrives. Everyone not in the Maritime Academy is missing out because the VP is not focused on the entire campus.

if a new superintendent is hired, the VP and COO may do the actual job of this position as is described in the report which includes leading the day-to-day operations of the Galveston Campus. This would be a better use of limited resources than hiring a Chief of Staff. Better still, give the VP and COO a superintendent and chief of staff so that the campus can really start moving forward. It has been in a stall for too long.

If there is going to be a change in the organizational structure, will there also be an audit done? There is the obvious need to look at spending and budgets but it would be important to determine what each VP does (and does not do) before making any kinds of changes.

Will the reorganization of the Galveston leadership to align with College Station centralization and clarify roles include alignment of salaries and staffing levels? most campus leaders wear many hats. does this mean a big investment in aligning the job duties of Galveston leads? I would like to see this happen. I would also like to see more faculty in leadership roles, especially in academic affairs. Faculty should be driving the academics on the campus, just like they do in College Station. will this come with title changes too? so that we can stop we the confusion because Galveston has different kinds of titles? "

The Galveston campus needs a veterans office just as college station has, veterans on campus have zero help. Even the employees tasked with helping veterans do nothing but point you to college station, we need an office for veterans on campus.

"The org structure still does not properly address the faculty and staff divide. Tasks and Responsibilities are not well defined in this chart. A Chief of Staff seems redundant and of no real accountability to the Campus, just the COO. The COO should actually rely on his VP in corresponding areas to be project managers, advisor to COO, and be community liaisons in the areas of expertise. The Chief of Staff appears to be redundant and meant for a particular person, not a need for the campus.

In addition, the Organizational Structure is incomplete and does not properly address faculty versus staff issues, nor does it properly structure the Master of the ship as a direct report to Superintendent. Under the Deputy Superintendent, all federal requirements for LO program, which are not academic, should be listed. This includes Corps of Cadets, Licensing/Credentialing, STCW tracking, Sea Term Logistics, and other related items outlined in the SOP for maritime academies. Having the Corps of Cadets under Student Organization is inappropriate since the purpose of the Corps of Cadet on the TAMUG

campus is to support LO and NROTC academic programs. The experts in LO and NROTC should report directly to the program oversight, not split duties around campus. Also, it is not acceptable to put academic courses under the oversight of Deputy Superintendent. For example, Sea Term is all about academic courses, along with commercial berths for MART 350. It would make more sense to use language which supports the academic mission under the Deputy Superintendent. Suggest changing the wording from: Summer Sea Term to distinguish Deputy Superintendent oversees the operational Sea Term Logistics, not the courses. Courses are under the corresponding Academic Department. This allows leads to changing the wording of Commercial Sea Term to Finding Commercial Billets, which then the academic department faculty of record would oversee the approval for cadets to take the alternative to 300 sea term level. Right now, it is not properly under the control of faculty of record. Process is inappropriate and vague. Some have gotten through based on preliminary approval and TAMMA did not follow up on completion of pre-reqs, but the process eluded to faculty of record the DH approved....Bad practice to allow a non-academic support department place interns without follow and academic department full oversight.

Where is facilities? Maintenance and Repair?"

The overall recommendation by MGT report on organizational alignment with College Station is sound.

There is an opportunity to develop stronger leadership on the Galveston Campus that includes better communication of campus goals and priorities internally and externally. At this time, the academic side of operations articulates this clearly but improvements are needed for the COO position. As an alternative to existing structures, a leadership model typical for colleges in College Station may benefit the Galveston campus and prevent fragmentation of decision making.

What is that first recommendation - Galveston should align with the organizational structure of TAMU Health? Surely, that is a typo. Such a blatant mistake in the bold headline of the very first recommendation makes me question the credibility of MGT and this entire document. The report is full of bad grammar, poorly expressed ideas, and mistakes. How can I take this report seriously? It reads like a clumsy first draft. Send it back for a full rewrite.

"While there are some merits to further establishing and supporting a strong working relationship with College Station through initiatives such as the creation of a Chief of Staff position, there are also some significant drawbacks to aspects of centralization outlined here, especially in terms of aligning our Technology Services with a model that is over a hundred miles away from Galveston. Such an action creates risk of confusion, slow responses to tech issues, and a higher likelihood of work disruption based on an inability to receive quick resolutions to IT-related issues. We have an incredible support network of IT professionals at the Galveston campus, and it is paramount that they have the necessary autonomy to respond to issues on the campus quickly and efficiently.

The same is true for Human Resources. If centralization is the goal, then there needs to be some safeguard measures for HR staff in Galveston to be able to quickly and efficiently

respond to campus-specific issues and concerns. The turnaround time for responses and approvals going through College Station offices is less than ideal, and before instituting such reorganization, there needs to be some clear directions for how our on-site entities can do their jobs without requests being stuck in the system for longer than necessary because we are prioritizing centralization over efficiency and efficacy.

I wholeheartedly agree that there needs to be a clearer onboarding procedure for the engagement and training of new employees; however, such procedure should be designed with stakeholders from Galveston as well as College Station. Galveston has a unique mission and context that needs to come across in any training for new employees to this campus.

Finally, the time for an extended compensation and classification study is long overdue. The cost-of-living in Galveston far surpasses College Station and now Houston. Employee retention will continue to be an issue if the compensation discrepancies are pushed off in favor of conducting extended studies while the income gap continues to widen over time. The foundation for all of the exciting initiatives and potential on the Galveston campus can only ever be sustained by having a faculty and staff that can afford to be part of the institution. At this time, given the significant compensation discrepancies between Galveston and other higher education institutions, even within the same geographical region, it is difficult to justify why a dedicated and competitive candidate should choose this institution to establish or remain in a long-term career. The longer this lack of equitable compensation and competitive salaries is allowed to continue, the more this institution puts its initiatives and long-term goals at risk. The employees on the Galveston campus are a community, and they give a significant amount of their time and energy to ensuring that the campus is a rich resource within the A&M system. They deserve to be paid what they are worth. "

Yep

## **Aggie Student Experience**

- Financial aid should be managed by College Station with an Associate Director placed in Galveston to provide day-to-day local support and authority.
- Recruitment should be centralized through College Station where there is a coordinated and dedicated effort to recruit for Galveston.
- College Station and Galveston need to work to recruit students to Galveston who best fit the mission and purpose of the Engineering programs offered in Galveston, which can make for a better student experience and higher retention.
- Elevate and develop the competitive opportunity to attend Galveston as a distinctly different Aggie Student Experience. Identify and recruit those students with a specific interest in attending the Galveston campus to reduce enrollment swirling back to College Station.

## **Current / Former Student**

A lot of effort and resources will need to be put into elevating the Galveston campus to convince students that it offers a competitive opportunity. As it is now, the general consensus is that Galveston is a stepping stone to College Station.

Advertising TAMUG as more than just apart of the TAMU system would be a great place to start. When telling people who are not familiar with the school where I go, they automatically assume that I am not an Aggie, similarly to TAMUCC or TAMUSA. Even people that go to the College Station campus have told me they did not know we were an extension of main campus. I think emphasizing this connection would increase the enrollment greatly. I personally love being apart of the Aggie family without having to go to such a large school, having the Aggie values at a smaller campus has greatly benefitted my education, and I think that if more people were aware of this, they would benefit as well. Advisors for engineering students must be a priority. Trying to navigate classes, questions and tutoring has been awful for our students, especially our freshman who are still learning how to navigate this. Zooming to CS is not ideal. They need someone at Galveston they can speak with in person.

Aggie students with ties and involvement with Maritime Studies should have been interviewed on these topics with their major, as they have first hand experience of how the department is truly working and experiencing.

Aggies who are required to live in the dorms on the Galveston Campus should not be forced to buy a meal plan. The food is not good and they should be able to feed themselves, without overpaying for food that is not good.

All suggested ideas are in some way in place what the mean to say is give us funding. The campus is over flowing they stated 1700 can be housed on campus however the campus mandates anyone under 21 shall stay on campus. This lack of housing and the overflow of engineers to to administrative decisions has created issues on all campus. I noticed this report did not commit on any student day to day activities and experiences .

As a former sea aggie, I found the "aggie" experience to be lacking in general. Galveston has a very introverted personality and many of the traditional aggie traditions are generally extraverted. The campus does not do its part to tie the sea aggie experience back to the traditional aggie experience. My general feeling while I was on the Galveston campus was that the people in charge aren't holding it to the standards that college station holds itself to, so as a result the experience lacks.

Both myself and other students have had to jump through many hoops to get some sort of response from College Station in some cases. I fear that centralization may translate to weeks of waiting for a response from College Station on critical aspects of my education. Bring more engineering disciplines to Galveston so students wishing to switch between majors can do so without having to transfer to college station. Have a dedicated financial aid staff in Galveston so students don't have to rely solely on emails and remote communication to get things taken care of.

"College Station and Galveston need to work to recruit students to Galveston who best fit the mission and purpose of the Engineering programs offered in Galveston.

100%, I get that there's an overflow of general engineering students, but you guys need to push your marine engineering program harder. Students get scared off by the license option in the core, and the 'hands on work'. You need to show them there's more to the degree than that.

They don't HAVE to join the core, and the 'hands on portion' in my opinion, is only 10-20% of the entire degree in my experience.

I would almost argue marine engineering is a multidisciplinary degree, as it touches on many subjects such as mechanical engineering, and electrical engineering. "

"-College Station financial aid already struggles to keep their head above water. Do not let College Station manage Galveston student's tuition if they are not on that campus. It will take away priority from current Galveston Students.

-Main campus should support Galveston recruitment, but not become the central broadcaster. The individuals on the College Station team do not know how to market a different campus.

-Agree

Agree

"

"College Station should not be made responsible for recruitment on the island. They lack the personal experience of being at our location. You can not replace personal first hand accounts by students and faculty, especially when speaking to the maritime academy's history.

Financial Aid offices are already hard enough to get a hold of. Student activities already refers to College Station to approve checks, a process that has taken 5 weeks and counting now. Changing the office location adds just another line of burden between students and the people they need services from."

Completely agree with recruiting people who actually want to go to the Galveston campus. The entry to major program for engineers brings people to campus who bring down morale and are generally miserable. I think that program should be done away with entirely.

Elevate and develop the competitive opportunity to attend Galveston as a distinctly different Aggie Student Experience. Identify and recruit those students with a specific interest in attending the Galveston campus to reduce enrollment swirling back to College Station.

Ensure faculty and staff understand the students are the customers and they are to provide support to the customers

"Financial aid should either be shifted fully to Galveston or fully to College Station because no one knows what they are doing here, and students are not getting their agreed-upon financial aid.

Stop focusing on recruiting engineering students who don't want to be at this campus and instead focus on recruiting students for the Marine Sciences. Focus on turning A&M into a highly recommended college for Marine Science because it is not at this time. "

Financial aid should not be controlled by College station. The needs for the Galveston campus is unique to Galveston alone and should remain its own entity without College stations input. I do not think the recruitment should be up to College station but more or less advertise Galveston campus on the College station campus.

funneling college station wannabes into the campus kills the culture. I have had multiple people tell me they hate boats and hate the ocean. the chartwells contract needs to be revisited as soon as possible to fix the lack of variety and slacking quality. TAMMAH feels like a prison. Cameras everywhere and we have to scan our cards 3 times to access our rooms. there needs to be resident parking by P MEC for those of us that have to walk across the road and across campus to get there. right now many residents at TAMMAH have commuter permits to get around this issue.

Galveston IS unique and should NOT be mainstreamed into the main campus on any level. Stop sending non-maritime engineering students there and ruining the maritime culture. Graduate students are struggling to afford increasing rent and wild inflation. Galveston student should be paid as much as, if not more, than College Station students. If you value being an R1 university, treat your students conducting that research as such. Hire better HR and graduate student staff. The treatment and pay of your graduate students is abysmal at best. Do not bring on LGBTQ+ students if your systems will fail them.

I agree

I agree that recruitment needs to be improved. If a student does not want to attend the Galveston campus, they make it known and bring down the experience of the students that actually enjoy going here. We don't want a campus full of people who will just leave.

I agree with all of these.

I agree with everything here as well, more importantly I agree that there should be clear communication regarding being accepted to Galveston when applying for the College Station campus. When I first received news I was being sent to the Galveston campus I was



worried that I had applied for the wrong location since I was not informed of this. The Galveston campus for Electrical Engineering (and I believe Engineering in totality) was pitiful. The staff were uncommitted, uncommunicative, and most disappointingly lacking in knowledgeable in some areas of their teaching. When I asked for help of my professor for my coding class he stated for me to look it up as he didn't really fully understand Python as well as C++ and wasn't appropriately trained in it. Furthermore, my engineering math and physics had such a drastic disconnect I felt lost no matter how much I studied or how many people I consulted regarding my schoolwork. I am now at College Station as a Sophomore and am having a completely different experience with communicative, knowledgeable, and extremely helpful staff who bend over backwards to assist students with their needs. Nonetheless, despite these academic difficulties and challenges I faced with the staff I still enjoyed being in a smaller class and go to know a lot of life long friends and even met my girlfriend through Howdy week. Last thing I would like to mention is the lack of quality and diversity in food. I'm sure this has been discussed many times but the lack of quality and diversity and food had a major impact on my experience. There were a few times at Cabo Grill where I saw ventilation humidity leak into the food. Multiple times was my food raw/undercooked at Cabo and the cafe. The fact that there is only 3 places on the entirety of the campus to get food is crazy to me. The cafe food has the same monotonous rotation of low quality fried food or frozen reheated food.

I am attending TAMUG as I am a Maritime Administration & Logistics Grad student. I believe that a greater emphasis needs to be placed on promoting the degree plans a unique assets of Galveston. College Station should work jointly in their recruitment to highlight the opportunity that Galveston provides

I am concerned about the centralization of recruitment to the Galveston campus in College Station. Staff and students involved in recruitment based in College Station will not have the experiential perspective of the Galveston campus to share with prospective students. Improving coordination for recruitment to both campuses is important for efficiency and reach, but as a graduate student that was recruited to Galveston by Galveston faculty, I urge caution in shifting too much of recruitment effort for Galveston to staff based in College Station that may not have the full perspective of this campus.

I appreciate and see the efforts that the student activities department puts into giving the students a good experience on campus. However, it's clear that with so many time constraints and other factors, some events go unnoticed or no one participates in them. One prime example is knowing that most of your student body doesn't stay on the weekend (or even past Friday) and yet scheduling events at 8PM on a Friday, etc.

I believe we should really focus on the third point. A large majority of campus is filled with freshman engineers who hate Galveston and want to move to cstat. This makes it hard to build a community as a large chunk of the on campus body is leaving every 2 semester. Galveston is a unique experience and should be encouraged to all, not forced.

I completely agree that engineers seeking an engineering program in Galveston should be placed in Galveston and other engineers in College Station. Having to change campuses after the first year is really problematic and is socially stressful on students who aren't outgoing.

I do not feel that having financial aid run through college station is the most efficient option. I personally think hiring more financial aid staff would solve problems. I think that recruitment should still go through the campus with more representation and effort. I think the cause for the lack of retention is the engineering/other students who get told they can go to tamug for a year and transfer. Treating our campus as an overflow campus creates an atmosphere in which the students here won't be here for long, so friendships cannot be formed. Because of this, I agree that our campus should not be treated as overflowing. "I don't agree financial aid of Galveston is managed by college station. Things here are already complicated enough. I don't see how that would benefit Galveston campus. Galveston campus should have its recruitment event separately of the one of college station. "

I like being an Aggie, particularly a Sea Aggie, but some of the registration and financial aid work has been slower, I think the changes will help shorten this process.

"I personally chose to attend Galveston for the marine sciences and the smaller campus experience. The admin, staff, cafeteria, faculty and students have all been friendly and helpful.

It would be helpful if more courses were hybrid; that might reduce the "swirling back to College Station. It's odd that Oceanography is at College Station and not at Galveston, but after all this time, faculty at CS are well invested in labs, etc.

On this topic, a PhD in Marine Sciences is more inclusive and used at other universities.

Other: Code of Ethics

This needs review and updating. The students of the 21st century need to miss or make up classes for new reasons: return to home country to update VISA, work at off-campus employment to pay tuition, take care of children, aging parents or handicapped siblings. With the post-COVID capability to record or Zoom classes, most responsible students want to fulfill university requirements and also meet personal responsibilities."

I strongly agree with the last comment above. The people who support the community here are the ones who want to be here. We are not college station and we want to be different. Stop flooding campus with who only cares to leave for college station. When 80% of your classmates hate this campus and were forced to be here, it becomes impossible to develop a community

I think Galveston should improve on the number of engineering organizations that they have, as that tends to be one of the things that put the Galveston engineers at a disadvantage compared to the engineers that start at college station.

I think it is unfair to send engineers here when they will just be transferring to Cstat when marine biology majors or those who will stay in Galveston have to wait for an open spot. I think this is a good change

"I totally disagree. Veterans need someone capable and competent in servicing veterans needs. Everyone one that College Station has been unable to support veteran needs in any way. We are left to our own devices to find the support we need. What we need is someone here that we can walk up to with out concerns and not rely on College Station only to be

cast aside due to College Station having more veterans. We are part of the same university and deserve to be treated as such.

Since our veterans are often left out to dry and have no orientation specific to the needs of veterans our veterans are often forgotten about after the first day off orientation. Veterans are not given any direction as to whom to report or to seek out when they have issues and/or concerns.

Our veterans are often forgotten about when it comes to having opportunities as majority of the opportunities are designed for the younger students. Our veterans lack the same resources as our brethren on main campus and we are forced to watch and learn about their successes and we have to struggle for the opportunities just to be successful.

We need to have a veteran specific orientation where they are taken around to meet key personnel and offices pertinent to our veterans. We need a team building event akin to the ones at every other school in the US. Most student veterans that come here are again cast aside and have no knowledge of student veteran community or our community spaces. Despite the antiquated gear and state of disrepair it was still a place to call our own. We have windows 95 workstations and a couple of dot matrix printers for which barely work and are now full of mold as is the rest of our veteran spaces. Yet we can not seem to afford to support our veterans or their spaces many have taken to try and clean the mold themselves.

We have students to don't know where their next meal is coming from and yet students are charged twice as much as those with careers. Every state has a free or reduced lunch program in high school and elementary school but yet we show how little we care about our students when we don't care if they starve just as long as the school has got their money. If we were to raise the faculty/staff meal cost to that equal to the students we could afford to feed our students instead of begging others for handouts.

There is a huge breakdown when it comes to the health and safety of our students. We lack any resemblance of escort service for those whom have to walk across campus in the early morning hours. Additionally, there are no cameras covering parking lots should a students car be broken into or vandalized. Additionally, several of our blue lights are broken and not near sidewalks where our students have to walk. Many of the lights used to light the way for our students are broken and have been for at least a year but instead of addressing these safety concerns we are given things such as the rings. While amazing and helps to foster Esprit de Corps, that money would have had better use in enhancing the student experience. "

I worry that a centralized recruitment will devalue Galveston as a unique entity. aka it will get lost in the recruitment for CStat.

If the campus can not improve the food at the cafeteria they should not limit how many meal swipes students can use at cabo grill and sea wolf subs.

International student support and onboarding is non-existent. Often times rely on College Station which is sometimes helpful, other times not so much.

It [REDACTED] (sulfur from the refinery, i prob have a type of [REDACTED] cancer) that [REDACTED] stupid, like [REDACTED] dude, also beaches [REDACTED] from the heavy industry dumping their chems into the water. Whoever made that campus newer went to the build site, [REDACTED] worst year of my life.

It's hard to recruit engineers that would like to go to TAMUG when College Station sends the majority of engineers here that didn't intend to go to this campus. Some do stay, but most complain about how they hate the campus the entire time, bring down morale, and then leave, and the cycle starts again the following year. It would be ideal for College Station to send their engineers to an alternate campus because they would have more resources there catered towards them, and it would not impact Galveston students that intended to go to this campus from the beginning. Galveston doesn't have the proper tools or resources to support the number of engineers coming to campus, so unless it's intended to give us more resources, the campus will continue to accept more and more engineers, and the people that want to go here will suffer. Additionally, while it is not listed, the liberal studies department should NOT be dissolved. This department contributes a lot to campus and allows our students to go into paths such as environmental law and policy, and maritime law. Many students go into this program and love it, and the staff is some of the most helpful on campus. Stating that very few students go into this program is false. While we are a STEM based college we still need liberal arts to attach ourselves to the humanities and learn basic comprehensive skills such as speech and how to properly write an essay or even the niche topics they teach such as History of American Seapower.

"Key failures that make the Galveston campus unattractive are its isolation from the positive aspects of Galveston (both graduate students and undergraduate students) and lack of CoLA (graduate students). As many students lack cars, a regular shuttle from Pelican Island into Galveston would allow students free access to the positive parts of Galveston and reduce the isolationist feel of the campus, aiding in retention. This would also ease the deep displeasure students feel with the dining hall weekend hours, as they could go out instead. Students without cars are trapped by the lack of a way off of pelican island, despite being only 4 miles by car from downtown.

The issues of thesis masters and doctoral student pay harm faculty retention. Most faculty research is done using graduate students, and uncompetitive salaries result in fewer highly skilled applicants accepting, reducing the quality of work and the number of grants received. It is important to note here that for most biology, MCES, and oceanography graduate students, the small class sizes and location as a town within a red state are actually a meaningful negative, so this must be balanced with pay that meets Cost of Living."

My answer remains the same as my previous response. I enjoy galveston as it is and feel it doesn't need to be changed. Many of my fellow students agree with me that these changes seem unnecessary.

My engineering experience in Galveston has been abysmal. The ETAM system is vindictive and kept me from actually obtaining a major for 2 semesters. The blanket education we get

in foundational engineering is good, but in application, a student who is pre-ETAM and potentially decides to switch majors or change schools is at a huge disadvantage. The limited engineering choices and classes surrounding the engineering curriculum (PHYS 206, MATH 251, etc) in Galveston have severely hindered education experience. Purely because sometimes there is no choice for classes, a schedule may be unoptimized and jarring, and choice of professor can also cause detriment.

"My son is a freshman this year and a national scholar. TAMUG really needs to do a better job of attracting and retaining these type of students. The merit was lower than at CSTAT when the cost is truly higher because of the lack of conveniences TAMUG offers. The honors program isn't strong at all and a second thought with no true benefits. My son choose TAMUG because he's a marine biology major and so far he's been disappointed. He got way better offers at other public universities that he missed out on because he was sold that TAMUG offers as solid opportunities as CSTAT. TAMUG just has the reputation as a placeholder for kids that can't go to CSTAT first. You want to elevate - then talk with those students who actually made TAMUG their first choice.

Regarding financial aid, separate it from TAMU. It's horrible being bounced around between two campuses. It's especially evident that TAMU doesn't see the need for equal merit scholarships which is ridiculous. It's not cheaper to go to TAMUG. That's one major display of TAMU not understanding the TAMUG campus and other costs associated with living on an island in a town that is a tourist trap.

As for student experience, you tell me how you would feel being told you're a true Aggie and being excited about games, etc then told - get there yourself and figure out where to stay. Seriously, not all students have cars or places to stay. That's a TAMU privileged attitude which again shows how they are detached from the TAMUG student base and challenges they face. ■■■■■, don't even get me started on the ■■■■■ food and lack of options. At least kids at TAMU, don't have just two options and have to literally leave an island to get better food choice or groceries to cook. "

"Some of the smaller programs at TAMUG such as computer science will never grow any bigger without support and advisors in Galveston. If it is not feasible to create a whole new advisor for the program then one of the established advisors on campus needs to take on these students. Currently it is so hard for computer science majors on this campus to be successful without anyone to help them build their course schedules and know what they can do to satisfy their degree plan.

These solutions will reduce enrollment swirling back to College Station and encourage the smaller programs to grow on the Galveston campus. If there is not going to be any support for these new majors being added then they should not have been made available here in the first place. "

Stop sending Galveston the "lower tier" engineering students, and then transferring them out! They come here and form communities then leave those communities and that hurts the health and sense of belonging on this campus. It signals to all the people here, not just

engineers, that they are of less value than college station students. if they are sent here, keep them here. If they are not "good enough" to go to college station, why should they be admitted at all?

Student housing must be improved and expanded to improve the aggie student experience in Galveston. Not only does on-campus housing need to be improved but especially off-campus housing, it is currently too expensive in Galveston for students to live anywhere off campus unless they want a long commute. This discourages students from going to Galveston and or staying in Galveston for an extended period. If on-campus student housing is improved, student retention in Galveston may improve.

Students would be more incentivized to stay at Galveston if the school received more funding and didn't rely on hand-me-down equipment and supplies from College Station. "The changes recommended in this section is valuable, however, what is likewise important to financial aid support is also academic advisory. A lot of TAMUG students apart of the Engineering Program, including myself, found it difficult to get ahold of an advisor, due to the departure of the local advisors in Galveston.

Another way to improve the experience in Galveston is to improve the professors, a lot of the professors have questionable teaching methods to say the very least, and some professors, especially in the Mathematics, are hard to understand/hear. In fields like mathematics, clarified communication is essential for the learning of a concept, but if I can't understand my professor due to them being too quiet, and just reading a few sentences off a slide, then I am forced to allocate more time into my studies than I should be. This only makes me more eager to go to College Station where I can expect a better experience from professors, or atleast a larger student body who can assist me in overcoming a poor professor experience.

Lastly, the smaller student-teacher ratio in Galveston should be concentrated upon as an incentive for students to remain, especially engineering students, as I would remain in Galveston if my ETAM target, Environmental Engineering, would be offered at Galveston and the student-teacher ratio remains small comparatively to College Station, whilst offering the same Aggie experience and knowledge."

"The first suggestion I agree with. Centralizing financial aid for Galveston students through College Station should allow for more students to receive financial aid and reduce barriers to attending TAMUG for qualifying students.

As for the centralization of recruitment for the Galveston campus at College Station, I think this is a recommendation that if enacted will undermine the the unique experience that is offered at TAMUG and ultimately lead to lower student recruit and retention rates at TAMUG. Students that attend recruitment events and see College Station and Galveston sharing a table will certainly lead to further confusion about what's offered at TAMUG. Additionally I believe students are more likely to become enticed with the larger student body, larger campus, and nicer (and newer) facilities at College Station, which can ultimately result in lower recruitment and retention rates for students at the Galveston

campus. Furthermore, more students may be likely to switch their majors or academic path to align with College Station programs, which will have a significant negative influence on student recruitment for TAMUG."

The Galveston campus absolutely needs better recruitment. I am a business major and do not feel that I belong in Galveston, but I will mention that later in the academic section of this survey. Many of the problems that Galveston faces could be self corrected if enrollment increased tuition income. The food on campus is acceptable but nothing like what you would experience in College Station. We contracted with the cheapest bidder, or at least it feels like it. It certainly does not feel like a part of the A&M experience, the cultural experience like Northgate cannot be replicated but the academic competitiveness should, especially for the science majors who get the most out of being so close to the water.

The staff and students at Galveston should retain full autonomy in addressing the specific financial challenges that students at TAMUG might face; offloading those responsibilities to departments at TAMU will reduce this autonomy and impede the capability of the departments involved. Furthermore, the resources available to students at TAMU college Station are already strained and unable to provide the necessary support.

There was practically nothing that truly covered the Aggie Student Experience. The school is so concerned with merging TAMUG and TAMU that just covering a little of the issues. You think merging our FAID department with the one in College Station would help but it won't. When students from TAMUG have to deal with College Station we are put on hold until you have no other choice but to hang up, or you are treated like scum, like we are undeserving to be Aggies. We didn't choose College Station for a reason. Do not think that by merging the two schools it will help with how not only your students see us, but also with how your faculty and staff see us. I, personally had to deal with College Station in order to get information and when I said I went to Galveston I was met with "why did you go there, were you not good enough to come to College Station." That was from one of your faculty members. No one wants this. This is something TAMU has decided to do of its own accord. To better connect the Aggie students, they should concentrate on not separating what is available to the students. When a galveston student travels up to college station for a weekend game they should be able to eat on campus using meal swipes and be able to have the gyms/reds open to their disposal. Nothing more insulting than telling these students you are a full blown Aggie but are denied access by every means on campus. And yet both students pay the same price for school. 1 student gets a Cabo grill and the other gets Chick-fil-A for their meal swipes. Completely not competitive.

Travel funding for both students and student Veteran's alike for events to and from Aggie related activities such as medical/VA medical care/football games/etc.

True

"We need a financial aid officer ON CAMPUS here in Galveston, so please keep that.

It seems a lot of students come here to the Galveston Campus with the intent of transferring to College station (they're not actually interested in the studies here but did not get accepted into College Station), and thus it makes it harder for individuals who ARE

interested in Marine Sciences/Maritime Admin/Resource Management to be able to come to this campus. thus something needs to change to where College Station and Galveston have the same qualifications for admission. If a student did not get accepted in College Station, they should not be able to come to Galveston and deter students who will actually stay and graduate from Galveston."

We need better food. Badly. Student health is at terrible. Also, possibly a gym large enough to fit more than 20 people. High schools have better food and gyms.

What drew me to the Galveston campus was that I still felt like a part of the College Station campus. I think the underlying motive in this Student experience Proposal is to increase the Engineering program that ultimately funnels into the College Station campus instead of building up the programs unique to the Galveston campus. Financial Aid only at College Station is incredibly difficult because it can be confusing which scholarships apply and competition with College Station students means Galveston students have less funding overall. I think combining the campuses at college fairs will lead to more confusion and College Station will overshadow the Galveston campus with the majority of marketing and applications being focused on the College Station campus instead of trying to increase the student size of the Galveston campus.

"While communication between College Station is important, all financial aid with Galveston students should remain in Galveston in order to allow students an easier way to get the help they need with out having to try going between several people from Galveston and College Station. On numerous occasions I have heard of my peers having issues where they try to get help in Galveston and are told that they can't be helped because ""It's through College Station I cannot help you,"" and then receive a similar response from the College Station faculty or have issues contacting them while trying to focus on their academics.

In addition, it isn't mentioned in this survey but briefly discussed in the report but there is an issue on this campus. Students want to leave it because either as stated in the report, they are temporarily here as a General Engineer or they are unhappy with the lack of available things to do on the campus during the weekends as practically everything shuts down. Additionally, having more meal swipe options on this campus over dinning dollars would in my opinion also be useful to promote student moral."

Former Student

A problem

"Again, seems reasonable, but I question the research protocol that apparently neglected to also survey current students.

"

Agree

Agree with all of this. As a former student of the college station campus, I knew nothing about TAMUG other than it was there. I thought if it as a "lesser" campus, when it absolutely is the opposite. More college station "awareness" and marketing if TAMUG needs to occur



"Centralizing 100% of financial aid will create issues in the long term, unless there are specific pots of resources 100% dedicated to TAMUG students. 5 years post implementation I could very easily see relevant funds not being used by Galveston students because 1) reducing on campus assets will reduce on campus knowledge and access based on f2f communication and student awareness; 2) Drawing from a much smaller pool of students, resources will be more easily comingled and then redirected when notional pressing needs arise in BCS. While I agree centralization will create initial strong advantages, these will wain if a strong on campus presence is not maintained, and assets are co-mingled.

Recruitment will see advantages from large campaigns, however the lack of understanding of the feel and ""distinctly different Aggie Experience"" of Tamug will be lost with out local recruiting capabilities, this means that at minimum a cadre of recruiting staff is still needed to be hosted in Galveston "

Centralizing the financial aid is definitely needed. It was very frustrating to hear that there was a scholarship for single parents but then to be told that it wasn't offered to students at the Galveston campus because of this split between the campuses.

College Station needs to keep their hands off of Galveston. The two Corps' are completely different entities for a reason. A vast majority of TAMUG Corps graduates end up growing out their hair and beards immediately once walking upon the stage to become sailors. Sea Aggie LO's get a license to move 85% of the worlds goods around the world on rusty ships who are constantly needing attention. They never have been similar to College Station's corps and never should be. The fact that TAMUG's corps gets pushed so hard to march is absolute nonsense. Upon graduation, we wear Carhartt and steel toes as our uniform. Not polished shoes, and there's 0 usefulness for marching and unnecessary military activities for a future merchant mariner. College Station is nothing more than a financial boost for that corps. Aside from that, they are an unethical obstacle that refuses to see what an actual maritime program is.

Galveston should be paying less tuition instead of the same tuition as college station for lower quality

galveston should be the base for recruiting for galveston, college statin won't have our best interests as primary.

Great, but not enough people or organizations and things like main campus. I bonded through classes or at the cafeteria. Mostly salt camp

"How will managing financial aid and recruitment to College Station benefit the students in Galveston?

"

I am class of 96 College station campus. My daughter attends Galveston Campus. We love the size and access to faculty. She is very involved in leadership, student organizations and her classes. Although we love both campuses, I would love to see more support (financial aid, technology, facility updates) for our Galveston students.

I believe the circle back to College Station became more of an option when Galveston became the destination of 1st year Engineering students wanting into College Station and as an option as a PSA. Stop sending PSA to Galveston along with first year engineering students, and then Galveston becomes a unique campus as it should be. I agree. Galveston should sit at the same table as College Station. However, I do not believe recruitment should be through college station. I believe Galveston will be lost and forgotten and enrollment will decrease. I also disagree with the increase cost of summer cruise students already pay an exorbitant amount. The university should be looking at ways it can implement grants and other national programs to help fund and subsidized the ship. I don't disagree with this... it is and always has been (and should be) a distinctly different program and experience from College Station.

"I feel in order to reduce students transferring to College Station. More effort needs to be given so show the beauty and uniqueness. I don't think moving all recurring to College Station will answer this, because you need current/former students of TAMUG to share that beauty.

However, I do think more funding and efforts need to go into aligning TAMUG with other Maritime University's and showcase us as the ocean jewel in the south. A&M is the IVY league of the south and we need to recruit that way. "

I have knowledge of a marine biology student who transferred to the main campus after one semester. I would work directly with current students and partner with the city of Galveston for recommendations to improve student and faculty life on the island. The possibility of several thousand additional personnel should be enough leverage to motivate the city.

I think it is important to still recruit at the Galveston campus level. The campus is appealing to a lot of kids. They need to see where they will be.

I think that Texas A&M should recruit both Galveston Aggies and College Station Aggies. May they all experience Aggie traditions. Create the world wide bond that being an Aggie creates.

"I would agree with these statements. As a former Galveston student the facilities , buildings, dining options, and support are not as adequate to the college station way of things. One big difference I've noticed from college station to Galveston is that Galveston is not as clean as College Station campus. The dining options is also limited and most of the time, they are not up to par with main campus. If you were wanting to slow down the swirl of the students coming to college station, then the best way to fix that is by making the campus equal the Aggie standard, which I don't believe it currently does. Another big thing that could be improved is the housing. There are limited housing options and most are not kept up with. The overflow student makes it hard to live comfortably.

"

If you want to increase enrollments, then aggressively, and with positive attitudes, recruit for ALL departments/programs.

"Improve the quality of life at TAMUG, specifically involving on campus housing and dining. (an example is the fact there were 2 working washers and dryers for a dorm of 300 students or food being inedible or not nutritious)

Improve student pay so that necessary positions are filled. (due to a lack of workers, amenities like pool or rec center had severely reduced hours. An example is the gym being closed at 9 am because they had no workers)

"

It needs to be easier to transfer, due to ETAM decisions being in the summer it is difficult to get on campus housing because you are not yet "accepted". Some people I know had to sublease because they were unsure they would pass and get a major.

Many students in the Galveston County area begin their Aggie experience on Pelican Island and transfer to College Station. Local recruiting in the area should be encouraged.

no comments

Please get some on campus engineering advisors for the students at the Galveston campus. My son is a freshman this year and did not have an advisor.

Recruitment & support centralized in College Station concerns me because License Option programs are only in Galveston and are very specialized. Will the financial aid department in College Station understand & be able to advise License Option students properly?

Especially for summer cruises (loans require at least half-time status of 6 hrs yet cruise is only 4 hrs)?

Students are lied to about always being welcome on campus. Students are treated like walking bags of money that must be emptied into A&Ms pockets before they graduate. Students who plan to leave after a semester to a year to go to CS outwardly refuse to make friendships with students who are on track for a Galveston offered degree plan. This alienates TAMG students especially if they are housed together. The campus we have found is a commuter campus where the student body all leave on the weekend making it even more difficult to make connections whether in their field of study or in general. Not to mention the amount of money wasted on meal plans when students continue to go home. Recruiting out of state would benefit the campus and entice a more enriching college experience, which is what the students want that is similar to CS or any other university.

"The Galveston Campus is NOT experiencing the same level of support as College Station, which is extremely disappointing to both my husband and I who are Former Students.

Advisors: These kids were left with NO advisors to assist them in enrolling for the Spring semester. Those lucky enough to get an appointment were told upon arrival their appts were either cancelled (one student was advised by the advisor they were quitting, and no attempt was made to assist the student) or the staff did not show up for the appointment. Some staff members attempted using email but were unresponsive to the students when the students sent the advisor the requested information. Some kids were referred to the College Station campus for advising - CS provided little to no assistance. We were advised all the advisors left the campus and the students had to fend for themselves during a time in which they should have only had to focus on their final exams. This carried through Christmas break where kids had no idea when/if they would be able to have their classes

signed off on before the first day of class causing them unnecessary worry during a time in which they should be resting and recharging for the next semester. This is unacceptable. I hear that Engineering has a grand plan to increase the number of students in this discipline - if you can't support the students you do have then expansion should not be discussed at this time.

Food: While I appreciate the food service team setting up theme nights and other fun activities, the food is just not good (raw chicken on some occasions, unappetizing at other times) - this is causing the kids to either leave the campus to search out fast food/restaurant options or heat up meals via the microwave. Because we have to buy a meal plan, this is leading to an unacceptable amount of money left behind unused. Seriously, this needs to be addressed ASAP.

Housing: Dorms are limited, and it has been challenging/frustrating to the parents and students. How can you continue to accept students when there is no space for them? Neil Golemo and his team have been amazing in their attempts to find space, but housing must be addressed immediately.

Galveston and College Station campus: Most CS students - and probably some staff members do not even recognize that Galveston is part of the A&M system. A&M has got to do a better job in promoting BOTH these Universities as equal.

We appreciate Col. Fossum and his leadership. His work with the students and his support of them is nice to see. He is constantly working for the students and makes himself available to them. The students know who he is when they see him. Neil Golemo and his team have been awesome as well - keeping parents up to date and responding to inquiries. The help they provide the kids is critical and very much appreciated."

The purpose of the engineering program at TAMUG should be one that gives students accredited degrees in mechanical (e.g. marine engineering) or similar accredited engineering degrees. There is no reason TAMUG should not have a robust engineering program like it once had. This will help stop the swirl.

The students that attend A&M Galveston do not want a distinctively different student experience. The majority of engineering students at the campus did not want to accept admission there and we only did so because that was our only option to transfer and stay in our major. The Galveston campus lacks necessary resources such as academic advisors and proper chain of command in terms of student success resources. Recruiting for this campus should not be made out to be a feeder school for engineers and that it will provide a better experience because that is false. The only people at that campus that enjoy it are those who are there for anything except engineering because they mostly applied directly to TAMUG, not TAMU.

The target student base is very different. This will result in reduced enrollment. Why would you do this?

"There are two reasons for students to be at the galveston campus, marine specific studies and the licensing. There are many people there who are not there because they want to go to A&M but because they want to get their license. This causes them to not care about many of the A&M culture pieces.

The path from galveston to college station for engineers should not be removed but restructured. in the admissions process send students interested in marine engineering to the galveston campus instead of students who are interested in degrees not located there. allow a path for students who want College Station ocean engineering to move there but try to promote the galveston program by sending those students there first. you have no chance if the student wants to study something that is not offered there but if it is offered there then you have a year to convince them to stay"

"Third and fourth bullets: YES.

My son chose Galveston over College Station because he had toured both and preferred Galveston. He started as a marine engineering f technology major just to wait until ocean engineering was a Galveston option.

He came with a 1550 SAT and 29 hours of AP credit. He loves the Sea Aggie traditions and doesn't like for people to think of TAMUG as "less than".

People actually said to him: oh, did you not get into TAMU?

He worked as an OTL last summer because he wanted other people to see TAMUG the way he does."

This year's enrollment at College Station went up because they increased the number of students admitted and not due to their recruiting efforts. So I'm a little confused about how College Station would have a team dedicated to recruiting for Galveston. What does that look like? Will there be staff located on the Galveston campus?

Why do we need 'recruiting' at all? If we've got to 'sell' tamug then it seems either the premise of higher education has changed or the leadership is failing.

## Faculty / Staff

"- While there are merits in recruiting students through College Station, I would still recommend keeping the concerned department in Galveston involved (in screening, interviewing, etc.) to ensure that the new recruit(s) meet the department's requirements and are aligned with the offered programs.

- Raising Galveston to a competitive position compared to College Station is a promising strategy to balance the recruits between the two campuses--alleviating the pressures on College Station and addressing the declining recruits issue in Galveston. This would lead to potential win-wins between the two campuses. "

"Prioritize" College Station and Galveston need to work to recruit students to Galveston who best fit the mission and purpose of the Engineering programs offered in Galveston, which can make for a better student experience and higher retention.

A degree in engineering without other courses to develop a well-rounded graduate is inadequate. Note the cause of most engineering failures -- the social environment.

A hard look needs to be taken regarding the physical location of TAMU-Galveston. The island is isolating, with no walking pathways off of the island. However, even if walkable, there are no "undergraduate centric" places to walk to. Additionally the giant sulfur mound and industrial across the channel is unappealing.

After forcing TAMU engineering students to Galveston you are now recommending "recruit students to Galveston who best fit the mission and purpose of the Engineering programs offered in Galveston". There are a number of reasons that recruiting engineering students to Galveston has historically been difficult. This statement totally ignores history and papers over major issues with wishful thinking. Moving recruiting to Galveston to College Station yet holding Galveston responsible for recruiting is a recipe for disaster. Repeatedly in the report the issues associated with TAMU staff "overlooking" Galveston were raised and documented. Overlooking Galveston while recruiting could destroy the TAMUG. How will the staff in TAMU recruiting understand and relate to the unique Marine and Maritime programs in Galveston????

Again, I am very skeptical about this obsession with centralization. Centralization is not always the solution. Moreover, the administration has yet to show a reliable example of centralization being better than localized approaches.

Agree

Agree with all the above.

Agree! Recruitment should be centralized through College Station where there is a coordinated and dedicated effort to recruit for Galveston. Chair of the search committee should not be from the department that's looking for new hire(s). Do not honor anyone a tenured- upon-arrival as such a department will suffer from that department head (MARE Dept. has been in the situations for so long-:)

"Agreed on these recommendations. The Aggie experience at College Station is distinct from the Aggie Galveston experience. That is by design and it should be reinforced.

I disagree on the reduction in enrollment swirling back to College Station - this does not seem like an appropriate way to consider these two campuses. Investing in resources for Galveston will increase enrollment there, with the support of College Station. As it is written above, it seems like College Station wants to outsource students, which is inappropriate. " Am I reading this correctly that Galveston's main mission is engineering now? I thought it was a maritime campus with part of the program devoted to engineering. Marine engineering is important ( I should know because I have two marine engineers in my family), but this is not the only or principal mission for Galveston. What is the goal here? TAMUG is proud of being the Sea Aggies. I don't see how the non-engineering programs fit in here.

As a professor in Oceanography, I support the idea of stronger connections between College Station and Galveston, including the development of new programs that include both campuses. Centralizing recruitment, and increasing transparency in the recruitment process, would help a lot with this. I would also support the creation of a brochure and linked web presence that includes ocean-related programs on both campuses. Students often do not know about our major and they associate Oceanography with the Galveston campus. More collaboration between campuses and clearer messaging about what programs are available would help students find us and understand what we are offering. at the very least, I think it is essential that the MCES and MARB programs maintain their own recruiters, even if they are organized through TAMU

"Centralization is a theme of this report, building on many of the recommendations for the College Station Campus in the first MGT report. Creating an integrated structure for the student experience will help unite the two campuses for this essential group of stakeholders. A united structure will, for example, will make it easier for students to move their programs between campuses.

However, I would be concerned that some of the bureaucracies involved in this integration will become too big for purpose. For example, will students in Galveston feel marginalized if there is a long processing time for Financial Aid decisions in a large College Station bureaucracy?

Undergraduate recruiting is an opaque process at Texas A&M University, I would be concerned that the 'best' students will be recruited into the flagship campus at the expense of Galveston. Integration of Galveston with the College Station Campus will fail if Galveston is regarded as a lesser location.

Recognizing what makes the Galveston campus unique and special should be central to future recruitment and retention on both campuses. I agree that the Galveston experience is very different and students should be made aware of what Galveston has to offer (e.g. small friendly campus, proximity to the ocean, ocean focused programs etc.). Students leaving Galveston for College Station has been an issue in the past, if more students in College Station were aware of what Galveston has to offer, then there may be a flux in the opposite direction as well.

"

Centralized recruitment efforts may lead to friction in developing appropriate recruitment materials and activities to satellite campuses.

Centralizing these functions in CS will not be beneficial for the Galveston Campus. These functions are better handled locally rather than be a big bureaucracy in CS.

Collaboration with the recruitment offices in College Station has the potential to increase the resources and reach of the Galveston recruiting plan, as long as Galveston's unique identity isn't lost in the shadow of the College Station powerhouse.

"Emory University has a branch campus (their Oxford campus) and they actively promote it to university applicants as one of the two choices for how to at least start their degree at Emory. They promote it in many of the same ways that we could easily promote TAMUG to Texas A&M University graduates. I strongly suggest that all of Texas A&M University promote the TAMUG campus as the likely best campus for at least some applicants, for at least some of their degree.

I also strongly suggest that we at TAMUG be very, very mindful of our students' well being throughout this organizational review process. Students have been panicking all over campus for reasons that are often not well informed. I am worried about the worst case scenario for some of these students, and I believe that tragedies could be avoided if we take care to make sure that our students know that they will be ok, and that things will be ok."

Engage actively with Galveston faculty to ensure these changes serve the interest of the campus.

Financial aid should be managed by College Station with an Associate Director placed in Galveston to provide day-to-day local support and authority.

Galveston needs its own recruiters to take about the Sea Aggie Experience Good.

Great Ideas. Galveston is clearly not succeeding in its recruitment efforts over ten years, for whatever reason. Change is needed to hopefully re-invigorate enrollment. Galveston does have a unique identify, and getting a better marketing campaign around the would be great.

I agree that effort need to be focused on retaining the students that join Galveston and prevent the enrollment of students that use Galveston as a temporary spring board to then go to College Station.

I agree that the appeal of the Galveston campus should be elevated to attract and retain students who are the best fits for its specific mission. Recruitment should be as broad as possible, but the Galveston campus should be empowered to conduct its own recruitment efforts, in co-ordination with College Station. It would be great to follow a similar model as suggested for Financial Aid, with an Associate Director for Recruitment placed in Galveston. The report emphasizes Engineering, but there are other programs (e.g. Marine Biology) that are big attractors for students.

I agree with these recommendations. A concerted effort to articulate the sea aggie experience and recruit for specific programs is needed.



I agree.

I am excited that the report highlighted the need to revamp recruitment to grow our programs and better suite student needs. The recruitment office has had quite a bit of turnover over the years, in no small part due to low pay and fluctuating leadership. This issue is compounded by the lack of communication and coordination between them and the faculty who oversee TAMUG majors. Without a plan in place to structure strong coordination between College Station and TAMUG program coordinators, I am concerned that decentralization will further hinder program growth. I agree that there is an opportunity to elevate and market TAMUG majors as a distinctly different Aggie experience, but I worry that even with proper structures in place, the treatment and stigma of TAMUG programs as second best will limit rather than grow student enrollment.

I am ok with this.

I am wondering what have been the student's experience in the past related to the Engineering programs.

I did wonder why engineering was the only specific discipline mentioned in the student experience recommendations

I have no objections.

I like the idea of recruiting students with a specific interest in attending at the Galveston campus. I was not aware of enrollment "swirling back" to College Station.

I think having important things like financial aid based in CS and not Galveston will harm students and delay important processes and information.

I think most students come to TAMU to experience the traditions at the College station campus -- including sports, especially football. Good luck in convincing students to skip that.

I think that TAMUG could benefit by having recruitment centralized through CS so that we have access to better resources and so that TAMUG is presented as a direct branch of TAMU not a separate entity.

I think this all sounds great!

If recruitment is handled through CSTAT they will prioritize their needs before ours. We will see enrollment fall and the quality decline.

"Integrating Financial Aid through CS could be an impactful change, so long as there is actually a liaison on the Galveston Campus. Centralizing recruitment through CS would be a disaster for Galveston enrolment, there simply isn't enough of a recognition of the importance or knowledge of the role of the Galveston campus at CS for there to be meaningful recruitment. We are so small in comparison as to be insignificant to their efforts. That is a College Station problem, not one that needs to be addressed through reorganization at Galveston.

What Galveston is lacking is resources. Integrating some services into CS units makes sense (HR, Fin Aide, Marketing and Communications), but making CS responsible for Galveston is not going to be effective. If a transformational reorganization is what is wanted, the Galveston campus needs facilities. A natatorium would be transformative to the academic possibilities, and the student experience. It could integrate office spaces, class rooms, and

pools used not only for academic classes (DIVE being the only academic user still limping along with the current pool), but also for rec sports and club use. The robotics classes are currently using the pool a few days per semester working on small, student built ROVs, but that could be expanded significantly with more extensive facilities. A wave generator could be integrated for engineering and physics classes and labs. A facility like the O.H. Hinsdale Wave Research Laboratory at Oregon State University would completely transform this campus. The current development of next gen offshore energy development all had to go to Oregon for testing. We should be able to keep that in Texas where all of the energy industry already is located.

The DIVE program (currently under LIST) is one of the largest academic diving programs in the country, and houses the second largest minor on campus. We have the faculty to further develop it into a world class training opportunity, which could include research diving, field work, professional dive certifications and opportunities, equipment maintenance training, technical diving and public safety diving. We are significantly hobbled by lack of facilities, and can add no more classes to our current offerings.

If the Galveston Campus is to be considered a lab campus, investment in a natatorium/wave research facility would truly change the course of this campus.

"

It would be nice to counter balance the STEM oriented success with investment in humanities and social sciences that could study poverty on the island.

Local support in Galveston should consist of more than just an Associate director but also advisors for questions that need to be sorted out locally.

"Make an option for 1 or 2 semesters in CS for Galveston students and the same for CS students in Galveston, to take classes not offered at one place or another. (This is better than having them take online courses for those.)

Provide more transportation for certain high-profile events, like Career fairs, football games, etc."

More centralization may not be the solution. Please show us the data to justify additional centralization of services.

Most students targeted for recruitment to Galveston (except for students interesting in the Maritime programs specific to Galveston) would likely major in a program related to environmental studies were they to come to College Station. This seems like it will weaken student demand for environmental science, geoscience and biology in College Station.

N/A

No Comment

no comments

No comments

No concerns.

No, this looks like a subjugation and not a development. I fear that College Station will look at Galveston as if it a junior college to the real campus at College Station.

NONE

Of course we try to find and recruit students who are interested in our unique campus and programs. Centralized recruiting is economically advantageous to us as a small campus with limited personnel to send out on recruiting trips. But the TAMU table draws a lot of attention, and it is hard for them to properly tell every department's story, let alone every campus's story. There may be better ways to help Galveston that involve more education of high school teachers and counselors about our programs.

ok

Recruitment needs to be coordinated from Galveston, with the help of College Station, not vice versa

Regarding student recruitment, any involvement that targets underrepresented minorities (URM) and changes the abysmal representation of Hispanic and Black students on our campus, to represent the makeup of the State of Texas demographics is welcome. Local recruitment has failed to change the number of individuals belonging to URM (although the proportions have changed) as can be seen on our record for the last 10 years.

Sounds reasonable here.

Still need to listen to local recruiters in Galveston

Students who have different goals or curriculums from the main campus will be hurt by this structure.

"The fourth bullet is very important. The mentality that we can use Galveston as a ""holding spot"" for students who overflow from College Station diminishes the value of Galveston on its own, and this attitude spreads across the faculty, staff, and students who might otherwise be proud to be in Galveston.

Invest money into the student infrastructure and resources down in Galveston to attract students there who want a small-campus atmosphere. Elevate the value in that, for example to students from small towns who might be overwhelmed by the College Station experience. However, the quality of life and staff support in Galveston must match that received in College Station, and I'm not sure we're there yet without an injection of funding...

I like the recommendation of TAMU-CS taking some responsibility for recruiting students to TAMU-Galveston, since some of the retention issues in TAMU-CS may be improved by directing them to the smaller-campus atmosphere of TAMU-Galveston."

The idea that Galveston is a distinct Aggie experience is important. It is hard to see how the retention rate will improve without this, because I think that attrition is typically towards College Station.

The move to Galveston represents an immediate loss of current NSF-funded interdisciplinary research opportunities.

The net cost of attendance at TAMUG must also be a priority to address. Students have far fewer "amenities" at TAMUG, most visibly a substandard recreation center. Relatedly, students have poor access to grocery stores and restaurants in the city. To successfully recruit students to TAMUG, the cost issue must be addressed and amenities addressed by,

for example, building a new rec center and providing incentives for the development of a grocery market and café near campus (on Pelican Island).

The recruitment recommendation refers to all students as if undergraduate and graduate students are recruited using the same means and by the same office. They are not. I completely disagree with the centralization of recruitment. Perhaps just giving SES and Graduate Studies access to the same resources as College Station would be just as effective without risking a disconnect between College Station's recruitment style and our campus's focus and needs. I agree with differentiating and elevating the Sea Aggie student experience as a recruitment, marketing, and public relations tool.

"The whole purpose of centralization of processes is to provide increased levels of service and accessibility. Our fear is that centralization will mean a diminishment of our already extremely limited authority to respond to local issues. This should be preserved in whatever processes go forward.

The concern over recruitment being centralized through College Station is that Galveston will be sidelined in recruiting efforts in favor of College Station. Whatever changes are made should maintain Galveston as having some authority in the recruiting process so we do not get ignored.

Sea Aggies have a defined sense of identity separate from College Station Aggies. This should be preserved while extending opportunities to both student populations for collaboration. Galveston should seek to complement and supplement existing TAMU traditions with Galveston unique traditions of its own. ie stop trying to be a smaller copy of everything at CS.

The attitude of Galveston being a dumping ground for students who could not get into College Station has to STOP! Faculty and Staff who perpetuate this narrative to students need to be corrected. This is a pervasive attitude among College Station personnel that is unfair to students and has caused real distress."

"There are limited opportunities for joint main campus/Galveston activities. It takes 3 hours one-way to drive between the two campuses. There currently is no overnight housing for visitors except in hotels, which makes field work difficult. A MAJOR problem is that so many students view anything regarding ""Marine Biology"" as being beautiful beaches, clear water, coral reefs, leaping dolphins, etc. The Galveston campus, located on a shipping channel, has very low biodiversity and not even a source of clean sea water.

"

"There is so much value for our students in a closer alignment to TAMU Student Affairs, and ultimately everything that is implemented from this organizational review needs to center student success as the unifying guiding principle. With a grounding in student success in mind, it is critical that the proper balance is achieved between coordination with the amazing structures and resources available in College Station and the inherent value and efficiency of local decision making to ensure timely processing/service for our students. Thus, it was very encouraging to see structures recommended such as the

Financial Aid Associate Director “placed in Galveston to provide day-to-day local support and authority.” This type of local accountability will build and sustain trust and alignment between both campuses, and should be implemented for all of the service units proposed to report directly to College Station.

The recommendation to “Elevate and develop the competitive opportunity to attend Galveston as a distinctly different Aggie Student Experience. Identify and recruit those students with a specific interest in attending the Galveston campus to reduce enrollment swirling back to College Station,” resonates so deeply and positively, and we are so grateful to the MGT team for honing in on this transformational theme. The creation of a new School of Marine Science and Maritime Affairs absolutely would fulfill the “distinctly different Aggie Student Experience” and distinguish the Galveston Campus as a destination of higher education, both within Texas and nation-wide. Many of us in the Galveston Campus community already have been ideating what a “destination experience” looks like, and the vision of a signature, incubator ecosystem facility to support research and development, as well as build out and support the new labor architecture required of the sustainable Blue Economy perfectly matches the proposal of an experiential learning campus. Such a facility would provide interdisciplinary training and R&D from all sectors of the Galveston Campus - the Maritime Humanities (critical for training the next generation leaders in regulatory, policy, legal, and communications necessary to scale up new R&D), the Maritime Academy, Engineering technology, Marine STEM, and the logistics expertise imparted through the Maritime Business Administration degree programs – and, attract destination learners, scholars, and start-up entrepreneurs. This signature facility would be a huge opportunity for a naming donor as well!

“

These are all great recommendations. Developing programs that elevates the Galveston campus requires an initial investment. There is no doubt that the campus can be elevated with sufficient initial funding.

These are very necessary changes. I highly support all of them.

These statements seem to overlook the fact that some students attend TAMUG for purposes unique to that campus such as marine programs and not just to do their first year of engineering on that campus. I do think the use of that campus for some first year (and later) engineering students is brilliant but it should not overlook the importance of other programs there. That campus is a gem and needs support!

This should not only apply to engineering but also the other programs as well. Applying such standards across board would result in quality students admission. This will eventually reflect in good scholarship and quality of our graduates.

To elevate the “Aggie student experience”, I do not believe that moving all OCNG majors to Galveston would accomplish this. Most students want to experience the College Station campus. Isolating them at Galveston would result in a reduction in students applying to the OCNG major (so, looking to other universities OR by applying to a different major at TAMU in College Station). The report’s recommendation is not feasible nor will it accomplish the goals for the “path forward”.

We most certainly want to attract students who want to be here for our degree programs that are offered here. While I agree that Engineering's investment in TAMUG should and will be grown, let's not forget the strong undergraduate degrees already here, some of which are offered by world-class faculty. Recruiting efforts in Engineering should not be at the expense of these tried and true degree programs, nor the faculty that make them happen.

"Whether or not attending TAMUG is a "TAMU" experience or a different sort of experience, this is a cultural shift I do not know can be fixed by this report. I do, however, appreciate the focus on this, and especially in what that might mean for our recruiting efforts. Respectfully, though, I do not think that these issues can be fixed by asking College Station to do our recruiting for us. We need to focus on selling our mission and our brand in the ways only we know best how to. I see the value in collaboration with College Station, especially in their redirecting students to us that might be going initially to them. But I do not know that they would best be able to market our campus. What is their motivation to do so? There absolutely has to be buy-in from College Station on this, and historically we haven't had that buy-in. It is hard to trust them to recruit properly for us if they do not know what we can offer as a campus.

When we recruit, we really need to emphasize what students find valuable here. Not just what we believe that we are good at. Students have expressed that they value the small class sizes more than they thought they would, as well as the community we form. They also emphasize that they find the maritime focus of the university more engaging than they had supposed it would be (and this is particularly true of engineers who come here not intending to stay for four years). These need to be highlighted in our promotional materials.

"

Wonderful - whatever you say.

Yes, we should strive to have similar standards to College station, this way we can attract quality students.

Staff

"- A FAID Associate Director is fine but please monitor the workload. This person is now responsible for all other remote locations. At best, this is 1.5 FTE to support GV students at least in person. This position is creating stronger relationships vertically with TAMU but losing horizontal relationship within the campus. It is not included in the proposed organization charts. All ""remote"" operations should have a point of coordination to the local campus.

-Recruiting can benefit from TAMU expertise and support but recruiting is also different for a remote location. Campus level recruiting must be driven by the academic program. University level recruitment does very little to promote academic programs. That is almost a secondary contact. Galveston requires multiple messages. There is not a ""standing"" pool of people motivated by the culture of the larger campus.

-Galveston should not become a feeder location to TAMU.

- [REDACTED] are building solid programs that can grow and develop.
- Bravo concerning Engineering. It is getting better every year. There is still very significant misunderstanding in College Station of the GV experience. Just yesterday a CS admission counselor misadvised a student that they would lose financial aid if they were to attend the GV based engineering program. This just created another level of anxiety.
- The relationship with student enrollment services will be difficult since GV is not a college model. Galveston staff are generally broader than counterparts at TAMU and can often span recruiting, admission, registration, records, and some advising for new student processes. Siloing these positions will create a lack of synergy needed as a local team. This needs to be much more thoroughly developed and capture the nuances of the maritime academy records, graduation processes, records management, facilities usage reports, etc..
- "
- I don't interact with undergraduates much in my job but it does seem like some undergraduates attend the Galveston campus for the first year and then transfer to College Station once they get their basic courses completed. It doesn't seem that TAMUG is advertised well to incoming freshmen and how this campus compliments the main campus.
- "- I understand the logic behind a centralized recruiting model, but don't believe main campus can correctly support recruitment to TAMUG. Recruiting students to TAMU is different than recruiting students to TAMUG. In a centralized model, it typically would follow that both options are presented to students. After all the TAMU brag points are mentioned, it is difficult to then give a fair and equal presentation to make TAMUG seem equally as appealing. TAMUG is different, it has a different purpose, a different atmosphere, a different culture. It is not just Texas A&M copied and pasted to a Galveston location. I believe centralization may actually create a negative recruitment and matriculation outcome.
- To properly recruit the TAMUG campus, you need a TAMUG Recruitment office of its own. I agree it should target populations that are more likely to consider TAMUG. This is both from a geographical standpoint and an academic standpoint. Geographically, hire TAMUG recruiters for the PSC locations in Houston and Corpus Christi. Academically, work with colleges and programs to create pathways for transfer with PTA agreements specific to TAMUG, then promote these opportunities to community college and junior colleges in a geographic area near TAMUG. This would be most effective if TAMUG had its own people and own recruitment office so they can make modifications to programs and events as needed without the politics and bureaucracy of main campus getting in the way.
- The main campus is experiencing significant turnover in key areas related to SFAID, Admissions, and academic advising. These areas are currently having difficulty serving the main campus population of students and I am concerned that it cannot take over the needs of another entire branch campus successfully. Additionally, centralization of services seems to have created less support for our students. Students complain that they cannot see an advisor face-to-face, they call and get placed on holds for hours sometimes, they are funneled to online advising in groups, and they feel unsupported. If centralization means less accessibility to real people for our students, we are losing quality. Our quality was

never meant to diminish as we grew, but that is not the current state of things at this time.  
"

"College Station and Galveston need to work to recruit students to Galveston who best fit the mission and purpose of the Engineering programs offered in Galveston, which can make for a better student experience and higher retention." - This should not only be for Engineering students but rather all students who would benefit from the disciplines offered at the Galveston campus.

"\*Financial aid should be managed by College Station with an Associate Director placed in Galveston to provide day-to-day local support and authority.

I thought that this was the current model?

\*Recruitment should be centralized through College Station where there is a coordinated and dedicated effort to recruit for Galveston

What does recruitment in College Station look like? Is it by college? If so, how would that be helpful for TAMUG majors?

I think this is helpful for engineering at Galveston, included in recruitment for the College of Engineering. Which may be what is already implemented. How intentional are we recruiting for academies or Galveston sites specifically, versus engineering in general/ traditional College Station? How are students chosen for the Galveston campus?

In addition (may be a different issue), I have Navigated the admissions websites for engineering, and it is hard to find ETAM information as an applicant to the College of Engineering. How up front is the ETAM information to students who are applying or admitted? The EATM process would have been a big factor in whether to accept or decline an offer from Texas A&M University.

\*College Station and Galveston need to work to recruit students to Galveston who best fit the mission and purpose of the Engineering programs offered in Galveston, which can make for a better student experience and higher retention.

This defeats the general engineering at Galveston purpose which is to house students who will be going to the College of Engineering under any major, but we can be intentional at highlighting Galveston majors during recruitment & during the ETAM process.

\*Elevate and develop the competitive opportunity to attend Galveston as a distinctly different Aggie Student Experience. Identify and recruit those students with a specific interest in attending the Galveston campus to reduce enrollment swirling back to College Station.

Even if they are ENGE and go back to College Station, their first year would have a different feel. Do ENGE Galveston students have higher or lower GPAs than College Station, and how do they do in ETAM vs College Station?



Agree for TAMU students though some come with the intention of transferring to College Station."

Again, I do not support the idea of moving Departments/staff currently in College Station to the Galveston campus. Being in College Station campus means more opportunity for interaction with students and faculties in other departments in the Geoscience discipline and which is crucial for students.

#### "Aggie Student Experience

I found the work in this section of the MGT Report to be incredibly heartening. It is absolutely true that the experience offered on this Galveston Campus IS unique and that it fills a niche that there is reason to believe is, as of yet underserved state/nationwide.

Especially in the following ways:

-The Texas A&M Maritime Academy: The Maritime Academy is NOT the same as the Corps of Cadets in College Station, and it was incredibly confidence-inspiring in this report that it made that so clearly known. There is great opportunity in discarding that inaccurate paradigm, for instance:

1. The Texas A&M University Maritime Academy is THE only License Option-granting institution associated with a major AAU-level University and Division 1 athletics. Given the ever-increasing need for sailors/engineers and the ever-shortening average length of careers in that field, it is obvious that many who go into this field are interested in a ""second act"" state-side portion of their careers. There is a significant argument to be made that the name on your degree would matter GREATLY for that second step.

2. The Maritime Academy is set for unprecedented success as the leadership in that organization has never been better nor more consistent in the last 20 years, and with the arrival of the first dedicated and sail-worthy training ships in 20 years, there are no longer any artificial caps on enrollment for those programs. Given the 6-figure starting salaries and 95% placement rate of license-option graduates, any failure to grow that program by marketing it across the state is an incredible shame and lack of vision.

Engineering - The engineering program in Galveston has been a god-send in many ways. The students are high-quality, mission-driven, and ready for college. It's arguable whether they have been a net positive in effect on the overall campus culture of Galveston, but thus is the nature of the beast. Still, there are some successes and opportunities that need to be recognized and upon which we can build:

3. Our colleagues in Engineering -especially on the Galveston Campus, have been fantastic and completely engaged in the community.

As to recruiting students who wish to come to Galveston, there are a few thoughts.

4. There has to be top-notch support for re-recruiting our students on this campus (recruiting the students who are here for their first year). It seems at times that there are limits placed on those recruitment efforts in the name of ""being even-handed"" which results less on increasing knowledge of all sub-majors, and more in watering down (no pun intended) the possibilities of the Galveston based sub-majors. They don't push other majors more, they end up just pushing Galveston LESS, which reinforces the idea that our Galveston sub-majors are lesser.

5. Galveston Engineering environments have to be seen as a BOON to Galveston. We aren't ""TAMU... too"" we are ""TAMU... if it was smaller."" There HAS to be a subset of the state that would LOVE to have an Engineering degree from TAMU but doesn't want to go to a campus of 75 THOUSAND students. I specifically didn't want a big school. In Galveston, you can get the AAU level degree with a private school environment. TAMU needs to see Galveston as a way to ADD to the portfolio of what they offer! This WILL speak to students, if we can get the word out. I know this because I have actively recruited in support of our campus needs and this has WORKED.

6. We have to be elevated in the eyes of College Station.

a. At one point, multiple CORPS Leadership originated in Galveston ('09-'11?).

b. We arguably have THE most successful and lucrative majors in the University.

c. Our Faculty more than pull their weight in research output.

d. Our staff successfully interface with multiple sets of constituencies and support units in College Station. We are called to be experts in multiple areas and our culture is such that we are highly collegial. We are expected to uphold every standard of practice worthy of the TAMU mantle, but, we have to do it with the materials and personnel we have laying around. We wear a lot of hats, and we have to be experts in each of them. That's worthy of laud and praise and should be valued.

e. We are what College Station USED to be.

f. We should be recognized for continuously ""punching above our weight"" and that investment WILL pay off if done so.

"

Aggies should still have the "Aggie" experience no matter the location--agree. Recruitment can be targeted to local high schools/colleges and other nearby cities.

Agree

Agree that offering Galveston as an alternative to the student who wants to be in College Station leads to higher dissatisfaction and will likely result in the student not having the college experience they are hoping for. Which leads to lower retention. The mindful approach to recruiting specifically for the degree programs and unique experience of TAMUG will result in more engaged students and an improved campus climate.

"Along with an assistant director, there should be knowledgeable student employees to give basic peer support for customer service. The current Financial Aid structure is a barrier for students to get financial aid.

Recruitment strategies being centralized is a wonderful suggestion, but the way in which CSTAT recruiters vs Galveston specific recruiters recruit are vastly different. If this is the way we are moving forward, I would recommend inviting these regional recruiters down to Galveston once a year prior to the recruitment cycle to have a VIP experience of the simulator, ship, biology labs etc. so they can see what we are offering to students.

"

Although I interact with students regularly, I do not know enough about the specifics to comment.

As far as Engineering students go, there is a severe need for more tutoring resources and better faculty and teaching assistants in charge of running labs. We had a couple of issues with faculty or TAs that I found totally unacceptable and that did not align with Aggie values as I have come to know them. Virgil dropped one class in Galveston as he could not get any actual help from the Professor other than "just try harder and please do not drop," even though he made a 46 on the first exam and a 60 something on the second. We dropped anyway so he could take it up here in the summer semester and he got an A in the class with the tutoring resources that we have available. Many of the paid local resources were not aware that the Engineering curriculum/classes at Galveston were the same and so they would not agree to help the Galveston students.

Benefits should be the same for TAMUG employees. If offering State Group Insurance Premium (SGIP) reimbursement to new employees during the first 60 days at other campuses, this same benefit should be offered to TAMUG new hires (faculty, staff and grad students). TAMUG does not offer SGIP reimbursement during the first 60 days.

Both financial aid and scholarships ARE managed by College Station. There is an Assistant Director and a financial aid advisor on campus in Galveston. The duties currently associated with the Assistant Director currently in Galveston are comparable to the duties of an Assistant Director in Scholarships & Financial Aid in College Station.

Centralized recruitment only works if there is a strong commitment to recruit marine, maritime, and engineering students to the campus. The reality is College Station does not "recruit" but instead determines which of the 30,000 interested applicants to admit into its 10,000 freshmen slots. That is a very different process from the Galveston campus which is no where near as known and needs active recruiting to identify and draw students to the specialized degree programs. If main campus begins to simply use the Galveston campus for its capacity to admit students who intentions are only to spend one year at Galveston before changing to College Station, the culture of the campus and Aggie Student Experience will be destroyed. This impacts the residence halls, the student organizations and even the morale of the campus as the campus becomes home to a student body who does not want to be there and actually detracts from the high involvement culture that is typical of the Aggie Student experience. This has become a significant and growing problem as the percentage of engineering students in the freshmen class has steadily grown.

Centralizing recruiting and the financial aid department efforts would concentrate resources and ensure a unified direction for the growth and turnover of the student body. Consider aligning scholarships to management by College Station to clarify and simplify the process for students. If recruiters from College Station will be recruiting for the programs and degrees, staff should rotate through a work location in Galveston to understand the experience on the campus and resources.

"Current:

""The varied perspectives of students entering the Galveston campus can make for a challenging student engagement experience and impact the campus community identity.""  
THIS IS THE EPITOME OF HITTING THE NAIL ON THE HEAD. We are routinely being asked to encourage students to continue their education in Galveston despite the inability to offer

their desired career choice. We mention above our structure doesn't meet the needs for expanding staff retention and advancement. Many student service operations rely on the same concept on a 4 year scale. Can you imagine how difficult it is when half of your incoming class has one foot out the door and you develop a farm system of young leaders where half are gutted to blossom at a campus somewhere else when you are unable to receive and continue the fruits of your initial labor. We are basically incentivized to NOT include engineering majors into our staff structures to ensure we are investing ourselves into talent we can develop to stick around to expand and continue the high level of service into our program administration.

""While the Galveston campus offers unique activities, some of the activities are required as part of an academic program or certification and can be very costly to students, beyond the regular cost of attendance.""

The is a diminished level of costs as you have more mouths to feed. We are a small STEM campus. We only have expensive majors (labs, ships, etc.). The cost per head of student to offer them instruction and education worthy of the Texas A&M name, is greater than that of College Station. Couple that with we are a small campus that doesn't have the volume to offset our operational costs as certain elements of infrastructure we require to stand alone, it creates an impossible task of doing more with less, not to mention keeping up with the standard of one of the most prestigious universities that we are supposed to be the same as or equal to.

Recommendations:

""Galveston staff should have equal access to view financial aid information at the same level as their counterparts in College Station.""

And we needed MGT to state this? We have nothing but expensive majors (relatively) and we are handicapping our professionals to able to adequately financially support our students?

""Recruitment should be centralized through College Station where there is a coordinated and dedicated effort to recruit for Galveston.""

Once again who is enforcing ""coordinated and dedicated"" The Texas A&M brand speaks for itself, Galveston has been the afterthought. Galveston will be absolutely hammered if we aren't given intentional consideration attention and exposure, we will get lost in main campus. Being paired with the main campus brand will flock the numbers to the table or our information, but if we aren't actually and intentionally offered we will be lost. Look at the difference in resources highlighted in our websites and marketing ability. The disparagement in our resources and abilities is a perfect example highlighted in our digital offerings.

""Employees noted that students and families were surprised and disappointed when they applied to College Station and were admitted to the Galveston campus.""

[https://www.reddit.com/r/aggies/comments/seudd2/can\\_someone\\_tell\\_me\\_what\\_this\\_means\\_did\\_i\\_get/](https://www.reddit.com/r/aggies/comments/seudd2/can_someone_tell_me_what_this_means_did_i_get/)

This link explains all you need to know. Not employees noted, it is happening. Are Blinn or McAllen branch campuses that are the same as Galveston and Qatar? "

Develop and promote global opportunities for students and faculty.

Far too many students transfer to CS just because of the atmosphere and change degree path. Find a way to liven up Galveston campus to retain the students. Galveston needs to be promoted to the high schools. Not many students even know of this campus. Other than the ones that use it to get into CS.

Financial Aid has been switched to be managed by College Station. I agree with Recruitment as being centralized where there is more effort to recruit students specifically for TAMUG. Student retention is a big issue. When students transfer back to College Station, this causes a great loss of revenue for TAMUG since it is a smaller campus with a hugely smaller student body compared to College Station.

"Financial aid should be managed by College Station with an Associate Director placed in Galveston to provide day-to-day local support and authority -- strengthening, and reinforcing that strength, is essential to improving service to our students.

Recruitment should be centralized through College Station where there is a coordinated and dedicated effort to recruit for Galveston -- what cannot be lost in this recommendation is the sense that recruiting is not necessarily essential for the College Station campus, but is critical for the Galveston campus

College Station and Galveston need to work to recruit students to Galveston who best fit the mission and purpose of the Engineering programs offered in Galveston, which can make for a better student experience and higher retention -- this recommendation appears to neglect the non-engineering programs in Galveston (maybe I am missing something). The two campuses need to work together to recruit students to Galveston who best fit the mission and purpose of all programs offered in Galveston.

Elevate and develop the competitive opportunity to attend Galveston as a distinctly different Aggie Student Experience. Identify and recruit those students with a specific interest in attending the Galveston campus to reduce enrollment swirling back to College Station -- maybe this is what I missed in my comment to the previous recommendation." Financial aid should only be moved if the Galveston students will receive the same amount of financial aid that College Station students received.

"Financial and scholarships for Galveston ARE managed by College Station presently, as they should be. With this exact item in mind, the position in Galveston does not warrant Associate Director level responsibility. The SFAID Associate Directors have considerably more responsibility, staff to manage, and projects to oversee than an individual at Galveston would.

Recruitment should be centralized, and Galveston highlighted as an opportunity for all interested in Texas A&M, not just those who apply to the campus specifically. Additionally, there should not be separate admissions applications- there needs to be one app, presenting all majors/colleges/sites.

"

Galveston recruitment should NOT be centralized through College Station; however, College Station should be supportive of Galveston recruitment by providing more resources.

"HOW IS IT POSSIBLE TO RECRUIT STUDENTS IF YOU HAVE COLLEGE STATION CENTRALIZATING THE ABILITY TO RECRUIT?

College Station has no clue how our maritime programs even operate from the administrative side. To say that we have recruiting funneling through College Station now is like having a robot take over your own job that you were already doing efficiently and effectively and screwing up the entire customer service oriented environment we used to have at the Galveston Campus. "

"I agree with elevating the ""opportunity"" to attend Galveston. A student who chooses to come to TAMUG will do much better than one who is forced to spend time in Galveston when that is not their desired location to live, work or study.

Managing financial aid and recruitment in College station will bring a broader infrastructure to bear on efforts to recruit and assist TAMUG students. I can also see the opportunity for reinforcing the idea of both locations being one university."

I am very concerned that the Galveston campus will not be a high priority if recruiting is centralized through College Station. College Station recruiters have a very different philosophy than Galveston recruiters since they are recruiting for very different environment. We have a small number of very specialized programs, unlike College Station where they are simply looking for the best general students that can fill a large number of programs.

I believe it is important to separate Galveston from CSTAT recruitment as they are not the same experience and we need to focus on Galveston individual. I think it could be beneficial if there was a Galveston table at every event next to the CSTAT table.

I believe that by recruiting students who have a specific interest in maritime research programs, we will be able to create a student body that is better aligned with the mission and purpose of Engineering programs offered in Galveston, which will in turn lead to higher retention and a more positive student experience.

"I believe that it takes recruiters that know the Galveston Campus and are aware of the student experience on the Campus to properly advertise and recruit students to attend and stay at the Galveston Campus.

It really creates the question of the identity of the student. Although they are all considered ""Aggies"" Galveston and College Station are still different line items in the State of Texas. Many services are merged but we are still treated very differently when it comes to

finances and merit. Merit is based on student enrollment, if College Station is recruiting students how will merit be recalibrated for our Campus?

College Station is recruiting students and they belong to the College of Engineering. Currently within the Canvas LMS engineering courses are not visible in the Galveston Canvas sub-account, because they fall under the College of Engineering in College Station.

The influx of Engineering faculty and students on Galveston Campus and the proposed merger of other departments to College Station creates the issue of how we locally support those courses that we do not have access to on Canvas. The solution would be for us to gain access to courses locally taught in Galveston but still fall under the different College Station Canvas sub-accounts. "

I concur on all points.

"I disagree with recruitment efforts being centralized in College Station. As an entity who has positions specific to the maritime industry and has professionals within our organization more trained/qualified in recruitment of those roles over the professionals in the College Station. This feels like you all are creating a pyramid where only College Station professionals will be the primary handlers of the day-to-day tasks/operations of our campus. This also screams out ""Lets eliminate you guys in the staff positions within a few years and replace you guys with professionals that have no clue how to recruit for Galveston maritime positions""

Just my two cents."

"I do like the name Sea Aggie!

you are still an Aggie with a title applying to your location."

I feel like we do not value our students on Galveston's campus. Particularly our ETAM students. I feel that we need to reframe our approach particularly the way our faculty and staff speak about and to our ETAM students. We have them wear a "2nd class citizen" badge metaphorically because they're not "real Aggies". There's not a lot of clear investment in our ETAM students (via workshops, one on ones with faculty, tutoring, etc.). This "weed out culture" is killing our students' mental, emotional, and physical health. I believe we need to do a much better job of creating a sense of community. I've heard students verbalize that the ETAM program "is an embarrassment to students". They feel duped into being enrolled here become most applied for College Station. Are we creating fans of our institution? Do students recommend to others that they attend our campus? Or do they just do what they need to do to survive then get the heck out of dodge? I don't know if enough of our faculty enjoy working with college students rather than viewing them as obstacles to their research and tenure. I also believe the amount and experience of the Engineering advisors for our campus gives the perception that our ETAM students are not valued, they are on their own, and that they are just a number. ETAM students seem to be viewed like the machines that they are working on.

I loved my time as a student. I appreciated the closeness and family environment.

I the recruitment should stay in Galveston, where the employees are more familiar with our campus and to avoid getting lost in the crowd.

I think student retention is valuable, and these steps seem logical.

"I'm concerned that Galveston will get swallowed by College Station for recruiting and our enrollment will dwindle because of it. We have always been an afterthought to College Station.

I'm also worried that if financial aid is in College Station, that our students won't have the same access to assistance with financial aid."

"In 2022, based on conversations regarding a higher-level financial aid position on the Galveston campus, we elevated a Financial Aid Advisor III position to an Assistant Director.

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED], the

Assistant Director position is the appropriate level of position for Galveston based on their job given the overall level of responsibility needed.

The Assistant Director position provides a director level position to oversee day to day financial aid customer service and administrative functions related to financial aid on the Galveston campus; and a director level position to interact with leadership personnel on the Galveston campus. In addition, the Assistant Director ensures there is greater knowledge and skills needed on the campus for financial aid oversight. Lastly, providing the Assistant Director authority to make decisions daily. There is also a Financial Aid Advisor on the Galveston campus who works alongside of the Assistant Director to ensure access for students to financial aid personnel.

Financial Aid administration for the Galveston campus transitioned to College Station's Scholarships & Financial Aid Office approximately 15 years ago. The administration of Galveston students financial aid in College Station, was to specifically align the financial aid processes with College Station's from start to finish. The responsibility of the College Station office is automated wherever possible, receipt of students' financial aid applications, receipt of requested required documents, review and processing of documents, automated awarding of financial aid awards, review/management of tuition set asides for grants to be awarded to students, management of Galveston financial aid staff and some other specific processes. The main area of responsibility for financial aid staff on the Galveston campus is front facing advising for Galveston students, handling of Satisfactory Academic Progress review, military benefits certificate, processing of Galveston students aid via reports as needed, and answering phones, emails.

Regarding access to financial aid records, financial aid data is protected to ensure only those who need access based on their prescribed job duties may view/have access to the data. The Assistant Director and Financial Aid Advisor at Galveston campus have full access



for all the task and responsibilities they are responsible for. In the past, there were individuals on Galveston campus who were not responsible for financial aid administration and did not have a legitimate business reason for access to financial aid data, in these cases access was not permitted. Academic Advisors have very limited access based on their job scope. We have many request on main campus for access to financial aid data in Banner or scholarship data in other systems, however if an individual's job responsibilities do not pertain to the administration of financial aid or scholarships, we do not provide access to such data. Based on review of access in annual audits, we follow appropriate measures to ensure security of data.

Information may have been shared in interviews for the MGT report, that were related to concerns of the past. There was a scenario related to the scholarship administrator on the Galveston campus, and the level of access permitted a few years ago. This was addressed at the time based on the individuals job responsibilities.

Galveston campus scholarship administration transitioned to College Station Scholarships & Financial Aid office last year, based on meetings and discussions with leadership on the Galveston campus to better serve Galveston students with the loss of a scholarship administrator on the Galveston campus over a year ago and loss of knowledge based on other Galveston staff departures; there was a definite need to transition scholarship administration to the main campus. There was no longer a scholarship administrator the duties had fallen to an already overwhelmed staff member on Galveston campus. In addition, to ensure record keeping, accuracy of awards based on donor intentions and overall review of funding as well as succession planning transition was needed. The transition of scholarships has been successful as College Station staff, reviewed all scholarships, their accounts and ensured documentation was imaged into our scholarship repository for record keeping. The overall benefit of this transition, like the transition of financial processing that happened 15 years, benefits Galveston students immensely. By, timely awarding of financial aid and scholarships, overall oversight of the programs and the increase automation, and last ensures compliance with aligned processes.

I acknowledge the length of time to hire staff in 2021 was longer than normal. Scholarships & Financial Aid in College Station did send staff to Galveston campus in peak processing times, such as the beginning of the semesters, during New Student Conference etc. We were aware we Galveston at least one, if not two financial aid representatives on site to assist students and parents during the busiest times. In addition, email and phones calls were directed to main campus for College Station staff to respond to daily. After the extended time of vacancies on Galveston campus, if a financial aid position becomes vacant, we will take a different approach to hiring and to providing coverage on the Galveston campus, and more actively seek a replacement for position(s). I believe it is important to note, we have historically had a greater challenge filling positions at the

Galveston campus due to the workforce availability of qualified applicants. The need for hiring experience people who have the level of knowledge and skills for the positions in Scholarships & Financial Aid is imperative for students and for overall compliance in administering financial aid. In addition, compensation levels for Financial Aid Advisors adds to the challenge. During 2021 and present there are financial aid staffing shortages nationwide. Compensation and the breadth of responsibilities for financial aid staff are contributing to the lack of applicants holistically.

"

In addition, there should be an office dedicated to Veterans Affairs on the Galveston Campus.

In my role, I meet with many students who want to relocate to College Station. The general sense is that TAMUG is a "lesser" A&M campus, so anything to promote equity of education and experience is a great idea. I think TAMUG offers even more advantages than College Station, with it being a smaller campus with a more personalized feel (and great views!) Is it possible to provide daily school buses between College Station and Galveston? If so, students at Galveston have more opportunities to take classes in person on the College Station campus.

It was clear that the recommendation writers had no idea what the Maritime Academy mission was, how it works, and what the purpose of the TAMMA Corps is. Centralized recruiting at College Station, 150 miles from the sea, would put recruiting dollars and effort in areas not close enough to TAMMA for the recruiters to truly understand the maritime mission and recruit accordingly. We do NOT have an NROTC unit here - the mission is different - making merchant mariners. That our Navy detachment can facilitate an occasional scholarship is a bonus, not an end goal.

Moving all financial aid is the right move - since the research was done for MGT, College Station is handling more awarding and scholarship communication than reflected in the report. Centralized recruiting will hopefully go hand in hand with some of the issues Marketing and Communications currently faces, since it seems that an incredible amount of time is dedicated to recruitment materials. I would hope that specialized experience and training for recruitment staff would allow for them to provide a first hand overview of the Galveston Campus. When continuing these efforts, it would be a great next step for the career services office of College Station to also have joint type efforts and programming for Galveston.

No Comments.

"Our students should have the same access to financial aid that TAMU students have, especially in light of higher cost of living in the Galveston area and higher cost of some of academic programs.

The Galveston Campus should not in any capacity be thought of or marketed as a feeder school to TAMU. The Galveston Campus has historically had an exceptional slate of academic programs, which should not be put on a back burner to Engineering at Galveston.

Engineering at Galveston is a great program but should focus primarily on engineering programs that are fully supported at the Galveston Campus. Increased funds for student support services should be directed to Galveston to support academic programs (Tutoring, Coaching, Supplemental Instruction, etc.) given the number of students in first year programs and to ensure students have equitable access to support programs for them to meet their ETAM goal. "

Our students/families deserve better. We are a top tier university and the Galveston campus does not provide a welcoming atmosphere for our students/families. On a daily basis, our lobby is vacant. There is nobody to greet visitors and students are lost and do not have access to assistance. Students are directed to "the website" but we have not been diligent in cleaning up outdated material that remains on obsolete webpages that are still out there. With our enormous and invisible MARCOMM staff someone could monitor and remove outdated internet material if our student is left to rely on Google to receive assistance.

Parents do not like making a trip to the Galveston campus only to be told nobody here can help them.

"Personally, I enjoyed the smaller campus life that Galveston provided me. I also liked that it wasn't the exact same as College Station. We were our own campus and did things our way with the Aggie Code as a backbone. Diversity mattered.

\*\*Cannot find where to put this following statement: from personal experience the access to mental health counselors was a STRUGGLE and when I was finally able to be seen, they were not good at their jobs. Not sure if this avenue has gotten any better but it definitely should matter just as much b/c it did not seem to matter when I was attending."

Recruitment should be centralized through College Station, but a specific strategy is needed to enhance the reputation of the Galveston Campus and grow enrollment.

Sounds great!

"TAMUG Student Enrollment Services is short-staffed especially in the admissions counseling area [REDACTED] When [REDACTED] [REDACTED] is off-campus recruiting or conducting an on-campus visit with families/groups, admissions counseling services (whether it be in-person, phone, virtual, or email) is delayed until they return. I know they are trying to fill two vacant admissions counselor positions, but consideration should also be made for additional staff to serve just as recruiters (but still have some training in the admissions process--similar to what the Prospective Student Centers do) especially since there has been an increase in recruiting requests from high schools now that we are past the pandemic.

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED] Is there space to establish a Visitor Center?"

The Engineering at Galveston program has been a campus burden since its inception. The program has continuously expanded on the Galveston campus, seemingly with little regard

for the toll it put on the campus. As the program grows and more departments come down its requiring exponentially more of our campus resources (housing, classrooms, common courses, peer assisted support, offices, labs, facilities staff, etc.) which has almost completely stymied the ability for our own programs and departments to grow. It also has caused extensive stress and frustration amongst the faculty, staff and students when it comes to scheduling, and finding spaces for our grad students, visiting scholars, post docs, and faculty. Up to now the Galveston campus received little funding for our resources. This program helps the College of Engineering greatly but the contribution to the campus has yet to be seen. In terms of the centralization of the OCEN program as "One Department, two campuses" I would hardly say it was a success, and barreling ahead with other engineering departments before the New Engineering Building is completed and the processes for the Galveston campus have been well defined and tested would be a detriment to everyone involved. This entire recommendation means putting our campus' future in the hands of of the college station recruiting, which without significant buy in and desire to learn about our campus and identity will negate everything we've built and potential stifle our campus entirely. I feel like we could quickly become an exclusively engineering based campus.

The placement of Financial Aid leader in Galveston to support Galveston students is critical. Often students receive misinformation when they contact the financial aid hotline in College Station. Coordinated recruitment through College Station will enable additional recruiting past what the recruiters in Galveston can provide. Galveston is a distinctly different Aggie Student Experience and I appreciate that this report recognizes that. There should be a point person in Galveston for recruitment.

This is an excellent plan.

Veteran's office needs to have an in-person representative in TAMUG campus.

We desperately need consistent Financial Aid help.

"We need to support all student areas of study, not just Engineering.

"

While servicing the Aggie student experience through TAMU College Station is a great answer to this need, please promote engagement with the Galveston campus as a top priority. They know the lay of the land, the unique offerings available only at their site and what will appeal to faculty/staff AND students over time.

You reference the Engineering programs; will there not be a collaborative effort to recruit for the other programs offered at TAMUG?

## **Industry partner/affiliate**

Agree that recruitment should be centralized through College Station, but it should be monitored from Galveston, to ensure TAMUG interests are being vigorously pursued. Everything at this point should be managed by College Station in regards to admissions. Clearly there's been an issue with leadership for many years.

Galveston students need personnel and support IN Galveston. Engineering students who are NOT marine engineering should NOT be in Galveston. It is getting too crowded and is NOT good for the Galveston marine culture.

Let the Galveston campus run its own business

Provide much better quality and variety food service including a diverse Food Court with more Healthy and Fresh Food options. Lots of Reviews of TAMUG has shown that this is currently one of the biggest negatives at TAMUG.

"TAMMA needs more full time employees to manage: SST, scholarships, aid, mental health, class offerings, tutors!

TAMUG Students need better math and physics in their campus

TAMUG students need access to more tutors on their campus that are qualified and have availability. Too often they are booked, cstat has more tutors and academic offerings than TAMUG when you compare proportionally. TAMUG is being short changed here even though paying higher tuition.

Food - need to improve food quality, increase options, and hours. Get a franchise on campus too allow food trucks, help students to stay on campus and use meal plan.

Help foster connection reg and no reg (Corp and reg) students. Have more mixers, information and cross pollination, they tend to be alienated in uniforms, separate dorms, separate classes, especially those in maritime.

Let seniors in maritime academy live off campus senior year- will help build life skills, line credit, etc teach life skills.

Have therapy dogs on campus more

Have buses to cstat games

Offer trips/retreats thru rec center etc for stubdebt weekend getaways like Nola, camping, kayaking, etc that are affordable

Have beach parties, bonfires bbqs for seaggies,

Keep tailgating at cstat games but combine TAMUG and TAMMA tailgates no reason to compete against each other.

More mental health professionals, training for students esp maritime students and staff. This is key for their industry at sea- they need to have a healthy work life balance/financial/on n off/traveling/relationships course.

"

The idea of centralization is fine, but it needs to ensure that the Galveston Campus gets the proper attention and respect from College Station. There is a major issue that is either lack of knowledge or respect coming from the College Station Students/Leadership in relation to the Students on the Galveston Campus. They are all Aggies and deserve equal respect and that is not the case at this time.

We see so many parents of new engineering students coming on campus [REDACTED] that they are not in college station- not a great way to start college. While the report showed three distinct groups of students on campus, I think it's great to stop funneling College Stations rejections down to Galveston. Galveston campus is a distinctly different experience and Im a little disappointed that there isn't anything in here on liberals arts- since President Banks mentioned it as a push for CSTAT to expand. It needs to be added as it's also unique in Galveston for hospitality/coastal and museum/anthropology. Galveston has such an amazing history and culture of music and arts that you could have a cultural studies or art minor - which is not offered. If anything the ability to have more online courses to help students who are not engineering, corps or marine bio to complete there degrees. Why have College Station recruit for Galveston?! Makes no sense! Put the responsibility and authority for success in the hands of those who benefit. Put full recruiting autonomy in Galveston.

[REDACTED]

- I believe there should be a major focus to elevate the prestige of an A&M Galveston degree. This would apply to all degrees not just engineering. In our Marketing and Communication efforts we need to let parents and prospective students understand that a degree from A&M Galveston is a Texas A&M University diploma along with a very coveted Aggie Ring. Even though A&M Galveston has a predominantly maritime focus, the university should follow the very exclusive and successful path of Texas A&M University in College Station. As we continue to expand the brand and reputation of Texas A&M Galveston, the prestige and reputation of the university [REDACTED] will grow rapidly.

"1) Financial Aid REQUIRES a dedicated Associate Director if it is to be managed through College Station.

2) Centralized recruitment is fine, but will require extraordinary effort to coordinate recruitment efforts, especially for maritime students and marine sciences students."

Agree

Agree that College Station should take the lead on financial aid and recruitment for Texas A&M at Galveston. Align both schools.

"Agree with the recommendation on financial aid management -- and would strongly recommend that the new position of Associate Director be filled by an experienced employee from College Station to make this seamless, and as well as to have the benefit of someone who already knows their way around the systems/processes, and has relationships in College Station to be a strong advocate for Galveston.

If recruitment is centralized, there needs to be a targeted effort by College Station to recruit specifically for the Galveston campus -- and that may include going to certain outreach events where the recruitment activity is focused exclusively on Galveston. It also needs to mean having dedicated employees and resources in College Station recruiting who focus solely on Galveston.

Galveston should be highlighted as a unique [not \*different\*] Aggie experience. "  
Elevate and develop competitive opportunities at Galveston

[REDACTED]

"Let Galveston become independent and excellent - and compete with College Station for the same top students, not get students distributed from College Station that College Station prefers not to admit .

Same with other TAMU system campuses many of which are denied the ability to create MS or PhD programs. Same for UT system. Not all campuses should proliferate with MS and PhD programs but with a state as large in population, economy and the PUF endowment as Texas there should be a handful of world-class public research universities in Texas that are at a stature of the handful of University of California universities. This could be done in 25 years but not with the current system. "

Must highlight and recruit for the Galveston Campus in unison with the Main Campus and align resources to provide support and attract the talent that wants and needs to be there. Opportunities to get a great education and step into the maritime industry, in the backyard of the largest ports in the country are tremendous. TAMUG should receive this attention.

"No comments

Lots of good recommendations."

One of the areas of concern with the report would be the utilization of the Galveston Campus as a "feeder" to Main Campus. A collaborative effort to promote both Main Campus and Galveston Campus and would provide for greater resources, bench strength, and a larger audience. As Main Campus has a long standing reputation for their degree paths the Galveston Campus should be marketed for their unique paths in maritime and ocean related degrees.

"Someone should (and perhaps it's already being done) monitor TexAgs threads. For instance, a couple of weeks ago, there was a thread by someone who stated his/her child did not get into CS and is being directed to Galveston. Poster was looking for feedback on people's experiences. Lots of comments from people whose kids loved Galveston after they got there, etc.

"

The whole scholarship program at TAMUG needs additional attention and if that attention could come from CS - then it needs to be more effective in getting available monies into the students. There are specific monies for TAMUG and they should not go to students in CS - unless they are enrolled in TAMUG programs. I am not sure if CS monies come to TAMUG students, but that direction of flow of monies would help, if they come from general academic or specific program objectives that are on the TAMUG campus. We were told no out of state tuition from college station. Imagine the shock when our tuition doubled and we had to borrow a lot of money. It should be the same at both campuses  
Unknown

A survey to inquire about the cadet's experience at the Texas A&M Maritime Academy would be advantageous. The maritime academy cadets have a different experience, program and expectations on them. It's been said and heard that they are not even considered as equal to the TAMU Corps of Cadets in College Station. That's unacceptable. They are also not included as members of the TAMU Corps of Cadets Association. Can the membership be extended to the cadets in Galveston? These cadets pay the same tuition as the cadets at college station. Some of the cadets transfer to College Station after a year in Galveston. For sure, the maritime academy cadets do want to share in the total Aggie Student experience.  
"Agree with the recommendation.

The food or cafeteria has not been covered but it has gotten better than last semester. My student doesn't have stomach issues like last semester but the quality is no where near the College Station food. They would call the Cabo Grill the ""Cabo Clense"" because they were almost guaranteed to get sick from eating it. When thousands of dollars are spent it's very disappointing to hear and stressful for the student who knows there are few options and several are guaranteed to make them sick."

As part of new students conference, new students should have part of their fish camps held in College Station so that both student body knows they are one and the same. Please also include the TAMMA Corps of Cadets there. Definitely will be a morale booster activity and a new culture change for both campus.

As the report indicated, there should be personnel in Galveston to assist students directly, as opposed to having to refer them to College Station for various programs

College Station and Galveston need to work to recruit students to Galveston who best fit the mission and purpose of ALL the programs offered in Galveston, which can make for a better student experience and higher retention.

"College Station manages the financial aid and scholarships for Galveston. There is an Assistant Director and Financial Aid Advisor there that provide day-to-day local support and authority. I agree with this recommendation, but it is already in practice. Also, if the structure of Scholarships & Financial Aid is reviewed the Associate Directors have much more responsibility than one campus of 2400 students. The position of Associate Director



in Galveston would not be equivalent to the Associate Director's responsibilities in College Station.

As for financial aid access it is not true that Academic Advisors in College Station have more access than Galveston. Scholarships & Financial Aid access is restricted to support services like Admissions, Recruitment, Students Business Services, etc. There are regulations in the HEA regarding who on campus can have access to what information. That can definitely be evaluated but there are reasons for access restrictions.

In reference to the time it took to hire financial aid professionals on the Galveston campus, there are financial aid staffing shortages nationwide. Galveston not being any different. Finding the right candidate with the experience we needed was very difficult.

I agree with the other recommendations in this area. One area that needs to be addressed is staffing in College Station. If there are responsibilities coming from Galveston to College Station, College Station must be staffed for that. Additional duties given to offices without additional staffing is a set up for failure.

"

does not make sense to recruit for Galveston in College Station; Galveston should be about more than Engineering

"Financial aid is already being managed by College Station and an Associate Director is in place. I also know we are working on centralization recruitment already. I have heard chatter around campus after the MGT report came out that one table at recruiting events where Galveston is included will not work. Others feel very strongly that we will be lost in the mix of College Station programs. However, I disagree with them to an extent. TAMU recruiting is able to cover much more of the state/nation than we can with our little team. I think one table sends a stronger message that we are one University, and we have to trust the recruiters to find those students with a marine and/or maritime interest and help them connect to our programs. A recruiter passionate about our campus at the table would be important though or what others fear could come true, and our applications go down, which leads right into the next recommendation – elevate and develop the competitive opportunity to attend in Galveston as a distinctly different Aggie Student Experience. If we can develop the right message, one recruiting table will be successful!

Centralizing recruiting will also present us with challenges with our admissions and records. If students cannot get support locally and all we become is a funneling mechanism to send forms to College Station for further processing, we will lose that which is vitally important to our students' success – a sense of belonging and being taken care of/supported. Should admissions be centralized, we will lose out on a dynamic student population that may not make the cut from a numbers/stats perspective, but our special

purpose mission brings us passionate students, who become hugely successful – that would never have this opportunity if we let TAMU admissions make the decisions.

To this day, I am still hearing things like, we (TAMU dept) are working as fast as we can to process “our” own stuff, let alone help “you” (Galveston). Mid-level management is not understanding the one university concept and we (Galveston) are part of their “our” and we are still second-class citizens at the back/bottom of the line.

"

"Financial aid is managed by College Station. Scholarships need to be managed by College Station too. Financial aid and Scholarships need to be managed by one group. If not, Galveston students will continue to miss out. These two things go together. The last 20 years shows you all the reasons why keeping these separate is a massive fail. Some students get too much money, some get none, and we do not have an experts on campus that do both at the same time to maximize bang for our buck. Scholarships should be used to recruit the best and brightest and Galveston does not do this. Scholarships should be used to retain great students. We need to stop losing students because they can not afford school and when you talk to them they are short just \$1000 or \$2000 dollars. We also need to stop playing favorites. Having both these things handled together by College Station with a person or people in Galveston is the only way to do it. The campus has [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Financial aid already. let them do their best work and manage scholarships as well. The campus is overdue an audit of the scholarship process to see where the loss of opportunities are and to start helping more and more students.

This is a big problem statement:

College Station and Galveston need to work to recruit students to Galveston who best fit the mission and purpose of the Engineering programs offered in Galveston, which can make for a better student experience and higher retention.

It should say:

College Station and Galveston need to work to recruit students to Galveston who best fit the mission and purpose of ALL the programs offered in Galveston, which can make for a better student experience and higher retention. Just [REDACTED] focuses to much on the Maritime Academy, the focus on recruiting should not focus just on Engineering. We have a lot of great things to offer on the Galveston campus. Recruiters should be bringing in students for ALL the programs.

If you really want students to have a better experience and stay, then you need to recruit mostly students that want to stay the full 4 years on the campus. Our students and faculty are treated like second hand citizens by engineers coming for just one year. Bring more engineering programs to Galveston. Help the Marine Engineering Technology program be the best it can be.

If you continue to focus on just Engineering, you will continue to focus on us and them. Then you have little hope of providing a better student experience and higher retention.

And if you are going to call this Aggie Student Experience, then why not create opportunities for the other 70,000 students in College Station to spend time in Galveston. The swirl could happen in both directions by offering programs, certificates or minors to students that want to spend some time at the Galveston campus too."

I do not think that recruitment for Galveston should be moved to College Station. College Station has done a terrible job recruiting for the Ocean Department in Galveston.

Enrollment in Galveston students Ocean department has significantly declined since the merger with College Station. Keep recruitment in Galveston.

I like the approach of having a local Associate Director in Galveston that is also integrated into the main campus to leverage centralized functions.

It is a good idea to centralize students' recruitment and financial aid.

Love the ideas, interested to see if there's anything that can actually make this happen considering a lot of the disconnect here comes from employee attitudes

Most engineering students want to attend classes and graduate from College Station, unless they specifically want to obtain a marine engineering related degree and work in the maritime industry. The only reason Texas A&M University management wants to move non maritime industry engineering majors to Galveston is solely for the benefit of Texas A&M University, not for the students interest or benefit. This shows the lack of customer focus.

Texas A&M University Galveston is located in a port. This does not provide college experience may students are looking for such as college level sports and a traditional college campus community. I understand that many students and their parents are upset to learn that having been accepted to the engineering programs, they end up in Galveston. Most students expressed concern over mold problems in the dormitory.

My daughters experience (she recently graduated from main campus) that initial Aggie student experience connected her to main campus. I would suggest a complementary, not separate, student onboarding experience.

Still seems to be a divide between campus student life and professional development to improve academic outcomes. Divided. If wrong people are "Put" into positions, then the same outcomes will happen. All positions should be properly posted and interviewed by a balanced search committee. Often times, valuable campus positions are found through a staff heavy committee that leaves out academic needs. This impacts student experience. The TAMUG recruitment services operation has been struggling mightily for years. We have a great product to draw interest. Yet, we have run through at least a half dozen young leaders who have not had the experience or the necessary mentorship to be successful running this vital program. To direct an enrollment services program, we never shopped for an experienced proven professional, instead, we promoted good people from within who were great professionals in their own right, but all have been overmatched for this critical role. For this reason, being absorbed by College Station may make the most sense. Financial should continue to be supervised from College Station but we need more FA personnel present on our campus than we currently have.

"There has been issues reported by students related with students' financial aid. Since those issues get resolved through a personnel in College Station, it is a good idea to centralize it to be effective.

Most students in Galveston campus naturally desire to be relocated in College Station campus for a variety of reasons. Galveston students have expressed concerns over limited housing options, mold problems in dormitories that cause health issues, low-quality food provided in cafeteria, and limited number of courses offered in Galveston campus.

Though Galveston campus is close to ocean and nice to hang out on the beach, job prospect after graduate is gloom and doom. Often marine-related majors have difficulty getting jobs. Perhaps computer science majors may have better chance to get job offers in industry and possibly in big techs.

"

"There should be a dedicated and coordinated effort to recruit with, instead of for, the Galveston campus; however, this cannot be achieved without the contributions of the Galveston campus. Galveston has a specific mission, its own unique campus culture, and opportunities that are incredibly diverse. Who knows how to best market these opportunities and recruit students to this space like the individuals who are in the space on a daily basis? College Station does not need to ""centralize"" recruiting for Galveston; rather, Galveston should have space at the table (literally and metaphorically) in recruiting discussions, events, and fairs. Providing that space does not need to be on the condition of lost autonomy. The College Station campus and the Galveston campus need to work together to design these initiatives, and Galveston's efforts and suggestions on recruiting for our campus should be valued at an equal level.

College Station and Galveston need to work together to recruit students who best fit the mission and purpose of the diverse range of programs offered at the Galveston campus. Period. While thriving and great for the campus, the Engineering programs at Galveston are not the only ones offered here that have significant value. Promoting the accomplishments and unique campus experience of the Galveston-specific majors appeals to a wider audience of potential students while also recognizing the accomplishments of those majors. A better student experience and higher retention depends on ensuring that all students considering Galveston are aware of their opportunities and aware of their value on the campus. Limiting this to serve engineering only is short-sighted.

Galveston already is a distinctly different Aggie Student Experience, but it is difficult to recruit students with specific interest in Galveston if we do not support and promote Galveston-specific majors. The contradictory nature of the suggestions outlined here represents a larger issue in terms of how Galveston majors are valued. We need to elevate and highlight the unique affordances of the Galveston campus for all potential Sea Aggies, engineers and otherwise. "

This place is depressing, no joke. Close the campus and just accept 1000 more students into blin team or college station. Its also makes no sense why it costs more in tuition and fees to go to school in galveston, with bottom tier facilities and black mold across all the entire campus, compared to college station.

Why is only recruiting for Engineering mentioned ? What about our specialized marine based courses which is what Galveston Campus is known for? We aren't just an Engineering Campus. The way things are going we will end up just being another extension of Main Campus Engineering programs.

Why the emphasis on engineering? Galveston offers other degrees besides engineering.

👁👁

## Communications

- Centralize Marketing and Communications efforts in Galveston to align the mission, brand, and communications efforts at College Station.
- Address lack of internal communication at various levels of leadership.
- As centralization progresses, communicate processes and expectations to ensure accountability for compliance and alignment to College Station.
- There is a lack of communication and joint decision-making from College Station to the internal Galveston campus.
- Promote that Aggies are Aggies regardless of where they are, sharing similar values, hearts, souls, and amazing experiences. Aggies benefit from a variety of unique experiences at different campuses, centers and other locations in College Station, Galveston, Qatar, McAllen, Dallas, or anywhere in the world and beyond, which should also be shared.

## Current / Former Student

Aggies are Aggies, I wish this was true. All of my complaints boil down to not feeling like an Aggie. My experience is in no way similar to those of my main campus friends.

"-Agree

Agree

-N/A

-Disagree

-Agree

"

Agree.

Agreed. Internal communication and leadership is a major point.

Agreed. The university system needs to put serious effort into making the students at campuses other than College Station feel like they too are Aggies.

"Are Aggies Aggies wherever they are? Whether it's lower merit, lack of truly assessing TAMUG students' needs, subpar honors program and not helping them easily find ways to engage at CSTAT, this TAMUG parent has seen that things are more beneficial for TAMU students at CSTAT.

If you centralize, you need to first realize you are trying to compare apples and oranges.

You must have TAMUG student and professor feedback to inform what you're doing. The study you paid for has so many errors in it - the Sea Aggie moms had a briefing on it - and we were shocked at how TAMU let that slide. This is a key indication of how out of touch TAMU leadership and those making decisions are with the TAMUG campus and students. "

"As a current college station engineer who started at Galveston the absolute biggest thing I can recommend is tying the campus tighter to college station. There was a massive disconnect between campuses (each had its own benefits and disadvantages) which leads to the disparity. And tying back into my previous response the reason the sea aggies are

viewed differently is that the campus personality is different. If you fix the issues relating to the lack of the aggie experience then the sea aggies will be viewed as the same.

The advisors in Galveston are an issue that was not addressed anywhere in the report. I would like to highlight it as a blazing issue as somebody who wanted to transfer to college station. The Galveston engineering advisors are painfully uneducated about anything engineering related at college station. On top of that the advisors were trying their hardest to recruit me into staying at the Galveston campus despite them knowing from day 1 that was never my intention."

As someone who has leadership experience on this campus, I have seen the issues caused by lack of communication between our campus and College Station first hand. Because of this, I know that more communication is needed, and I personally think that the centralization of certain aspects would be beneficial, but without the appropriate communication between campus's, there this would cause more harm than good.

Centralizing would not help increase our numbers, allow recruiters to go out and actually talk about TAMUG. Promoting Aggies and that they are aggies no matter where they are is something you should preach to College Station. NOT US. The lack of communication is on TAMU's side. Has TAMU ever been on hold for over an hour trying to find out what is happening to them.

College station has not always had the best things in mind for Galveston. Galveston and college station are the same school but have different students and needs than main campus can not understand, therefore Galveston should have the power to make their own decisions along with joint decisions with college station.

College station literally lost one of the MARE department's bank accounts causing stress, preventing us from finishing projects, and causing student workers to apply elsewhere communication if very well and I receive all updates and alerts in a timely manner

Fix the miss communication among students/parents and staff

Galveston and college station should comunicate more. Also, Galveston NEEDS an ISSS office. We're a many international students ,and every semester we receive more internationals that feel abandoned by ISSS because we don't have a office or representative here. The moto of Aggies by the sea it is what represents us. We're the Aggies by the sea. This should stay.

Galveston and other sister colleges need to be further promoted and in most cases given more funding as well.

Galveston needs to focus more on being on brand. Marketing heavily on the sea and the school as a maritime school. I believe if we used more marketing we could get a lot more out of state students to too how unique the school is.

I agree to the recommendations, however I do wish for the TAMMA to have control over its own social media presence

I agree with everything here, communication is a massive problem

I agree with this

I firmly believe that Galveston deserves more attention from the College Station campus in the forms of funding and representation. [REDACTED]

I look forward to the growth of Galveston Marketing through College Station.

I often travel to College Station for my classes. In-person instruction is nicer than on zoom and I enjoy being able to connect more with my cohort. However, my Galveston parking pass is not valid in College Station and I am not permitted to purchase a College Station pass. I propose that the parking passes work universally on both campuses, to reduce the barrier between students wanting to attend in-person classes at either campus.

I think A&M should promote its other campuses as well, stating that Aggies are Aggies. I know while I was at Galveston, College Station students didn't really think highly of Galveston students just because it wasn't the main campus. The only reason myself and many others didn't attend central campus was because we wanted to focus on majors that weren't optional in College Station.

I think communication could improve. I think these recommendations are vague about how these issues will be solved. Currently, in things that do go through college stations, the people making decisions are not informed about how our campus is. Because of this, things are often difficult and not streamlined, and I feel as a student, I am not at the forefront of these thoughts. It often feels that college station does not care about how their decisions affect us and only does what they think is best without consideration.

I think that it would be beneficial to realign all campuses to one mission and to provide support and resources for the Galveston campus to get there. However, I think there is a contradiction in this proposal where it is stated that it is wished the Galveston campus stays separate and the running of programs such as TAMMA are left to Galveston authority and then it is also wished that College Station and Galveston are united and Galveston is re-presented as a branch campus. I do think improving communication and providing an easier chain of command and leadership will aid in the future of the campus.

I work at a college that has several locations each with their own identities UNTIL they tried to mainstream everything which caused low morale among students, faculty and staff. Do not consolidate anything.

If aggies are aggies regardless of where they are, then we should have the same opportunities here. The truth is that the aggies here do not have the same opportunities that college station Aggies do. Fix the state of being before you change communications. If you don't, that is called propaganda!

If there exists "a lack of communication and joint decision-making from College Station to the internal Galveston campus," then why is this study and report deciding to further centralize it? It would seem more training, processes and coordination are needed for consistency and cooperation, rather than centralization.

"In general, I would say the Communications suggestions lack proper context regarding TAMUG internal leadership discussions with College Station leadership. In my experience, internal leadership at TAMUG has been beyond sufficient to support students, create academic and scholarly literature or other forms of communication to disseminate their research, and make significant advancements in their respective fields of study. I do believe



there could be more concerted efforts toward collaboration amongst departments and their leadership groups across the College Station and Galveston campus but I feel the suggestions offered regarding communication between leadership are misplaced.

Additionally, I believe centralizing marketing efforts through College Station would be appropriate for necessary marketing resources, but I would urge strong caution in overlapping marketing efforts because they could undermine the unique qualities of the Galveston campus and/or confuse potential students on opportunities distinctly available at College Station versus Galveston.

Finally, the final suggestion in this section is already taking place. Aggies I've met at College Station and Galveston (or others) have the same academic values instilled in them and I believe that is because professors are significantly vetted and therefore well-suited to teach students these values inherently in their research and coursework."

Most of the state doesn't realize that A&M Galveston is a branch campus, so it isn't given as much respect. More people would apply directly to Galveston if they realized they would still be and Aggie and get an Aggie ring.

N/A

No comments

No comments.

One Aggie! We all need to be on the same page and share the same experiences. It all begins with coordination and a centralized message

Promote that Aggies are Aggies regardless of where they are! And of course, communicate between college station and Galveston more.

Promote that Aggies are Aggies regardless of where they are, sharing similar values, hearts, souls, and amazing experiences. Aggies benefit from a variety of unique experiences at different campuses, centers and other locations in College Station, Galveston, Qatar, McAllen, Dallas, or anywhere in the world and beyond, which should also be shared.

Students in the corps are having to go through too many administrative people to get simple things done. The academic advisors need to be aware of cadet requirements for the different tracks. A couple examples being LO cadets need certain credits before going on cruise, and NROTC students need to take certain courses to be eligible for contract, which need to be reflected in the degree plans and understood by ALL relative administration. Terrible communication and unification between the two campuses. Treat graduate students better.

The last bullet point is a nice thought to promote. However, galveston is special on its own. It's still affiliated with A&M but it doesn't need to replicate or be aligned with college station fully.

The message that "Aggies are Aggies" should be widely promoted because as of now, there is a clear divide between those who are at Galveston and those who are in College Station. The understanding that Aggies are Aggies regardless of their branch campus is extremely important for improved collaboration with College Station. In my experience with the

Graduate and Professional Student Government in College Station, I noticed many barriers to communication and resources for Galveston students. There is an assumption among many College Station students that the Galveston campus is not held to the same standards or is not even part of the same University.

There is a lack of communication and joint decision-making from College Station to the internal Galveston campus.

There is an enormous gap in communication between the main campus and ours when it comes to supporting our veterans as the school claims to do. Aggies are Aggies just because we have a different major it should not somehow disqualify us from the same opportunities that are provided main campus veterans. There has been a gap in communication when it has come to veteran finances and veteran support. We have on several occasions tried to get veteran advocates from main campus to come down and experience what it is like to be a veteran that very few care about. While we only have 36 student veterans every semester we have to struggle with the same financial issues and never get a solid solution to address them. This is not a new concept and it shows a lack of support and lack of communication when our veterans have to fight. This has been reported for years and still no solution is set in place.

There's an incredible level of non-commitment to delineating the TAMUG experience from the experience of main campus. Revoking Galveston's autonomy and routing all processes through TAMU main campus while ensuring students that Galveston is distinct is a poorly strategized approach. I'm positive that there are process that must be streamlined and reinforced; however, the suggestions laid out in this report seem too indecisive to achieve the implied and expressed goals.

This is the worst college for communication that I have ever attended to be honest. We don't want to be aligned to College Station. If I wanted to go to College Station I would have chosen to go there. You cannot make blanket decisions that will work for both C-Stat and Galveston. Yes, we are all Aggies, but we are not the same.

This sounds like a good idea. There is some confusion among the general public about A&M Galveston being a separate school.

Yea please

Yes communication is key! It also needs to be fair across the board. Galveston students feel they are not given the same opportunities as those at CS. Gym doesn't stay open long, food choices are less than stellar

Former Student

Agree but need better advising for students at both campus locations.

Agree, especially with the last bullet.

Are the missions of the Galveston and College Station campuses identical?

As a SEA AGGIE Former Student, I am concerned about the loss of Galveston-specific branding. Sea Aggies, especially in the maritime industry, are known as Sea Aggies and Galveston students, not as Aggies or College Station students.

Centralize Marketing and Communications efforts in Galveston to align the mission, brand, and communications efforts at College Station- especially for TMA.

Communication between the campuses is an area that needs lots of work.

Communication is very important. I feel this area could be improved however not all that applies at one applies to the rest. So don't share unnecessary information and cause unnecessary confusion.

Definitely for the latter. An Aggie is an Aggie. Bleed Maroon and support all other Aggies.

May all A&M campuses unite in traditional activities and pride.

From the students point of view there is no coordination between the galveston campus and college station. except for rare occasions.

Fully support your recommendations.

Galveston and College Station campus: Most CS students - and probably some staff members do not even recognize that Galveston is part of the A&M system. A&M has got to do a better job in promoting BOTH these Universities as equal.

Good

Great recommendations. This has always been a problem. It was a problem when I attended TAMUG in the 1980s. Bring up academics, programs and accreditation, too. The engineering is watered down.

I agree, very strongly with the statement. Students and golfs and do not feel like they're treated like real Aggies. The feedback they get from college station. Students is usually that Galveston Aggies are not real Aggies. This is not true. I think sea Aggies as well as Aggies around the world should be integrated into events and promotions. One of the biggest I think is allowing the Galveston yell leaders to cheer with the main campus. Yell leaders from time to time. Giving Galveston students a special span chance to experience sporting events and conferences they wouldn't usually get to experience otherwise at home.

I completely agree with this. Special emphasis needs to be placed on getting trained academic advisors to the Galveston campus, especially with in the Maritime Academy I concur. Aggies are Aggies wherever they happen to attend class.

In what ways does the Galveston campus not align with "the mission, brand, and communications efforts at College Station?" I suppose it wouldn't be so bad if it were actually helpful. However, it is quite obvious that MGT does not understand what Galveston actually does. Galveston needs -- has always needed -- marketing help, not marketing control. Again, just another straw-man argument.

Inclusion in decisions that impact the Galveston campus should be a high priority.

Promote that Aggies are Aggies regardless of their campus. To this end a consolidation of functionality across all campuses should be achieved.

Sea aggies are seen as the 'red-headed step child' of Texas A&M. Especially between the two Corps'. Sea Aggies have always been able to have facial hair, as long as it was compliant with wearing an SCBA, which is practical for being a mariner. Hair regulations also used to just be 'clear by the collar'. Until good ol' College Station powers that be had to step in and force TAMUG Corps to TAMU Corps regs. TAMUG Cadets should be disciplined along similar lines of competitor maritime academies, not the same policies for a military-based TAMU Corps.

Somewhat surprised that this has been an ongoing problem.

The Galveston campus lacks everything involving communication with students of important information.

The uniqueness of TAMUG should be pushed harder. It is not College Station and any attempt to bring it in line with College Station will dilute the program and diminish the benefits gained from being different.

These seem obvious and need to be worked continuously

This is also a very important need. Several times during my time at Galveston us being put on the back burner or forgotten about my main campus affected me and other class mates. When were supposed to be a sister campus we were treated like a distant cousin. We found communication at the TAMUG campus was far better than CS campus. Adding more resources would only improve the campus and administration.

Yes, yes, yes! The communication needs to be streamlined. That way when events, or inherent things are being done. Guest are not given a the run around.

You need to communicate with students and tell them that when they graduate, they are not welcome on campus on threat of trespass.

Your TAMUG students must attend a Kyle Field Game & yell practice. Maybe freshman MUST go by bus to attend as a field trip. Make it a tradition. They must understand that spirit.

## Faculty / Staff

"- I strongly agree with the need to centralize marketing and communication efforts between Galveston and College Station. For instance, as it stands now, Galveston's website looks a bit detached from College Station's website (e.g., formatting, pictures, menus, etc.). Many visitors do not even see the link between the two campuses from the first glance. I also recommend unifying the logo between the two campuses, while adding the word ""Galveston"" in a way similar to adding a department's name. This will create a sense of unity, belonging, and inclusion across all Texas A&M's campuses.

- I applaud further collaboration and joint-decision making between the two campuses on teaching, research, and service fronts.

- When I talk to students, I can sense how proud and honored they feel to be part of Texas A&M University (yet without an emphasis on Galveston as a campus). I believe they would like to be associated with the ""big campus"", cheering for the same teams, wearing the same shirts, singing the same songs--simply identifying themselves as Aggies just like their peers. "

" Same page" Address lack of internal communication at various levels of leadership, including faculty and staff.

Aggies are Aggies, but emphasize the unique culture of the Galveston Sea Aggies!

Aggies are Aggies, but Galveston Aggies have been seen as second-class citizens. This applies to both students and faculty. True integration is badly needed.

Agree with all the above.

Anybody making decisions about TAMU-Galveston should at least visit the campus.

As long as more work is being compensated with more staff in the College Station campus, this should be fine.

ASAP, please. As centralization progresses, communicate processes and expectations to ensure accountability for compliance and alignment to College Station.

Centralization efforts have led to confusion and unmet expectations. Do you have data to show that the lack of centralization warrants centralization?

Centralization of communications may hinder the ability of the Galveston campus. I am extremely skeptical of this approach to communications and I have first-hand experience of how detrimental has been the communication centralization efforts on the main campus. I am afraid that our colleagues in Galveston will suffer even more due to the geographic distance.

Centralize SRS! Collaborating with faculty in Galveston campus is difficult because they work separately.

Centralizing marketing and communications at TAMUG would be great -- but they are woefully understaffed! I am a PhD academic, and it is obvious that there is confusion on this campus on what marketing is supposed to do, and the roles everyone plays. At McDonalds, do chefs make the burgers, does marketing then sell them? This is not my field, but there is clear confusion on who does what with respect to marketing at TAMUG.

Communications centralization in College Station has been an abysmal, unmitigated failure. Do not replicate this failure in Galveston.

Completely agree

Cool - whatever you say.

Good sloganeering.

Good.

Having clear communication lines would help a lot, especially for faculty. A system should be in place so faculty and staff can freely express themselves without fear.

Hopefully this will improve the lack of communication and action in terms of marketing and communication. Department websites at the Galveston Campus are decades behind. In this day and age, dedicated personnel should keep up with changes.

"I absolutely agree with the report's suggestions for more transparency at various levels. I will say, however, that I think certain people on campus are doing that very well. Our CAO communicates openly and freely. Our faculty senators host monthly post-faculty senate meetings. Some of our department heads hold regular department meetings and disseminate information. The problem is that this is not being done equally well by all parties across campus. To address this, I think review of communication processes is probably best; if departments could evaluate their department heads once a year, for instance, this would be ideal. This would especially address mid-level administration communication. That oversight needs to go to the CAO of our campus.

Our MARCOMM department is very complicated, and I am excited about the possibility of merging them with College Station. But I do have some concerns about branding, very similar to those I expressed with recruitment – that is, if we depend on College Station to tell our story for us, we aren't giving ourselves a chance to tell our best story. We are a unique campus, and College Station may not have the tools to market our work in the most engaging and innovative way. If we are intent on sharing what different experiences look like at different campuses, we have to provide a way for MARCOMM and recruitment to know that experience.

"

I agree with these recommendations.

I agree with these recommendations. There is a lack of communication between campuses that could be reduced with a new commitment from personnel at both locations to ensure better integration.

"I am sorry but this is totally wrong. Any maritime campus needs its own identity. Making Sea Aggies into just Aggies is wrong, goes against the historical brand of the Galveston program, and weakens the stature of their program. Scripps is known as Scripps around the world. It is part of UCSD, but its identity is as a world-class maritime institution. This move to weaken the image of Galveston is appalling and without justification.

"

I am wondering if the communication is more focused to the student body? What about staff and faculty including researchers? I think this part is missing

I appreciate the focus in the report on marketing and recruiting for TAMUG to re-brand TAMUG as a campus of College Station. I encourage leadership to take this a step further to market TAMUG as THE campus for ALL things marine and coastal at Texas A&M. For example, the model of bringing engineering students to the Galveston campus for the first years of their undergraduate education seems backward. Instead, they should leverage the resources for completing the basics of their education at the College Station campus then come to the Galveston campus to specialize in marine and coastal issues and methodologies. If, as the report recommends, Galveston is to become a "lab campus," then the focus MUST be on the specialization of teaching and research in marine and coastal environmental sciences, not a landing place for freshmen engineering students.

I can't comment on the lack of communication. My impression as a parent is that TAMUG does a good job but could use more support for aging infrastructure in order to be able to handle more temporary students.

I have no objections.

I still do not feel that Marcom is focused on marketing departments and programs here in Galveston. They are reactive rather than proactive. I think they work especially well for [REDACTED] the administration and not as well for the rest of us. Most of us are not marketers, so for us to write the marketing materials is not a good use of our time. It would be better if Marcom would interview the faculty about their research or their degree programs and what the benefits are, and then write something up for us to edit, rather than asking us to write it ourselves. Scientific writing to peers has a very different approach than I would expect to see in marketing to high school students.

I utilize the toolbox on the website that has been provided by Marcom; however, they do not respond when you need them. My last email that I sent was responded to 126 days later. I do not know if they need more man power or leadership; however, what they currently have is not working. I would love to have access to Marcom for our program. If College Station wants to promote Aggies are Aggies, then it must deemphasize College Station. Presently, the spirit is that if you are not at College Station then you are really not an Aggie.

If marketing is handled through CSTAT they will prioritize their needs before ours. We will see enrollment fall and the quality decline.

I'm in support of more alignment with College Station, but I'd request that it come with significant efforts to authorize Galveston staff and faculty to carry out functions that are currently only able to be completed in College Station. Of course, this should come with significant accountability to College Station structures. If we are simply placed into reporting lines toward College Station units, I fear centralization efforts will simply overburden College Station folks and create bottlenecks.

Improving and elevating communications will forever be a continuous effort, and we appreciate the recommendations to find strategies to enhance/strengthen within-campus communications as well as improve the way in which university-wide communications impact the Galveston Campus. The centralization of MarComm already has occurred, and we are working through the bumpy road of implementation similar to the implementation in College Station.

"Internal communication, particularly related to staff tasks and contacts, must be improved.

Marketing of TAMU-Galveston as a unique Aggie experience must be improved."

Joint decision making between the two campuses and open dialogue is essential.

Joint decision making should be prioritized, absolutely. Internal communication will improve with more event that bring the campuses together. Additionally, cross campus collaborations can be strengthened by demonstrating what resources are available at CS vs Galveston (and vice versa). For example, the facilities for microscopy and sequencing genetic material at CS are unmatched - collaborations between CS and Galveston scientists that leverage these resources are exciting to think about.

"Marketing and Communications in Galveston has historically been centralized.

What kind of a recommendation is ""Address lack of internal communication at various levels of leadership."" HOW??? The report cited previous failed attempts to do this. What is the new recommendation for doing this? This is an ""end world hunger"" type of statement. A good idea but somewhat devoid of any possible approach or valuable insight.

I don't understand how ""There is a lack of communication and joint decision-making from College Station to the internal Galveston campus."" is a recommendation by anyone's definition. At best it's an opinion, at worst a fact. Centralizing functions in College Station will obviously make this worse. HOW can this be addressed?? Where is the recommendation we paid so much money to the consultant to develop????"

Marketing efforts should be carefully vetted to be sure that they correctly align with TAMU's roles and missions.

More communication and exchanges/visits (2-way) and not just similar-looking websites

N/A

need their own marketing.

No Comment

No comment - this all seems reasonable.

No comment.

No comments

No comments

No concerns.

NONE

ok

Remove the us vs them problems, especially with Galveston thinking College Station is preventing things from happening. (Some of those same things are not allowed in CS either.)

Seems to be a contradiction between promoting unique experiences at different campuses and promoting one brand

Shared decision-making and accountability will be very important for the success of centralization. This will also begin to repair the deep distrust felt by the Galveston campus towards College Station. Many in Galveston feel as if they have been neglected and abused



by College Station and it is imperative that this relationship be rebuilt for any of these recommendations to be successful.

Sorry, I spent hours writing police reports this week at TAMUG and ran out of time to answer this question.

Students on the College Station campus often do not know very much about the Galveston campus, and only have the opportunity to go there towards the end of their degree.

Developing programs that encourage students to visit the Galveston campus and engage more with the resources there could be helpful, particularly if transport were provided. The distance between campuses is a barrier to centralizing the brand, and I think it would help to incentivize more collaboration if students could more easily travel between campuses.

The Aggies are Aggies branding is very similar to a "Mules are Mules" brand.

The last bullet needs to be developed in a way that stresses the uniqueness of Galveston.

The only lack of internal communication has been the historical disinterest by the CS bureaucracy towards the Galveston campus. Centralization in CS will not address this problem.

These are very necessary changes. I highly support most of them. I still believe it is important to differentiate the "Aggies by the Sea" or "SeaAggies" as a distinctive brand for Galveston.

This is fine.

Very positive, acknowledging current limitations and the need to improve

When marketing and communications was centralized in Engineering, the quality of the efforts dropped significantly.

Yes, create a good communication channel for faculty especially so they freely communicate. At the moment everything is clustered at the department. Once the department has a problem it stifles growth.

"Yes, for sure on the Marketing and Communications. A specific question, does MarCom control the webpage updates process? That is the frustration I feel. My department's webpages sorely need updating, but to whom should we turn for help is unknown.

Nobody claims ownership and the department's do not have the staff to do this.

Additionally, all TAMU's webpages should have a toggle for viewers to switch content from English to Spanish, and vice-versa. How can we make this happen? Is this in MarCom's court? It seems it should be.

To the fifth bullet point here, the main campus has football games and North Gate.

TAMUG will never have that. For TAMUG to grow, the strategy should not be to emphasize that "Aggies are Aggies regardless of where they are", but instead the emphasis should be on the uniqueness of pursuing TAMU's Sea Grant Mission by the sea. Our promotional campaign should be something as simple as "We ARE the Texas Sea Grant Mission".

Moving the Texas Sea Grant Program and OCNG department to TAMUG moves us in the that direction, for sure!"

Yes, please do give us access to the College Station website templates and/or provide adequate Marcomm staff to handle campus websites for all departments.

Staff

"- I disagree that Aggies are Aggies no matter where they attend. This implies they have equal opportunity and access at all locations and thus have the same experiences. This is not true. I agree that we can promote the values of TAMU at each institution, but each institution has its own culture. Having family in the RGV, I can tell you that the culture on that campus is different than the culture on main campus. The students enjoy some of the traditions and uphold our Aggie values, but they bring their own culture and backgrounds to that campus. We need to let the branch campuses be who they are, and not expect them to be copies of main campus.

- I agree there is lack of joint decision-making from TAMU to TAMUG. I believe this is more a lack of expectation and trust at the higher levels of leadership. I believe that if we believe that the leaders at TAMUG are competent individuals, then they should be allowed to make high level decisions for that campus without the interference from main campus. Trust that the leaders at TAMUG share the TAMU values and goals, and let them be the leaders you hired them to be. If they must go to main campus for permission, they are not going to be effective. I understand the constraint of resources, so main campus can assist with setting boundaries for operation, but let the leaders at TAMUG freely lead. "

"- There definitely is a lack of communication on the TAMUG campus. I didn't know that Human Resources and Marketing and Communications had even moved to main campus until I read the MGT report.

- I agree that we need to promote that Aggies are Aggies regardless of where they are. I have been told that I'm a sea Aggie and not a real Aggie since I work at the Galveston campus. I could see the ""sea Aggie"" designation affecting the students and not having the same experience as main campus students.

- Would the centralization of TAMUG and TAMU campuses increase the approval process? I've had issues with approvals (for purchases, for field trips, for travel) taking longer than 30 days and items arriving later than expected. It's hard planning to order items because some things arrive in 1 week and others take 5 months. This makes accomplishing my job very difficult.

I've frequently had to reach out to companies to ask for an additional quote because the quote had reach the 30 or 60 day valid limit. The most recent example of this is I've been trying to order some equipment for the summer field season and our colleagues on the TAMU-Corpus Christi campus have already submitted a PO. We started the ordering process on 12/7/2022, the vendor approval for AggieBuy occurred on 1/6/2023, we had to request an additional quote on 1/7/2023 because the quote was only good for 30-days, and I'm still waiting for a PO to be submitted to the company. Our colleagues in TAMU-CC placed the order on 1/10/2023 and a PO was submitted on 1/26/2023.

- Another purchasing experience I had was attempting to get research supplies ordered: it took 5 months for my research supplies to get ordered and delivered to me. I basically missed my entire summer field season because I didn't have my equipment. I started the ordering process in May, hoping everything would be there in 4-6 weeks (the time it takes the vendor to make my research items). Because of issues on TAMUG's side, it took 5

months and hours of my time emailing and on the phone trying to get the order processed. I know from this experience (and others similar to this) our colleagues outside of TAMUG have decided to not work with us on future projects because it took so long to get supplies. - I've also had issues with processing invoices and the invoices taking longer than 30-days to reach our vendors. So far this hasn't lead to huge problems, but we do work with some smaller businesses and I know that a delay in payment could cause financial problems for these smaller businesses. Right now I'm working with FMO to process an invoice that was submitted on 12/19/2022 and the vendor still hasn't been paid as of 2/6/2023. I think this hurts the reputation of TAMU and decreases the likelihood that small businesses will want to work with us in the future if they know it takes multiple months to get paid. "

"\*There is a lack of communication and joint decision-making from College Station to the internal Galveston campus.

The tone of this report illustrates this. It feels like the client is College Station and how College Station can or should take advantage of Galveston. It doesn't feel like the report was directed at Galveston to help Galveston personnel know what is best for Galveston. Furthermore the constant recommendations of centralization through College Station increases that feeling. The centralization should take Galveston personnel into consideration in their decision making. I could be thinking erroneously, but it sounds like leadership is being taken out of Galveston.

\*Promote that Aggies are Aggies regardless of where they are, sharing similar values, hearts, souls, and amazing experiences. Aggies benefit from a variety of unique experiences at different campuses, centers and other locations in College Station, Galveston, Qatar, McAllen, Dallas, or anywhere in the world and beyond, which should also be shared.

Yes"

A Sea Aggie is also still an Aggie!

Agree with all points, however, promoting that "Aggies are Aggies" is made more challenging by the System schools. The general public continues to be confused by the fact that a graduate from Texas A&M-Corpus Christi is not an Aggie. A dash "-" versus an "at" doesn't explain the difference.

all is good

All units that expect to have regular transfer or travel of students to/from CS and GV should have dedicated staff at both campuses to answer their questions. When support staff from our unit in CS visit the Galveston campus, we are regularly asked questions from Engineering at Galveston students that should be addressed to the College of Engineering, for example, and the students never seem to know who to ask.

Branding is an issue here at Galveston. The bookstore still sells shirts with the "wave" on them but I was told the logo has changed years ago. Can we have more town-hall meetings to address the communication gap?

College Station's lack of communication frustrates staff and students and inhibits daily progress. Students can wait from days to weeks before receiving assistance or feedback

from College Station. College Station's unwillingness to include Galveston in joint decision-making makes Galveston staff feel insubordinate and worthless.

Communication has always been a problem at TAMUG. Upper level leaders put out information and the Department heads have a mixed record, depending on the department, of sharing that information with faculty and staff. There has never appeared to be a mechanism in place to hold Department Heads accountable for any of their actions. "Communication strategies are needed. A timeline is needed for these changes and there needs to be accountability in completing this process.

"

"Communication, or lack thereof is a problem in many organizations. I do think Sea Aggie Daily provided updates to our campus community about upcoming events. In most cases, we get little to no notice about events. We can plan our schedules to participate if we are aware.

There are certain organizations with too much responsibility and power if that is the correct way to put it. Decisions are made unilaterally and not communicated. For example, If a report should be sent to the TCEQ and we are not aware of purchases or changes, then reports are not filed in a timely manner as required by law.

Span of control of those on the ET should be evaluated and five to seven should be the max. When I cannot text or call my manager and I send safety-related e-mails that go unanswered for 48 to 72 hours that is a problem. Some decisions need to be made in an instant and there isn't time to call an admin to schedule an appointment to talk to the manager."

"Communications - I think this is one of the areas in which this campus has grown most. Our presentation standards campus-wide have undergone a sea-change (okay, pun-intended) since the time of R. Bowen Loftin's charge. The upper-level management's support of communication efforts has really paid off, and more support is needed.

1. We should have communications experts in Student Affairs/Auxilliaris, as well as spread across the Academic Departments to trumpet the incredible work that is being done.

2. Also, we desperately need to input the wayfinding plan that has been in the works for 15+ years and held in stasis due to lack of funding. We are no longer the tiny campus we used to be. Our entrances should be as grand as the education our campus offers.

3. Social media/account managers + graphic design should be imbedded in Student Affairs as well as Academics/Support.

Communications between the Executive Team and Campus. The Executive Team on our campus is tremendous. It is incredibly rare for any campus to enjoy the level of continuity this campus has had. Dr. Thomas and Colonel Fossum are the only members with less than 15 years of experience on our campus (HR notwithstanding). That is something that should be treasured. However, it can also present some weaknesses if not managed.

1. During COVID, the ICT system our campus developed served us incredibly well. When in a bunker, we were able to be nimble and respond to needs with great efficacy. However, we were slow to leave the process, with a lot of decisions being made at the

executive level. That's great for coordination in the room, however, those decisions made at 60,000 feet often struggle to be articulated with the conditions presented by the environment at sea-level. There are only so many minutes available in the E.T. meeting space, which explodes the attention economy of those meetings. At the ground level, we found ourselves jockeying for the attention of our representatives attending those meetings, hoping they would spend the precious time-capital allotted to them on our project. This results in the "urgent" competing with the "important" with the former often crowding out the latter. It placed a lot of stress on the comity and sense of shared destiny that has always defined this campus -stress that continues today -and it affects morale.

2. Nearly all of the Executive Team has too many direct reports. Dr. Sutherland has 8 (9 if SeaCamp is added) and as assistant superintendent of TAMMA, he's spending an outsized amount of time on getting the CORPS up and running (and to be clear, that has worked out incredibly). But it isn't sustainable, and Student Affairs has continued to succeed due to the level of experience at the Director level. It's much the same in other parts of campus. It has to change. Responsibilities should be re-organized within Student Affairs.

3. In conclusion, much of the communications issues on this campus goes back to how our decisions are being made. More responsibility for decisions have been consolidated at the upper levels, which while it may work in times of crisis, suffers from a lack of ground-level input and working knowledge. It also stifles and calcifies the responsiveness that has always been a strength of this campus. Consolidation REALLY places a lot of stress on the mental real-estate practitioners and makes redundancy incredibly difficult. If everyone is wearing 5 hats, no one has any thought of how to anyone else's hats are being balanced.

"

CS really does not recognize Galveston. It is frustrating to students who try to communicate with CS and seem to be put on the back burner. It gives all Aggies a bad image.

"Current:

""employees expressed concern that mid-level leaders do not share critical information, leading to a culture that is perceived as mistrusting and fearful.""

The executive team is very insulated. The only way to pass information up is through VP's who are one of 14 at a table through a VP who has up to a similar level of direct reports the COO currently has, that was earlier stated was inappropriate to achieve effective operation. The experts who have their boots on the ground must pass their concerns up to a level that has 1/10th attention to a room of detached professionals who are double digit years away from their time in the lower levels, and honestly have no idea what it is like to operate in the current climate at those levels. So not only is information upward so diluted, but important decisions also that are very impactful, are made with incomplete information paired with outdated understandings without the ability to be properly explained or understood. Then downward that level of dilution is highlighted down with 1/10th of the dissemination efforts and ability to leave the 4th floor MAIN conference room. I and many others for instance had no idea that Bob McClain, External Relations was no longer with the

university and that seat had sat vacant. How can entry level positions that are three steps away from the COO know so little? Because in each level attention span and information has to be split 10 different ways.

""Delays can also occur because of multiple people serving in two or, in some cases, three roles."" Many positions are serving the roles of 5-10 counterparts in College Station. Once again same level of effort required to make the same presentations for instance, who has time to accurately communicate when we are meeting the same demands and standards for some work that requires equal base level of work and preparation of 5-10 people at main campus.

""Campus leadership gets information at regular Executive Team and Academic Department Head meetings, but how this information is passed on for each area is unclear.""

Hopes and prayers that you are able to catch your executive team member and they have the time to accurately convey their information while they still remember it clearly balancing the 10 different reactions and responses to the news and how that adjusts their operations.

""As centralization progresses, communicate processes and expectations to ensure accountability for compliance and alignment to College Station.

There is a lack of communication and joint decision-making from College Station to the internal Galveston campus.

Promote that Aggies are Aggies regardless of where they are, sharing similar values, hearts, souls, and amazing experiences. Aggies benefit from a variety of unique experiences at different campuses, centers and other locations in College Station, Galveston, Qatar, McAllen, Dallas, or anywhere in the world and beyond, which should also be shared.""

Easier said than done, but ABSOLUTELY vital to our success as ""one university"" because the current climate could not be further from what is being said.

Recommendations:

""Faculty and staff discussed that policies and procedures lacked clarity and accountability, making it easy for individuals to disregard protocol and establish individual marketing plans.""

While this is true, admitted, it is because there is a lack of resources to assist functional areas to to be successful in marketing and communication. MANY departments in College Station have in-house (now centralized) marketing individuals and resources at their disposal. In Galveston, marketing resources are at the disposal of those with ""Chief"" and ""Officer"" in their title. A greater emphasis on the maritime academy is also given as I am sure as well, is linked to the COO also being the superintendent of the maritime academy. The rest of campus is left to fend for itself and the only interaction given is for enforcement

and accountability. If greater resources were spread throughout campus then there wouldn't be as much of a need for "accountability" as the ease of resources will be offered to assist and a greater adherence to one brand and voice would be much easily achieved. Instead of focusing on greater policing, it should be examined why do individuals feel they are on their own to meet their marketing needs?

"Department heads are meeting with campus leadership regularly"

What department heads? Division leadership yes, but not department heads. They are kept from the table instead of being called upon at an as needed basis to offer more accurate direct information to impact decisions.

"Leadership should consistently communicate critical information and mid-level leaders should emphasize critical information and provide additional information that specifically relates to their units."

As stated previously, how can that be effective when it has to be spread across so many levels. To achieve that impossible task requires great communicators, and even then it is difficult. How many people at the leadership table reached their position because they were lauded for their ability to clearly communicate? They were promoted for their ability to effectively develop and operate their areas. So why are we setting them up to fail at a task that would be difficult to achieve for even the best?

"New procedures for Marketing and Communications, Information Technology, Human Resources, Finance, and other areas will need to be communicated to appropriate employees to ensure that expectations are met across campus."

Why is there an emphasis on some operations to be centralized, if we are truly one campus with one mission why are only some operations being centralized while others are left back. Phrases such as "well they're College Station employees who work at the Galveston Campus" exist while we are half in/half out."

Done properly, Galveston will be in the vocabulary of College Station operationally and not create a "left out" or "what about us" feeling when critical communications are sent. Done poorly, communications will be disjointed, create confusion and affect decision-making. In an emergency situation, poor communications compound the emergency.

Frequently decisions are made both in College Station and at Galveston without consulting with other stakeholders. In Galveston, we feel that we are at the mercy of College Station and our preferences have no weight.

Fully support; I will agree that for several years there have been communication issues both internally at TAMUG and with TAMU as a whole.

Galveston has its own identity. You shouldn't want that campus to be the exact same as College Station. Does College Station make any efforts to align itself with Galveston? Not from my experience. As long as the Aggie Code is being upheld, leave it be.

Galveston remains in the Stone Age in terms of communication. As a former College Station employee working on GV campus, it was terribly challenging to exist and properly

assist our students because of the lack of participation, communication and presence (even prior to 2020).

I agree

I concur.

I love the idea of promoting "Aggies are Aggies regardless of where they are" and think many on the Galveston campus will embrace that messaging. Aligned branding and communications causes some confusion, because it feels like a contradiction to "Aggies are Aggies regardless of where they are". TAMMA and Sea Aggies have many specific and special logos and images that would be a shame to lose.

I think providing additional communication across the campus is important. There needs to also be a central place to find information on campus events instead of relying solely on digital signage (often there is not time to stand and watch a TV in a hallway to find events). I think this benefits the Galveston campus, however, we simply do not have the same resources as College Station or the law school so this seems disingenuous.

In Galveston Mar Com has effectively eliminated one of the most welcomed communications from years past, the Sea Aggie Daily. The name is not what is missed it is the feeling of belonging together. I've worked here for 7 1/2 years and found that the first several years our campus felt like a family. In today's climate we are reduced to a separate AggNews for each and every news item and a feeling that the family of staff/faculty is not cohesive. Sea Aggie daily brought us together because we were all interested in what we would find each day. It encouraged departments to advertise their events and successes. It is extremely difficult when working with two different branding models and needs to be consistent.

It is true that Aggies are Aggies regardless of where they are. However, it is in College Station an Aggie can get the full experience of being an Aggie with respect to traditions and activities throughout the year.

Its important to increase the visibility of and opportunities for staff and faculty to attend the "Leading Self" professional development course and continue to celebrate the traditions and values that make Texas A&M such a special place.

Main Campus should just annex TAMUG.

Make all resources at our main campus available to the Galveston students. Not a lesser and inadequate version of them please.

Marketing and Communications should be ongoing and consistent. Branding is important. (Note: TAMUG website should be more user friendly and updated. This may fall under Information Technology.)

Marketing has been centralized with College Station. Internal communication needs to be improved. For example, specific rules pertaining to Alternate Work Location (AWL) at TAMUG were not communicated to TAMUG employees. Communication from College Station needs to be improved as well.

N/A

Need additional support for both the MARCOM department but also staff that serve in informal MARCOM-type roles within their department. All Galveston Campus webpages should be updated to reflect current web design used by TAMU.



No Comments.

Our MARCOM office does a tremendous job. I would start to ask them what they think is best.

Promote that Aggies are Aggies regardless of where they are, sharing similar values, hearts, souls, and amazing experiences. Aggies benefit from a variety of unique experiences at different campuses, centers and other locations in College Station, Galveston, Qatar, McAllen, Dallas, or anywhere in the world and beyond, which should also be shared. - That bullet point is a joke in my opinion. Aggies only benefit from College Stations hierarchy that this centralization process has caused, not the other campuses. Dont believe me? I would initiate a survey with the students and/or our "customers" that are now effected by the inefficiency of this organization restructure.

See comments above but I feel like things would be much improved if Texas A&M did not treat the Galveston campus like a overflow campus and charter school.

So many silos... so little time. That is usually the excuse for lack of communication. Many times the only way to enforce communication is to have an approval process that dictates who is to be notified. In this instance, having such a process could be beneficial in the short term as an internal training tool. Also, please have a bi-monthly or quarterly review of this process as people leave and priorities change, so must the communication process.

"strongly support this: Address lack of internal communication at various levels of leadership.

currently gossiping and small talks appear the way to get to know early about some important things that are going to happen, which is not transparent and unfair to most others."

The lack of communication and difficulty with processes is partially due to structures. There are currently functions that do not have a chain of communication to the Executive Team. Due to the centralized structures, there is no flow at the campus level. All units must be included in a communication chain to TAMU counterparts AND a communication chain to the local campus.

The lack of communication from upper admin to daily workers is awful - both internally within Galveston & from CStat to Galveston.

There should be a marketing and communications person located on the Galveston campus and can report to Marketing and Communications in College Station.

This is a complicated one. Promoting that Aggies are Aggies sounds great. But, does that also negate the uniqueness of the Sea Aggie?

This needs work everywhere. College Station campus communications are still in flux so this will take time.

Would like to somehow ensure that processes with not be slowed down by adding additional bureaucratic hoops. A loss of efficiency would be detrimental to the campus.

## Industry partner/affiliate

"A few years ago hired cool gal for TAMUG she's done a great job.

Monthly TAMUG Newsletter would help update parents, students, alumni etc and help prospective student recruitment.

TAMMA needs better communication to students and families

When a student is applying for the Maritime Academy, and will have to go on a summer cruise it needs to be very clearly communicated that there is a fee basically tuition during the summer that is required for every SST in addition to regular annual tuition the cost of SST is not included in their tuition.

Communications should always verify with faculty that safety regulations are being followed before they post pictures.

I mention this because few years ago a TAMMA cadet was on an billet internship, his photos were shared by TAMMA and TAMUG and praised however, he was not wearing a fall arrest safety properly, was outside the railed platform, and was not attached to an actual anchorage point. He was being unsafe. This billet was not training him properly, he should have known it was incorrect (he was A student who didn't actually do hands on stuff-he was in a student leadership position too). Unsafe cadets are not good for cadets, getting more billets, getting cadets hired, nor good for marketing the program or the university. "

Communication is necessary! Do not micro manage

Could not agree more with the last statement, but would also state that the current Marketing and Communications Team in Galveston is very poor at best with a continual lack of communication or response to anyone that reaches out to them.

MARCOM is perfect on campus. I truly think they're doing the best for TAMUG.

No comments

No comments

"The more TAMUG aligns with TAMU, the worse the process and the product.

Work orders take longer, student performance deteriorates, admission standards drop, costs increase, information technology becomes less responsive, HOWDY/E-Campus/CANVAS become an evermore elusive target to manage."

Totally agree with this. It's embarrassing at how bad the marketing, branding and communications are for Galveston. We are thought of as were all the students that didn't get into College Station go and then transfer- a transfer school. College Station really doesn't do much to help that label. Sail Away is HUGE but the marketing and communications were not there- lots of parents and people confused- if you just look at all the social groups for Galveston parents you will see. Barely saw anything from College Station on that as well as the Galveston Campus anniversary this year. Just a fundraiser

dinner for fundraising and local support. AND there was nothing in local Galveston reporting it out... what a waste of a great opportunity! We are very disconnected from the local Galveston community and businesses because our brand is not strong even locally. Additionally Galveston website is constantly outdated and not a viable resource for parents or students the -calendar isn't updated regularly and hard to manage. Family weekend promoted the month before- how are you supposed to plan when it's not on a calendar and unsure when its going to happen.

Board of Visitors member

- I agree with most of the recommendations, however, I would be very cautious about dual reporting of subordinate roles to Texas A&M College Station. Particularly having major functions of A&M Galveston having dual reporting under the AVP of Operations. This type of organizational structure could create an air of mistrust as well as the appearance of a spy for the College Station campus. This type of structure can also lead to power struggles and a division in the leadership team of the university. Texas A&M Galveston has a very strong leader in Col. Mike Fossum. He is a very intelligent and highly respected leader with unwavering integrity, strong core values and strong work ethic. Texas A&M University College Station should give him the title of President/COO and let him lead this great university and he will take it to the next level.

"1) Centralized marketing and communications efforts must initiate with College Station and there needs to be a focus on working with Galveston to align efforts. TAMUG has historically been left to ""fend for itself"" in too many cases without the full support of the main campus.

2) Although lip service has been given to the idea that ""Aggies are Aggies"" most people (including faculty in College Station do not recognize that TAMG is a part of TAMU rather than just another cog in the Texas A&M system."

"A themed campaign should be created along the lines of ""Best of Both Worlds"": Aggie Traditions tracked at TAMUG, Aggie Ring, Diploma, etc; AND being in the industry vortex for career field, if maritime related.

"

Agree

"Agree with the ""lack of internal communication"" comments (I have seen it happen) and action recommendations.

There isn't a section in this survey for ""general comments"" so I am going to put them here.

The review and report are very good, and they provide a lot of thought stimulating information. The recommendations are well thought out and presented. However, there is no Closing of the Loop. By that I mean, what is the mechanism for:

- 1) Who decides which recommendations should be implemented, and in what priority
- 2) What is the formal mechanism for authorizing these actions

3) What is the timeline for authorizing and implementing and who will be made the accountable ""champion"" of each action

4) How will the action items be tracked for completion and reported back

Without the above loop closure activities, reports like this can very easily become a document that looks nice on a bookshelf, but that does not achieve the stated goals." Agree.

As mentioned already, TAMUG in my opinion, should get the attention, resources, recognition, and marketing it needs. Well beyond what it receives now. It is part of the University and must have the resources to market for many of those potential students that do not know it exists, or do not know of the great opportunities of landing a job it has to offer.

Communications will always be an area for continuous improvement and centralization and collaboration are essential.

I do feel like communication has been good but that's a moms Facebook group. With what seems to be six million A&M Junior Colleges. Let the world know TAMUG and TAM are equal schools.

"I think the TAMUG messaging is unique and needs to continue to be part of the TAMUG objective - they just need more general marketing support from CS Marketing. I am talking external marketing...

Internal marketing/communication - that could be a joint effort with both CS messaging and specific TAMUG messaging coming from the same team."

It doesn't matter what we have to say, you didn't even bother to read the feedback on the changes you made to college station. It's insulting that you would even attempt to try this again knowing full well you'll do whatever you want.

Promote Aggies are Aggies

Seems the goal is more to have TAMUG Aggies be connected to 12th man spirit than to allow TAMUG to pursue academic excellence and campus independence. I do not agree that should be the goal. Academic excellence and campus independence is the only way Texas (UT and TAMU systems) will catch up with California, maybe in 25 years if Texas changes priorities.

Unknown

""Faculty and staff discussed that policies and procedures lacked clarity and accountability, making it easy for individuals to disregard protocol and establish individual marketing plans."" This is because the Marketing Department is ineffective and doesn't respond to requests either at all or in a timely manner. The current Marketing Director is all talk and no action. Until that is addressed and it is explained to her that they are a service department and not a dictatorship, nothing will change. " acceptable

"Again, with the Path Forward, centralization of Marketing and Communications is already happening. Communications is always challenging and please know there are those of us

on campus that do all we can to help information not only come down through the ranks, but also up through the ranks in settings where we have that ability.

Some of the challenges with communications comes from a lack of trust in our Marcom leadership due to frequent unavailability and lack of response. This leads to what was written in the report about departments taking matters into their own hands – yes, they have done this. But it is due to lack of consistent support from the Marcom team – but in all fairness, Marcom did not have enough staff to handle the workload. Now that the team is fully staffed, we are all hopeful for improvement all the way around. I am a brand champion and will continue to do all within my power to keep us compliant with Marketing & Communications requirements.

Promoting Aggies are Aggies no matter the location is a great campaign idea that we need all colleges/schools and remote locations using. The feeling of Galveston being a stepchild, forgotten, not as important or prestigious has to stop. I can remember when my daughter started at A&M Galveston, her best friend from K-12 school went to main campus and had the gall to tell my daughter that she had it easy being in Galveston and College Station was more rigorous/harder - which is simply not true. So this message has to reach all current students too, especially those in College Station. Galveston has a rich, unique learning experience where students will know their professors and not be lost in a crowd of hundreds of students in a classroom.

"

Aggies are Aggies and transparency is crucial to the success of the institution. Without transparency and joint decision-making, we risk cultivating a culture of mistrust and suspicion. Even within these recommendations, there is a critical discrepancy between the way that the report suggests that "Aggies are Aggies" but also recommends that we "communicate processes and expectations to ensure accountability for compliance and alignment." If Aggies are Aggies, Galveston should be part of open conversations regarding what "compliance and alignment" looks like rather than bereft of autonomy as passive receivers of decisions already set forth by College Station.

Agree with the recommendation

Almost everywhere on Galveston campus, people are talking about distrust and mis-communications/no-communications between faculty/staff on one side and administrators on the other side. Some department heads on Galveston campus hides information from their faculty, and they seem to consider head-faculty relationship as master-slave relationship. Department Heads' siloed attitudes and malicious behaviors cause faculty/staff's health problems, create potential life and death situations, lead distrust towards administration, and damage students' education. Department heads blame Galveston campus leadership Debbie and Col. Fossum, and Debbie (VPAA and Provost) blames TAMU President. Even students brag about how advantageous it to lie and having friends in Honor's Counsel who would support lies.

CSTAT Marketing needs to manage and oversee the marketing and communications efforts in Galveston

Do something about the non-stop emails from College Station pertaining to group activities that our students see, yet are not a part of. The Galveston students frequently complain about the non-stop emails from College Station. Where are the emails from Galveston going??

Galveston students are called Sea Aggies for a reason. Homogenizing the branch campuses removes the aspects of each campus that makes them unique.

Getting effective marketing materials for some programs in Galveston has been a problem for years. Aligning with CS could be an improvement but only if they give our campus majors equal priority.

I agree with their assessment

"If Centralize Marketing and Communications means we get capable people helping to support the campus community, then I say keep going. Galveston is under served by the current team and has not had an effective Marketing and Communications team since I started on the campus. These people work for the VP and COO and have a limited focus. As far as I can figure they either do hazard communications or promote things to undergraduate students or COO events. Everything else is neglected. So many of us have given up working with these people due to the lack of responsiveness, the lack of respect we get from them and because we do not like to be embarrassed by the things they do write when they do (not always but often times).

Communication is a big problem on both campuses. Some of this is simply that what is going on in College Station does not impact us, and vice versa. Some of this is just that there is not a good way to share information and so people do not. I miss the days when we would get an email with an update. Even if I did not read it or use the information that moment, I knew I could always go back and find it and have the information I needed. I do not understand why there is so little communication from the leadership of the university.

If we are to believe that Aggies are Aggies anywhere and we will no longer be Aggies by the Sea then does this mean we will no longer be a branch campus? Everything in the report makes it seem this change is coming. Knowing this why did not the leadership take the opportunity to get a better report written. So sad. A lost opportunity.

"

NONE

TAMU main campus faculty and staff could also use some reminding that Aggies are Aggies no matter where they are....remember there are other parts of our greater whole that should be recognized and supported

The communication between faculty and leadership are lost at the department level. However, Dr. Debbie Thomas clearly encourages all staff and faculty to fight against the MGT report and the reorganization recommendation.

This report and the handling of its release highlights all of the stated concerns about communication. It was egregious that it took so long to release and there was back and forth with an official release. A very consistent and typical display of gaps in communication.

"This seems to scale well and be a model that can be integrated into other locations. Will there be a dotted line reporting relationships between MarCom units?"

It strikes me that the College Station campus may be in need of training/communication regarding how branches do/don't relate to the main campus - whether for funding, decision making, student matriculation, or retention efforts."

To address lack of communications within department-level, new leaderships at college-level become necessary. The current department heads in many departments on Galveston campus often hide information from their faculty and share important information only with those close to them. These siloed attitudes and behaviors result in distrust towards administration, and the department heads blame Galveston campus leadership, and top Galveston admin such as Dr. Thomas blames TAMU President for not sharing information and not respecting college deans. Students, staff and faculty expressed that a culture of cheating and lying is brewing among top administrators on Galveston campus, and worry that there would be serious trust issue.

To address the communications issues raised in the report, I feel that not having a weekly newsletter has added to the feeling of not knowing what is going on at the University. Also, department heads should also be encouraged to have monthly or twice a month meeting with their faculty and staff. They don't have to be long meetings and they can be over Zoom/Teams, but they must have an agenda. I know in my department we have regularly scheduled meetings, and this ensures at least most of what is important gets disseminated.

## **Student Affairs**

- Ensure management of all summer camps and other camps, as well as minor programs are under the oversight of Student Affairs.
- Programs should balance being part of the Texas A&M College Station traditions but should also have a focus on building community, mattering, and belonging opportunities for students that is specific to life in Galveston, given this is a campus-based on place.

## **Current / Former Student**

Agreed. I would also recommend a weekend bus route to take from Galveston to College Station however I am not sure how viable this idea is.

Fund the Sea Aggie Band.

Good job

I agree

I agree with the recommendations, especially the creation of a more unique aggie identity in Galveston.

"I believe the suggestions offered in this section are adequate. I would argue that aspects/actions within both of these suggestions are already underway and suggests the consulting firm curating this report didn't sufficiently study current Student Affairs at the Galveston campus.

"

I can agree with this

I fear that by placing Galveston summer camps and other camps under Student Affairs that lacks of communication will arise as well as less freedom in the running of these camps.

Many are student led and by placing it under campus direction, the creativity will be hindered and I feel there will be more red tape to go through to put these activities on.

Minors should remain as Academic led because they are academically focused.

I feel that Galveston does a good job of building community as it is.

I would like to thank you for taking the time to inform me, an already enrolled student who went through the application process how to apply. I am sure that took a lot of your effort and again thank you. Without it I don't think we would have known how we applied to be

here. I am so glad that you barley scratched the surface of what it is like to be a student here. Maybe next time you can take the time to actually sit down with a student for more

than five minutes and here their stories. Why should these programs be balanced with College Station we have different ways to do traditions and just different traditions.

I would recommend more summer camps or activities at College Station to help integrate the Galveston students with the students from College Station such as during the DI Saturday weekends so that people can make new friends. I would also recommend more



school housing options for Galveston students that transfer for the Spring semesters as most housing is only available annually starting the fall semester.

"If I could highlight the biggest issue I had with this campus as a former student of it, this would be it. Student life on the Galveston campus is non-existent. The lack of things to do on campus led to me and my buddies calling the place ""Galvatraz"". SALT camp is a fantastic idea, however it was poorly executed (at least while I was in it). The campus is not big (in size or student body) so having all the incoming freshman together for one SALT camp rather than breaking it up would increase bonding. The salt camp activities are also nothing short of a joke.

Also forcing students to live on campus at Galveston I felt was unfair. It was a very large amount to pay to live on that campus, and not having the option to find cheaper housing, like I did in college station, is doing no favors to the economically challenged students. This could also help with keeping students down in Galveston as not everybody wants to live in a dorm."

If you want to focus on building pride in our campus, stop building statues that don't help the students in any way, and start providing facilities and programs that actually benefit the students who go here.

It mid

Keep the Galveston culture!!!

Keep this going!

Make it easier and affordable for students to engage with TAMU activities. Put yourself in their shoes - cost to travel to CSTAT, having to pay for a place to stay, etc. myself and others with kids at TAMUG have started labeling the lack of TAMU realizing our kids issues as "CSTAT privilege."

Make this campus a place worth living at over the weekend, otherwise the local students will just go home and we will never develop a community here.

Most of the events on campus should be based around the Galveston specific campus. The campus should have its own traditions in addition to the widely know Aggie traditions that already take place

N/A

No comment.

No comments

No comments.

"SALT camp is good as unique to Galveston, with College Station having fish camp.

Galveston Campus seems to have a lot of student events going on throughout any given semester to get students interacting.

We get a lot of emails with various events. Couldn't there be a TAMU Galveston home page with an event calendar, banners with menus to types of events, with drop downs, news events for current week and look ahead for semester. For example, maybe I'm interested in pool/gym stuff, but not pep rally stuff, I could just go to what I want to know about and not have to skim/read all these announcement emails.

But, I do appreciate that College Station lectures (like from Bush School) and other institutes are available via Zoom to Galveston students.

Galveston Aggie Ring is installed and looks great."

Student Affairs is a growing department. If they want that department to continue to grow and take on these programs, then they may need more funding. We focus on all traditions but stress the importance of making their time on the Galveston campus the best that they can.

Sure

The "balance being part of the Texas A&M College Station" portion of the report concerns me. Galveston has a unique aggie culture as I am sure you may be aware, but much of that culture is not shared by College Station. While improvements such as our adoption of the College Station Yell leader system are great, we have variations of traditions that must remain intact. Saying "Sploosh" during a yell constantly shocks those who may be from College Station and serves as a unique identifier for Galveston students. This is a small example but and incredibly important one.

The employees who work at Student Affairs are the lifeline of this campus. Organization lead activities are the heart of the student experience and without Student Affairs none of the amazing events that are run by students would be able to happen.

There is too much separation between student groups here at the Galveston Campus. Especially in the Maritime Academy Corps. Keeping the engineers and deck students separated creates a polar environment for the two groups of students. Deck and engine students should coexist with one another through all the companies in the Maritime Academy. As well, there is no uniformity between company leadership. One company can do something completely different than another and this creates several different environments within the corps. Ultimately neglecting the whole purpose of having a regimented program. This could be fixed by having more faculty engagement in corps activities and day to day operations instead of leaving the student leadership to their own devices.

This already occurs in a variety of ways and is redundant if they did better research.

This campus would do much better as a campus you come to for a semester or a year as an upperclassman to learn as an engineer, scientist, or sailor and have real world practice of what you learned in class in College Station. It would give everyone the main campus feel because they would be main campus students, here to engage with the material they have already heard from main campus. Let the license option Corp fold into the College Station Corp. Yes it is different and there is plenty of room for difference in uniforms, traditions, and responsibilities but it would make them a part of the real thing. As campus stands, it feels to me like a poorly made replica not a real part of the real thing.

This is already the case

This is fine

Traditions and programs do need the oversight of Student Affairs

Veterans don't have one so let's work to get one established. Our veterans are nearly twice the age of the student body and have different life experiences which require different needs. There should be a program where we reach out to incoming veterans introduce ourselves and let them know they will be part of an orientation where they will meet with and visit key places and personnel. Our veterans need to have an opportunity to meet and interact with the other veterans on this campus and therefore should have a similar team building event such as College Station but more centralized around the water (e.g., Deep Sea Fishing, Sailing, etc).

We need more people to help sponsor on campus orgs. Especially those involving the sea and local environment.

While basing traditions off College Station (which isn't a bad idea) it needs to be stressed that we are NOT college station. We do not have the numbers, resources, or space that college station has, so it does more harm than good to treat Galveston exactly like College Station. An example being the fish last semester were cut from the NROTC program if they did not pass the initial PFA. College Station does this because they have the numbers to justify cutting that many people. We do not have those numbers down here, and also because we were unaware this was going to happen, we went from having a good-sized unit to barely having enough people to do colors without rotating through the entire roster in less than a week. We were told this happened because college station does that and the higher ups wanted to follow more in line with them, but the midshipmen ended up suffering as a result.

Yes

Former Student

Agree

Agree.

All Galveston programs should focus on building a Galveston-specific community, especially if the requirement to live on campus will continue. Galveston Sea Aggies are unique.

Allow former students back on campus to fish, or make it clear to students before starting that they will not be welcomed back on campus.

As a former TAMUG student, I was aware of opportunities to participate in Main Campus traditions (Yell Practice, etc.) I believe that the unspoken

Attendance has dropped significantly at TAMUG due to the lack of student affairs and how miserable it feels to be stuck down there. Make it enjoyable to be there, and worthwhile to want to go to TAMUG to be the best mariner you can be.

focus more on galvestonm

"I agree with the statement

"

I agree with these recommendations. The question is how to make the Galveston campus a desired destination. Again, I would seek partnership with the city to see how they could enhance life for Aggies. They seem to do a good job attracting tourists and this re-org would surely help diversify their economy

I agree.

Love this. Sea Camp is a treasure that needs all the support to run efficiently and effectively.

no comment

One Item you missed is to break down barriers based on campus for student activities and , while time and logistics may create barriers, any administrative barriers should be removed. As a side note. I was U4 Senior Galveston student who wanted to take 2 semesters of classes in college station that met my degree program, however the administrative hurdles to pull this off were challenging. When BCS staff realized what I had done, I received a call from an assistant dean of academics, who made me feel like a second rate aggie because I wasn't admitted to BCS but rather TAMUG. We need to keep in mind that Aggies are Aggies, and free movement between campuses should be allowed while keeping ones academic major.

Pay student wages similar to those in college station. A majority of student workers in Galveston are paid minimum wage, whereas the same position is paid significantly more at college station. (Necessary jobs like Resident Assistants are paid minimum wage and don't receive a real discount to room and board)

provide more student activities. there are many events but few activities. as a student the on campus options are fishing and sports. there are very few club activities. They will never be as large as College station and may require more funding to get numbers up but it will cause more students to want to go there and get the ones that already do more active in the campus. The clubs need more funding, some such as the band and choir should be restructured to be under College Station Music activities.

Salt camp was good, there were some counselors during my time that weren't in it for the right reasons. I thought camp was good, it helped me find my friends. But definitely needs more work to be closer to fish camp in cstat

"Shared services does seem to be a sensible approach here.

"

TAMUG could do more to promote students staying at campus on the weekends. We have been so disappointed with the campus and lack of engagement or activities (no inter mural sports, etc) to entice students to remain on campus on the weekends. This is not the same experience that students are getting at CS. The facilities, dorms, etc are so outdated where CS campus has all state of the art facilities yet we pay the same costs as if the students were on main campus.

There is no campus life for Galveston students -- no music/concerts, no theater productions, no significant speaker series, no rehearsal hall for students with instruments, no art gallery, etc. No quality of campus life for the students. It is an absolute shame and is something I hear from students all the time.

"Tradition is what brought both my husband and I into the Aggie family and we are proud Former Students. Tradition is important - we should not expect, nor want to find ourselves just as bland and cookie cutter as other Universities.

"

Upperclassman in the Maritime Academy, should be able to live off campus in order to make room for more undergraduates to live on campus. This gives way for the uniqueness of the campus.

Yes!

## Faculty / Staff

"- Despite my emphasis on unifying the identity of College Station and Galveston, I still see the merit in tailoring specific programs in line with Galveston's special needs and potentials -- thus creating a unique experience for those joining this campus in particular. I think ""balance"" is a key word in this regard.

-One more recommendation that the MGT report has touched upon (p. 29) is having the Department of Maritime Business Administration (MARA) joining the Mays Business School. I highly suggest considering this initiative as it may open a healthy channel of collaboration (in terms of teaching, research, and service) between the two units--which is almost non-existent today. Such a merger would allow both units to benefit from each others' resources, expertise, and strategic locations. It is important to note that MARA is in fact a business school (with a maritime flavor), with a heavy focus on business areas such as accounting, finance, human resources, supply chain management, and marketing. To bring an example where this merger may create potential win-wins: the MARA department has struggled during the recent AACSB visits (i.e., a prestigious global accreditation given to business schools), as it was unable to meet the accreditors' requirements in terms of having a sufficient number of faculty to ensure constantly meeting the department's strategic missions and values. In other words, the department was seen ""too small"" for an AACSB accreditation, especially that AACSB is granted to business ""schools"" (and not departments). Here one may wonder if joining Mays -- which is already AACSB-accredited -- will spread the benefits of this accreditation between the two units, thus avoiding redundancy/wasted efforts to acquire it by MARA though joining the larger umbrella of Mays Business School. In terms of research, many of the research areas handled by MARA's faculty (e.g., supply chain management, logistics) are relevant to Mays Business School and vice versa, especially today with the increasing pace of interdisciplinary research across all areas of business. "

"Agree" Ensure management of all summer camps and other camps, as well as minor programs are under the oversight of Student Affairs.

Affordability remains a problem for students and staff at Galveston. The rents are high, any trips involving going aboard ship or to less polluted coastal areas may require student fees. Such fees may be unaffordable or limit the classes to people who really just want a vacation.

Again, the intent seems to be to take away the identity of the maritime history of Galveston and make this campus into something like an extension of CS CoE.

Agree strongly with the second bullet

Agree with all the above.

Agree! Ensure management of all summer camps and other camps, as well as minor programs are under the oversight of Student Affairs.

Agreed

Agreed. As the student composition is changing, there is need for more clubs and other activities to help student integrate. For example a fair to exhibit each countries food, dress

or dances would be nice. This can attract the Galveston and Houston communities to campus.

Centralization has taken away any local identity and forced A&M values on other programs. create Galveston based chapters of some organizations that work together.

Eliminate duplication and have staff mirror the student body. They need to be more conservative in Galveston. Right now they are way too liberal.

Engage actively with Galveston faculty to ensure these changes serve the interest of the campus.

Fully agree with these assessments and recommendations.

Good

Great points raised.

Helping TAMUG students feel like they belong (in any and every possible way, as much as possible) is one of my biggest goals in life. I have always been fine with not everyone caring about this, but I sometimes have faced resistance, criticism, and even hostility over this issue. The second, main recommendation in the "Student Affairs" category is wonderful.

I am concerned students will feel isolated by centralizing most student affairs services and programs to College Station. Additional support is needed for the offices on the Galveston that provide face-to-face communication for students so that they can strengthen and potentially expand their role.

I am in favor of this recommendation, but I suspect it will require additional resourcing of Student Affairs.

I am wondering if building community is something that never before has been implemented in Galveston? Building community should also involve staff and faculty.

I have no objections.

In practical terms, this is nonsense.

It seems like having orientations/camps at Galveston is important as there isn't much connection between CS and Galveston for students.

It's not clear what "management of all summer camps and other camps" means. There is a significant amount of content knowledge involved in the summer camps that isn't understood in Student Affairs, nor should it be.

Loosely

maybe!

N/A

na

no comment

No comment - this seems reasonable from my (faculty) perspective.

No comment.

No comments

No comments

No comments.

No concerns.

None

ok

Sounds good.

sounds reasonable

Student Affairs should receive more money and staff for community-building and belonging opportunities.

The facility should be open during the summer to all TEXAS A&M departments!

"The report emphasizes the need to make students feel as if they are part of College Station. Community building is essential. But there is also an implicit confusion over which community we are creating. Similarly to some other sections, the report seems to ask for contradictory things; it wants to wrap us into College Station more, but it also wants to celebrate our individuality. Giving our Student Affairs staff access and resources would be helpful; but curtailing their freedom to decide what is best/most appropriate for students here is not.

There are four main concerns with Student Affairs that the report did not address, or in some cases only tangentially addressed.

First, is a confusion between student and academic affairs. This is an ongoing problem at TAMUG, as Student Affairs staff continue to frame their work as "curriculum" and insist on its importance over classes. An overall cultural shift towards college as an adult day care center is problematic. We need to retain our academic prominence as a University – not emphasize student organizations over academic work.

Second is an issue of nepotism. Many of our Student Affairs staff are getting degrees from College Station. They do this as they continue to work here. This has the problem that they are trained by the University they are working at; at best, this is simply limiting the experience of our staff and limiting the kind of staff we recruit. At worst, this is a potential issue of conflict of interest. We need to be recruiting beyond Texas.

We cannot do this until we pay more (our third issue). Pay and retention are probably the worst among Student Affairs staff, which means we cannot recruit new talent. These are the problems faced by all staff, to a degree, but it harms our students a great deal when it is the people they interact with most.

Last, I worry that College Station believes they are supporting us well enough when they offer remote services to our students. Many of the services that Student Affairs provides simply cannot be provided digitally with the same amount of care and concern. We need to do a better job differentiating what can and cannot be presented remotely, and make sure that we have the resources to provide in-person services for the kind of community building that we need to encourage. In particular, it is unreasonable to expect that things like Domestic Violence support, counseling resources, and affinity groups be engaged in remotely. These interpersonal relationships are precisely what make students feel welcome on a campus; if we aren't welcoming them to our campus and making them feel like a valuable part of our community, they cannot be expected to stay here.

"



The words and thoughts in this question make me think of what is missing in our campus tours and much of our recruiting (speaking as a parent of a student who came to TAMU [College Station] for a tour). The emphasis of much of what goes on is about Aggie traditions, which are good things, but some of the brightest kids want to hear more about the education, the science, the cutting edge cool stuff that people are doing. Saying our summer campus should be within the bounds of Aggie traditions somewhat misses the point...our summer camp is to celebrate our environment and get kids interested in it, and in learning more, and perhaps coming back to become an Aggie later. Sea Camp is an Aggie tradition itself, on our campus!

These are very necessary changes. I highly support all of them.

They are doing a great job with the summer camps now. TAMU main campus, on the other hand, is having to offer substantially fewer camps this year because of re-org compared to last year. I am concerned that reorging Galveston's will result in the same problem for their seacamp programs.

This is fine.

To the second bullet point, yes, of course. But details are needed here. It is difficult to comment with no details.

Wonderful - whatever you say.

Yes

Yes, community and campus building programs should be initiated

Staff

" As a member of the Sea Camp team, I agree with this statement. Education outreach is an expert when it comes to minors on campus. We are best suited with others who understand the UYP applications and the nature youth programs. Although Sea Camp interacts with many departments on campus, Student Affairs best aligns with our risk management requirements and procedures. The report suggests that student affairs handle the risk management. I do not agree with this statement. Student Affairs is not best suited to support our CPM applications due to the wide variety in our programs. We have online camps, day camp, overnight camp, international camp, school field trips, and online field trips. Each needs an individual CPM application submission detailing our associated risks and our management procedures for each. Student Affairs will not be able to take on our risk management responsibilities, however I believe we over at Sea Camp can help to support the Student Life Department if they need to create events for minors. According to Cynthia Olivera in University Youth Programs at TAMU, we have the model risk management practices throughout our programs. Our transfer is a good idea; however, the report underestimates the magnitude and the outreach of our Non-Profit organization housed within TAMUG when it suggested that Student Affairs handle our risk management. Dr. Daisy Dailey has been here for over 25 years and well versed in the variety of our programs and should be in charge of our risk management policies.

I am in support of this merge as I think it will be great for everyone involved and look forward to hearing the ideas on how to transition our department smoothly and benefit student life on campus for all students including our campers. "

- I think you let students at TAMUG decide. It should not be university leaders deciding what traditions are important to be promoted to TAMUG. University leadership should support and not direct student activities, including TAMU traditions.

- none

Aggie traditions need to be supported in Galveston. When a senior gets their ring in Galveston and the travels to CS to celebrate. There is something wrong. There needs to be more of a connection to this campus.

Agree

Agree with both points.

As far as Engineering students go, there is a severe need for more tutoring resources and better faculty and teaching assistants in charge of running labs. We had a couple of issues with faculty or TAs that I found totally unacceptable and that did not align with Aggie values as I have come to know them. [REDACTED] dropped one class in Galveston as he could not get any actual help from the Professor other than "just try harder and please do not drop," even though he made a 46 on the first exam and a 60 something on the second. We dropped anyway so he could take it up here in the summer semester and he got an A in the class with the tutoring resources that we have available. Many of the paid local resources were not aware that the Engineering curriculum/classes at Galveston were the same and so they would not agree to help the Galveston students.

As someone who was highly involved in getting the volleyball club up and running there, I feel as if that student affairs aren't as supported in Galveston as they should be. Galveston doesn't have school teams (besides rowing) because those teams are here in College Station. So club teams should be provided and better supported and accessible in Galveston by the University.

Concerns regarding the bandwidth of the current office of Student Affairs and adding to the scope of supervision. We frequently struggle with getting information, communication, and leadership with all of the different components housed in student affairs at the time being.

"Current:

The lack of a separated section for student affairs shows the attention to detail and support student affairs routinely receives. The findings section is combined with Aggie Student Experience, but yet recommendations are separate. This lack of in-depth analysis as related to other areas shows the level of investment received towards the understanding of what student affairs is and its needs to support our students best.

Recommendations:

""Student Affairs is best positioned to handle the risk management and support of programs with campus guests and minors.""

While I agree with this recommendation, it highlights the persisting problem that student affairs is only paid attention to when something is going wrong. To most, a quiet student affairs is a good student affairs. Student affairs does much more than risk management and prevention to a university's reputation. This appears to only be a response to a reputational threat faced to the university. Also this would add another department to our already overborn tier structure that is highlighted before in previous feedback.

""Programs should balance being part of the Texas A&M College Station traditions but should also have a focus on building community, mattering, and belonging opportunities for students that is specific to life in Galveston, given this is a campus based on place."" Galveston specific community building is what student affairs already does well. It is all they can afford and is realistically available to them. They reference football games as traditions that are available to our students, but that is a massive undertaking. They require a 6 hour round trip, where students are expected to find their own lodging and transportation. It is an absolute chore and investment to make our students feel involved and participate in College Station traditions. This is why we have our own yell leaders, midnight yell, etc. because it is simply an unrealistic expectation to make our students feel included and ""Aggies"" based on resources, and College Station support. Our yell leaders even have an MOU with the College Station highlighting and reminding them that they are second class citizens to main campus. Everything located in the recommendation below the bold print has the same limitations and obstructions, resources and College Station investment and cooperation.

"

EHS does not have adequate input regarding safety and health of students and those who attend day camps or Sea Camp.

"Ensure management of all summer camps and other camps, as well as minor programs are under the oversight of Student Affairs. I am not sure what the reasoning is for this recommendation. I agree that Student Affairs understands minor programs, but believe the current structure has operated well.

Programs should balance being part of the Texas A&M College Station traditions but should also have a focus on building community, mattering, and belonging opportunities for students that is specific to life in Galveston, given this is a campus-based on place -- absolutely support. The best of both worlds."

Fully support.

Galveston Student Affairs is doing well to incorporate more traditions and student involvement.

I agree with the recommendations

I agree.

I concur.

I do not have an opinion on Student Affairs with the exception of the struggles our faculty members have with staff in Student Affairs not enforcing the Aggie Code of Honor.

Students that cheat in class are not held accountable. "No accountability" is the Galveston campus unofficial motto.

I think SALT camp is a valuable resource to students at Galveston.

I think that the Sea Camp offering should be publized more at the College Station location. Include the name Sea Aggie ,especially in Summer Camp!

Makes sense.

Moving summer camps under student affairs is consistent with the structure in college station. The direct lines to college station should be a change that happens to increase communication and bonds between the campuses.

N/A

No comment.

No comments.

No specific comments.

Oversight of camps by Student Affairs is critical to the success of our programs.

"Provide more regularly opportunity for students at the Galveston campus and students at the College Station campus to visit the other campus. For example, perhaps a bus trip is coordinated once a semester for Galveston students to visit College Station and College Station students to visit Galveston. Students could learn more about potential academic programs of interest if they are still undecided or want to change major, they could connect with students at the other campus and build their Aggie network, they could learn more about the amazing and unique experiences only available at each campus so they are better advocates for Texas A&M as a whole.

The students attending the Galveston campus would greatly benefit from more University-sponsored resources that aren't needed at the College Station campus. This could include trips to/from the airport, the UTMB health center, DPS, the SSA office, grocery stores, etc." Sea camps were not mentioned directly within the report -- would these now report through the Student Affairs structure?

See comments above regarding the unique and separate nature of our Corps of Cadets. Placement under College Station Student Affairs would remove the TAMMA Corps from the TAMMA Superintendent's chain of command.

"Student Affairs – this was another part of the MGT Report that mostly rung true. However, there were a few things that were confusing

1. Alignment with College Station is very high here. If one were to survey Student Affairs here and in College Station (as well as at the System Offices), one is likely to see that Student Affairs in Galveston is a Division of professionals that work very hard to set up, maintain, and honor healthy and productive relationships with their many counterparts in College Station. Be it Muster, Silver Taps, or hurricane evacuation, the Galveston Campus works very well with College Station, in spite of having to manage multiple lines of communication with disparate and silo'd departments on the Main Campus. What's more, on the Galveston Campus, Student Affairs has earned a reputation as well-run, efficient, and dedicated. In the last 15 years, Student Affairs has taken over more and more responsibility for running campus: New Student Conferences (from Recruiting), Wellness

(from HR), Corps of Cadets (from TMA), while their staff members hold outsized representation on committees across campus (Police hiring, Accreditation and Assessment, DEI, Camps and Conferences, etc.).

Given the above, it is confusing that alignment and attention to relationships would be rewarded by removing the leadership responsible for said alignment from the chain of command of the COO. With full respect to General Ramirez, it seems the suggestion to place our AVP of Student Affairs under the VPSA in College Station is universally regarded as misguided by the TAMUG campus, especially those in Student Affairs. It would raise more questions, create more inefficiencies, and it has already shaken trust from those on the TAMUG campus. What did we do wrong? Why would College Station suggest/support a change that would result in upheaval in what seems might be what amounts to an attempt to fix problems that don't currently exist.

2. Regarding software decisions made in college station that affect our campus. Campus Labs is one stark example where our campus spent \$15-30k and had nothing to show for it because of decisions made in College Station without regard to our set-up -or at least that's how it appeared.

I don't know how this issue can be solved in a way that doesn't require College Station to check a box or give special treatment that may only end up sowing resentment or with our campus being forced to do more with less (we spend much of our time interfacing with College Station systems meant for decision making on a macro scale, while our problems are more individualized by nature. But there could be a way to change these via a mindset. If College Station truly highlighted what we do in Galveston -honored that we are generalists by nature, and that is a specialty in and of itself, then we could interact with College Station on an even footing by serving each other. We both have student success as our end goal, with different roles to play. Galveston Campus is there to help our students interface with College Station processes -the tip lip of the funnel, so to speak. Where that practice is already in place, there is success upon which to build.

"

Student Affairs does not nearly have the budget the Student Affairs division in College Station does. I would start there.

Students should be able to participate in Galveston activities and College Station.

The recommendation to change the reporting line of the AVP to TAMU is more significant than the two recommendations listed. This structure needs to be clarified in formal documents. It could impact the application of student rules, emergency procedures, alignment of campus policies, differentiation of the Texas A&M Maritime Academy to name a few.

The second bullet point does not seem like a recommendation. This is already a priority and from my perspective, is already happening. What is the action item here?

"There are certain traditions that are unique to TAMUG that should remain as TAMUG. The sunset parade and sunset salute are good examples.

What is being done to prevent overbooking of on-campus housing? My understanding is that there were many students offered admission to a TAMUG major (non-engineering) but decided to go elsewhere because there was not any housing available."

There should be a Student Affairs Coordinator located on the Galveston campus.

This leaves out the rather significant recommendation of changing the reporting structure of Student Affairs to report directly to College Station. I believe having Student Affairs continue reporting directly to the Galveston COO and adding a dotted line to the VPSA in College Station is far more appropriate. For one, there are already strong connections to College Station, including a weekly meeting with the Chief Student Affairs Officer in Galveston and the Associate and Assistant Vice Presidents of Student Affairs in College Station. This has ensured strong communication and alignment in programs and policies, much stronger than you will find at any of the other satellite campuses. However, day to day operations make more sense to report to the COO of the Galveston campus. If a parent has an issue, they are not going to call College Station, they will, and have, called the Galveston COO. When a student ends up in the hospital after a significant accident, it will not be the College Station VPSA visiting them, but rather the Galveston COO. Lastly the Associate VP of Student Affairs in Galveston is also the Assistant Superintendent for Cadets, who reports to the Superintendent of the Texas A&M Maritime Academy (who also happens to be the COO of the Galveston Campus). Changing the AVP of Student Affairs to report directly to College Station disrupts the organizational chart of the maritime academy. From a positional standpoint, it just makes more sense, but also quite frankly from a personality standpoint, the campus COO has an incredibly strong presence with the students. This has come through his activity within student affairs programs, like student organizations, aggie traditions, and the student activities. Quite frankly the students love him and detaching him from Student Affairs would just interfere with his connection to the student body, something that has been a huge asset to the campus since he has arrived on our campus.

This makes sense. I believe Galveston is a unique place and we should promote that as well as the Aggie values. Not just promote that we are the same University/degree. Wrapping the Galveston student experience into College Station seems almost like a demotion for the Galveston campus. They have a dynamic culture and that should be celebrated.

## Industry partner/affiliate

"Do more on TAMUG build community, student engagement etc

Don't plan cool events during finals, licensing exams, have more often and longer-so TAMMA students can attend. Corps prevents them or demerits rather than having attitude that's excused activity

Love family weekend, usually great presentation by dr Lang, great meet other families.

TAMMA needs be better represented in GUSA"

Galveston needs to maintain its OWN culture alongside that of the CS culture.

"In one recommendation under Student Experience, ""manage"", ""recruit"", through TAMU and become more aligned with TAMU; in another recommendation under Student Affairs grow more aligned with Galveston. These recommendations are contradictory."

No comments

Student Affairs is greatly understaffed and needs more support in employees. Students need opportunities - especially off campus to be part of the on campus activities. They also need more funding... especially for food pantry.

Student Affairs should have a heavier focus on mental health. Help the counseling office have more resources and counselors for the students. Students need counselors, and that department is so small and they need a larger team. Students mental health should be number 1 on the "what's the most important?"

Support recommendations

There is certainly an aspect of uniqueness to the Galveston Campus and that should be welcomed and supported, but that in no way should exclude it from the overall engagement as a part of Aggieland.

Board of Visitors member

- All university programs should stress the core values, integrity, and character that separate Aggies from other universities, and has attributed to the unrivaled reputation that all Aggies and Texas A&M University hold with great pride today.

Agree

Agree - no additional comments.

Competition between UCLA, UC Berkely in football, and independent campus autonomy, identities and traditions across the UC system has made UC system superior to Texas' strategy of higher education. That is too bad.

I certainly believe College Station should be involved in the creation and management of summer camps, but it's such a localized event, I don't understand why it wouldn't be up to the Galveston campus to know what works best locally. How can you find the balance of building community and what happens in Galveston if this is managed out of College

Station.... that's like saying the Qatar campus knows best on how to manage and coordinate Fish Camp in College Station. I don't think so.

I don't like either choice

It doesn't matter what we have to say, you didn't even bother to read the feedback on the changes you made to college station. It's insulting that you would even attempt to try this again knowing full well you'll do whatever you want.

"no comments to add

"

The second bullet point is a bit of a Word Salad - and I'm not entirely sure what it is trying to say or accomplish. My comment may sound a little trite - but I think it is critical that recommendations and their purpose are clear to all, so that the end goal is achieved. Unity in student affairs programs are important and must be embraced. Aggies are Aggies.  
Unknown

acceptable

Agree with the recommendation

Agreed on all accounts. And Sea Aggies should be invited to be part of larger traditions at College Station as well.

Are they contacting the students on the Galveston campus who are in the College Station programs (e.g. Ocean Engineering Department)?

Does this include Sea Camp? Someone really needs to look into Sea Camp and how it has been mismanaged for many years. A once profitable program is now constantly in the red due to bad management. And this was before the excuse of COVID.

Dr. Quigg is a better fit to be in charge of student affairs at Galveston campus.

Galveston campus has some health concerns such as mold problems in dormitories and asbestos in old classroom buildings.

"I am not sure I understand what it means to "ensure management of all summer camps and other campus, as well as minor programs are under the oversight of Student Affairs". The proposed org chart did not move "outreach programs" under Student Affairs, which is the area that host sea camp for minors. This is just one of the many inconsistencies in MGT's recommendations. For the money spent, I feel we did not get what we paid for and if this was a paper for a class, it would fail. MGT also chose the absolute worst time to come, when faculty and students had already departed after the spring semester.

It also needs to be stated that we have our own set of Student Rules so changing the reporting structure alone will not provide the same student experience.

"

I think that having a shuttle at set times between our campus and the CS campus could be very valuable.

"If Sea Camp and all their programs are moving to be under Student Affairs, does it mean that they will be managed properly? Does that mean the staff will have to follow the same rules as all the other staff on campus?"



Sea Camp programs is for minors. Student affairs activities are all geared to undergraduate students. This looks like a problem waiting to happen. Dr Thomas keeps talking about developing an education and outreach group. This is already the base for what she talks about doing. Guess I do not understand why Galveston would mess with things this way.

If this is about student affairs, can you please think about doing something for our international students. They are Aggies too but do not get a good experience." Isn't a staff member leading the Office of Student Affairs? Perhaps someone like Dr. Quigg or Dr. DiGeorgio should lead Student Affairs.

Leave summer camps and other camps the responsibility of each campus. Do you really expect someone in CS to understand all the aspects of Galveston campus life?

None

Remove Corps of Cadet and Liaison from Student Affairs oversight. Both of these are actually academic requirements. NROTC offers courses and historically considered an academic department. Corps of Cadet is a federal requirement for LOs. Best under Deputy Superintendent to streamline cadet experience as part of Academy, not an extra-curricular student activity.

Seems consistent with the aim of student affairs professionals. Interested to see where camps go, especially Sea Camp which is a chaotic and unstable department

"Student Affairs leadership needs to be more visible and staff is too broad and seems to overlap in roles but focus is heavily centralized in non-corps activities. Student activities in the Galveston corps needs improvement for the cadet's morale.

There should be transportation available for students to go to CSTAT during the week and during football season if anyone would like to just explore and take part at student organizations at CSTAT and vice-versa. "

The Texas A&M Maritime Academy Corps of Cadets should be under the oversight of the Student Affairs at TAMU Corps of Cadets so together the cadets can focus and share in the same traditions, community building and opportunities that is unique to the entire TAMU Corps of Cadets.

## **Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion**

- Tell the story of successful women and minority students to showcase their diverse participation in maritime programs.
- Revamp the SILE website to direct students, faculty, and staff towards services and resources located at the Galveston campus instead of linking to College Station services/resources that are not accessible in proximity.

## **Current / Former Student**

Agree

Agree with both recommendations. There are many emails on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion for Galveston students.

Agreed

As we are more small and a more closely knit community, I truly believe that women and BIPOC students have a greater chance of achieving more here than they would possibly be able to at larger campuses. I have firsthand seen women and other minorities positively change this school and not only would recognition would inspire more great leaders, it would also be good PR for the school.

DEI initiatives in the face of hostile living conditions are not meaningful. Additional affinity dorm blocks should be attempted, as LGBTQ students and minority students may succeed more readily if they feel comfortable in their dorms.

Diversity and inclusion efforts on campus are already one of the most funded and actively controlling departments. Giving them more money and more authority is the opposite of what a diverse campus needs when so many other specific student service groups and organizations lack elementary funding.

Diversity in the Maritime industry is a huge issue. Many women and minorities do not know about the tremendous career path this industry offers. Women are grossly under employed in Maritime jobs. I do believe this is a huge area for growth. Not until I took classes at TAMUG ( because I am in Logistics) did I learn of the incredible opportunities that the Maritime industry offered. There needs to be better recruitment material and overall awareness for these under developed classes of people.

Diversity, Equity and Inclusion are important to the college experience and the proposed changes sound great.

Honestly, y'all have been pushing this a little too hard sometimes. Putting the spotlight on select individuals inherently isn't diverse, even if they are a minority. I know some of my minority friends can get annoyed by this "special" treatment they receive; in reality it still singles them out as someone different.

I agree

I agree with this

I am all for diversity, equity and inclusion but please dont focus so much on the minority's that you start to exclude christians, whites, strait people, and Republicans

I believe that showing you had diverse graduates in the past doesn't do enough. Showcasing students without actively giving us proper resources or funding just isn't effective. SILE has to fight constantly for funding for programs and events and trying to have an influx of more diverse students without the proper resources applied FIRST will not work.

I think a revamped website would be good because I often find the redirections confusing. I think it would be important to tell stories of successful maritime individuals who were not strictly straight white men. I do appreciate that there's not a lot of statues on campus because they often become a symbol of the past unchanging.

In order to make women and other minorities feel safe on your campus, you need to get the rampant misogyny in the corp under control. Telling stories doesn't matter if women are still get assaulted and harassed.

Mid

N/A

No comments.

No opinion

Not needed, and if so shouldn't be a priority compared to the other problems.

Our veterans are often excluded and prevented from participating in events on this campus as we are too old or don't live on campus. We live in the community but are not permitted to partake in the opportunities afford the other students. However, when we try to start a combatives class for women taught by women we are denied as it is not inclusive. The hypocrisy is not lost on the females on this campus when we had to report to the females that only the university is allowed to exclude people.

Revamp the SILE website to direct students, faculty, and staff towards services and resources located at the Galveston campus instead of linking to College Station services/resources that are not accessible in proximity.

Sounds good to me.

Support diversity

Sure

TAMU's recent choice to discard the university-wide DEI statement for hiring and admission purposes demonstrates that any DEI initiatives henceforth are piecemeal and not designed to encourage change at a systematic level.

The campus is very white and male so there does need to be a fair amount of diversity work, but I feel the campus does a fair job at it.

The reason these initiatives are failing is due to the student body. Almost everybody there is white and straight, with an almost concerning male-to-female ratio (if I had to guess probably 5 guys per one girl). It is a waste of time to push for all of these things when the group of students they appeal to is nowhere to be found.

"The suggestions made in this section appear to be adequate but, again, my understanding is that actions being suggested are already underway. For example, there is a Women in Science Club that meets on a bi-weekly or monthly basis. I will always encourage more notoriety from under-represented social groups, but this suggestions create skepticism on the overall integrity of the report.

That being said, I do agree with the second suggestion. More specifically, I believe the redirection of "students, faculty, staff towards services and resources" toward the Galveston campus to assist with students is greatly needed. The SILE website revamp is a great start but the bigger take away for me is that the suggestion insinuates funneling of resources to the Galveston campus to assist with students on the Galveston campus. That suggestion would align with what I believe is lacking at the Galveston campus and would create more sustainable and equitable programs and opportunities on the Galveston campus."

They're doing a good job regarding diversity and inclusion, it's slowly turning more into a majority-minority campus which will further promote diversity. However, the inclusion could be a little better, there are still instances of people doing bad things such as being racist that never meet any consequences.

Well, you need to start with giving equal merit to kids, like minority scholars, attending TAMUG so that you can attract and retain them so you can have success stories to tell. What was there about Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion? There was information that said "this is what you should have." But how are we suppose to have access to something that the School cannot afford. You have all these big picture ideas but not looking at the smaller details.

While it is very important to celebrate these stories based on minority students, we need to ensure we're not forgetting others who may not fit under the minority umbrella since they are also making their own success stories. In short celebrate all success stories and include everyone deserving of the praise.

wokeness doesn't benefit anyone

WOMEN IN SCIENCE! It should be encouraged, ESPECIALLY in Galveston where the majority of Marine Biology majors are women

Yes! Galveston is NOT CS and they don't have near the number of opportunities CS students have

Yes, direct to Galveston and have offices for ALL departments (like financial aid) at the Galveston campus.

Yes, this is great. Women and minority students need more representation.

Former Student

"A link to an academic TAMUG calendar that is easy to find and updated would be helpful"

Agree

"Don't just tell the story, get them jobs! Work with D&I & HR contacts in industry and build pathways to internships and careers. Just talking about D&I just makes you feel good, but what makes you successful is to turning it into reality. Efforts should be focused on how to connect industry with students in these demographics.

TAMU is one of the leading universities in the nation for international student exchange, especially in the shipping industry, these international opportunities to broaden students' exposure horizons should also be present in a big way in Galveston. "

excellence and quality graduates is far more important than diversity!

Focus on diversity, inclusion, and equity concerns me as a SEA AGGIE Former Student in the maritime industry. The focus should be on producing quality mariners, as per the purpose of Texas Maritime Academy in the CFRs. Focus on increasing the number of students going on commercial cruises for their second cruise and maritime industry-style leadership, not on DIE.

Galveston Island is diverse.

Get rid of it

I agree with the statement

I agree with these thoughts. A successful program presented to a diverse array of candidates is key

I feel excluded and discriminated against for being threatened with trespassing for peacefully fishing on my former campus. I feel like I am being treated like garbage, and I am extremely upset that I was lied to for 4 years by every staff member for telling me I will always be welcome back on campus, but didn't tell me that if I did come on campus I run the risk of being arrested.

"Important, but hopefully TAMU can also use its influence to address the issues in the profession that these students will face once out of school.

"

It's okay, mostly 60% male so not much diversity with women and men. But that's because most women choose not to go to Galveston. Maybe they should offer more majors

No comment

No student should be denied access based on physical traits. This means that we take the best academic performers, period.

Resources should be provided for EVERY location - it is very frustrating to not have the same level of resources in Galveston that exist in College Station.

"Showcase what actually happens. Show pictures of a classroom or club activity or intermural team.

Showcase interesting stories, this does not have to be diversity related. Look at the College station corps media for examples on stories worth sharing."

Tell the story of "successful women and minority students?" How about recruiting women and minority students? And, to ignore the importance of LBGTQ students as a possible recruitment base is simply self-defeating. Please note: LBGTQ students like coming to Galveston -- at least, for now. No matter the politics of it, if we want to grow A&M, seek and embrace this growing market demographic.

Tell the story of diversity but do not make it the central theme. A&M has a lot to share, so share all not just one area.

The maritime industry is one of the most diverse work field worldwide. I've worked with every color, ethnicity, race, gender, etc. you can think of. However, the worst ones I've worked with are the weak. No one cares what your background is at sea, but those that

can't handle tough work don't last long. Therefore, those troublemakers and those who can't make it through the basics at TAMUG without raising [REDACTED] should be the focus of removing from the academy as they are the bad names and faces that enter the industry. Silver spoons and hands being held because of gender or race is absolute nonsense for a maritime academy.

These actions are promoting division and exclusion. Why?

This: Revamp the SILE website to direct students, faculty, and staff towards services and resources located at the Galveston campus instead of linking to College Station services/resources that are not accessible in proximity.

Wholeheartedly agree.

Why are we still dividing people? Let's bring people together and stop separating everyone based on race, gender or color.

Why is everything else being centralized to College Station except for SILE? Where is the logic in this exception? Are you trying to streamline operations, reduce the ability of the Galveston Campus to operate with any form of autonomy, or justify increasing hiring more staff. Something isn't being communicated properly.

Yes. The websites need to direct to our resources.

## Faculty / Staff

-

"- Women and minority students are still under-represented and I applaud every effort made to recruit, train, and retain them.

-I believe any activity related to Galveston's students, faculty, and staff should be accessed remotely from Galveston. "

"Monthly social activities for all, including LGBTQ" Need more than Telling the story of successful women and minority students to showcase their diverse participation in maritime programs.

Agree with all the above.

Agreed. Additionally, events that bring students and researchers together (annually? or every semester?) from both campuses have the potential to showcase the strengths that the marine sciences and ocean engineering programs have with two campuses.

As a recruiter for the Biology Department here at TAMU, I constantly heard from minority students that they were pressured to go into medicine or biomedical sciences because of the higher salaries. Marine biologists do not get rich!

DEI is important to creating a community of integrity and respect, core Aggie Values.

Unfortunately the State of Texas is determined to eradicate this aspect of our Traditions.

For D.E.I. to be anything other than a hoax or lip-service, ethnic diversity must be created at the leadership level, at Galveston and throughout TAMU!

Good

Good ideas.

Great! Promote monthly activities for minors and tell the story of successful women and minority students to showcase their diverse participation in maritime programs.

Have programs for both faculty and students of minority descent. There should be ways to deal with people who racially abuse colleagues.

"I am not in disagreement with recommendations made for DEI, but I'd love to see more incentivisation or resources for faculty (in particular) to join DEI work. At present, it's primarily staff who support the operations of the 1973 Center and the Office of Diversity, I'd love to imagine ways that DEI work could become faculty initiatives, as well.

I'd particularly like to see more DEI resources for actually classroom delivery, but the DEI program is crucially underfunded. It could be transformed with an infusion of resources that would allow for the development of a variety of offerings such as a Women's Resource center, such as College Station has.

"

i am supportive of these initiatives. i have incorporated assignments into my [REDACTED] (Oceanography) course that allow students to learn about important oceanographers, specifically including scientists from groups traditionally underrepresented in Ocean Science alongside more recognized names like Darwin, Sverdrup, etc. i would be happy to discuss incorporation of decolonizing exercises in marine science curriculum

I am surprised that DEI activities still matter.

"I feel that we should be showcasing our underrepresented populations in all marine fields beyond just maritime fields. This should be a common theme across campus. We need to provide resources to our underrepresented populations of students and our international students. We need to incorporate transportation into this conversation as well. Currently there is no university nor public transportation to serve our students that do not have their own vehicle traffic. This needs to be considered as we continue to recruit a diverse population of students/faculty/staff. We should consider having a TAMUG van to facilitate transportation of students to get basic necessities such as groceries and personal hygiene supplies.

Yes TAMUG students need to be directed to resources available to them here on the TAMUG campus. If there are online services that TAMUG students can access they should also be directed to those resources. TAMUG students need to clearly be aware of how to access health care on the island as well and they need transportation provided by TAMUG to those facilities. "

I hate this topic

I have no objections.

I strongly support the continued efforts to share DEI success stories and to provide educations and training resources and opportunities for us all to continue a journey of self- and community-improvement. I hope that we can continue to work as a community to improve the climate of support and welcoming in the classroom and on campus.

I think this is a good start.

In favor. However, DEI has to be more than just revamping a website.

Merit is never considered in these programs.

Minorities and minoritized groups are extremely underrepresented in ocean-orientated careers. Any efforts to address this imbalance would be welcome and are necessary for representative management of ocean resources and development of the blue economy. More needs to be done not just for students but also faculty. When racially discriminated against because of color or gender is demoralizing. There should be a safe place for faculty as well. One of the key places will be pay equity irrespective of color or gender. Each should be treated based on their output and credentials.

Much work needs to be done across the entire university on this issue.

My comment and recommendation is to be sure that we have a statement addressing that we are serving to ALL the citizen of the state of TX in multiple ways. It also implies to have a very firm commitment improving formal and informal education in the city of Galveston.

N/A

No comment

No comment.

No Comments

No concerns.

None

ok



One of the advantages of the Galveston Campus is its proximity to the diverse city of Houston. Increasing investment in programs that recruit locally could be very helpful, and could help more underserved students access higher education.

Revamping the SILE website to direct students, faculty and staff to resources available in Galveston is a good idea.

Sorry, I [REDACTED] and ran out of time to answer this question.

Sounds good

sounds good to me.N

sounds reasonable

TAMU should continually strive to provide opportunities and access to underrepresented groups. The bright young minds across all of Texas and beyond should be represented - this is part of what the land-grant mission is supposed to encompass.

Tell the story and highlight benefits

Telling the story of successful women and minority students is not DEI. Successful DEI is about ensuring all students have a seat at the table and are afforded the opportunity to be successful. Telling stories does not achieve this. Acknowledging where a student comes from and their story is the first step toward an equitable university education.

The DEI resources in Galveston will never be as diverse or numerous as those offered in College Station, which serves a massively larger population. However, encouraging cross-talk between the CS and Galveston student groups could improve this. Also, if there was a bus between the campuses, even 1-2 times per week, we could facilitate more connections between the campuses to improve student experience.

The first item of this recommendation worries me because it appears that the authors are unaware of the difference between 'maritime' and 'marine'. At TAMUG we have both, maritime and marine programs. That point aside, TAMUG has largely failed to attract members of Black, Indigenous and People of Color (BIPOC) to our marine, but in particular to our maritime programs. A change in culture is necessary to create an environment where BIPOC students (and faculty) feel welcome.

"The first recommendation doesn't go far enough. Certainly we can attract women and minority students to campus with marketing, but if the financial aid opportunities and other services are not strong enough to meet their needs, we will not retain them and inequity will be increased for these students on campus.

The second recommendation is not wrong - the website does need an update. However, the writers of the report clearly don't realize that one of the reasons that the site links to College Station pages - particularly for international students - is because there is no ISSS on our campus and is therefore appropriate and necessary. A better recommendation would be to have a dedicated ISSS staff member to serve the influx of international students on campus due to the College of Engineering's increased presence on campus." The Galveston Campus needs to dedicate an administrative FTE to inclusive excellence in support of the land grant mission of Texas, and accountable to implementing the report recommendations (and shepherding all of the amazing work not highlighted by the report). This FTE should be a member of the COO's cabinet, whether as an AVP or Associate Dean

within the proposed School. The individual serving in this role would represent the Galveston Campus on the University DOC, and oversee all dimensions of the IDEA programming including serving as the chair of CLIDE.

The Oceanography Department will fall from rank. The successful women faculty members will leave the department and work elsewhere. This objective will not be met.

The report notes on page 17 under "Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion" that there is "a lack of visibility to valuable information regarding a student's socio-economic status, work study eligibility, family income and other life situations that create barriers for underrepresented students." The gaps in understanding challenges presented to underrepresented students goes even further than this. There is an urgent need to study trends and correlates of underrepresented student enrollment, retention, and completion. The CLIDE committee does not have the capacity to undertake this. Support for a systematic study of minority student success – undergraduate and graduate – is needed.

The two recommendations seem a bit limited in focus. I wondered if there was a missed opportunity to mention community.

"There needs to be opportunity for faculty involvement. This would allow the faculty to bring this into the classroom on another level.

The students and faculty are not aware of the resources that we do have due to lack of information provided. Updating the website with ""Galveston Resources"" is a crucial step.

"

These are really not meaningful attempts at diversity and inclusion and don't do anything to actually counteract the decades of racism and sexism that have made TAMU unwelcoming to many students. There should be much stronger recommendations, not just more marketing.

These seem like good goals, but why limit it to the maritime fields? To many people maritime means going to sea as a merchant mariner or in the military. We need to also celebrate the diversity in marine and ocean-related literature, science and business. And having the website show the local resources is of course very important.

"To promote diversity for its own sake can quickly become racist. Okay young Asian man, we don't have enough black females . So, even though you are over qualified, we will take the black female because that will help in our diversity numbers.

DEI is dangerous, bureaucratic, and expensive, and does little if nothing to bring about cohesiveness.

We are seeing more and more instances where community life has suffered because of the intersectional game that begins to be played.

And how do we determine the race of a person? Was President Obama an African American? His mother was White and his father was Kenyan. Do we go back to the South African apartheid policy of determining your race by the way you look, or the old racist south policy of ""one drop of blood"" policy of the Confederate South?"

To the first bullet point, again, of course. But again, details are needed here. It is difficult to comment with no details.

What do you truly mean.

"What the report includes on DEI is surprisingly minimal, given the number of important considerations we must account for at the state, institutional, and regional level. I therefore have very little to say on what is actually included in this section. The problem is not what is in the report – though what is in the report looks like Diversity work as it was done in the the 1990s, with no consultation of anybody in the wide and fascinating field of DEI in higher ed. What is NOT in the report is much more of a concern. There seems to be no understanding of the ways that our campus has built unique DEI initiatives. There is a possibility we might understand what DEI looks like in the Maritime Industry better than College Station does; and hence, that we might need supported in that work.

In particular, we need to include a line for a Chief Diversity Officer. The work of DEI initiatives on campus is large, and by requesting that already overburdened faculty and staff (who are wearing multiple hats) coordinate this work is unreasonable. As a side effect, the work itself remains haphazard, ill supported, and ill coordinated. We also need to present a united position on the state's increasing attacks of DEI work, and to do this, we need a point person that can take on the role of advocate. Peer institutions have appointed such a position, and have filled that position with qualified candidates formally trained in this area, preferably with a PhD and published scholarship. Doing so on this campus would allow us to emphasize TAMU's core values – especially "respect" and "leadership – through our DEI work, and would put us at the forefront of necessary national change.

"

While these are important and relevant for the purpose of diversity, equity and inclusion, there is a lot missing in these policies in terms of accountability. There should be a stronger system to hold people accountable for TAMU/TAMUG diversity, equity and inclusion policies.

Wonderful points.

yes

Yes that is important. We should improve DEI.

Staff

- I agree with highlighting women and minority students

"- Of course. Both are fine. The website does need attention. But this is also very superficial. I think we could do so much more to address how GV can contribute to being a Hispanic Serving Institution. There are opportunities to better reach the south Houston communities and industries.

-As one of the smallest TAMU units, GV campus has the highest proportion of students participating in education abroad of all other units. (Due to the Texas A&M Maritime Academy.) "

- This is the first time I have read that individuals should be directed to resources at TAMUG instead of TAMU, and it is in regard to diversity, equity, and inclusion. Why do we believe

that everything else from recruitment, to leadership, to marketing, and student affairs are best done centrally from the main campus, but diversity, equity, and inclusion is best supported locally at TAMUG? This is the disconnect I have tried to make on all of these areas. TAMUG should maintain all of these areas issues locally and not be centralized to the main campus.

"\*Revamp the SILE website to direct students, faculty, and staff towards services and resources located at the Galveston campus instead of linking to College Station services/resources that are not accessible in proximity.

What resources in College Station are also available to TAMUG students? Can they use the rec center if visiting for a football game? Can they use counseling services or health services there?"

Agree; fully support providing links to local resources.

Agreed.

Any activity to promote diversity and inclusion is welcome. But, I do not support the idea of moving Departments/staff currently in College Station to the Galveston campus.

As a woman and person of color I fully agree that highlighting the achievements and experiences of women and minority students in maritime programs is crucial in attracting and retaining a diverse student body. Showcasing their stories serves as an inspiration for others to pursue their passions and reach their full potential.

Based on the Governor and Chancellor, this recommendation may not be possible. HR site should be all inclusive and list resources located by proximity. There may be CS staff who commute from the Houston area who may also benefit.

Both suggestions deserve adoption.

"Current:

""However, with the increased enrollment of international students at Galveston, additional on-campus support is desired as primary processes for registration are not currently facilitated by the Galveston campus but outsourced to International Student Services in College Station""

Staffing and resources, I am tired of beating a broken drum, but there is a common theme to what is holding back Galveston from achieving the standard of the Texas A&M name. Many of the resources linked to College Station are simply because we do not have the same resources and abilities to serve our students. There is a base level of investment to achieve the same product, to a certain point, doing more with less cannot be achieved to the same result.

""Additional cultural competency, mandatory reporting, and bias education were presented as opportunities to elevate a more inclusive campus environment.""

We are only check boxes for College Station to meet minimum standards and commitments without consideration for aid in advancement or improvement. For title IX training we are all shoved in ASEC once a year to be informed once to check a box of a mandated standard then it is forgotten about because we achieved ""what we had to"".

The rest of the findings are completely accurate to the same themes, we simply cannot pull doing it well with what we are given.

Recommendations:

""Tell the story of successful women and minority students to showcase the diverse participation in maritime programs.""

To tell the story, marketing, requires dedicated, intentional assistance beyond the offices in 4th floor MAIN. Once again the centralization picture beyond the two newest buildings and the rest of campus could not be a greater divide. We are a university of two halves.

Diversity received such little consideration as well as their first recommendation is just an extension of a marketing point.

"" Revamp SILE website to direct students, faculty, staff towards services and resources located at Galveston campus instead of linking to College Station services/resources that are not accessible in proximity.""

SILE is exclusively responsible for updating their own website along individually along with actually offering the actual programming, along with other entities across campus. We can only do so much at the same time and expect a work life balance while also actually being proud of our work.

""If spaces and resources do not exist on the Galveston campus, efforts should be made to establish spaces with clear designation and resources to support diverse populations""

There is no if, the spaces and resources do not exist. Plain and cut. We cannot advertise what we do not have and cannot offer.

An office of now recently expanded to three is expected to meet the same levels of wide programming. An extremely laughable concept. This section literally has equity in its name. How can we be expected to offer it if there is none to begin with starting at resources and investment?

"

"Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion – this section was perhaps the most confusing. It was excellent to see the goals in place! Just having them mentioned and this whole set of proposals being given their own section was awesome! However, the specific implementations listed left much to be desired.

1. DEI/IDEA initiatives are about leveraging all available strengths and difference for the collective good. It's about making sure that the mission of the institution is serving everyone, regardless of position, race, creed, or disability. It's about removing barriers, not creating them. Currently, our population is not representative of our state or nation. What good are CORE Values if we aren't spreading them to all willing to do the work of appreciating them?

2. No budget – currently, these initiatives on campus are almost exclusively ad-hoc and funded through grants, and allocations from student fees. There is no dedicated, enumerated budget for any of these initiatives. Hopefully we can all agree that allocations

made yearly cannot count as a “budget” as it is still living year-to-year and hand-to-mouth. One could see why, given the current state of political interests during a legislative session, the word “budget” wouldn’t appear in a report section highlighting the need for DEI efforts. However, these initiatives can’t be carried out without structural, procedural, and operational imperatives being put in place. Systemic problems require systemic solutions. Lactation spaces are important, but signs for lactation spaces require funding, and in an environment where the current funding is scrounged and scavenged, un-funded mandates -no matter how benign- run the risk of being cannibalistic. Having reliable, dedicated funding is core to any sort of long-term, evidence-based decision making.

3. Personally, it’s pretty disgusting that we have to work so hard to hide that we’re good at finding a way to make college work for EVERY SINGLE one of our students. It’s beyond exhausting that we have to worry about the fact that we are trying to pretend like “Inclusion” means anything more than making TAMU work for EVERY Texan.

4. Here’s the facts:

a. Texas is one of only 4-5 states in all of the U.S. that has enjoyed positive population growth of college-aged students over the last 10 years.

b. Texas STILL isn’t producing enough college-educated workers to meet the needs for our growing state economy. We have to IMPORT workers from other states!

c. Higher Education in America was not built for ALL students. It was built for college-prepped students. That portion of the population isn’t growing and Higher Education in Texas is getting most of them already. To meet our needs for Texas, we have to make college work for those students who are not traditionally college prepped. Those students are more diverse ethnically, they are lower SES, and they come with a whole different set of skills that are worthy of appreciation.

i. More likely to be bilingual.

ii. Often have extensive work backgrounds.

iii. Often have plus+ communication skills as they’ve had to serve as their family’s translator.

iv. They are also increasingly responsible for supporting their families, and those families are increasingly mixed in their documentation statuses.

d. The need to embrace DEI/IDEA initiatives isn’t just the right and moral thing to do, it’s GOOD BUSINESS! Texas DESPERATELY needs these students to graduate and enter the workforce -and Higher Education in Texas desperately needs to enroll them -because the rest of the country is getting older, not younger. Flagship institutions from other states with dwindling populations are going to come for OUR students if we don’t. Do you think it’s a coincidence that Bama has opened recruiting offices in Dallas/Ft Worth and Houston? We need to state the facts and let the politicians find a new bone to chew on.

"

Everyone needs to be welcome on campus. Focusing on one or two specific group(s) is discrimination. If someone is good at something then support them no matter what culture they come from. Stop classifying people. That drives more division.

Getting to know (Insert name) feature. Outreach to high schools/colleges in the community.

Honestly? This is an embarrassment. This does nothing to actually better the experience of the women and non-white students on this campus that can be openly hostile to both groups. We need to provide resources for these students to thrive, not just use them as tokens for recruitment.

How can we call the Galveston campus diverse when financial aid for international students does not exist? Tragically, this is one of Donna Lang's favorite topics and this is especially interesting since she is the most over-paid, unqualified, unethical and unprofessional person I have ever worked with in my 35 years as a professional. I fail to understand how salaries paid to Lang and Susan Lee are rationalized. These individuals inject a cultural and organizational toxicity to our campus that I cannot believe is tolerated and even celebrated.

I agree

I agree with these recommendations.

I concur, but we must not shift from doing all of the work that is required and needed to serve this community.

I don't believe our campus values DEI work and that we are on par with Governor Abbott's narrow-minded view of this area. We need to do a much better job of putting DEI work front and center while also practicing what we preach as faculty and staff. We need to leave no doubt that people of different backgrounds are not only welcomed but celebrated here at Galveston. I believe that we fall extremely flat in that regard.

I had to search "SILE" on the tamug.edu website -- didn't know what that stood for. Also, I'm not sufficiently knowledgeable about DEI on the Galveston Campus to comment.

I would also encourage the diversity of the stories told. It feels common that TAMUG identifies one woman in leadership in the maritime industry and uses that as the blanket example and story for success. Having several and different stories will make this feel even more impactful.

N/A

No comments.

No real comment as I felt the Galveston was diverse and equal.

Our SILE department has been doing an amazing job at providing programming and support that is much needed. Unfortunately, as we are a state school, the current legislature is going to make it nearly impossible for them to continue growing. I think we need an administrator at a higher level to show the University's dedication to this work. I also am a firm believer that we need to step up as a Hispanic serving institution and define what that means and provide resources, training, and funding to help faculty and staff better support those students.

"Please do not highlight women and minorities in maritime programs only to hide the discrimination, sexism, and harassment they will face in the industry.

Implement more conversations regarding these issues, and begin harboring a culture of equity and safety for women and minorities in the maritime industry. "

Provide additional and more dedicated resources for international students and scholars at the Galveston campus.

Revamp the SILE

Revamping the SILE website is a necessity.

Some of the services/resources are linked to College Station because the resources don't exist in Galveston. Perhaps the recommendation should be to provide these resources, but that would require funding.

TAMU needs to provide additional funding to support DEI initiatives on the Galveston Campus to provide equitable support programs and resources.

TAMUG has gone over and above to include all and diversity is definitely emphasized. If salaries are included as part of equity, my response is that as a female, I make less than my male counterparts with similar job responsibilities.

"Tell the story of successful women and minority students to showcase their diverse participation in maritime programs -- fully support but, for some reason, I just feel like this recommendation seems too narrowly focused.

Revamp the SILE website to direct students, faculty, and staff towards services and resources located at the Galveston campus instead of linking to College Station services/resources that are not accessible in proximity -- support completely. Galveston students need to connect to Galveston resources. At the same time, referencing College Station resources can sometimes be appropriate."

the interpretation of diversity should be diverse, not only by gender and ethnics, The students the chose Galveston as their main campus are resentful of students who did not have a choice in going to Galveston and want to get back to main campus. This keeps the kids assigned to Galveston instead of main campus, with less student inclusion.

"These recommendations are a joke. The report itself was wonderful in assessing our issues as a campus in true inclusive excellence then the recommendations fell short by giving a few quick steps. Stop putting a bandaid on a severed limb. Our campus community DESERVES more. Our leadership should be pushing for more inclusive strategies to continue the work from our strategic plan for the campus. The most immediate need is creating and funding the work for a Senior Diversity Officer.

There should be continued support to create and maintain equity plans for the maritime academy, campus climate, faculty recruitment, retaining talent, and a campus wide equity plan. "

These recommendations are crucial to our efforts in diversifying the maritime industry and creating a respectful culture. Danny Roe has done excellent work with showcasing diversity in maritime with the Maritime Academy.

This sounds logical.

We are Aggies, however, there are no super Aggies. This could work as a recruiting tool to bring under-represented populations to think about different career paths. You run the risk of pandering and turning people off, while diminishing others' accomplishments.

Website resources are needed for students to easily direct students in need for student success.

yes

Yes.



## Industry partner/affiliate

Agreed totally. The diversity on Galveston campus needs more visibility and local on campus support.

All Students deserve their stories to be featured and shared. There is NO need to exclude or focus on one specific group over the other.

"D/E/I are of course, very important and should be emphasized.

But need to be careful not to divert resources unevenly away from the TAMUG major demographic of the young male student. When trying to increase student count, it makes sense to focus efforts on the demographic most likely to bear results."

Definitely link to Galveston services.

DEI is destructive. We once had a university and a nation that promoted harmony. DEI (DIE) promotes racism, exclusion and partiality. It is a recipe for "Critical Race Theory" and communism. The result will be what has always come out of communism: fear and hunger... always.

"Do more high school events and recruit, have a camp or perspective student day stay in dorm and visit. So many people do not know about Texas A&M Galveston, or its offerings or what I need campus. It is especially the Maritime and oceanography type programs.

Would be great info and build programs.

Recruit more diversity

Have more women's in leadership

"

Let each person or entity stand alone and earn or not their inclusion! Let no one have an advantage due to race, gender, religion, or color! Be open and fair to all!

- I believe that expanding and educating everyone on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion is extremely important in any organization.

1) Supporting diversity, equity and inclusion requires reaching out to women and minorities in order to promote the benefits of TAMUG, not just telling stories of existing stories.

Agree

Agree - no additional comments.

Agree.

"Ah, the land mine..... Emphasizing the diversity of successful TAMUG graduates is a no-brainer. Singling out specific identity groups for special treatment is not helpful.

"

All these issues are a great reason why Galveston and other campuses should be independent.

Completely agree with the recommendation on highlighting successful women/minority students -- and part of that can be showcasing Galveston alums (through articles in newsletters, campus talks, etc.) who have succeeded in the maritime industry. Galveston does not cultivate its alums like other schools do -- and needs to do a much better job at alumni outreach and relations.

Diversity is only what you recruit. It is unethical to pay anyone extra money because they are red white or blue.

Eliminate DEI

I think the success of all students should be showcased, including of course women and minority students. However, women and minority students should not be judged by a different standard of success. If the showcasing decision is based in part because of gender or race, then potential legal violations may occur as well as resentment by those who were not signaled out for special treatment. Even the recipients of the showcasing could feel demeaned if they find the decisions were based upon their sex or the color of their skin instead of the content of their character.

It doesn't matter what we have to say, you didn't even bother to read the feedback on the changes you made to college station. It's insulting that you would even attempt to try this again knowing full well you'll do whatever you want.

No Comments

The main barrier preventing students, staff, and faculty from visiting Galveston often is the lack of transportation and housing. If there were dedicated shuttles and realistic options for short term housing, it would make the collaborations more fruitful. This would make the connection to Galveston more equitable.

Unknown

Agree with the recommendation

Diversity, Equity and Inclusion programs should be dropped. They are done only for the benefit for the Texas A&M University to allow it to be accepted into the university community. How does the constant bombardment of programs, honor months that constantly exclude caucasian heterosexual males provide campus unity? It doesn't. Women and minority students have been on campus for over 45+ years. The doors are wide open for all who meet the qualifications and want a degree. Why should the successful be showcased when other successful graduates are not based on what they look like.

Fair and reasonable criticism. Only issue is that we don't have a lot of the aforementioned resources to even promote and not from lack of trying.

Galveston leadership does not care about diversity at all. Almost all administrators are White people on Galveston campus. The only tenured African American faculty on Galveston campus as of October 2022 quit, and we do not have a tenured African American faculty on Galveston campus at the moment. For another example, Dr. Yi who is a tenured Full Professor in FSCI, would never get an administrative position on Galveston campus due to her race. She is the only persons not holding an administrative position among women Full Professors on Galveston campus. If Dr. Yi were White, she would be the head

of FSCI. Even students express their concern over derogatory language used towards people of color in Texas Maritime Academy on a daily basis. It is hard to see any person of color along the chain of the command. It is well known among faculty and staff that Galveston leadership use different measures and standards towards faculty, staff and students based on one's skin color, and the most important factor in one's salary and promotion and one's grade is his/her skin color.

good recommendation

I am wary of a recommendation that suggests simply telling a story of successful women and minority students without a plan of action for further supporting and promoting their success on the campus. These students should be represented, absolutely; however, supporting these students is more than simply showcasing them in campus publications. It is ensuring that we have a campus environment in which they can thrive. Providing additional resources to Galveston for on-site resources to be administered through our evolving initiatives would evidence our commitment to the success of women and minority students.

I feel MGT let us down with their findings on diversity initiatives. There is so much more going on than an outdated website. Yes, there is a lack of consistent funding that causes angst as we move into each new fiscal year on whether or not we can continue our efforts, but it did not reflect our successes with the CLIDE committee and IDEA work. Also, local resources and solutions are needed to meet some of the challenges identified for this to become a reality. Blaming our leadership for not choosing to fund diversity initiatives is also not correct due to the budgetary limitations created by the funding model that we must be self-sustaining. What other schools or colleges on main campus have to pay for police, residence halls, food services, etc. We are not on equal footing as a branch campus. It is important and needs to be well rounded. The diversity, equity, and inclusion on TAMUG campus has not been full. Many feel targeted or used to promote political views. Opportunities, support, and professional development aspects should be positive. It is important that a salary study be performed at the Galveston Campus. Too many of our staff have left for higher paying jobs. At the same time a climate study should be performed so faculty and staff can voice their opinion of the current work environment. Let's all be humans & Aggies...nothing should be determined or rewarded because of color of skin, gender or sexual preference. Let's tell stories of success, period.

Need more programs here.

TAMU does not need to pretend for diversity, equity and inclusion. TAMU should simply do what is in the interest of students and staff.

"Telling the story of successful women is an out-of-date concept when you are talking about diversity, equity and inclusion. Unless you really mean you will just focus on maritime programs (again). What about the women doing great things in ALL the programs on campus. Can we recognize everyone on the campus and not just the people in the maritime programs?"

These recommendations are disappointing to say the least. It is 2023 not 2000. When will the campus leadership start to think about the needs of the students, staff and faculty they serve in 2023 and beyond?

Recommendations should focus on access to ALL students in ALL programs on the Galveston campus. And making people feel safe and respected in ALL parts of the campus, especially those in the maritime academy.

Recommendations should focus on the HSI designation. Why does the report not talk about this? Why is the campus leadership not doing more to promote HSI on our campus? If we are supposed to look like the state of Texas on the Galveston campus, then we need to be ready to serve all the people on our campus.

Recommendations should talk about improving hiring practices on campus and creating an environment which is safe for all that work on it. A campus where all people are respected including minority staff, students and faculty. The two recommendations posed put the horse before the cart. There is much to be done."

The only tenured African American faculty on Galveston campus left. Clearly, the current leadership on Galveston does not care about diversity. Many administrative positions occupied by non-white person got replaced by a white person. Perhaps Galveston campus is on mission to whitening the entire campus through different standards. Different standard being used depending on one's skin color is prevalent among Galveston leadership.

There is sufficient Diversity , Equity, and Inclusion efforts on Campus. Focussing on Race, gender, or ethnicity is discrimination; regardless of your intentions.

This is a great idea. Will there be any additional recruitment efforts for faculty, staff, or students of diverse backgrounds?

This make sense.

☐

## Academic Programs

- Clearly link related sea grant academic programs between Galveston and College Station.
- Combine the Marine Biology and Marine and Coastal Environmental Sciences departments.

## Current / Former Student

Agree

As a Maritime Business Administration undergrad, why am I here? We don't directly engage with the water, our industry engagement comes mainly from networking opportunities we receive in Houston. College Station is a little further from Houston than Galveston is but the benefits would massively outweigh the negatives. For starters we might build a real culture of academic excellence. There is an unspoken rule that there will be significant opportunities for extra credit because the department cannot afford to flunk you. For example, I have a 3.6 and was confiding in my friend (the only person I know of with a higher GPA than me) that I wish I was doing well enough to be valedictorian. He told me that when his girlfriend graduated their valedictorian received Cum Laude meaning I was not far from the mark. Depending on how this and next semester goes I have a real shot at it. Not many students, possibly myself included, would be doing so well were we at College Station. For one we wouldn't have the safety curve, but for another the professors push you harder there. We lose a lot of our best faculty to College Station and our program needs to be aggressively reworked. I think that goes overlooked because we are so far away. The point I am trying to make is this, the scientists, sailors, and maybe even engineers get something out of being here. They get hands on real world experience. Business majors do not, we benefit from small class sizes but nothing else. Here our education is what we choose to make of it. Graduating is almost guaranteed, learn or don't but you will graduate; there is no risk of not making the cut. It is not prestigious like a Mays Business School degree should be, it should carry some weight especially in the logistics sector. Our competition is the University of Houston and T.C.U., we should blow them away with the quality of our grads but don't. Move the MARA majors to main campus, being here hurts more than helps. Focus Galveston resources on those degrees that get something unique from this location. This could be a great place with proper funding and academic scrutiny, it just isn't the right place for business majors.

As long as "link" doesn't mean "move all such programs from College Station to Galveston," then that sounds fine.

Clearly link related sea grant academic programs between Galveston and College Station. College Station yes. MARB and MCES no.

Do not do this. As a student at A&M galveston. The marine biology and marine coastal sciences are separated and it works sufficiently. The degree programs work wonderful with each and do not need to be combined.

██████████ except the math department

I agree about the combining of Departments

I agree with combining the Marine Biology and Marine and Coastal Environmental Sciences departments. The departments already have a lot of cross-over in research and academics so why not just combine the two?

I agree, again this links with communication, please inform people of every detail.

I agree.

I agree. I also believe the school should work on professor retention with regards to the MART department.

I always found it a little silly that marine bio and coastal environment studies are different degrees

I am hesitant about coming the departments, as I am worried it will limit opportunities of those in the Marine Biology department. I would like to see more evidence of this being beneficial to everyone involved.

"I am strongly against the recommended merger of Marine Biology (MARB) and Marine and Coastal Environmental Sciences Departments (MCES). The MCES department and MARB department are rooted in very different research traditions, aims, and practices (i.e., focus area, methodologies, etc.). The MCES degree offerings are rooted in applied science for policy and management of marine and coastal resources. Furthermore, the interdisciplinary graduate programs are of increasing value to the career fields of natural resource management, hazard mitigation, and public policy. There are few departments across any of the universities in the U.S. and abroad that draw upon the multidisciplinary expertise exhibited in this department thus demonstrating a rare strength among comparable programs. While the MARB department draws top tier faculty within their field, the research, degrees, and courses offered by the MCES department align more closely with fields related to urban planning, public administration and geosciences. In fact, in many other universities, marine biology is housed within oceanography while a resource management department would exist elsewhere. Forcing a merge with the MARB department will inevitably shift focus of research, courses, and degrees available on the Galveston campus away from its current trajectory towards more traditional biological and marine studies and increase conflicts for departmental support, resources, and funding.

I understand the concern for increasing enrollment, however, merging two departments for this reason simply because they share a workspace and similar names is not a promising solution. I urge University leadership to defer to the decision repeatedly made by the impacted faculty and students to keep these two departments separate. The fact that this issue has been raised in the past with the same outcome each time should point towards apprehension among those most impacted. Alternatives to improve enrollment and retention should be explored such as providing more intentional coursework and fostering (new and ongoing) research engagement opportunities in partnership with Texas Sea Grant, College Station, and the local Galveston community. "

I do not agree with combining MARB with CES. MARB has a more difficult course load and is a biology degree. CES has an easier load and is not part of the biological sciences. They do

take similar classes but what I have experienced the CES degree is more for people that could not handle the heavy sciences required for a MARB degree. This makes each department unique and having separate departments allows for more options to students who want to change their major at Galveston.

I do not think the Marine Biology and Coastal, Environmental, Science and Society or in this proposal referred to as Marine and Coastal Environmental Sciences degrees should be combined. Doing so would force students of both majors to compromise on specialized coursework that would hinder their learning in their desired fields. While I understand the decreasing number of students in the MCES degree, I think it would best be combined with Marine Science or Maritime Studies. Many Marine Biology students are focused on learning about the animals in the ocean and aquaria and many MCES students are focused on water quality, environmental impact, and sometimes policy. The main job promoted on the MCES (CESS) degree webpage is for oceanographer or oil and gas consultant, whereas, for MARB it scientist or aquarist. The core classes may be similar because they both are marine focused, but electives in major coursework and career paths are not similar and I think combining these two programs will negatively impact students in both degrees.

I don't agree to combine marine biology and marine and coastal department. That would decrease the financial support to marine biology. But of what I think we need is more staff in the two departments, well paid staff and increase salaries for grad students. The cost of life in Galveston is increasing everyday more and more.

I don't have a foot in this race so sounds good to me.

I think that getting rid of the Universities study program is a mistake. If we get rid of the program, so many students will lose the opportunity to attend this campus. Oceans and One Health is under this classification and we have a program with UTMB to provide those students with medical experience. Taking away this program will hurt both parties.

I think the Biology and Coastal Environment department should remain separated due to each field of study is different in their own right. I believe there should be overlap of each department, like students taking environmental classes while being a biology major.

"I think the grants should be clearly linked, to provide less confusion.

I do not believe Marb and Mces should be combined. They are similar in interests (marine and coast life) but they focus on different aspects. "

I think the Maritime Studies program should have more recognition. It seems to receive the least amount of funding and recognition of all programs in campus but it is the only program that every single student must take classes in (English, history, etc.).

I would defer to what the faculty in staff in these departments want and not what this document suggests. On paper it may make sense to combine these, but that's about it. I would like the marb and mars departments to stay separate. I want my degree to say marine biology

If combined, MARB and MCES require an INCREASE in support staff, not decrease. Wait times of months to have grants set up, purchase orders fulfilled and unmaintained vehicles result is a dysfunctional research org that cannot follow through on grant obligations in a timely manor, thereby hindering future grant acquisition.

If the Maritime Academy is such a unique opportunity here, why is funding for more classes or better labs being addressed? The 10,000 HP diesel generator that we can't run because of the foundation, the ETO minor and nuclear science classes.

If you are going to admit so many engineering students, make sure Galveston is equipped to handle it...No advisors is not helping!

Include more programs in Galveston so students have more choice to stay in Galveston or College Station.

Make sure that students do not feel the repercussions of this cost-saving measure.

MARB is one [REDACTED] of a major. I would not like to see it not giving its full honor as someone who has continuously worked my [REDACTED] off. I do think environmental science courses should be worked into the MARB degree. I took environmental science in high school and my credit did not transfer which is aggravating.

Marine Biology and Marine and Coastal Environmental Sciences ARE NOT THE SAME THING. Students pick their programs for a specific reason. Students and faculty in C-stat hated the combining of programs on their campus.

Maritime Studies should stay the same, and not merged or dissolved as previously mentioned in this review.

move ocean related programs at college station down to galveston where they belong such as the ocean engineering program that is smaller than the one in galveston but is maintained in college station.

N/A

No comments, other than as a marine biology major, I wish I had taken some coastal environmental science classes (or been more exposed to them).

Offer programs

PhD in Marine Sciences is more inclusive and used at other universities. Should all the departments be evaluated for a broad solution. For example MARB, MARS, Oceanography, and several others would fit under Marine Sciences and allow student degree plans to have a boarder span of courses.

Please do not remove the liberal arts classes from this campus and force incoming to move to college station; science cannot exist without the history that it is built upon and the students that reside here deserve to know that history

Please get rid of some of these horrible professors please get rid of them this campus would be so much better without [REDACTED]

Promote the ocean engineering department here. Even though we are ran by college station we could use more marketing down here especially to freshman engineer

Push Marine Engineering, it's dying.

Sea Grant is not an academic program and does not facilitate courses, develop academic curriculum, or oversee students. Sea Grant, strictly speaking, is not supposed to affiliate itself with academic programs in an effort to avoid conflict of interest when assigning funding to projects.

Texas A&M University in College Station has one of the most state of the art nautical archeology programs and labs in the nation. There are many students here at the Galveston campus that are passionate about nautical archeology, but there is a disparity



between the resources allocated between campuses. One would think that the campus at the school would have more resources available for this program, or at least offer more opportunities for students from main campus to come and use these skills that they learn in a practical setting. This is just one of the ways that the Liberal Studies department is vital to the university. Many of the students from the Maritime Studies department continues on their education at the graduate program in College Station.

The dissolution of the Liberal Studies Department would deprive the campus of essential courses and experiences for students. The programs and opportunities offered to students in the Liberal Studies Department would never have been possible in College Station. As a freshman in Galveston I was able to travel for conferences and in my Sophomore year I went abroad. I feel as though this would have been impossible to do as an underclassmen in College Station, or any larger school for that matter. The Liberal Studies students are often the most potent campus leaders as well. Many organizations are run, if not created, by Liberal Studies students. Taking away this department would strip this campus down and take away an essential community on the Galveston campus.

The distinction between the MARB and MCES departments is very important. While the fields are interconnected they are still two very distinct fields. If it seems as though the MCES program is underutilized it is only because of the tremendous popularity of the MARB program at TAMUG. The MARB program here is the biggest in the nation and the MCES program as a stand alone department should not be lost just because it is being compared to MARB. There is enough overlap between the two programs already that people who enter as marine biology majors but match the marine science discipline better will realize it in their freshman or sophomore year. This is because both degree plans for 1st and 2nd years requires MARS courses for MARB majors and MARB courses for MARS majors. Combining the two departments will merely make it harder for students to find the resources they need and make the already huge MARB department bigger for no reason. "The first suggestion I believe is spot on and is probably the most beneficial and impactful suggestion made in this entire report. Not only would this promote significant academic and scholarly collaboration between the Galveston and College Station campus, there would be access to greater resources for students on the Galveston campus and more opportunities for potential students to be interested in. Additionally, funding obstacles could become less apparent for potential students resulting in stronger admission and student retention.

The second suggestion I believe is the absolute wrong decision for both the Marine Biology department and the Marine and Coastal Environmental Science department for a couple of significant reasons.

Firstly, the two departments have researchers who focus on related but entirely different fields of research. For example, many individuals (students and faculty) in the Marine and Coastal Environmental Science study natural disasters that may occur in coastal communities but are also more focused on upland or non-marine environments/phenomena. In contrast, Marine Biology individuals may suggest policy

implications that could have an effect on upland or non-marine systems but their research is reliant upon marine environments. While there is interdisciplinary approaches in both departments, they are entirely different fields of research that should be treated as such.

Secondly, the potential of merging these two departments could have irreversible and negative consequences for both students and faculty in both departments. More specifically, current students could have to reconsider research tracks, graduate committees, funding sources, and overall academic routes, which would ultimately reduce enrollment and retention rates for the Galveston campus.

Thirdly, the merging of these two departments would SIGNIFICANTLY reduce the allure and attraction that the Galveston campus has to offer. Marine Biology is a very competitive field in high demand for incoming students and should be emphasized as such. Additionally, research that is undergoing within the Marine and Coastal Environmental Science department has some of the most profound impacts within the entire A&M system and has received significant international attention for its robust and impactful research. Therefore, these two departments have vastly different but equally significant fields of research that should remain separate.

Lastly, I would like to instead offer an alternative suggestion for these two departments. I believe that more individual support in terms of new faculty and staff should be encouraged. I've found that professors within both departments are often overworked and have to teach numerous classes that are outside of their realm of expertise or rely on graduate student lecturers and teaching assistants to fill open teaching roles. An influx of new adjunct and tenured professors within both departments can be supported by increased funding that has been awarded recently to both departments and could offer greater support and better opportunities for incoming students. Additionally, I would suggest housing the various, relatively smaller degrees (in terms of number of students) into the Marine and Coastal Environmental Sciences department. Furthermore, I would suggest that some of these degrees either get renamed or reorganized to align more with current research happening within the Marine and Coastal Environmental Sciences department. Some of the specific degrees I'm referring to include Marine Resource Management, Marine Sciences, and Coastal Environmental Sciences and Society. Additionally, I would consider adding a degree program or two more explicitly focused on sustainability and resilience. Finally, I would consider renaming the Marine and Coastal Environmental Sciences department to maybe reflect more of the interdisciplinary resilience approach much of their work stems from. More specifically, I would consider dropping the word marine and focusing the title more on Environmental Sciences and Management. "

The Galveston campus needs to do a better job of advertising their programs as well. Most students aren't aware of all the opportunities they have here.

The MARE department needs staff that is more focused on bringing a premier education to its students rather than focusing on their individual research. Staff need to put their

students first instead of research and this could be monitored by the department head through class sit ins or statistical analysis of that professors class averages.

The Marine Administration degree program should not be added to the May Business School. It has been my experience in both business and commercial shipping that regular business professionals and professors often feel they have a strong understanding of marine logistics. Unfortunately, this is rarely the case. Adding the program to the Mays Business School would have a negative effect on its administration and effectiveness.

Marine topics are best taught by people with real world experience.

This could be done, but it needs to be done in a way that ensures enough classes for the Coastal Environmental Science students.

This is a brain dead decision as independence is important for department decisions.

"We need engineering advisors. As an ocean engineering major we have a great advisor in cstat, however it can be annoying have to play "email tag" for all my questions. I believe they should also promote ocean engineering more as a major here. As a freshman's engineer I didn't know a single ocean engineer on campus. The advisors and heads of department should work a lot more on recruiting more engineers on the Galveston campus.

We also do not need general engineering majors here on campus. Keep the school as a maritime focused school instead of turning it into a transfer school."

What are the benefits of combining the departments. How will it benefit students? Will it help them be more marketable in the job market?

Why combine the departments? To have 1 department chair to save money? They are unique departments.

Why would you combine these two programs. They are different in so many ways. A Marine biologist cannot go and get a job in a Coastal and Environmental field and vice versa. This will only hurt the school and the students which from your report is what it appears is what TAMU is trying to do. You would think with all of the research and success that comes out of TAMUG that TAMU would want to highlight this and continue to grow the school.

Former Student

Combine the Marine Biology and Marine and Coastal Environmental Sciences departments. - In Galveston? I would like more clarity. I think these should take advantage of proximity to the coast.

Degree plans are difficult to find on the TAMUG web site

"Do not see the need to combine these programs.

PLEASE PROVIDE BETTER FOOD CHOICES FOR THE STUDENTS IN GALVESTON. GET ON THE FB PAGES. PEOPLE COMPLAIN CONSTANTLY ABOUT THE QUALITY OF FOOD ON GALVESTON CAMPUS. "

Good organization. Only water-based majors though so not much opportunity

Highly agree with the first bullet. Anything sea related should be the territory of TAMUG.

I agree

I am a former Marine Sciences (MARS) graduate. TAMU/G. The MARS program was small when I attended and I had many close personal relationships with the MARS faculty. This was mentioned in the "Aggie Student Experience and Student Affairs" section of the Organizational Report. I believe it was an accurate description. I don't have a strong opinion about merging the MARS and MARB programs. However, in my first semesters at TAMUG, the course-work was similar between the MARS and MARB (ex. "BIOL 101"). The first years I interacted more with MARB students and if combining the two Departments helped to increase the networking opportunities a little more between MARS and MARB students, then that would be a positive for all students. I recall learning late in my experiences ("Senior year") that some MARB faculty conducted really interesting work (i.e. tracking mammals, observing sea lions, etc). If the two departments were combined, then Coastal/MARS student may not think they are restricted from interacting with a MARB faculty doing some interesting work...and hopefully a MARB or MARS faculty seeking student worker help in their labs would be open to either a MARS/Coastal or MARB student. Not just MARB. I would suggest keeping the schools united in such a way that the TAMUG students still obtain the TAMU Diploma! That should be emphasized/advertised more to potential students, if it's not already.

"I don't see how combination of Marb and marine and coastal environmental science helps those programs.

I also have noticed that advisors not being in the department that the students are studying is causing students to stay in school longer or miss critical requirements, because they are not guided by advisors who know the academic pathway and requirements. As well as they can't advise what is best for that student in that subject, because they don't have knowledge of it. "

I think MARB should stay separate.

I would need more information on the combination. I would consider adding Marine Biology to Oceanography to maintain the blue water aspect. I think Marine and Coastal Sciences is a stand alone.

If a student has chooses to attend TAMUG for marine biology and not Marine Sciences you will have students looking to transfer very quickly. This would be a huge disappointment. If combined, Galveston campus should maintain authority over their group of students and resources. They should not be dependent on the College Station campus. Galveston knows their students and understands their needs and should be in the position to administer to their population.

I'm hoping the fact that the 'academic programs' section of this is survey being the second smallest doesn't mean that campus priorities are focused on things other than academics.

"In my opinion, College Station and Galveston should not have duplicate programs. Sea Grant & maritime programs should all be solely in Galveston.

I suggest adding an industry advisory panel for License Option degrees & Texas Maritime Academy composed of currently sailing mariners to better prepare graduates for their responsibilities upon graduation in their roles as 3rd Mate and 3rd Assistant Engineers. As

a Sea Aggie Former Student, I do not like that the quality of graduates has declined. It dilutes my degree and my ability to network.

"

Make all faculty and professors make it clear that when students graduate, they are no longer welcome on campus. Because that's the truth.

makes sense

Maritime Academy should be totally separate from A&M other entities!

Maritime and TMA need to work better together. Currently they act like completely separate entities, but their goal should be nearly same: produce knowledgeable, competent mariners.

Merging the departments is fine as they both can serve a similar purpose, I do hope the degrees are kept separate as they do have a different main focus and there are so few good marine biology programs out there that cover what Galveston covers.

No opinion.

Out of State students in the Corps of Cadets should receive In State tuition like they always did until 2019. That school is way too expensive for the mediocre skills gained, and definitely too expensive for prospective students looking between maritime academies.

Restructure the requirements for Marine Biology so that they more accurately address what will be needed in career (it is redundant to take two physics classes when neither are practical to Marine Biology)

There is no such thing as a sea grant academic program. Sea Grant is a non-academic unit. Sea Grant solves societal problems by employing ALL disciplines. It is transdisciplinary as described in Sea Grant Authorizing legislation and regulations.

These seem reasonable.

They should focus on those programs more than general engineering

What is the sense of engineers, biologists, and logisticians collecting paychecks if they don't have freedom? And, by the very definition, the Liberal Arts is where students learn what they need to remain free people. Do away with Liberal Arts and you can kiss freedom goodbye. But, I bet you already know that. And, maybe, just maybe, that's the whole point. Sure, if it makes you happy, just take "liberal" out of the department name as was done at CS. As Shakespeare (remember him) said, "A rose by any other name would smell as sweet."

"Your report missed one major component of the TAMUG Campus. Because of the challenges in retaining faculty and staff, you are left with a core group of folks who do not leave the campus and administer the programs year on year. This leads to intuitionism and narrowed focus on what they have always done, rather than what they should be doing. The Non-research majors (TMMA majors, MARA, Etc) desperately need industry board of visitors to guide the curriculum for each major. You reference in your report how non-engineering programs are shrinking, this is largely due to the lack of connections with industry. These practitioner degrees are largely not in touch with the current needs of industry. Having worked in industry with several TAMUG interns, I have noticed that they did not have the basic understanding of general concepts specific to maritime business and logistics. This could largely be avoided by reaching out to industry on a regular cadenced

basis (at least annually if not quarterly) to build long term partnership to help guide the future of the programs while simultaneously developing career pathways for graduates that benefit industry members, not to mention any ancillary scholarship opportunities that are derived out of this partnership. TAMUG should be asking the employers of there recent graduates what they are lacking and what they are good in. Likewise Tamug should identify targeted industry representatives and ask them do they hire from Tamug and if not why. Here is a short list to get your started.

(SeaRiver, Crowley, Kirby, Matson, Hapag lloyd, Pasha) and these are just vessel operators. This list could be expanded to include oil compaines, trade houses, Logistics 3PLs, etc. "

## Faculty / Staff

" I do not believe it is in the best interest of either university or of students to entirely reallocate Liberal Studies faculty to related departments on the main campus and remove the nerve center of the currently existing LIST department. Such a decentralization is likely to destabilize Galveston faculty and cause them to lose momentum for crucial cross-disciplinary collaborations. It would introduce inequity into TAMU departments by making it difficult for their Galveston-based faculty to access resources with parity to those in College Station, and it makes them more likely to be overlooked in routine operations. Some LIST faculty (and their corresponding CS depts) would benefit from joint appointments, but I would love to see this as a facilitated addition to the existing department rather than a replacement. It is crucial for these faculty to have local resources (departmental administration, leadership, and advocacy) rather than having it only 150 miles away where Galveston faculty far removed from supervisors.

Liberal Studies (LIST) is an center of experiential learning at TAMUG that works with almost every student on campus through the delivery of almost all curriculum in the humanities and social sciences, in hosting one major (Maritime Studies) and several minors (Dive Technology and Methods, Museum Studies, Anthropology, English, etc.) Their faculty are in the process of creating a new graduate program in Maritime Studies and a new minor in Maritime Environmental Law and Policy.

Already existing experiential learning in the Department of Liberal Studies (that might disappear if Liberal Studies is dissolved) includes:

- A robust and internationally recognized diving program (one of the largest recreational dive programs in the US!) that houses one of the only minors in Diving Technology and Methods in the country and facilitates student diving all over the US.

The dive program and dive minor takes students from zero experience to fully certified professionals in Recreational or Scientific diving who are consistently placed in diving jobs immediately after graduation. It serves as the only year-round in-water learning opportunity on the TAMUG campus. It has an important retention purpose for students in a variety of majors, and it oversees all research diving at TAMU Galveston...without a dive program there is no diving research. There is NO academic Dive program in College Station, so there is no CS home for this unique program to survive under the current recommendations.

- The Museum Studies program, which hosts more students than the sister Museum Studies program in College Station, and places students in internships in dozens of museums in Houston, Galveston, and beyond. It has an excellent reputation; the student quality is so good that museum professionals in the area actively seek to recruit them for internships and jobs.

- The MAST major is fundamentally experiential and important for students pursuing a wide variety of expertise. It allows students to participate in transformational experiential learning including trips to practice traditional rigging on Elissa (the official Tall Ship of Texas), trips to compete in the Model UN around the world, opportunities to visit museums and to interact with research collections in the Rosenberg Library and other archives, opportunities to interact with local heritage sites (cemeteries and historic buildings), etc.

LIST is poised for explosive innovation if a few key changes are made, for example:

- The Dive Program has all the expertise necessary to offer advanced training in Technical Diving, Public Safety Diving, generalized Aquatics, Cave Diving, Underwater Photography, Underwater Archaeology, study abroad courses, Diving Equipment Technology, and a certificate program in diving for Grad Students and external professionals. If even 20 percent of this growth took place, the TAMUG Dive program would be the pre-eminent DIVE program in the US.

DIVE is currently stretched to maximum capacity w/r/t staffing, funding, and equipment, and ideally it is gravely in need of a more reliable natatorium (consistently heated, larger, ideally indoors so it can be lit for more hours of daily training!)

A natatorium could also transform engineering education (underwater robotics or submarine tech) and student experience (recreational/aquatics), PARTICULARLY if it could also be equipped with a wave tank. At present, programs are out of space...we cannot physically fit any more diving labs in the pool than what we have since we don't have enough hours of pool space available to do any more instruction, while sharing it with recreational users and other academic units.

- The Museum Studies minor and MAST major, supported by the ANTH minor, are poised to become preeminent centers for archaeological fieldwork training and museum professional training in Texas.

Galveston MAST faculty have already begun exploring a joint Certificate Program or Minor in Heritage Management Policy with College Station Anthropology (so far with some interest but not yet success), We do not want to compete for CS students...there is some crossover, but among students with similar interests, the Galveston MAST students tend to be more museum- and policy-minded while College Station ANTH tend to be more archaeology- or anthropology- minded, and these very different foci of expertise should be enhanced rather than collapsed.

A joint Certificate Program that serves both programs would provide synergy between the departments without dissolution of LIST or the MAST major. It would give MAST students and ANTH students a competitive edge in museums, heritage centers, and as commercial archaeologists upon graduation by encouraging them to diversify, but it would still allow



both to tailor their degrees to specific interests and would allow MAST students to maximize the impact of the public policy part of their degree (VERY important for placement in the heritage sector!)

The “anthropological/material culture” arm of the MAST program should focus on field methods and museums, whereas the ANTH program should focus on archaeology and archaeological conservation in such a partnership. Both programs should focus on offering core curriculum and on serving ANTH minors, MELP minors, core curriculum, etc.

In Galveston, an archaeology lab and conservation lab for regular student use have been acquired on campus and some equipment has been secured, but TAMU Galveston would benefit from support from the CMAC (Center for Maritime Archaeology and Conservation) and CRL (Conservation Research Lab) in the College Station Department of Anthropology to get those labs fully operational. It would be fantastic to be able to fully equip the TAMUG labs and have CMAC and CRL shift the artifacts most suitable for preventative conservation/museum conservation here so they can ease their burden and focus more fully on archaeological conservation on main campus....students from either campus could participate in labs on both campuses as desired to obtain a more well-rounded experience that allows them to develop expertise in both areas. The Museum Studies program could also experience significant transformation if a gallery space could be acquired on the Galveston campus, allowing for more extensive education in exhibit development that, as far as I am aware, is not available on either campus.

TAMU Galveston should be the destination campus for students interested in museum work and museum conservation, since it already edges out the College Station program in size, has access to more local museums and heritage institutions, and has built a sterling reputation with external partners.

Again, if LIST and the MAST program cease to exist, there is no home for the Galveston Museum Studies faculty in College Station...the primary faculty member in Museum Studies at Galveston does not credential to teach in Anthropology, where the smaller Museum Studies program there is primarily affiliated. MAST is, and hopefully will continue to be, an excellent home for the Museum Studies program.

“

overdue

“(1) A central part of the recommendations in the report for Academic Programs is that faculty pursue joint appointments in College Station. For this to be realized, departments in College Station must be open to this, which in the experience of TAMUG faculty has not always been the case.

(2) The report recommendations under “Academic Programs” notes: “An expanded strategic recruitment effort, specifically to graduate students seeking to conduct research

on the Gulf Coast, should be further developed between Galveston and College Station to capitalize on the existing joint faculty appointments between the College Station Department of Oceanography and Galveston faculty, and provide opportunities for additional research and funding to come to Galveston." While this is a valuable recommendation it ignores synergy that exists between other groups of faculty at College Station and Galveston, including the disaster policy faculty in the Marine and Coastal Environmental Science department in Galveston and hazards and disaster faculty in the Landscape Architecture and Urban Planning department at College Station. Point being that where synergies exist, faculty should be supported whether or not they specifically belong to Oceanography and Marine Biology.

(3) Regarding the merger of the Marine Biology and Marine and Coastal Environmental Sciences departments – I disagree with the report assertion that "such a merger also will help address current recruiting and retention challenges specific to each department." It will take significant changes to curriculum and programs to address those problems, not the simple merging of departments. In fact, it will be challenging to not perpetuate existing trends in the a new, merged department as faculty are likely to support a degree programs that reproduce the separate departments.

(4) Regarding the merger of the Marine Biology and Marine and Coastal Environmental Sciences departments – I am disappointed in the lack of attention to the graduate programs each department supports. There is significant value added through these programs, and there is a severe need for capacity building of these programs that was missed by the report.

"

"A new department may provide an opportunity to reimagine marine/coastal sciences on campus. A particular emphasis on resiliency would be the best chance for Galveston to distinguish itself, capture academic value for education and research, and build on existing programs. However, a detailed study was conducted resulting in the recommendation not to merge the departments. It would be important to revisit these findings before moving forward. Also, it will be important not to simply dissolve MCEC into marine biology as this will create new problems. Why not create a school and have multiple departments situation within so existing programs can still be maintained?

If the goal is to increase student enrollment, there is no evidence merging the departments will actually solve the problem, just mask it for the short term. External research funds and products are the hallmark of the university. If merging will reduce this activity in Galveston and cause the best performers to relocate, that will be a big problem for the research enterprise of the university.

There is a thriving group of researchers focusing on coastal disaster resilience, overseeing three academic programs, and bringing in tens of millions of dollars into the university with even more upside in the future. It seems that creating a separate department or unit that expands this focus rather than diminish it would be the best course of action. When we merge our physical sciences departments, the management/social science faculty would

be compromised. Creating a situation where these researchers are celebrated and expanded would be great for the campus in the future.

Finally, it should be recognized that a forced departmental merger never works well over the long term. There will be lots of conflict, uncertainty, reduce productivity, departures, etc. The cost of doing this could last for decades as is the case for other mergers within the university. Administrators would be wise to frame this as an opportunity to become stronger for all the right reasons rather than take a top down mandate approach. Also, the benefits and costs of a merger should be articulated to those being impacted."

A recommendation to link academic programs with Texas Sea Grant is a serious error, that will be costly for Texas A&M, and will jeopardize its relationship with NOAA. The consulting firm has demonstrated incompetence in failing to understand the difference between Texas A&M's responsibilities as a land-grant institution and the federal statutes that govern NOAA's national Sea Grant Program and mission goals.

A strong link with Sea Grant and College Station will strengthen Galveston. However, this is provided that Sea Grant and Oceanography stay in College Station. shared educational programs will ensure TAMUG students enjoy the same resources as main campus students. Additionally, having Sea Grant and Oceanography on the main campus ensures their role as gateways for TAMUG students to also participate in main campus opportunities.

Agree

"Agree on first.

Not knowledgeable on 2nd point of combining departments."

Agreed.

"Although you do not include the Dept of Oceanography in this list, it is shown in Fig. 9 of the document.

The implication given in the report that all faculty would "need" to be on the water in Galveston is not logical. Most of the current faculty do not use Galveston, and in fact most faculty have more diverse, global views for their oceanographic research and academic programs.

Yes, having Oceanography in Galveston might be useful for teaching students (i.e. for local field trips) but we are an R1 university, with internationally recognized scientists who conduct research in locations around the globe, so again this report provides a very limited view of how our faculty contribute to oceanographic research at the national and international scales and again points out the obvious shortcomings of the MGT report.

Recommendation:

- joint appointments
  - o For faculty in Galveston and College Station in oceanography
  - o For faculty in MCES in Galveston and Geography in College station

This would elevate status of faculty and the research programs of faculty in Galveston

To elevate the TAMU-G branch campus, which seems to be the main goal. Increasing salaries (already happening, according to the report) and allowing for joint appointments

will go a long way to help faculty recruitment and retention in the MARB and MCES programs.

"

"Any decision to dissolve or significantly alter the composition or function of the Liberal Studies Department would be a short-sighted decision based on faulty information. While the MGT report makes the case for dissolving University Studies, something that is already underway, LIST does far more for the campus and university community than is reflected in the report. LIST is home to Maritime Studies, a unique, innovative, and dynamic program that is home to dozens of majors, many of whom progress to graduation at rates faster than other majors on campus. MAST is an important area of study that reinforces our campus's special purpose as a home for inquiry into the Blue Economy and Blue Humanities. This program contributes to our campus's mission and makes the university unique. There are very few interdisciplinary programs like MAST at universities across the nation. Endangering this program and the LIST department would threaten the competitiveness, uniqueness, and innovative character of the university.

Besides contributing to the campus's core mission, MAST and LIST make the campus what it is. MAST students make up the bulk of student government and are visible in campus-wide organizations. LIST faculty deliver the bulk of core-curriculum classes including English and communication, political science, history, philosophy, and social and behavioral science. In this capacity LIST faculty are unique, engaging with every single student on campus. What's more is that LIST is home to unique and transformative programs like the common reader and Model UN, while also housing the dive program, a cutting-edge museum studies program, and a successful and respected internship program. And this does not even begin to touch on the research LIST faculty do, racking up publications, book contracts, funding dollars, and national and international recognition in their respective field. Far from having to justify the existence of MAST and LIST in the future of the campus, the entire university community should be thanking them for their service and for making A&M-Galveston what it is.

The MGT report has made recommendations based on poor information and a poor understanding of the campus. Those recommendations also raise many questions on account of the lack of clarity and forethought. What are LIST faculty to do if the department is dissolved? What would seeking joint appointments mean? What guarantee is there that units and departments at College Station would grant such appointments? Have those units and departments been informed of such proposals? The report is lacking in actually explaining what these recommendations would mean in practice which is unsurprising given the sloppy nature of the work.

Quite simply, eliminating MAST or LIST would make the university worse and be an abdication of the campus leadership's responsibility to the students, faculty, and staff. Following through on such recommendations would seriously call into question the

character and thoughtfulness of any leaders who would base serious decisions on the kind of amateurish analysis seen in the MGT report.

"

As I stated above, the report authors misunderstand the role of the sea grant program. Please discuss this with Oceanographers, especially Dr. Pam Plompkin, the Sea Grant program manager.

As other half- (or even quarter-)baked changes lately made at the A&M, this will lead to the destruction of one of our main departments and programs. I firmly oppose!

"Boosting links between sea grant academic programs in Galveston and College Station seems like a fine idea, though it isn't entirely clear what that means in practice. Perhaps one of the intended actions is the relocation of Texas Sea Grant and Oceanography department to Galveston, as specified below.

The merger between MARB and MCES has been discussed many times over the years by task forces that have included faculty from both departments and external (College Station) departments. These task forces have recognized that both departments have unique sets of challenges (e.g., MARB needs to improve retention, and MCES needs to grow student enrollment). A simple merger between the two departments would likely dilute these issues, but not really solve them. A more strategic approach, perhaps by reorganizing faculty among MARB, MCES, and OCNG (and potentially other departments in College Station) could help strengthen the identity of each department and boost the sense of collegiality and belonging within departments. There are already several synergies across these three departments that could be capitalized on. For example, 6 of the 7 TAMUG faculty who have joint appointments in OCNG are in MCES. "

By combining both departments be sure that the new structure is the result of an open conversation among all the stakeholders (students, faculty, staff and top administrators/leaders).

Collaboration and cooperation has always been going on among the sea grant related programs. There is a long history of joint grants among faculty from all three departments. Additional incentives to strengthen these collaborations have been implemented during the past few years between MARB and MCES. Assuming that appropriate resources will be provided, a move of the OCNG Department to Galveston will open up additional formal and informal interactions. In fact, the undergraduate curricula of OCNG and MCES are very similar, but are struggling with regard to student numbers. Merging MCES with OCNG in Galveston has the potential to create new synergies and strengthen their programs. On the other hand, MARB is a strong and cohesive unit with successful undergraduate and graduate programs. Merging the department with MCES could dilute this successful model and lead to reduced appeal to students. The shared first-year experience between MARB and MCES programs has been a success, but students past their first year tend to identify strongly with the department that hosts their major.

Combine the Marine Biology and Marine and Coastal Environmental Sciences department to achieve what goals?

Combine the Marine Engineering Technology (and) Ocean Engineering departments (or) Department of Engineering Technology and Industrial Distribution.

"Combining MARB and MCES makes sense.

The enrollment numbers for the degree programs are off or does not portray the entire picture. For example, one of the university studies program attract a good number of new freshman. Total number of enrolled students in the Oceans and One Health program for a few years were high (30-50). However, students typically change their majors because the program lack support from Galveston administration and faculty. It is an attractive program that needs investment. Provide new faculty lines that will support the program." Combining Marine Biology and Marine and Coastal Environmental Sciences is long overdue. However, there is too much history and territoriality associated with the current leadership and for this to succeed, the new Department Head search must not be an internal search.

"Definitely more sea grant activity on our campus with public outreach would be welcomed.

A straight-forward merger of MCES and MARB is not going to work unless there are a couple of guiding principles:

1. a national search for a department head who can embrace not only the scientists but also the social scientists. There is too much history between the two departments over the years not respecting each other's styles. Neither has all the right or wrong answers. And there is no vision in the current MARB department leadership leading me to believe they will embrace or understand the value the social scientists can bring, or even respect of the physical scientists.

2. Interdisciplinary research between MCES and MARB works well without being in the same department, so merging does nothing to facilitate it. The incorporation of the social scientists into MCES brings knowledge and depth to the best use of tools like GIS and community polling to strengthen the science and understand how to use it to build sustainable and resilient communities. So much more could be done by someone with vision who appreciates all aspects of both departments."

"Dissolving the LIST department isn't on the included recommendations above, but it is by far the most significant aspect of the proposed reorganization. The fact that it isn't even on here, suggests that the report authors didn't understand the role that LIST plays on this campus, including the fact that EVERY student on campus has to take LIST classes to graduate. Tighter integration and equity of services with College Station does need to be addressed, but having the largest faculty group on campus have to report to department heads in CS is not going to address that issue, it is going to create another barrier. The proposal removes the entire Maritime Studies major, and the second largest Minor on campus, Diving Technology and Methods, without even addressing either one, or worse conflates it with the University Studies degree program, which is already in the process of getting phased out.

Having an option for LIST faculty to develop joint faculty appointments would be fantastic for those that wish to do so. Several faculty have attempted this in the past, but there has been an unwillingness from CS to figure out how to make that happen. Forcing all of the

LIST faculty to do so would be detrimental to both the Galveston faculty and the CS faculty and staff in the department in which they will be forced.

"

Engage actively with Galveston faculty to ensure these changes serve the interest of the campus.

"Faculty in Galveston absolutely should have unobstructed and facilitated pathways toward graduate faculty or 0% courtesy affiliations with Departments in College Station when the disciplinary connections are clear and can mutually benefit. This recommendation highlights the clear to be more inclusive of the brilliant, critically important, and highly impactful APT faculty in the consideration of graduate faculty and courtesy joint appointments across the University.

The Blue Humanities is an exceptional way to distinguish TAMU and the proposed new School of Marine Science and Maritime Affairs from the pantheon of existing marine schools, and propel the new School to a leadership niche at the cutting-edge of transformational higher education. To this end, the LIST department should remain an intact, locally-administered administrative unit, and should be renamed the Department of Maritime Humanities, forming a cornerstone academic program on the Galveston Campus, ideally within the proposed School of Marine Science and Maritime Affairs. The existing Maritime Studies major is an exceptionally powerful and highly employable degree program, and poised to grow substantially if recruiting efforts effectively showcase and communicate the nature of the degree and the high rate of internship and career placement. Furthermore, the current LIST Department is creating a highly-desired Tourism and Coastal Community Development degree program, long sought after by the state's tourism industry.

While at face value merging MARB and MCES might address some issues in terms of absolute faculty/student ratios, it makes more sense to retain the two departments as independent units in a new School. One way to elevate the entire marine science mission of TAMU is through a highly strategic and powerful suite of academic departments in the proposed new School, spanning the blue humanities, maritime business administration (with its strength in logistics and shipping) and the sciences. An even more innovative addition to the academic departments in the new School would be spinning off a social environmental science unit from MCES into a stand-alone department of Marine Sustainability.

"

Fantastic - whatever you say.

For the merger of MARB and MCES, structures or procedures for the newly merged department should be developed to ensure that minority voices in the new department (such as those of management and policy oriented faculty, i.e. IDRT affiliates) are not drowned out by the majority voices of physical science oriented faculty. The emphasis of the report on including management and policy perspectives in new degree programs suggests that perhaps there might be some justification/backing for taking steps to ensure the new department's structure gives voice to faculty working in these areas.

Good ideas, but these ideas existed for long time.

Good sharing of resources

"great suggestion.

"

Have the departments that will be merged in agreement with the merger? If not, why not? How about moving the sea grant academic programs to Galveston, and have stuff that has to do with the sea, at the sea.

I also think we must consider placing the Maritime Business Administration Department under the Mays Business School. Bringing Oceanography Department here is a great suggestion. Aggies by the Sea is the best home for the Oceanography Dept. New faculty need a more structured orientation and training from College Station so they are not caught wanting.

"I am a proponent for the merge of MARB and MCES especially if it provides the opportunity to bring our faculty together more collaborative opportunities. I do believe there are large disparities across the departments currently in terms of course loads (# of students in each course), in salaries and in leadership. I feel that this would be an opportunity for MARB to share the teaching load to decrease our student to professor ratio. I think that MCES faculty could take on larger course sizes to ease some of the lift on MARB faculty. I also feel that this would be a great opportunity to address the salary inequities between MARB and MCES. MARB faculty salaries should be brought up to that of the MCES department faculty. What a great opportunity to get equity across departments!

I also think that bringing these faculty under the same leadership will elevate the expectations of the MCES faculty. The MCES department has experienced lack of proper leadership for decades and I believe the MCES faculty will benefit from having more structure.

I know there will be challenges with this merge of departments but I feel that there will be positive outcomes. The salary inequities must be resolved for us to grow as merged departments."

I am not certain it is necessary to combine these two departments, as they sound different to me. Degrees in biology and in environmental sciences, even without the "Marine" designation, are quite different in scope and focus.

"I am quite surprised that there is no space to comment on the suggestion to eliminate the department of liberal studies (LIST), so I am commenting on it here. I found the report vague on the process of elimination, and after discussion with TAMUG administrators, I am still lacking clarity on a few key points:

1. The report recommended that LIST faculty pursue joint appointments with appropriate departments in College Station. I appreciate and welcome the suggestion to strengthen our relationships with College Station. I see clear benefits. Less clear is what that process would look like. Would administrators help broker such an appointment? In the past, our department has attempted to get grad status in the appropriate College Station departments, and despite good will, there seemed no administrative path forward. We



were told those on the instructional track were barred from grad status all together. I am concerned that even if there was good will on the behalf of College Station, there would be structural barriers to securing joint appointments. I would like to see strong administrative support to help this happen.

2. If LIST faculty were unable to negotiate a joint appointment, would their contracts be terminated, should the LIST department be eliminated? Also, if the LIST department was eliminated, joint appointments would not be possible, right, as it takes two departments? Also, if the LIST department was eliminated, who would be responsible for the oversight and responsibility of the faculty left on the Galveston campus? If it were the College Station heads of the departments in which the "joint" appointments were held, I have concerns that it would difficult for them to understand the context in which the Galveston faculty operate- this could have important impacts on faculty abilities to carry about important job functions, especially service, as well as on abilities to achieve promotion and tenure.

3. I am in agreement that the university studies programs should be phased out, and indeed, we are already in the process of doing so. However, there is no mention of the Maritime Studies (MAST) program. My hope is that the intent is to retain the program. It is by far the best performing social science/humanities program on an otherwise STEM-centric campus. Although MAST is a destination major itself, it also serves as home to several former MARB or MARS students who decided those majors were not for them but desired to stay on the Galveston campus because of its unique learning environment. MAST students are also among the most active in student and civic organizations, thus providing meaningful and important contributions to our campus community and the student experience.

Overall, the LIST department serves several vital functions for the Galveston campus. Not only does it teach nearly all core curriculum, it houses the vibrant MAST major, and we are in the process of developing a master's program in MAST. As we fade out the university studies programs, we are also looking to develop an industry steering committee to help inform the redesign of the Tourism and Coastal Community Development program. Galveston is an excellent living laboratory for such a program, and with some refinement, could be a real asset to both the TAMUG and Galveston community. LIST also support several minors, including ANTH, ENGL, Museum Studies, HIST, and DIVE. LIST faculty are also some of the most innovative on campus, providing transformational learning opportunities, such as Model U.N., the Common Reader, Honors, and the NSF REU: OCEANUS program. LIST faculty are also very active in student and campus civic organizations, and thus like their students, make meaningful and important contributions to our campus community. These include faculty senate, the campus writing lab and studio, Nautilus, and Rudder Radio, among others."

I am skeptical about merging Marine Biology and Marine and Coastal Environmental Sciences. The two disciplines are rather different from each other and I worry about the intellectual unity of the new proposed department.

"I do agree that we should link the related sea grant academic programs, I do not agree that we should ""rehome"" faculty to College Station from Galveston. The faculty who are seeking dual appointments between the two campuses should be granted those; however, not all of the programs on Galveston are offered in College Station. The faculty in Galveston are highly involved with their students through the various programs and basing them out of College Station will remove the ability to quickly make changes as needed, and will further reduce the already low morale.

LIST faculty work with the majority of the student on this campus through the core curriculum and house a multitude of minors that also reach out to students in other majors. If LIST is removed, these programs will be lost.

We have so many unique opportunities for students on this campus. One of the opportunities is the DIVE minor that is under the LIST department, but serves students in all majors across campus. We are only 1 of a handful of academic dive programs offering a Minor in the US. Many students choose this campus over others due to the dive program. The program currently has 4 faculty and has the expertise to offer training in Diving Equipment Technology, Underwater Archaeology, Underwater Photography and Photogrammetry, Cavern and Cave Diving, Public Safety Diving, Diver held Sonars, Technical Diving, general Aquatics, Conservation Diving, and Scientific Diving. This program has the potential for growth; however, we are limited by our facilities (pool). The program has looked at the opportunity to provide a certificate program, but do not have the resources to do so. A summer program offering courses to College Station students would also be a great opportunity for the College Station students and would introduce them to the Galveston Campus.

This campus desperately needs a Natatorium with a pool large enough to support all of the programs on this campus. Currently DIVE is the only program utilizing the pool on a regular basis because we have no other option. If we had a sufficient pool, it would allow for the other departments on campus to resume utilizing it for their courses.

"

I firmly believe the Marine Engineering Tech Dept needs to include an engineering program like in the past to increase student enrolment and the chance to research grant proposals awarded. Technically hiring tenure-track researchers with engineering degrees for a technology-based BS program without an engineering program will waste resources and will slow the process of funding. While we compete against other applications for FOAs to have our proposals awarded, the fact that we are claiming that we are a technology program without an engineering program will decrease our more and more. I highly recommend we start a small engineering program for the 300 and 400-level courses that can be taught by the Ph.D. faculty members. Most of our courses are aligned with engineering BS. This way, the department can become Marine Engineering and Technology to offer licensed and non-licenses for the technology program and an engineering degree

which will facilitate and feed our research purposes and strongly enhance the student's enrollment pipeline and the research funding status.

I support high profile coordination between campuses. It might be useful to have voluntary rotations of faculty from C-stat to the island.

I support linking the programs more strongly, creating joint degrees. As a professor in Oceanography, I would also support full joint appointments in Oceanography for some TAMUG faculty. This would help us to communicate and collaborate more on creating new academic programs, and to communicate existing opportunities with students.

I think both recommendations make sense and are important.

I think it would be very advantageous for TAMU if Dr. Brody's Institute for a Disaster Resilient Texas and his other Gulf Coast Policy Centers and programs now located at TAMUG were joined with the Bush School on the main TAMU campus. I believe there are great synergies there for research, teaching and outreach that could better serve the interests of the State as well as help boost the reputation and ranking of the Bush School. Thank you for considering this administrative move.

"It is disappointing to me that this survey makes no mention of research activities or the proposal to consolidate Oceanography in Galveston. Moving the College Station part of the Oceanography department to Galveston is a terrible idea. It would devastate collaborative research programs with Oceanography from across the College of Arts and Sciences and the entire University. Oceanography has well developed mechanisms for effectively collaborating between the two campuses. A great strength of Texas A&M is the close connection between the Oceanography, Atmospheric Sciences, Geology and Geophysics, Geography, Chemistry, Math, Physics, and Statistics departments and IODP. This collective strength is nearly unique among universities in the U.S.

The long-term financial impacts will be large, as this will be a clear signal to the National Science Foundation that Texas A&M is not invested in Ocean Drilling (IODP), and in the geosciences in general. It will also greatly reduce the chances for a major gift to the university from potential donors in the geosciences, although it will make it easier for a donor to target a gift only to Geology and Geophysics.

If the goal is to eliminate the Oceanography and Atmospheric Sciences Departments, consolidating Oceanography in Galveston this would be a great first step. I believe that Texas A&M is capable of managing and supporting a wide range of different types of departments, large and small. But perhaps that is not the case, and university in its emphasis on size can only manage a small number of large departments. That will be a loss to the sciences and to the people of Texas, who will need the university's expertise in the geosciences to cope with critical challenges in climate change, sea-level rise, and energy production over the coming decades."

"It makes sense to combine MCES and MARB, so long as they have a new name that captures the value of both.

There is a long history of competition between TAMU-CS Oceanography and TAMU-Galveston, which is unfortunate. I hope we can see this report as an opportunity to start

afresh and elevate the value of both academic programs. For example, TAMU-Galveston is very strong in Marine Biology (not even a focus of College Station Oceanography) and they excel in coastal studies that benefit from proximity to the sea. Oceanography, in contrast, is a "blue water" department focused mostly (but not exclusively) on open ocean research. This does NOT require proximity to the ocean, as it uses long expeditions on ships not owned by TAMU, and it requires access to cutting-edge analytical facilities only present on the flagship campus. There is benefit to both programs, and they should be acknowledged and advertised for how they are different and how they are both excellent.

Curricula on both campuses should be better linked by degrees offered on one or both campuses. This has historically not been possible because of administrative hurdles (e.g. no funded joint appointments to incentivize teaching across campuses), which we can overcome with administrative attention and re-budgeting. Additional 3+2 BS+MS degrees that cross the two campuses are another way to highlight the value of both campuses."

Link is different than relocate. Again College Station faculty and staff whose work is based more locally should not be forced to relocate to Galveston. This would greatly affect specific funding, lab equipment, and other resources unique to College Station faculty and staff. Many excellent faculty and staff would leave their positions if this were to occur.

"Linking sea grant programs between the two campuses makes a lot of sense -- at the end, Galveston Campus was built to be by the sea and therefore should be included in any sea-related activity.

-I don't belong to either the Marine Biology nor the Coastal Environmental Sciences departments. However, if combining them would result in better benefits for both departments' faculty, staff and students while fitting in with Texas A&M's general vision, mission and values--then why not?"

Make use of the technology in Galveston in other departments, like Computer Science. (Systems on our new ship, navigation systems, etc)

Makes sense and needs to be done. Keep the separate majors of Marine Biology and Marine Science. Merge the graduate programs into a single program with separate tracks. Could also include Oceanography.

MARB and MCES combination requires faculty input

Marine Biology and Coastal Environmental sciences are distinctly different sciences with unique identities. Additionally Sea Grant does not have any academic programs, so I'm not sure how to address this recommendation.

"Merging the departments of Marine Biology and Marine and Coastal Environmental Sciences is not a good idea. This is very likely to diminish the visibility, cohesion, and effectiveness of fulfilling missions of both departments. Students likely will be confused and the popularity of the Marine Biology undergraduate program, and possibly even the graduate program, would decline.

Note: in 2020-2021, a TAMU committee was formed to study the pros and cons of such a merger. That committee, chaired by Jack Baldauf, collected a great deal of data, including surveys of faculty, staff and students. After over 6 months of diligent work, that committee's study report concluded that a merger was not likely to yield major benefits

and could do greater harm to some successful components of each department. Did MGT consultants have access to the 2021 study report?

Also, why does the MGT report recommend that Galveston researchers develop relationships with colleagues in the new College of Arts and Sciences? There already are many strong relationships among biologists in Galveston and the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences. Other colleges also could be cited in this regard."

"MGT Organization Review recommended combining MARB and MCES into a single department. As everyone is aware, two assessments of the MARB-MCES merger were completed in 2018 and 2022. Both were significantly more comprehensive in scope than the evaluation performed by MGT, and each did not support merging the two departments—both to the disappointment of TAMUG administration that were supportive of a merger.

Here we are addressing the same issue once again, with the MGT report recommending the merger as a strategic opportunity to elevate faculty collaboration and student experience. While many doubt that a merger will elevate either (note: these points are well supported in recommendations from the previous merger committees), many of us have spent a considerable amount of time and energy assessing the merger issue and believe it is time to move on. The MGT report provides the administration with the requisite cover to merge the two departments. Thus, please do not string us along any longer by intimating that we have some say in the final decision regarding the merger. There is no need to waste more faculty time with town halls or requests for us to develop ideas (white paper) on possible paths forward without a merger. We all feel the outcome will be the same and therefore we would genuinely appreciate a decision from the upper administration on the merger and a proposed timeline.

Several of the past defenders of keeping the two departments separate are gone and there is mutual respect of colleagues on different floors in OCSB. While there may be clear benefits to merging, there are many areas of concern with the most important being leadership in the new department. Bringing the faculty together from both MCES and MARB will be challenging and require significant restructuring of courses, degree plans, teaching assignments, committee assignments, etc. across a markedly more diverse faculty. There will also be a need to eliminate redundancy in course offerings and degree plans to create cohesive and clearly defined pathways for our students. Given these challenges, leadership in the new unit will be the key to its success. Many of these challenges will necessitate that new leadership is sensitive to all faculty and genuinely respectful of different viewpoints and opinions during the creation of the merged department. The past few years there has been a clear lack of engagement by faculty in OCSB, and this is due to leadership problems. Many believe that the leadership (DH) within a merged unit will make it or break it. Dr. Thomas will need someone overseeing the new department that honestly supports shared governance and consensus building, along with a good dose of self-awareness and emotional intelligence.

"

Moving Oceanography to TAMUG would be great. Combining MCES and MARB would be great. All these academics and their programs are clearly intermingled. After over a decade at TAMUG in ocean science, this so much sense. It is bizarre how those most opposed to these mergers/changes do not see the opportunity it creates because it comes at an individual-level cost -- some loss of fiefdoms created over decades that are no longer relevant.

Moving the Department of Oceanography to Galveston would be a grave mistake and will threaten the teaching and research mission of the Depts. of Geology and Geophysics, and Atmospheric Science. What will happen to jointly operated labs such as SIGF - the stable isotopes lab? Faculty from College Station who don't wish to move to Galveston will seek jobs at other institutions - and those faculty that are able to leave may be among our best. I predict it will be much more difficult to recruit faculty to Galveston.

"MOVING THE DEPARTMENT OF OCEANOGRAPHY TO GALVESTON WOULD HAVE A NEGATIVE IMPACT ON TEACHING ON MAIN CAMPUS:

- The Department of Oceanography at Texas A&M University has educated generations of Aggies through our core curriculum teaching of OCNG 251 Oceanography. For many students it may be their only opportunity to learn about the ocean and its role in weather, climate, providing resources etc. Moving the Department to Galveston will reduce capacity to teach future generations of Texans about the ocean on the flagship campus.
- The College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) is investing heavily in an Environmental and Sustainability Initiative. If Oceanography remains in College Station as part of CAS, then we can provide classes on the environment that covers 71 % of our planet – the ocean. The ocean is fundamental to how the Earth system functions (e.g. weather and climate). It is a major source of resources (oil and gas, fish etc.) and the growing 'blue economy' reflect that. A cutting-edge Environmental and Sustainability Initiative needs expertise on ocean issues. For example, 60% of the students I have taught over the last five years were undergraduates in the Environmental Programs of the legacy College of Geosciences.
- Oceanography is a relatively new undergraduate degree at Texas A&M University. For most of the Department's history we have only offered graduate degrees. We now offer a BS and have just been approved for a BA. We MUST grow our undergraduate programs as they are simply too small (we have around 45 students). As a discovery major, I think we are best placed to grow on a major campus. On College Station campus, we offer an ocean focused STEM degree that can be taken by (for example) students who find that engineering or 'pure' sciences are not for them. This pool of students offers our degree programs a chance to grow and retains students at Texas A&M University. The simplest path to grow student numbers in Galveston is to grow Marine Biology, a program that is already in Galveston and can does not have the resources to meet potential demand. Moving Oceanography to Galveston would not increase student numbers significantly.

## LOSS OF RESEARCH INFRASTRUCTURE AND MOMENTUM

I would be concerned that moving the Department of Oceanography to Galveston will degrade the research capacity of College Station, while not resulting in a significant addition to Galveston for several years. Some oceanographers need space full of sophisticated and expensive instruments (e.g. cutting edge mass spectrometers). Capacity, including infrastructure (clean rooms) and instrumentation, has been built up over the last 15 years through investment of start-up funds in collective facilities, successful NSF Major Research Instrumentation grants, and donor contributions, to build up world-class resources fitting of the flagship campus of an R1 university. Will these facilities be moved from main campus? Or reproduced, at great expense, in Galveston? Either approach would cost millions of dollars and likely hold up research for years to come.

My own requirements are less sophisticated, but I would still need a laboratory suitable for wet chemistry and biology with sufficient space for my instrumentation. My understanding is that there is no space in Galveston. A new building would cost tens of millions of dollars and take years to complete. Would there be funds? How would our research enterprise fair in the interim period? How long would it take for research to recover after moving to Galveston?

In the context of the CAS Environmental and Sustainability Initiative, the Department of Oceanography is one of the few departments in CAS that has active research programs in the natural environment. We conduct field work all around the globe and offer access to the environment for our students and collaborators through our research.

## COLLABORATIVE RESEARCH

A successful R1 university is characterized by a web of interactions across campus that elevate research and teaching. For example, I am currently a PI on a National Science Foundation (NSF) grant that is worth almost \$1 million. This is a collaborative project that requires us to be physically located on main campus near our collaborator's laboratory – time sensitive samples prepared in my lab are taken directly to my collaborator's lab for analysis. We would not be able to do this research in Galveston.

## HUMAN CAPITAL WILL BE LOST ACROSS CAMPUS IN COLLEGE STATION

Most of the Oceanography faculty on main campus have families based in College Station, including partners/spouses who work at the university and in the surrounding College Station community. Many of us will not be able to move to Galveston because of the needs of our partners/spouses and children.

In my own case, I am married to an accomplished Texas A&M professor in another Department within the College of Arts and Sciences. Last year, she had 6 grants from 3 different Federal agencies, plus 3 ongoing funded collaborations with National Labs. She is also a Center Director. Her research accomplishments at Texas A&M University were

recognized by the President of the United States during an award ceremony at the White House (PECASE Award). She has been recognized on campus as a Presidential Impact Fellow. She exemplifies research leadership at an R1 university. She has the CV to leave Texas A&M University and we will be forced to do so if I am based in Galveston. I know of several of my colleagues who are in a similar position.

Consequently, moving the Department of Oceanography will lead to a loss of human capital in oceanography itself and across campus.

"

"My comments about the TAMUG MGT Report are concerned with the assessment and recommendations concerning the Department of Liberal Studies. This was in the report as an area to be redesigned, but is not mentioned in the above bullet list.

As others have surely noted, the MGT team's brief two day visit on our campus (especially at a time without students present) has resulted in a misunderstanding and misrepresentation of the LIST department's purpose, achievements and essential value to the mission and stature of Texas A&M at Galveston. Moreover, they are blind to why we need to continue existing as the Department of Liberal Studies serving all students, especially those who minor in fields of the humanities and major in Maritime Studies.

The department has nearly seventy Maritime Studies majors, they too are part of the stated "Blue" focus of this campus. We also enable students to explore their interests beyond a solely STEM focus through minors, not just in the humanities but diving and Sports Management. Yet our reach and impact extends to all students since we are the pivot point for providing many of the core curriculum courses necessary for earning the Texas A&M degree. Doing that in a classroom with a teacher with whom students can interact on a more personal level, rather than replacing with distance-learning options, is an important element to learning as both a process and experience.

A number of LIST faculty are also engaged in research with a national and international impact via book and article publications, as well as conference presentations.

The vision of the university experience requires an idealized framework, such that we allow students to be more than vessels for information and job skills. To study subjects outside a singular track, to train them in the practice of critical thinking and analysis recognizes their deeper potential value as citizens, not just future employees."

N/A

Need Academic Advisor(s) for each Program.

No comment

No comment.

no comments



No comments

"No concerns. As TT faculty in MARB I see tremendous opportunities to teach new courses in collaboration with merged faculty. These courses can reflect emerging areas of priority such as coastal resilience, emerging pollutants, etc. Collaborative research is likely to be encouraged by a MARB/MCES merger and opportunities for seed funding to pursue such research opportunities should be supported.

During informal conversations with undergraduate students in my class, it is clear that students are not concerned with the name of a department or school, but rather the degree awarded. Hence, maintaining existing degree's (Marine Biology) and with including new major/minor themes (Marine Biology and Oceanography) is likely to be attractive for recruitment."

OK

One recommendation is missing: to dissolve the Liberal Studies department and force its faculty to get appointments in their discipline's department in College Station. There's absolutely no good reason to do this - it just adds another layer of complexity and reporting lines to College Station that is not equitable with a similarly-tasks department on campus (Foundational Sciences). Liberal Studies has developed a lot of valuable programs on campus (such as the Common Reader), which the College Station programs may or may not support. Faculty at the Galveston Campus also make less than their counterparts in College Station, so that introduces another equity problem. Faculty at the Galveston Campus also do not have access to some of College Station's resources, which again will create a disparity between faculty under College Station departments. Finally, students in the Maritime Studies program strongly oppose the dissolution of their program and the department that administers it. It would also create a recruitment problem for the proposed graduate program in Maritime Studies. Too many valuable teams and individuals would be adversely impacted by this recommendation's implementation.

"Sea Grant has a specific goal that is Texas-specific (coastal systems) and not all researchers are involved in Texas Sea Grant. The programs are inherently linked, as the Sea Grant programs all over the country enable communication across institutions. This recommendation is misleading, as it does not include what kind academic programs would be linked?

Additionally, the combination of the Marine Biology and Marine and Coastal Environmental Sciences department appears to be an okay idea. A thorough plan for how this should be implemented is key. A strong plan of action and the resources for reinventing a combined programs like this should be a priority. This provides the opportunity to attract new students, but if the combination is not done well or not enough resources for the switch are provided, students (and faculty) will be dismayed."

Sea grant is an important strength for Aggies and for all Texans. Strengthening and elevating our sea grant programs is a huge benefit to the research enterprise and to the people of Texas.

"Should OCNG be relocated to TAMUG, the natural marine sciences stand to be greatly elevated. This goal will best be achieved through the merger of OCNG and MCES, two similar units with exceptional research faculty. The merged OCNG B.S. degree offered from OCNG and the MARS B.S. degree offered from MCES could be crafted in such a way as to easily support a minor. This minor would be very appealing to the large number of undergraduate students enrolled in MARB, a department with strong branding power stemming from its name, the reputations of its faculty, and the cohesion of the unit.

Should OCNG not be moved to TAMUG, a merger of MARB and MCES that involves revision of the current MARS B.S. degree so that it emphasizes the functioning of environments that support marine life, and involves the revision of the CESS B.S. degree so that it emphasizes how humans effect and are affected by living resources in the sea, would serve our undergraduate population well. There is no need to revise the MARB B.S. degrees as they support 550+ UG students. Note – there have been no barriers to interdisciplinary research between MARB and MCES faculty. So, a merger between MARB and MCES does enhance interdisciplinary research between these departments."

Since one of the axioms of the current regime is that "all centralization is good", how can one argue with this. Seriously, this should not be done to satisfy an easy-to-state first principle, but because it makes academic and programmatic sense. Having seen some of the other consequences of applying the centralization axiom, I am skeptical.

Sorry, I [REDACTED] and ran out of time to answer this question.

"The combination of MARB and MCES is not the primary problem in this report. The justification for this is both clear and logical; though we do need protections for APT faculty in that transition and an assurance that we will maintain enough faculty to teach the core courses in this curriculum.

The much more concerning aspect of this report is, unfortunately, buried in subtext. This is because the report seems to make a fundamental mistake in assuming that LIST is only responsible for the University Studies degree. It suggests phasing out University Studies... but actually, we have been doing this for some time now, and the program is almost entirely gone. Liberal Studies offers far more than a University Studies degree. That is neither our primary or strongest focus. Nevertheless, LIST is not on the proposed organizational chart, and the report suggests moving LIST faculty out of a home department and into College Station departments.

Liberal Studies holds a unique place at Texas A&M Galveston. It houses 24 faculty members that support the campus, and is therefore the largest department. If these faculty members were not teaching, and/or taught only University Studies, disbanding the program would make sense financially. But that is not the case. These 24 faculty members take on disproportionate teaching loads, many bearing a 4/4. We have a lot of APT faculty that teach some of the heaviest loads on campus. This is because they teach the core curriculum in person to students on our campus. These core classes include English,

Political Science, History, Language, Philosophy, Performing Arts, Social and Behavioral Science, Life and Physical Science, Creative Arts and CD/ICD classes. Our department literally sees all the students on campus, as we deliver the core requirements that have no home in other departments on campus. Some of the aspects of the core are so strongly represented that we even offer minors in them, including History, English, Anthropology, DIVE, Museum, Studies, and Sports Management.

There are also some unique initiatives run through our department, based on the Humanities unique position and its strengths interdisciplinarily. For instance, our department holds the Common Reader Program, which gives all students on campus an opportunity to engage in a cross-course curriculum and ideas. It also has traditionally housed the chair of the Honors Program, who administers interdisciplinary classes to Honors students. We are also visible locally, as we work to place students in Museum Studies internships, engage with the tourism community, and overall connect out students to local resources.

These unique initiatives, plus our presence in the core, means that Liberal Studies faculty make up a disproportionate amount of the service provided on campus. Our faculty are simply disproportionately visible and accessible to students. We all hold more office hours a week than is standard throughout TAMUG or TAMU. We are disproportionately represented in Faculty Senate, the Student Success Initiative, Hullabaloo U, CLIDE, the CARE team, and as advisors for student clubs/organizations. This is because we are incredibly visible, and therefore we are the people that the University asks to do service. We have taken on service responsibilities greater than any other department on campus. If we were housed elsewhere, or if our reporting structure were different, I worry that our work would be compromised in this regard. College Station will not fully understand how this work is impactful on our campus. Furthermore, we may be limited in the opportunities that we have to join hiring committees and broader institutional committees at TAMU.

And finally (and most importantly), the department offers a unique and well respected degree in Maritime Studies. That program currently holds about 70 students, which MGT drastically underreported. The MAST degree brings humanities into the Sea Grant mission, focusing on "Blue Humanities" within the Blue Economy and tying together students' other courses. The students who pursue this degree have a deep sense of community (indeed a MAST club that meets regularly). They travel together, pursue grants, and apply to graduate schools. The program is innovative and varied, and its students are deeply committed to the Blue Economy and to Texas' role in stewardship of the oceans. That MAST degree is in the process of becoming a Masters Degree, and the Tourism and Coastal Development Program is also in the pipeline pending final approval. We are at risk of losing this wonderful progress if some of the recommended changes in this report are effected.

The report may simply mean that we move lines of reporting to College Station. While this may be good for some select faculty (and I am open to that), it ultimately will put too many

faculty members at risk. It depends on the good will of College Station, which has historically not been forthcoming. It also depends on finding home departments, and while folks in the Department of Arts and Sciences could find homes (i.e., History, English, Anthropology), connections are harder to find for those doing Business, Policy, and Law. They are particularly challenging for special-purpose faculty, like those doing Museum Studies and Maritime Studies. APT faculty are also at greater risk of not being absorbed into their "home" departments. These are especially the faculty we need to keep in order to fulfill our mission overall, and exactly the faculty who would be put at risk. The structure of the department as it is now encourages stability, development, and interdisciplinary collegiality. It also ensures that students get the full experience of a humanities education, even within a STEM context and alongside their Engineering degrees.

When we devalue Liberal Studies, we lose something fundamental about our campus. We lose the human connection to the ocean. This is not merely a reorganization issue – it is a fundamental issue of which disciplines count in relation to the ocean. A humanistic inquiry into the oceans – their law and policy, their art and culture, their history and theory – is essential to any study of the oceans. To lose this would be to cut off an intellectual limb of our special-purpose institution.

"

The combination of the two departments seems sensible.

"The link between sea grant academic programs already exist, but strengthening this link is welcome.

The combination of MARB and MSCES is a bad decision at many fronts, and the findings have been summarized in two reports, but the people advising President Banks are choosing to ignore the findings and recommendation of NOT to merge these units. The failure of the multiple MCES undergraduate academic programs has been a headache for the administration for years that has resulted in a faculty to student ratio of 10:1 for MCES, compared to 34:1 for MARB. Accordingly, merging the two units will bring the faculty to student ratio to 20:1, which aligns with that of CS. That is the only benefit of the merger, and please do not trick yourself and others of the benefits of the merger, since none exist. Further, there are 131 faculty and TAMUG, yet the administration of President Banks is willing to accept a report based upon interviewing 15 faculty and staff (the number of faculty were never disclosed). How can the fate of a campus and or two programs, be based upon a sample size of 15! This is an embarrassment! If I had been in charge of hiring MGT to conduct this survey, I would simply not accept the report and would refuse to pay for their services unless the company would bring me a report based upon a statistically representative sample size. Further, I am certain that as an environmental scientist, President Banks would never accept the results of a microbial study based upon a unrepresentative sample. "

The linkage of G to CS is a good idea, provided that G does not lose its identity. Merging the two departments - I have no opinion.

"The MARITIME Studies program in the department of Liberal Studies is a valuable degree program. With over 70 majors the department offers these majors high impact transformational learning experiences such as our Model United Nations Program and our Archeology and Conservation Lab experiences and our museum classes that take students behind the scenes in museums to experience first hand learning. We have a high impact internship program and our graduates go on to successful industry careers in public policy and other areas such as museum work. Many also go on to graduate school. The time to graduation noted in the report is not the lowest on campus, nor does it reflect the impact COVID had on our program. The importance of this degree is its foundational connection to the special purpose of our campus as part of the Blue Economy and consequently, Blue Humanities

Further, our faculty deliver the bulk of the required core curriculum classes which include: ENGLISH/COMM; Political Science; History; Language, Phil. Culture; Performing Arts; Social and Behavioral Science; Life and Physical Sciences; Creative Arts and CD/ICD classes. In this context we engage with every student on this campus.

Our Common Reader Program is EXCLUSIVE to our campus and our Department—this is not done on main campus. On our campus only, it carries the CD attribute along with the ENGLISH/COMM requirement making it attractive to the first year engineering students who double dip.

Our MAST students make up the bulk of student governance on campus and we also operate the Writing Lab and Studio along with faculty engagement with student media such as the Nautilus, Rudder Radio, and Sea Spray.

"

"The MGT report initially recommends eliminating the University Studies programs directly and then leaves the Department of Liberal Studies off its organizational chart of academic units. When asked for clarification the MGT President responds that there was a typo in the report and instead of recommending eliminating the ""University Studies PROGRAMs"" they actually meant the ""Liberal Studies DEPARTMENT"" This causes confusion as it is evidenced that MGT had no concept that Liberal Studies and University Studies are two totally different things. Nor the fact that the degree program Maritime Studies is housed in the Liberal Studies Department.

This recommendation goes on by stating that faculty in Liberal Studies should seek joint appointments with the College of Arts and Sciences at College Station. Not realizing the diversity of disciplines within Liberal Studies and that not all of the faculty currently in the department would route to Arts and Sciences, Political Science would go to the Bush School as an example. DIVE would have no home, nor our Museum Studies program which is larger at Galveston than at College Station. Liberal Studies is also responsible for running the Writing Center, Media Hub, Rudder Radio, Nautilus (school newspaper), SeaSpray

(literary journal), Model United Nations program, Common Reader program, Archaeology and Conservation Labs. Liberal Studies faculty are the most engaged on the Galveston campus serving on most every committee and volunteer function. Many outside of this department describe Liberal Studies as part of the soul of Galveston and to eliminate this department would leave a gaping exit wound in the Galveston community. University Studies and Liberal Studies are NOT THE SAME THING, Liberal Studies here is so much, much more."

"The proposal is stupid from this perspective.

Example: to enhance interaction with Galveston Chemistry and Physics faculty is cited. On any ranking, Galveston has extremely poor departments in this area whereas College Station had very highly ranked departments. A similar statement could be made for Mathematics. Collaborations are very important for the oceanography program. This will simply downgrade Oceanography from a world-renowned department to an afterthought in history. What about the other non-science programs already noted in the study that also collaborate? Do they move too?"

The report states that there has been many attempts at merging the two departments. There was and they failed because the benefits of merging are less than the strengths of the individual departments. If the departments merge, there would still need two departments as the social sciences aspect of MCES would not fit into the greater department.

There should be increased focus of Sea Grant presence and activity at the Galveston campus. Current sea grant leadership has driven away Galveston faculty from the sea grant advisory committee as well as key roles with sea grant.

"There were efforts years ago to link graduate classes between TAMU-G and TAMU-CS by televised live classes. There were technical difficulties then but now with zoom and other formats, these joint classes could be feasible.

A continuing problem in classes regarding marine biology is that students either have not visited the coast of Texas or have a poor idea of what is present. The coast of Texas is heavily influenced by river run-off that brings silt, especially on the northeastern coastline. Much of the coast of Texas is a series of sandy beaches. The water may not clear up until one is 50 miles offshore or at South Padre Island. Some of the researchers must order their experimental marine life from suppliers in Florida."

These are very necessary changes. I highly support all of them.

THIS IS A COUNTERPRODUCTIVE TAMU TAKEOVER OF TAMUG PROGRAMS AND FUNDING This may not just be useful for Marine Biology and Coastal Environmental Sciences but also programs like Maritime Business Administration which will benefit a lot from becoming integrated into the Mays Business School as suggested in the report. This way the department can attract top talented faculty and keep them for a long time and same goes for students.

"To Whom It May Concern:

These comments cover the proposal to dissolve the Department of Liberal Studies and the Maritime Studies degree, even though the Organizational Review Final Report for Texas

A&M University at Galveston never explicitly states that either are to be eliminated. Also, the report never lists any criteria to justify why they should be eliminated. Instead, the elimination of both is implied by the absence of the Department of Liberal Studies on the new organizational chart (pg. 25), and in the second sentence in the paragraph below, beginning with the word 'Faculty'.

'In further alignment with College Station, the University Studies program should be eliminated as a degree program. With fewer than 10 students each year, the program is unsustainable and does not meet the needs of students or faculty. Faculty in the Liberal Studies department should capitalize on joint appointment opportunities or transfer tenure within the new College of Arts and Sciences in College Station to provide courses and research opportunities that further enhance the lab experience that the Galveston campus should seek to provide to students. Courses and experiential opportunities should still be delivered in Galveston and will require faculty to remain on the Galveston campus.' (pg. 29).

I have therefore used the criteria cited for the elimination of the University Studies program in the first sentence of the paragraph above, which states that with 'fewer than 10 students each year, the program is unsustainable and does not meet the needs of students or faculty'. This does not apply to the Maritime Studies Program because the data presented in the graph on pages 17 and 18 show that Maritime Studies is the only degree that has consistently grown from 2015 to 2020, and is thus sustainable. Additionally, the report does not take into consideration that a tourism concentration and a master's degree for Maritime Studies will be implemented in the near future, allowing for continued if not accelerated growth.

There are few people who have been around as long as I have on this campus, and everyone seems to forget that the purpose of creating the Maritimes Studies degree was to increase retention. Marine Biology and Marine Engineering have always had a number of students that dropped out after the first year or two. Unfortunately, many had GPA's that were too low to transfer to the main campus, and the university was losing these students as well as the income that came with them, especially after investing considerable resources to bring them here and integrate them into their respective departments. As a result, a Maritime Studies degree was created to give these students a home while they raised their GPAs, allowing them to transfer to the main campus. In this respect, this plan has been a success, especially considering that the report states 'for the past five years the B.S. in Marine Biology has lost an average of 42% of students after the first year' (pg. 18). Thus, the campus still needs Maritime Studies for this purpose, alone because if this degree and the Department of Liberal Studies are eliminated, these students will be lost, resulting in a loss of students and income to the university.

An additional benefit to the creation of the Maritime Studies degree has been that many students decided to stay, and as a result, Maritime Studies grew largely on its own without much support or resources from the administration. For example, a few years ago one of the new junior faculty went to a local conference and on her own was promoting the Maritime Studies degree. Word got back to Patrick Louchouart and he berated her for her

actions, informing her that the faculty was not to promote the degree. In spite of this, the Maritime Studies program is growing in conditions that are not conducive to doing so. This may seem to be an overreaction. However, in the early days, when faculty were allowed to promote the Maritime Studies Program, it quickly grew from 20 to 60 students, and students were applying from as far away as Oregon and New York to come to Galveston, specifically for this degree. Now, no one knows who we are. For example, if you go online to College Factual, to find the best Maritime Studies Program in the U.S., it states that #1 is Texas A&M University - College Station in College Station, TX (See, <https://www.collegefactual.com/majors/multi-interdisciplinary-studies/maritime-studies/rankings/top-ranked/bachelors-degrees/>). The only other online site I found to find majors was CollegeRaptor, and their rankings were: #1 SUNY Maritime College - New York and #2 Texas A&M University - College Station. There is no mention that Galveston even has a Maritime Studies Program, and to find any mention of it you have to go to the Galveston campus website.

Part of the problem is due to the Texas A&M University Catalogue (see 2022-2023). When describing the major, it states: 'Maritime Studies (MAST) offers students a unique opportunity to examine the varied ways humans use and impact coastal and maritime environments. The program is well suited for students seeking to understand the vital and synergistic relationship humans have with the sea.' There is no mention of Galveston. For the minor, however, it states: 'The Maritime Studies minor offers students an exciting interdisciplinary selection of courses to compliment and enrich all majors offered at the Galveston campus of Texas A&M University.' This gives the impression that the major is in College Station while only a minor is offered in Galveston. Furthermore, the major is largely ignored on our campus. I talked to one of the student ambassadors who gives tours on campus to potential students, and I was told that during the PowerPoint presentation describing various majors on this campus, Maritime Studies is not even mentioned. If a student asks, however, the only response is 'it is a good degree for archaeology'. In spite of this, Maritime Studies is the only degree that showed consistent growth in the five-year period cited by this report.

Thus, it is clear that Maritime Studies is growing and sustainable. The only remaining criteria for elimination are it 'does not meet the needs of students or faculty', and the report implies that it is not cost effective based on the statement that 'The Liberal Studies Academic Department/Division has the largest number of faculty (24)...' (pg 6) while having only 25 graduates in 2019-2020 (see graph pg. 17). The creators of this report are comparing only the size of faculty to the number of graduates of this degree as if it is a stand-alone major like other degree programs on this campus, but they do not seem to realize that unlike these other programs, the Department of Liberal Studies is a support department. Whereas all the faculty of other departments have one mission to teach courses in only their discipline so their students graduate with that one degree. So, each faculty member in Marine Biology only teaches marine biology classes. In contrast, of the 24 faculty in Liberal Studies one teaches only MAST classes. Some faculty don't teach any MAST classes while some teach only one class a year. This is because our primary mission is to provide support to the other departments on campus so their students can graduate.



We provide nearly all the required core curriculum classes for Communication; Language, Philosophy and Culture; Creative Arts; American History; Government/Political Science; and Social and Behavioral Sciences. We even offer core classes for Life and Physical Sciences as well as the CD/ICD classes.

Additionally, LIST faculty teach most of the classes needed for the required minors, including Maritime Studies, Anthropology, English, History, DIVE, Museum studies, Sports Management, and soon to be MELP. Comparing the number of faculty to the number of graduates in departments that specialize in only one subject is a relevant metric to determine if they are cost effective, but to compare the Department of Liberal Studies with other specialized departments on the Galveston campus is simply not accurate. Instead, a more accurate metric is to compare the number of students per faculty taught every year. Unfortunately, I have not been able to get access to these data, but from perusing the number of students in classes this semester, I bet that if an annual student-to-faculty ratio was calculated for every department, the Department of Liberal Studies would have the highest ratio on campus and would probably be one of the highest on the main campus, especially if this ratio was adjusted to take into consideration that some English and Communication classes have hard caps of 10 students per class. If these faculty and students were removed from the count, the Department of Liberal Studies would certainly be one of the most cost-effective departments on this campus and probably on the main campus.

It should also be noted that while LIST has 24 faculty, of those 16 are APT faculty. In contrast, of the 19 faculty in Marine Biology only 4 are APT. APT faculty teach more classes per semester for less pay, which, again, makes the Liberal Studies Department more cost effective, and by extension so is the Maritime Studies degree since so many APT faculty teach classes not only to support other degrees but also for the Maritime Studies major and minor. Furthermore, unlike classes in other departments, most classes that are needed to complete a Maritime Studies degree can be used to fulfill other requirements. For example, I am considered one of the primary MAST faculty, and every four semesters of a two-year cycle (I don't teach summers) I teach only three classes that primarily support the MAST major and minor; these are MAST 354 Egyptian Seafaring, MAST 333 Viking Archaeology, and CLAS 371 In Search of Homer and the Trojan War. However, I also teach ANTH 316 Nautical Archaeology every fall because it fulfills a MAST requirement for both the major and minor as well as a core class for Language, Philosophy and Culture, and it can be used as one of the upper-level classes for the Anthropology minor. I also teach ANTH 225 and 3 sections of ANTH 226, which helps fulfill a Life and Physical Sciences requirement. Finally, I also teach ANTH 351 Classical Archaeology and ANTH 423 Bioarchaeology that can be used as upper-level classes for the anthropology minor. By doing so, I support the MAST major and minor, the Anthropology minor, and two core requirements, and by teaching my classes only once every other year, it keeps class numbers higher. Of the above lecture classes, I have never had a class of less than 20 students, helping to keep the department more cost effective for both students and the university. Thus, the Department of Liberal Studies not only meets the needs of students and faculty, in contradiction to what the report states, but is vital to it, and it does so in a

cost-effective manner. If LIST was eliminated nearly all the classes presently taught would still be needed to allow students pursuing other degrees to fulfill their core requirements and their minors, the primary difference is without the Maritime Studies degree, there would be fewer students taking these classes, cutting enrollment, and making the campus less cost effective.

Additionally, in the section of the paragraph quoted from the report above, it gives the impression that once the 'Faculty in the Liberal Studies department'... 'capitalize on joint appointment opportunities or transfer tenure within the new College of Arts and Sciences in College Station' the support duties of Department of Liberal Studies will automatically and smoothly transfer to the various departments in College Station without any ramifications, giving the impression that the evaluators of this report are of the opinion that it takes little to run a department. If the department is eliminated but the faculty stay to teach the classes, who is going to be responsible for, to list just a few, determining what classes in each discipline are needed every semester as well as class times, room assignments, hiring new faculty, yearly evaluations, even buying needed supplies, such as new furniture, computers, or pens. How does the administration plan on compensating departments on the main campus that try to take on these faculty and the administrative duties that come with them? Furthermore, what if departments on the main campus refuse to accept faculty, do you just eliminate those classes and hope there are enough classes from other disciplines to fulfill core and minor requirements for graduation. Even if departments do accept Galveston faculty, what happens in a few years if they decide it is easier and cheaper to just transfer Galveston faculty into their departments, and they eliminate their classes on the Galveston campus? Some form of administration to manage classes for core classes and minors would have to remain Galveston along with the faculty that teach these classes. Whoever wrote this report simply did not think it out. This is especially evident in that if the people who wrote this report had legitimate reasons to eliminate the Department of Liberal Studies, a support department, then those same reasons would have applied to Foundational Sciences, which is a support department that offers fewer core and minor classes, and as such, it should also have been slated for elimination, but it was deemed cost-effective, even though both departments serve the same purpose.

A review of the report above reveals that the proposition to eliminate the Department of Liberal Studies and the Maritime Studies degree lacks justification and will be far more complicated than suggested by those who did the evaluation of our campus. At the very least, a more detailed study needs to be completed to see if such eliminations are in the best interest of the Galveston campus and the university. If both are eliminated and it is then realized at some time in the future that the Galveston campus does not effectively and efficiently function without both or even one as explained above, it will be difficult and extremely expensive to justify and reverse these actions.

[REDACTED]

P.S. I just noticed that when I went to paste this evaluation into the online survey the proposed eliminations of LIST and MAST are not mentioned. If I had not been told of these eliminations in two public meetings, the first by our CAO, Dr. Thomas, and in the second meeting by Col. Fossum and Dr. Thomas, I would have thought the omission of LIST in the new organizational chart on pg. 25 of the report was a typo, and I would not have known and outside of LIST, how many people know? Now to leave it off the survey as a proposed change is just sad, very very sad, sloppiness at one end of the spectrum, while at the other, it can give the appearance that this has not been a transparent process in regards to the elimination of LIST and MAST.

"

With OCNG being relocated to TAMUG, the natural marine sciences stand to be greatly elevated. This goal will best be achieved through the merger of OCNG and MCES, two similar units with exceptional research faculty. The merged B.S. degrees in OCNG (offered from OCNG) and MARS (offered from MCES) could be crafted in such a way as to easily support a minor. This minor would be very appealing to the large number of undergraduate students enrolled in MARB, a department with strong branding power stemming from its name, the reputations of its faculty, and the cohesion of the unit. Yes and also integrate some programs to college station like engineering has done. Maritime Business Administration to May Business School will help keep things up to standard and improve the reputation of the program.

Staff

"- I think it makes more sense to combine the Oceanography and the Marine and Coastal Environmental Sciences departments than the MARB and MCES departments.

- From a potential employer perspective: it's tough when degree names keep changing. The Wildlife and Fisheries Science degree was well known throughout the industry and now it's been replaced with a lesser known degree. For example: many people within Texas Parks and Wildlife, have a Wildlife and Fisheries degree from TAMU and now those people are hiring and they don't know that the Wildlife and Fisheries degree left and was replaced with other options. I worry that if the marine biology degree gets changed it will cause similar confusion for employers and students with the new degrees trying to find jobs. "

Academic programs can be linked as far as online activities and campus visits. I do not see the the point in moving Departments/staff currently in College Station to the Galveston campus.

Agree with the first point; not sufficiently knowledgeable to comment on the second.

"agree, a merger including the Department of Oceanography could further create a strong academic program to boost TAMU in Ocean Sciences at a global stage.

the combined unit should have a new leadership through an exclusively external search, who should be fully dedicated to administration and operation of the new program, and represent the faculty, staff and students to promote the new unit across the local, national, and international domain.

internal inequity of salary and other resources (office and lab space etc.) between MARB and MCES should be carefully addressed."

Agreed.

Combining the MARB and MCES departments will make each of the programs stronger especially as advisors have already combine efforts to support students together from these programs. Clarity is needed on which university study programs to eliminate (similar to College Station). In the recommended academic affairs organizational chart it does not include the Liberal Studies department and still includes foundational studies -- it is unclear if this is by mistake since it mentions combining faculty jointly with College Station and eliminated university studies.

Consider moving the JK Williams Library reporting line under the University Libraries at TAMU College Station. The University Libraries has recently taken steps to ensure consistency in the electronic journal and database access to the students at Galveston. There are more opportunities for the University Libraries to help the JK Williams Library support the students and faculty in Galveston. The JK Williams Library is a great library but has limited staff due to its budget. It is financially unable to provide the depth of services that could be offered if they were under the University Libraries' umbrella.

Do not combine Marine Biology and Marine and Coastal Environmental Sciences.

Fully support!

"HOW ON EARTH IS ANY OCEAN RELATED PROGRAM NOT LOCATED IN GALVESTON?"

Current:

Once again the greater attention paid to the maritime academy which comprises of roughly 12-15% of total enrollment and they are greater than 12-15% of the attention. Is it stated ""Marine Biology has lost an average of 42% of students after the first year"", how can it not be thought as to how the greater share of investment campus wide is spent on a student sections that are about 25% of our undergraduate Galveston based students? Students academically are focused on recruitment and retention. If recruitment is primarily focused on the maritime academy and retention is focused on engineers that are already one foot out of the door because we do not offer their desired career path, WHAT IS LEFT FOR EVERYONE ELSE. Our students in the ""other"" majors are routinely feeling ignored or an afterthought. We routinely drop everything on going to international work boat show, what about any marine biology conferences or fisheries with various parks and wildlife organizations? Afterthought.

Recommendations:

""joint faculty appointments between the College Station Department of Oceanography and Galveston faculty""

Make more faculty related to the ocean come down to Galveston, the sea grant link section talks about connected upward to main campus, but what about downward to Galveston. If faculty and research opportunities can be further linked down to Galveston, then resources and investment can be shared with Galveston. If faculty can achieve a greater desire to push and advocate for investment in Galveston vs College Station maybe greater equity in research opportunities can be further bridged. Make College Station faculty need us more and need Galveston to improve so equal attention can be achieved.

""Combine the Marine Biology and Marine and Coastal Environmental Sciences departments.""

Combine the forgotten Galveston majors into one so they can continue to receive less investment as one rather than two. This only will be successful if improve efforts or resources and attention with intention can be achieved. This frightens me with the opportunity for these areas to combine to do more with less. If paired, this invites the opportunity for resources to be diluted, and efficiencies to be discovered to funnel resources than need to expanded, further elsewhere."

I agree

"I agree with both these recommendations, which is not a popular opinion. I believe that marine biology is a big draw to our campus, being one of a few to offer a B.S. in Marine Biology. However I also feel that all of the faculty and programs in MARB and MCES could benefit from the ideas of their counterparts. They already share staff and they are rarely faculty who want to step up to be department admins so combining them just makes sense. They could be the Marine and Coastal Sciences department (MACS) or something. Not included here in the recommendations but in the report was realigning the LIST department. Losing our LIST department would cripple our programs and campus in terms of engagement amongst our faculty and students and it would split the faculty amongst different colleges in College Station. I would also worry that we would lose some of our most loved professors if the department were to be absorbed elsewhere.

I am surprised that nothing was mentioned about assessing moving Marine Engineering Technology under the College of Engineering, which leads me to believe it wasn't considered. "

I agree with these recommendations.

I concur.

I do not feel qualified to comment on recommendations concerning the academic programs.

I have no opinion on these items.

I like the idea of combining MARB and CESS. However, I think the academic advisors will need more support in general if they are absorbing all the former CALS students, particularly in MARB which is such a big program to begin with.

I think it would be a much stronger program to develop a college of marine and maritime studies and keep the various academic programs together on this campus where interdisciplinary can and have flourished. Breaking up the programs to have Maritime Business Administration does not make any more sense than pulling Agribusiness out of the College of Agriculture simply because they focus on the business aspects.

I would also more clearly link the engineering students in Galveston to the Engineering program at main campus? Especially the student tutoring resources?

If departments have similar programs then roll them together and stop making it a hard decision to what major to choose.

If you link all programs, it can benefit all of them. But Marine Biology needs to be left alone. Makes sense, but will be challenging.

Maritime Studies needs to stay. The program graduates some of the most impressive and successful former students from the campus, and the LIST faculty are vital to the foundational success of students from other degree programs.

Merging Oceanography with the Marine and Coastal Environmental Sciences Department instead of Marine Biology will elevate the undergraduate and graduate degree programs and enhance expertise of those faculty members to develop collaborative research proposals, etc.

N/A

No comment

No comments at this time.

Not only academic programs, but training and communication is key.

Should/could the Ocean Engineering and Oceanography programs be more directly tied to the Galveston campus since there is already so much collaboration for graduate students in these programs between the two campuses?

sounds good

"Strengthening the Sea Grant relationship and establishing an office on the Galveston campus has wonderful potential!"

The library was not considered in the report. There may be additional cost benefits to consolidating library operations. This is an area of potential centralization but was not evident in the report.

We need to develop a better model for the core curriculum certification, implementation, assessment and alignment. The course inventory needs to be clarified as well as mapping to multiple departments across remote teaching sites.

The recommendations concerning the LIST department need to be explored further. If the issue is related to delivery of core curriculum courses, the conversations need to include Foundational Sciences as well. The conversation needs to be clearly articulated first. With the new models including Engineering at Galveston, there needs to be good alignment of the technical courses. This can be accomplished and still celebrate the breadth and depth of the humanities related to the marine and maritime mission. If we embrace

interdisciplinary work, this is a critical component of the campus. It is one of the cornerstones that allows the Galveston campus to be positioned nationally as a marine and maritime center. No other institution in the United States can boast a fully integrated interdisciplinary approach.

The proposed organization chart is confusing related to the AOC Dean functions for the campus."

TAMUG Academic Affairs should work closely with TAMU Faculty Affairs for faculty position postings, recruiting, advertising, etc.

That sounds fine, but do not forget about TAMUCC.

The academic advising and business staff have already been combined in MARB and MCES so merging the faculty makes sense.

The MARB students have had so many changes in the short time they have been here.

Grandfather the current ones so any changes would only affect the new incoming students.

The Texas Sea Grant (NOAA federally funded program) mission needs to be clearly understood by the leadership team, as several misconceptions on the program have been identified in the report. A demarcation is necessary to delineate it from the marine related programs (both academic and research) as well as extension programs within the Texas A&M University System. Linking them together without an understanding of the funding sources, management structure, and federal requirements can be detrimental for the future of the Texas Sea Grant program at Texas A&M University.

There is no discussion of the dissolution of LIST, yet they do not appear in any of the academic organizational charts. What happens to the faculty?

These are excellent recommendations and will benefit all departments effected.

These are great plans! I'm looking forward to this change.

These recommendations appear to make sense, but I do not feel educated enough to make a reasonable comment.

Why did the report and recommendations skip right over LIST? How much money did the university throw at a company that skipped an entire academic program???

## **Industry partner/affiliate**

Are you one University or not? That question must be answered and then take advantage of your location, relationships, etc. to make all of Texas A&M Programs be in line and working in the best location and atmosphere possible.

I would NOT combine the programs.

No comment

Support Recommendations

TAMUG does not seem to have any International exchange learning exposure opportunities for Maritime and Marine Engineering students. This should be developed with Maritime Education organizations in Denmark, UK, Greece and especially Singapore. Singapore Education facilities are deeply integrated with the International Maritime Industry.

"Tamug needs more tutors.

Tamug needs qualified, tutors and teachers who speak better English for math and sciences especially physics.

Historically tutors have been booked up if they are qualified, just not enough of them. We need more academic resources to help students, especially those in the Maritime Academy, having a tutor in TAMMA Hall would be ideal.

Pay professors more so that they stay

Offer more options for fun classes for students to explore hobbies and other interests like arts PE some more electives would be nice.

TAMMA needs 2 to 3 people who are dedicated in acquiring internships and billets that is required for C days and service to graduate who will accept billet from new companies and referrals from students and their families to build a repertoire to help match the student to the internship. Over the years, we have observed many incompetent people handling the seatbelts, handover bullets to students didn't know what they were doing but nearly qualify because of a GPA and went out in the field this reflected poorly on the Academy.

Get more billets and different types of billets.

All the people who deal with TAMMA Hall or administration within the maritime program need to go on an SST even if it is for a week or two so that they understand the challenges at sea, what is needed, and how to better serve the students in Maritime.

The people who run maritime billets need to get organized, they have lost so many documents over the years with personal information that is quite disturbing.



Get an online document portal where TAMMA needed documents can be stored securely after they are scanned and uploaded by cadets etc.

"

[REDACTED]

- I believe the more that you can link Texas A&M Galveston's academic programs to Texas A&M University in College Station, the stronger you will make the academic experience at A&M Galveston. It will also continue to improve the overall prestige of the university.

Agree.

"disagree - the Sea Grant programs are already linked.

The MB and MCES departments would be better together."

I don't like either choice

It doesn't matter what we have to say, you didn't even bother to read the feedback on the changes you made to college station. It's insulting that you would even attempt to try this again knowing full well you'll do whatever you want.

Linkages between the two campuses via Sea Grant and the departments can be strengthened with joint appointments, transportation offerings, and degree tracks that allow students to chose their path between the two campuses.

"no comments to add

"

"Recommendations seem very reasonable.

"

"Sea Grant academic programs should be in Galveston.

The combination of the two departments will cause a reduction in the M&CES enrollment - I beleive"

"The MARB and MARS programs should have been combined years ago.

Also agree with abandoning the Liberal Arts/Maritime Studies program."

"There are good reasons for TAMUCS and TAMUG to have different areas of focus in SeaGrant. Why not allow each to focus on strengths rather than become more ""clearly linked?""

Do the Marine Biology and Marine and Coastal Environmental faculty at TAMUG think it is a good idea to merge? If they to not agree then I think administrative enforcement seems ill-advised."

Unknown

[REDACTED]

"1) A framework for the integration of marine and coastal resilience oriented programs with engineering to grow convergence research and scholarship should be developed. This is particularly important as engineering programs are expanding on the Galveston Campus.

There needs to be a roadmap in place to describe and plan how existing and new programs integrate towards common goals. These goals should address some of NSF's big ideas, and the need to expand capacity to ensure a habitable planet and the well-being of humankind. The Galveston campus is unique by having world-class capacities in some of these aspects and engineering can provide tools, ideas and approaches. Other universities should look at Texas A&M as a role model for new approaches and not the reverse. There should be an attempt to develop original ideas on how to move forward instead of simply copying other examples.

2) There are lots of benefits to strengthen the integration of Galveston and College Station. This requires programs to have strong representations on both campuses to benefit from field capabilities, core facilities, and expertise. For example, programs could have research and lab capabilities on both campuses and allow faculty and students to move between as needed or requested. In this regard, relocating oceanography to Galveston would sever many of the connections between the two campuses and disrupt organic relationships with other programs in College Station. Rather a footprint on both campuses is more logical but a framework should be developed to allow the flow of faculty and students as needed. The merging of MCES and MARB is a good step towards unifying the marine sciences on the Galveston campus and provide a more rounded marine science-focused education to undergraduate and graduate students. "

Agree with the recommendation

"Based on the MGT report on LIST (Liberal Studies Department), are faculty in LIST supposed to be integrated into the College of Arts? How about faculty in FSCI (Foundational Sciences Department)? It makes sense that both LIST and FSCI follow the example of OCEN (Ocean Engineering Department) where Galveston faculty in OCEN are now integrated into faculty in OCEN College Station with Department Head physically located in College Station. For FSCI, physics faculty, math faculty, and chemistry faculty could belong to Physics Department, Mathematics Department and Chemistry Department to align all instructions and eliminate unnecessary and inefficient administrative positions on the Galveston campus. Faculty on Galveston campus may get better support and clear instructions for their teaching, research and service if they belong to the departments in College of Arts and Sciences or College of Engineering.

In a separate matter, LIST is not siloed and students across the campus take LIST classes to fulfill minors, their core curriculum and electives— LIST faculty touch every student on this campus. LIST MATTERS!

The MGT report recommends that MARB (Marine Biology Department) and MCES (Marine and Coastal Environmental Science Department) merge into one department. Since many faculty in both departments share graduate students, this merger makes sense in making the department stronger while saving costs through reduction of administrators. "

I do not think it's a good idea to combine the MARB and MCES departments.

I would defer to those programs.

"In the MGT report, the status of the Maritime Studies major (MAST) is not discussed. MAST serves an important purpose on the Galveston campus by helping us retain students who find that they have broader interests than just marine related science and engineering, as well as attracting students who are interested in maritime archaeology, history, law, museum work and/or politics and policy. MAST has been growing over the previous five to ten years, and could become a destination major with the appropriate assignment of faculty and an improvement in marketing.

I support creating better linkages between faculty at the Galveston campus and faculty at the College Station campus. Current ties between Marine Biology and Oceanography have been fruitful, but take place on an individual level. I would ask that the administration work to create a process for collaboration between Galveston faculty and the appropriate departments in CS in order to avoid duplicating programs at the Galveston campus that could be a better fit at CS and vice versa.

I am agnostic to the merger between Marine Biology and MCES. As the report stated, this has been discussed for quite some time. However, there are a number of social scientists within MCES, and I don't see what role they would play in a Marine Biology department. These social scientists bring in grant money and conduct great research, and it is important to ensure that they have the resources they need.

Maritime Administration (MARA) could benefit from closer ties to the Mays Business School. However, for the most part other than this suggestion MARA was left out of much of the MGT Report. What would such a relationship look like, and how could it benefit students at both Galveston and Mays?

Lastly, I would like to address the proposed elimination of the Liberal Studies (LIST) department. I agree that LIST faculty should have stronger ties to their home departments in CS, as the report suggests. This would be particularly important in the tenure and promotion process, to allow review by disciplinary peers. However, I am unsure who is expected to do the coordinating on classes, travel, etc, if the LIST department is eliminated entirely and all faculty are to work individually with department heads in CS. "

Marine Biology and Marine and Coastal Environmental Science departments should be combined. Smaller programs, such as University Studies and Liberal Studies should be eliminated.

Merger of MARB (Marine Biology Department) and MCES (Marine and Coastal Environmental Science Department) is a great idea. Galveston faculty in LIST (Liberal Studies) and FSCI (Foundational Sciences) should be integrated into their respective departments in College of Arts and Sciences (for example, placement of chemistry faculty in FSCI into the chemistry department in CS, placement of english faculty in LIST into the english department in CS, placement of math faculty in FSCI into the math department in CS, etc) to streamline management (including offering courses and evaluation of faculty on Galveston campus) and to be cost-effective by eliminating heads of LIST and FSCI.

## Comments on TAMUG Organizational Review Final Report

In general, the report is poorly written and edited with remarkable oversights and incomplete arguments.

I'll limit my detailed comments to the specific recommendation to "combine the Marine Biology and Marine and Coastal Environmental Sciences departments." That issue was studied extensively in 2020/21 by an Administrator/faculty committee chaired by Dr. Jack Baldauf that unanimously recommended that the now MCES and MARB departments not be merged and stated that the negative consequences outweighed any positive effects. That committee was comprised of Dr. Baldauf, two department heads from College Station, two faculty each from MARB and MARS now MCES. [REDACTED] the committee and will try to summarize some thoughts below.

After extensive investigations and inputs, including presentations by MARB and MCES department heads, the committee carefully concluded that the merger was not needed. That report published Feb 25, 2021 was a much more thorough study of the potential merger than the consultants' report. This is easily shown in that the consultants' report merger arguments only considered the two departments undergraduate programs in their arguments.

But more importantly, MCES and MARB contain the major graduate programs and graduate student population on the Galveston campus. If the Galveston campus is going to be a viable part of Texas A&M University, it needs to foster development of research and graduate programs such as those that exist on the main campus. MARB and MCES are key departments in fostering such research and graduate growth. Also, the graduate programs are essential to increasing much needed student credit hours (SCH) on the Galveston campus with SCH for Ph.D. students up to 20 times higher than that of undergraduates. Each of the major graduate programs in MARB and MCES are healthy and would not benefit from a merger. MARB has an expanding graduate program that is supported by their excellent reputation and recruitment of Marine Biology undergraduates whose teaching is aided by GATs from the department's master's and Ph.D. students. Hence MARB large undergraduate classes and support its graduate program depend on Marine Biology's positive identity in undergraduate recruiting. The Marine Biology name is important to the Department and shouldn't be diluted.

MCES faculty works with two different Ph.D. programs. The more traditional Marine Sciences faculty have joint appointments in the Oceanography Department and guide students seeking masters and Ph.D. degrees in Oceanography. This program has been increasingly successful and should benefit further from the recommendation to move aspects of Sea Grant and Oceanography to the Galveston campus. MCES also has a relatively new Ph.D. mainly offered by faculty associated with the Institute for a Disaster Resilient Texas. Student demand is very high, and the program is currently limited only by lack of faculty. All three Ph.D. programs are viable and Galveston campus showcases. Each would not benefit from a merger in the need to develop content or in the competition for resources in a large, merged department.

I respectfully request that decision makers and implementers carefully read the Baldauf report before imposing a merger of MARB and MCES. I have attached a copy of the Baldauf report to my email.

██████████  
████████████████████  
████████████████████

"

No comment

"Oceanography is the most important minor for Atmospheric Sciences/Meteorology students, and the synergy between these departments is critical for the success of both. The Master of Ocean Science and Technology 3+2 program provides an important career enhancing non-thesis graduate degree for our undergrads. Having the Oceanography Department move to Galveston would be very detrimental to undergraduates in Meteorology. The barriers to academic cross-pollination will be very difficult to overcome with remote attendance and maintain the same quality experiences.

Oceanography is also critical to the multi-disciplinary Environmental Geosciences and Environmental Studies majors. Similar issues to above will arise if classes would have to be remote for main campus students. "

"Oceans and One Health needs better marketing and, quite frankly, a rebranding effort. Students want to major in academic programs that are clearly defined - Biology, English, Marine Biology, etc. Oceans and One Health requires investigation, and most students do not consider it further for their medical field aspirations due to immediately knowing what it is.

Consider changing the name of it to Medical Sciences or something along those lines. Also, it being under the Department of Foundational Sciences further obfuscates what the program is. If this is the only major for that department, the department name should be rebranded as well."

Put the word support back into support departments to academic programs which are designed to fulfill state demand for Universities to develop and create strong knowledgeable workforce. Many support departments do not take academic department head suggestions. Advising is one that has disconnected students from their major mentors. Often giving poor advising. Centralized advising needs to be heavily reviewed. It is not consistent between degrees.

Seems reasonable.

Some MGT report for Galveston campus is concerning. Dr. Thomas (VPAA and Associate Provost) told staff and faculty that College of Geosciences fought against the MGT report a year ago. Dr. Thomas appears strongly against the MGT report this time, especially the suggestion to bring Oceanography Department to Galveston campus, as she put it a stupid

idea that does not make sense. Perhaps President Banks listens to Dr. Thomas since they are very close friends. Another administrator expressed a concern that Galveston campus would become a community college if MGT report is adopted while others expressed support for intervention by College Station.

That's not really how Sea Grant works.

The LIST department is proposed to be dissolved — we could create a large department of “Foundational Arts & Science” at TAMUG to house all the humanities and social sciences faculty at TAMUG, Al long with math, Chem and physics.

The one-sentence recap of the recommendation appears anodyne, even if the reader is left to wonder what “sea grant (sic) academic programs” means. But the supporting text of the report appears to confuse many issues that have little to do with Texas Sea Grant. I conclude the report authors have themselves poor understanding of what “sea grant academic programs” means.

"The recommendations made for academic programs on the Galveston campus included the elimination of the University Studies degree program. Within the context of this recommendation, the report also left the entirety of the Liberal Studies Department off the organizational chart. I want to note here that this is a critical error that has sweeping repercussions for our campus and indicates a fundamental misunderstanding of the role of Liberal Studies (LIST) beyond the University Studies degree program.

To begin, the suggestion to dissolve the University Studies program is made redundant as this degree has been in the process of being phased out for sometime before the MGT report. The observations made about the University Studies degree program are based on outdated information, and I am concerned with the report's language as it seems to tether the Liberal Studies Department solely with the University Studies degree. None of the faculty in the Liberal Studies department are exclusively tied to teaching in this degree program. Further, Liberal Studies has a thriving Maritime Studies major, which houses approximately 70 students within the department at this time. These students receive opportunities to present research, engage with high-impact practices and events such as the Model United Nations program, travel internationally for academic purposes, match into internships, and pursue graduate degree programs. These opportunities would not be possible without the department on the Galveston campus. The Maritime Studies students also make up the majority of student governance on the Galveston campus. They are taught to engage deeply with their campus community. This degree program also serves the special purpose mission of the Galveston campus through engaging students within Maritime Studies major, as well as students enrolled in the core courses that Liberal Studies faculty teach, with our Blue Economy initiative with a special emphasis on the Blue Humanities.

Further, the Liberal Studies Department houses several high-impact initiatives and practices that provide significant learning and professional development opportunities campus-wide. The Common Reader program, a program dedicated to building community through engagement with critical literacy skills, is housed in Liberal Studies. This program is

exclusive to our campus, and English 104 on our campus carries a Cultural Discourse (CD) attribute because of its engagement with Common Reader. The ability for English 104 to also fulfill a CD attribute is crucial for attracting engineering students who want to finish their gen ed requirements quickly. Liberal Studies also provides conservation and archeology labs that connect with the goals of providing experiential-based learning spaces as articulated in the MGT report. Liberal Studies is also home to the Writing Lab and The Studio Hypermedia Lab, both of which engage students in lab-based learning initiatives. Students also have the opportunity to engage with hands-on experiences in media via The Nautilus student paper, Rudder Radio, and the Sea Spray literary journal. These hands-on experiences prepare them well for their futures, while also engaging students beyond the department.

Finally, the Liberal Studies department makes contact with every student on campus as it is primarily responsible for administering the Core Curriculum on the Galveston campus. Being able to engage with students in these courses is helpful for retention purposes, and it also offers students the ability to get to know their faculty within the context of a small campus that is part of a large university. The suggestion for joint appointments would be a great option, so long as it is optional, as the faculty in Liberal Studies are creating and shaping an innovative, effective, and experiential environment that centers interdisciplinarity and promotes the larger goals of the campus. "

This part is poorly thought out. Has anyone investigated why the University Studies programs are not doing well and/or conducted any research on whether -- if better promoted, managed, funded --, these programs could thrive? It is also unlikely, and/or not feasible, for Liberal Studies faculty to find joint appointment "opportunities" or to simply transfer tenure to College Station departments.

Whatever is done, it has to enhance RESEARCH, as well as graduate student programs "Why destroy the power house which is Marine Biology to save the mess that MCES at this time? The obvious solution is in the next section. Why not combine MCES and Oceanography? These two departments already teach the same classes but on two separate campuses. You could set them up just like the Ocean Engineering Program which has people on both campuses. Or not. This idea to combine both departments has been around for more than a decade. If you do it now, what will be done to ensure it is a success and we do not lose even more students? The current leadership in both departments is ill prepared to provide the kind of leadership a reorganization would need to be successful. Will the university provide a professional that can develop a unified vision and the resources needed to bring people together, develop new programs and retain more students? If not, it will be doomed before it starts. Then you throw in Oceanography but do not say whether or not it will be combined with these two departments or stay a stand along department. Or is the real plan to mush all 3 departments together? I hope so. If not, you are just kicking the problem down the road and creating a bigger mess. If this is going to happen, do it right. Invest in the programs, the people and create a set of dynamics programs for the students.

This is a Tier 1 university yet the academic programs are at the end of this survey. They should be right at the top. If we are not here to deliver excellent academic programs then we should shut our doors now. This part of the entire MGT report was a big let down. So are the two recommendations above. Boring! Why did the report not address the other challenges for the Galveston campus?

Marine Engineering Technology has very few students, lots of faculty and few resources. Why do they not get the same support as the other engineering programs? If Aggies are Aggies, then these aggie engineers need to be part of the bigger program. With the new ship that is coming, the program has to triple in size to have enough students to keep the ship running. We have all heard about the ETO program. When will that start? Seems a big loss.

Speaking of losses. The Marine Transportation department needs to have a strong academic leader that values scholarship. The current mentality of the faculty to keep doing things like they did it when they were in schools in the 70's, 80's and 90's is not serving the deck students that need to go out to see in 2023 and beyond. The university should be investing in increasing the scholastic's in this program.

And the biggest lost of all. Why was Liberal Studies not included in the list of academic departments? The faculty in this department teach every single student on campus English, Political science and so on. Most of them are instructional faculty and so joint appointments are not going to be an option. This group should be elevated or at the very least treated equitably. If the university is going to make this exception, then it should also be made for foundational sciences which is also a service unit.

Lastly, academic programs are the key to a successful university. I cannot finish this section without sharing that I wish the MGT report put more emphasis on this part of the work our campus does. It seems a massive lost opportunity.

"

"With respect to "clearly link related sea grant academic programs between Galveston and College Station", perhaps the biggest oversight of all by MGT was Liberal Studies (LIST). I realize they clarified that it was not an oversight, however, their recommendation is short sighted and ill informed – which I blame on the LIST dept head not being part of the conversation, through no fault of her own (she was on a Fulbright in Cambodia).

Joint appointments for all in the College of Arts and Life Sciences only takes care of a portion of the Liberal Studies faculty, for example they also have Political Science which would be the Bush School. While joint appointments are great – somehow, we have to get the main campus colleges/schools on board. For many of our faculty, particularly in Liberal Studies and Marine Engineering Technology, securing joint appointments has been a nightmare. We submit the request to the department head/dean as required and we never



get them back signed so it can be filed with Faculty Affairs. Months and months go by without response or accountability from our TAMU counterparts.

Telling us to eliminate University Studies as part of their recommendations comes late. We've already started moving in that direction with both programs attached to Liberal Studies (Marine Environmental Law and Policy "MELP", Tourism and Coastal Community Development "TCCD") with MELP becoming a minor and TCCD becoming a major. The faculty in this department do not solely focus on the University Studies programs. They teach in our core curriculum, provide Language, Philosophy and culture options, creative arts as well as cultural discourse options to all students in all undergraduate majors located on the Galveston Campus. This also includes many courses attached to the various minors we can offer locally.

LIST also houses a BA degree in Maritime Studies (MAST), which was also not mentioned in the recommendations. It is important to note here that our MAST students are highly engaged in self-governance through the Student Government Association. This department also operates and supports our writing lab and multi-media studio, including our student newspaper the Nautilus, Rudder Radio and Sea Spray, our literary journal – all of which enrich the student experience on the Galveston Campus. Without our MAST program, our marine and maritime campus would lose the "Arts" in STEAM which would be a shame, as the Blue Humanities is an important component of the Blue Economy.

One of the most unique offerings we have on the Galveston Campus is our diving minor, housed within our LIST dept. Students from any major can learn scuba diving alongside their traditional academics. This is a high impact practice, with a dedicated team of faculty who consistently go above and beyond to meet the challenges of an aging swimming pool long overdue for replacement, inclement weather and numerous field trips occurring outside of business hours so students can be certified. It brings students from across our majors into a collective experience that allows them to make lasting connections and relationships outside of their major which is so crucially important for cross collaboration and multi-disciplinary work.

Furthermore, some of our LIST faculty are the most actively engaged faculty on campus, particularly our Academic Professional Track faculty who are delivering huge service loads in the form of Faculty Senate service, Honors Program, and our Common Reader program just to name a few. I cannot advocate strong enough to leave the department intact as we find a path forward. Should they be absorbed into their respective disciplines in the various colleges/schools on main campus, we will lose not only a part of our identity, but our cohesiveness in delivering the best student experiences possible. I am not opposed to corresponding joint appointments with their College Station counterparts to help deliver the same experience and curriculum that main campus students experience, but we do have to solve the problem of our joint appointment requests going into a blackhole never to see the light of day again.

Following this same vein to “clearly link related sea grant academic programs between Galveston and College Station”, Maritime Business Administration seems an afterthought of “oh, hey, that could fit with Mays”. Our Maritime Business Administration department has had a rocky relationship with Mays in the past and they really have never wanted anything to do with us. Since this report has been released, Mays has been silent and does not even seem willing to engage in a conversation with our Chief Academic Officer (although we are still very early in this process and perhaps schedules are just not aligning). This is a very versatile degree program at both the undergraduate and graduate levels that should remain a Galveston major due to the unique niche of specializing in maritime business, supply chain management and logistics – fitting perfectly with our special purpose institution mission of all things marine and maritime.

With respect to “combine Marine Biology and Marine and Coastal Environmental Sciences departments”, this is long overdue. It just does not make sense to be the only institution in the country that separates Marine Biology from marine sciences. Additionally, Marine and Coastal Environmental Science has been floundering in my opinion. Their recent name changes have created less than desirable acronyms (ie: CESS), caused confusion in our own culture, their enrollment is down and currently suffering from lack of leadership – which can be attributed to no succession plan when the former department head stepped down at the end of his term.

Also of significance is the undergraduate retention rate of Marine Biology. I am one of those people who throughout my entire childhood, wanted to be a marine biologist. So, they have no problem recruiting students, some of which are not suited to math and heavy scientific work, causing a retention problem. We have to get better at recruiting the right students to the program and once there, need to support them to be successful. One of the most promising actions I have seen of late is the common first year experience across both MARB and MCES. I believe this is having a lasting impact and opens student eyes to other disciplines/opportunities that compliment Marine Biology and is just as important and rewarding from a career aspect. So, while the departments are not officially merged, they are now operating as if merged with respect to staff and the common first year experience.

Although not really mentioned as a recommendation, one of the findings on page 19 of the MGT report “Considering the interest of some students to transfer between Galveston and College Station, discrepancies in core math and science courses between Galveston and College Station are a concern despite having the same core requirements.” stands out loud and clear and has been something we have tried to rectify without much success due to push back from our faculty about their academic freedom or in some cases, just being stubborn in their teaching methods and do willing to change.

It is essential that our math and science courses align with College Station and our faculty need to understand their responsibilities and obligations with teaching in the core

curriculum. I know the recertification process has not gone well here due to faculty not retaining the right artifacts or taking it seriously. It may be time for a team from main campus to come down and start having these conversations with our faculty in the same room. We are going to need main campus support to change/reshape the culture as our academic leadership can beat the topic to death without seeing any real change in our faculty behaviors.

Another point of concern from page 19 of the MGT report is the fact that our faculty in Maritime Transportation and Marine Engineering Technology are on 9-month appointments with a plus 3-month appointment to go on summer cruise. They simply do not get time off throughout the academic year other than relying on the fact that they do not have to be on campus if classes are not in session. However, on those days there are no classes, a lot of the planning work needs to happen to be prepared for summer cruise. Again, that new ship is coming. Will the Galveston Campus really be prepared? Not if we keep working our faculty under the current expected workload without adequate compensated time off. Although no one wants to go in this direction or even have this conversation, 12-month appointments may be appropriate for those faculty that consistently work aboard the summer training cruise.

"

## The Sea Grant Mission

- Emphasize the priority of the sea grant mission activities existing in Galveston by moving the sea grant headquarters and the Oceanography department to the Galveston Campus.

## Current / Former Student

100% agree with this recommendation!

Agreed

Completely agree!

Do not move the oceanography department to Galveston. Many students agree this is not a good idea. The students at college station attended your campus for a reason. I would assume they would not want to be moved. Also, the galveston campus is a small campus but it has wonderful community being so tight knit. Myself nor the other students want to see it become overpopulated. I do not think moving the department is a good idea.

█ the ocean, its going to be dead in 20 years, thanks chem

I agree

I agree this should happen. It makes sense to have oceanography by the ocean.

I agree.

I believe that Sea Grant and the Department of Oceanography would be more successful on the College Station campus. Currently, the focus of both organizations is on the open ocean, as all cutting-edge oceanography departments. Moving the facilities would cost millions of dollars, would not support the cutting-edge research, and would incentivize professors to change to coastal research. In my experience, oceanography departments that focus on a specific coastal area (aka Galveston Bay) are not regarded as the best programs in the country and do not attract the most competitive students or professors.

I do agree but there still needs to be awareness at College Station

"I do not agree that the entire Sea Grant office should be moved to Galveston, especially as many of the academic programs that take advantage of the grant remain on the College Station Campus. However, maybe a sub office should appear on Galveston campus.

Oceanography should remain on College Station campus since it's move will affect the families of professors and students who have made their lives here in College Station."

I don't even know what this is. This should be stressed

I don't even know what this is so definitely get the word out more so that students can take advantage of it.

I don't think it's a good idea to move the Oceanography department

I fully support the official recommendation. It is foolhardy to govern sea grant money from a place that is far from where it is needed and used. Why is oceanography in college station? We have an ocean right here!

I had no idea this was a thing so Galveston needs to advertise their programs better.

I have nothing to do with the Sea Grant Mission or Oceanography but it has been a joke between me and my main campus friends that I, a business major, have to get this degree

at a waterfront location to prepare for my office job in Houston. But the Oceanographers, can learn to study the ocean from 140 miles inland no problem.

I support the idea of moving the sea grant hq down there however moving the oceanography department down there could hurt the headcount as not everybody (students and staff) would be willing to move down there for a 4 year degree given the state of the Galveston campus

I think moving the sea grant could create beneficial opportunities for Galveston students and I do not think the risk of a bad storm affecting artifacts is good enough reason to not offer the opportunity to Galveston students.

I think this is a great idea.

I think this is the appropriate and right suggestion for the entire Galveston and College Station campus. It ties well into the counterarguments I've had to some suggestions and further emphasizes distinguishing the unique opportunities TAMUG offers to increase recruitment and retention rates.

Increasing access to Texas Sea Grant for Galveston students can greatly improve opportunities for applied research, engagement, networking, and rate of nationally prestigious fellowships.

"It is the expectation of NOAA and the National Sea Grant that each state Sea Grant operation housed at a university keep close structural ties to the university's central leadership. Moving Texas Sea Grant to Galveston compromises Texas Sea Grant's ability to maintain this relationship and endangers the prospects of Texas A&M being re-certified as a Sea Grant University.

It is obvious by the information included in the report that MGT did not consult with TXSG's leadership or broad network of faculty & staff collaborators. The consultant team also failed to properly define and describe Sea Grant's core mission and activities accurately, and based on these inaccuracies, their recommendations should not be considered in regards to the operations of TXSG. "

It only makes sense for the sea grant mission and Oceanography departments to be next to the water where they would have the ocean to use for their programs.

It would be more practical to structure the oceanography department like the ocean engineering department. Moving all of the science and equipment from College Station would be time-consuming and expensive. Over 5-10 years it could be done, but not a fast resolution. I would also be wary of all of the technology and hurricane risks here in Galveston.

Move the oceanography headquarters down here. If students are dedicated to studying the sea and its properties they should want to live by it. Also it would allow for more research to location and oceanography majors could take non-major classes that are more related to their fields. This would also increase the on campus student size which will help build a healthier campus community

Moving an entire department is ridiculous. Uprooting faculty, staff, students and by extension families is a costly idea that will have many repercussions. Focusing on adding and not taking away would be more beneficial to all

Moving the Oceanography department to Galveston will require a diplomatic hand. The Oceanography department was founded in the late 1940s and was one of the first public Oceanography programs in the United States; it was founded in College Station. Moving the Oceanography department to Galveston would sever ties with the other departments and on-campus facilities that Oceanography faculty closely work with; these include the Atmospheric Sciences, Geology, Meteorology, the Stable Isotope Lab, various engineering departments, and the microscopy and imaging center. This will limit the quality of science performed if the department moves to Galveston and will decrease productivity since many students and faculty would have to travel between campuses instead of across College Station's campus. If the move does occur, additional lab space would have to be created before faculty move their labs down to Galveston. There currently needs more lab space to accommodate the whole department moving to Galveston. If the move is too quick, preventing new lab space from being created for the College Station Oceanographers, research would be brought to a standstill. This could prevent Ph.D. students from graduating or lead to several faculty members leaving the program. "My name is [REDACTED]. I am an oceanography undergraduate at Texas A&M University College Station campus. And I am mortified by your suggestion.

Texas A&M was not my first choice. I was offered a seat at UCSD, where I would be allowed to work with the researchers at Scripps during my undergrad. One of the reasons I chose A&M instead, which is neither as academically strong nor as prestigious, was because of the Aggie Network. I am a third generation aggie: my grandpa, [REDACTED], was class of '54, my parents met at bonfire, my aunts, uncles, even cousins have walked the same steps as me. I watched my older cousins march as part of the trumpeters in the aggie band, I held my grandfather's hand during the muster where they called my grandmother's name, I played in the grass outside Kyle field with parents during my first aggie game. I came here for the aggie network, for the culture I was born into and fell in love with. That was the deal.

For reasons unclear to me and unclear to anyone who's tried to explain it to me, you want to change the deal. You want to move my major to Galveston. Not just my major, the professors, labs, and projects I have poured myself into. You want to not only degrade my academic experience through this move but also degrade my social. The ocean department will not be able to realistically run as smoothly as it does now for a few years at least if you move it; and I would be deprived of the social groups I've interacted with here. My church is here, they are my second family. My clubs are here, TAMU artists lets me meet people from all different majors and explore ways to express myself. My friends are here, from many non oceanography departments. My housing is here, with leases I will have to break if you demand I follow you across state. You are forcing me to choose between my passions, oceanography, or my culture, which is here. And quite frankly? That was not the deal. I applied to College Station. I pay my tuition to attend college station. The deal was to live here.

If you change your side of the deal, I'll have to change mine. My options are transfer majors or schools: I don't like either. "

N/A

No comment

No comment.

No comments.

Offer to more students

ok

Reading this makes me think that the "Sea Grant" HQ and Oceanography is not here. Seems silly to give that to the land locked College Station. As the only US Maritime campus of A&M this should not even be a question. The question comes when the University can't afford to pay them a fair and competitive wage and the turnover rate increases. So the pay should be addressed first and then the Sea Grant Mission and Oceanography should be sent here.

Sure

TAMU uses Galveston marketing, Galveston data, etc. TAMU is misleading students by giving them the idea that they will see the water. Oceanography should have stayed with Galveston to begin with. Stop trying to move us away from one of the main reasons that we choose to come to Galveston. I highly doubt you will take any of what I have currently said seriously, but note the Students at Tamug are not happy and are scared.

The Oceanography major being placed in College Station baffled both myself and other students, I speak for many in saying this makes sense.

The sea grant headquarters should be on the Galveston Campus, as the students there are mostly studying marine and maritime activities.

This is a good change, there should be more trust and responsibility given to TAMUG facilities.

This is a great idea! There is no reason our Oceanography department should be in C-Stat.

This is a VERY good change.

This is smart. Highlighting the value of Galveston programs to the Texas Gulf Coast is important.

This is unrealistic, but I would like to see this happen in the future. We don't have the resources to support a new department but I would like to see a gradual transition if in the future we do.

This may be something to revisit if and when the Galveston campus is elevated to a position of competitive opportunity. Until then, moving the sea grant headquarters and the Oceanography department to Galveston lowers opportunity for the students tied to those programs.

YES!

Yes!! Move sea grant department to Galveston.

Former Student

Agree. Oceanography should always be in Galveston.

Agreed 100%

Excellent idea but ensure you have the labs, facilities, etc to ensure the program has what is needed to provide the best education.

Galveston campus should maintain authority over their group of students and resources. They should not be dependent on the College Station campus. Galveston knows their students and understands their needs and should be in the position to administer to their population.

Hosting any Sea Grant function out of college station just doesn't make sense; The Brazos isn't a salt water estuary. The legislature chartered TAMUG to a maritime campus, why wouldn't we use it that way?

I agree that oceanography would probably be a good place on the Galveston campus, but I also wouldn't take it fully away from college station.

I agree with moving both of these to the Galveston campus. Makes no logistical sense having "Sea Grant Mission" activities land locked in college station

"I am a former student '92, and a former member of the College of Geoscience Dean's Advisory Committee. I am also a state Sea Grant Director in another state and a former NOAA Senior Executive. I think it would be a major strategic mistake to move Texas Sea Grant to Galveston. Texas Sea Grant is the program that supports the entire state and is not simply a Texas A&M program. I have this same relationship as my program is based in a major state university. Having Texas Sea Grant located at the main campus raises the stature of the program, provides access for Sea Grant leadership to connect with Texas A&M academic leadership and increases access and visibility state-wide. Also, the National Sea Grant Program (based in NOAA) has expectations that each state Sea Grant Programs maintain close connections at the Dean, Provost or University President level. My concern is that by moving Texas Sea Grant to Galveston, it reduces the stature of the program and could potentially endanger the long-term funding of the program.

It seems clear that the report did not actually take the time to truly understand the nature of the Sea Grant mission, its continued positive impact on the state's challenges on the coast, its stature in gaining political support for addressing coastal issues, and its over 50-year history as a Federal/State partnership. Sea Grant is a partnership building organization that significantly leverages its federal investment and through its close connections with coastal residents, increases the stature and visibility of Texas A&M outside of the academic community. "

I believe Sea Grant and Oceanography in Galveston is a positive. there will be many detailed problems to work out considering the current interdependence on equipment located in other departments on the main campus currently .

I concur fully.

I think it would be interesting to move the Oceanography Department to the Galveston campus. This would impact the student experience. Especially for students passionate and/or curious about conducting field work in Marine Sciences and Oceanography. Living and studying/working on Galveston Island offers more opportunity (and/or ease) for experiential learning in the field: for example, field sampling, testing instruments in salt water, boat handling, etc. This was mentioned in the "Aggie Student Experience and



Student Affairs" section of the Organizational Report. As a former MARS student, I believe it was an accurate description.

It would be nice if GMT understood what Sea Grant means.

Leave them alone

Love!

makes sense

Maybe I would care more about this if I didn't feel alienated.

"Moving the Department of Oceanography to Galveston will not achieve the stated goal. It will isolate ocean sciences, it will not elevate the Sea Grant mission, and it will not elevate TAMUG.

It is critical for the Oceanography Department to physically remain in College Station and retain its administrative location (adloc) in the College of Arts & Sciences in order to maintain its outstanding research portfolio and cutting-edge academic programs.

Oceanography has gained valuable visibility, in both research and academics, from joining the College of Arts & Sciences, and would like to continue to serve that College.

- Reputation/historical justification: The Department of Oceanography in College Station is the oldest degree granting Oceanography department in the United States. The top Oceanography departments in the country are all on flagship campuses, implying that our presence on the flagship campus of TAMU, both in name and location, elevates our national and global visibility and reputation.
- Research justification: Oceanography has been/is home to several nationally/internationally recognized federally funded programs, largely due to physical access to resources on a large campus: e.g. World Ocean Circulation Experiment (WOCE; 1990-2002), Gulf of Mexico Coastal Ocean Observing System program (GCOOS; current). Additionally, the Oceanography department maintains a highly successful and cutting-edge research program (FY20 research expenditures, including Geochemical and Environmental Research Group-GERG were \$9,451,091). This research is dependent on collaborations and research ties with faculty from different departments and colleges in College Station. Faculty from departments in Engineering and the College of Arts & Sciences routinely contact Oceanography faculty to build interdisciplinary collaborations. This visibility is key to elevating Ocean Science at Texas A&M and would undoubtedly be reduced by moving all ocean-related science to Galveston. Furthermore, Oceanography has shared facilities with other departments in College Station, as well as the state-of-the-art research facilities already present in the O&M building. Any move to Galveston would require duplication of College Station facilities in Galveston in order to maintain the successful research portfolio of Oceanography faculty. This would not be possible without investment of tens to hundreds of millions of dollars to replicate infrastructure (including a building), startup, and NSF Major Research Instrumentation funding for shared facilities, e.g. Fitzsimmons trace metal lab, Liu organic geochemistry lab, GERG mass spectrometry facility, the stable

isotope facility, etc. If forced to move to Galveston, research dollars and productivity would drop precipitously.

- Academic justification: Oceanography is a core science that must remain alongside the other core sciences in the College of Arts & Sciences. The state-of-the-art reputation of the Oceanography department on the flagship campus enhances job opportunities for graduates.
  - Oceanography faculty currently teach a valuable arm of the Environmental Geosciences & Environmental Studies majors (we are the 2nd largest contributor behind Geography) with all Environmental Geoscience themes having several required Oceanography classes. Approximately 95% of the Oceanography undergraduate course offerings are taken by environmental majors, in addition to four major GEOS classes taught by Oceanography faculty. Furthermore, the Environment and Sustainability Initiative is a priority in the College of Arts & Sciences; Oceanography strengthens this initiative and embraces its development.
  - The Meteorology major relies heavily on the Oceanography curriculum to strengthen their degree and entry into the workforce by encouraging students to double major or minor in Oceanography.
  - TAMUG only offers Navy ROTC, however Oceanography students commission into the Navy, Army, Coast Guard, and NOAA Corp. Keeping Oceanography in College Station enhances our commitment to serving the Corps of Cadets and supports the March to 3000 initiative.
  - Oceanography is currently an undergraduate discovery major. Physically isolating a discovery major away from the flagship campus will reduce our visibility to students in other majors already on the College Station campus. Additionally, undergraduates that chose Oceanography over a TAMUG major have stated it is because they wanted access to cutting-edge opportunities and facilities currently found on the flagship campus.
- Practical justification: Faculty partners have jobs in College Station, with several as faculty in other departments at TAMU. Many faculty have expressed that they would leave Texas A&M if asked to leave College Station.

In summary, it is critical for reputation, research, and academics that the flagship TAMU campus retains the Oceanography department in College Station.

Ultimately, the Oceanography faculty believe the best investment in TAMU-Galveston would be an injection of funding into the Galveston campus to develop and expand their existing programs. Any investment in moving Oceanography detracts from funds needed to elevate Galveston. For example, the Marine Biology (MARB) program has capped undergraduate enrollment, at least partially because there are not enough faculty to support additional SCHs. Investment in the growth of the MARB program (the largest Galveston program), such as through additional faculty hires, should be prioritized in any effort to elevate TAMU-Galveston.

"

Moving the Sea Grant headquarters and the Oceanography Department to Galveston is a good decision, in my opinion.

no comment.

Oceanography department has a close connection and communication with departments on College Station (CS) campus, like atmosphere sciences, geology, and mathematics. It is not simply cruise and observations. Many students from oceanography also need choose courses from other departments. The lack of communication with other departments on CS campus would be increasing the difficulty of research and decreasing research interests. Then, it may further lower the evaluation of tamu itself.

"STRONGLY disagree with both of these proposals, speaking as a former student in oceanography. The economic expense and disruptions of moving the oceanography department make no sense whatsoever, and point to a lack of understanding by the consultants. Most of the research being done in the department has little to do with Galveston and has no need to be there. Of course, marine operations facilities need to be there, and have been for many years. The lab facilities, collections, and large faculty present in College Station have no need to move anywhere. Affiliated facilities and labs (GERG, IODP, etc.) are in College Station already. This one seems like a non-starter, a solution in search of a problem.

In addition, while Sea Grant headquarters could be moved to Galveston, this also seems unnecessary. With it ties to the Extension Service, Sea Grant has ties to a network of extension offices up and down the coast. Keeping it in College Station seems no less ""centralized"" than having it in Galveston, and having it in College Station permits the leveraging of services available more easily available on the main campus.

Finally, in both instances, the ""future proofing"" of retaining the College Station location by the avoidance of extreme coastal weather events and the future disruptions to be expected over the next century due to rising sea levels on a low-lying barrier island like Galveston should not be ignored."

There needs to be more priority and education about the sea grant in college station, to the public, and even to the Galveston campus itself. I do not feel like we heard enough about this and any opportunities that were offered because of it.

This is about the only suggestion that makes sense.

this is strange that it is not already in galveston.

Wholeheartedly agree.

Would be interesting, however TAMUG is currently dealing with a space and housing crisis and would be unable to have more people.

Yes this is important to Galveston students.

## Faculty / Staff

-

This is not a good idea given that the department is deeply rooted in College Station, and moving it to Galveston could result in its demise.

A&M will lose this program with centralization.

absolutely

Absolutely a great an idea. Some folks will argue we don't have the "real estate" to accommodate lab space allocation for CSTAT faculty in OCNG. However, a more critical look at available real estate in the OCSB building will find a lot of potential space not used AT ALL on the 3rd floor of OCSB. For example, Dr. Peter Sanschi is approaching retirement (80) and has a HUGE real estate foot print that is only supporting 1 part time Research scientist (no PhD students, no UG research projects etc.). That alone could likely support the real estate / laboratory needs of 4-5 TT OCNG faculty (instantly support folks like Drs. Fitzsimmons, Schamburger, Sylvan). Dellapenna also manages a footprint that could be cut-in-half and support another TT OCNG faculty lab. The entire executive suite on the 3rd floor of OCSB is entirely under-used real estate. There may be an IDRT label on the door, but only Dr. Merrel of the entire research team is really here, the rest are at the Ion Center in Houston. Short term (&lt;3 year) going pains would likely give rise to considerable more professional productivity in the long run. While

Again, facilities are needed before this can even be considered. Where are the departments going to be housed, physically? Where are we going to have classes? Where are the labs going to be?

Again, please learn more about Sea Grant. The report is ill informed.

"Agree.

All Ocean-related domains, including Ocean & [Coastal] Engineering HQ, should be moved to Galveston, and all new facilities/funding for Ocean-related domains should be directed to Galveston. This will ensure future faculty are incentivized to move to Galveston. The additional costs associated with the two-campus sub-optimal current status quo will be optimized. "

Agreed and also liase more with industries in the space.

Agreed.

Are you going to provide the needed space and other resources to accommodate the Oceanography Department and Sea Grant Offices PRIOR to any such moves?

Bringing Oceanography to Galveston is an excellent way to reinforce the Sea Grant Mission and build the Galveston Campus. I fear the pushback from faculty and the costs associated with creating facilities at Galveston to accommodate this department and headquarters.

But don't you want to avoid becoming disconnected?

Can't be better!

Do not have oceanography department moved to Galveston, but keep it in College Station and create a dual presence (similar to Ocean Engineering).

First, it should be noted that Oceanography, as a department and a discipline, involves research far beyond the scope of Sea Grant, even though most Oceanography faculty

members contribute to Sea Grant missions. Therefore, considering moving Oceanography with Sea Grant and its mission is not appropriate. Additionally, to strengthen TAMUG, we need to put most resources into strengthening the existing TAMUG infrastructure and improving existing faculty and student experiences, not devote resources to moving Sea Grant and Oceanography to Galveston. The move is costly and will dilute the impact of strengthening TAMUG. TAMU main campus has many research strengths, such as the Mays School of Business, Bush School Government & Public Service, School of Public Health, College of Engineering, and College of Arts and Sciences. These strengths are strongly supporting the next Frontier of Ocean policies, Ocean Justice, Blue Economy, and beyond. Having Oceanography on campus can start inter- and transdisciplinary programs that strengthen Oceanography and many programs on campus while providing a strong gateway for TAMUG to be integrated into a larger network of the program while TAMUG still enjoys the resources entirely devoted to further strengthening their existing programs and collaboratively build more with Oceanography and other TAMU strengths on campus. Instead of moving Sea Grant and Oceanography to TAMUG, one may consider a joint program through joint faculty appointments and shared graduate and undergraduate degree programs to ensure the best integrative effort.

Given the similarity of the programs of MCES and Oceanography, perhaps bringing Oceanography to Galveston and merging that unit with MCES would be a mutually beneficial proposal, and clearly much better than the creation of a dysfunctional unit if MARB and MCES were to be merged.

"Glad to see that Sea Grant is capitalized here (the report did not). So many points brought up in the MGT report were flawed or in error, but I will focus on Oceanography.

Moving the Oceanography department is ludicrous. This will not emphasize the priorities of Sea Grant (although giving Sea Grant operations space in Galveston could be beneficial). I am sure many other comments have outlined the issues about how this would lead to a precipitous decline in research funding and productivity—and I would like to emphasize this as a likely outcome (e.g., specialized facilities required for funded programs, specific shared equipment would no longer be available). Moreover, the Oceanography department faculty teach many of the required courses for the Environmental studies majors, that is a current area focused on improving and expanding (per the memo recently sent by Dean Bermudez).

In more practical terms, I do not understand the financial benefits to this proposal. Instead of the costs incurred by moving a large department or reconfiguring it to be part of Galveston, I would suggest investing in the Galveston campus. If the university really wants to promote Oceanography and coastal marine science, why not improve our research capabilities:

- a research vessel capable of coastal ocean research

This would certainly elevate the Galveston campus for both research opportunities and possibly attract more UG students to the Galveston campus

- a strategic plan that is inclusive of all environmental programs

Future planning should include stakeholders (i.e. FACULTY!!) and not rely on a questionable firm. The report was poorly written and internally inconsistent."

Having Sea Grant headquartered in Galveston or even Houston would make more sense than in College Station. Moving Oceanography to Galveston has been proposed before, more than once, and it really requires a major investment in facilities, which has not been suggested. And why not bring GERG, or some of it, also. They do oceanographic research and surely should be on the coast.

I absolutely support emphasizing and elevating the sea grant mission. However, moving the Oceanography department to the Galveston campus could have the paradoxical effect of weakening that mission, by divorcing the Oceanography faculty and students from all of the interdisciplinary collaborations that are possible in College Station's new Arts & Sciences college, such as the environmental initiatives that are already strengthening in the new A&S college. I suggest elevating the ocean sciences at the Galveston campus instead by strengthening its connections to the College Station campus and creating more opportunities for students and faculty on the Galveston campus to work with our strong, visible Oceanography department in College Station. It is important to strengthen Galveston's sea grant connections without undermining the College Station department, because working collaboratively with an existing strong unit will elevate them both, while trying to move the College Station department would weaken them by cutting their existing ties to other units and supports at College Station.

I agree with the recommendation, but moving the Oceanography department would require very large investment for buildings, labs, equipment, etc.

I am extremely upset that this consulting company is making such a recommendation without acknowledging that their recommendation would affect dozens of families. Our Oceanography faculty, staff, and students have built roots in our College Station community. This recommendation implies that these people are mere 'assets' that can be moved in order to meet some very vague notion of priorities relative to the sea grant mission of the university. This is an example of an administration that is not listening to its faculty.

"I am faculty in the Department of Oceanography and therefore address this point with deep understanding of my department. I was also a joint appointment in the former MARB-IDB graduate program so understand that program well. I start by reiterating the position put forth by my department as a whole: it is critical for the Oceanography Department to physically remain in College Station and retain its administrative location (adloc) in the College of Arts & Sciences in order to maintain its outstanding research portfolio and cutting-edge academic programs. Oceanography has gained valuable visibility, in both research and academics, from joining the College of Arts & Sciences, and would like to continue to serve that College.

All successful, nationally recognized and prestigious departments of Oceanography or Marine Science are on flagship campuses. It is simply not necessary for faculty, grad students, postdocs, or undergraduate students to be on the ocean every day to study it. While ~1/3 of my research funding is related to the Gulf of Mexico, something I am proud of and share that research in all of my courses, 2/3 of my research is for work far away from the Gulf of Mexico. During my career, I have spent 456 days at sea conducting research; 84% of those days were outside the Gulf of Mexico, in waters far away from land. That includes work that led to a paper in Nature and being interviewed by the Wall Street Journal in an article published just this week. And I am not alone in being able to conduct impactful, nationally recognized work that elevates TAMU without immediate access to the ocean.

In regards to research, the strength of this campus, for me, is its resources. I collaborate regularly with IODP and its location in College Station is specifically why I came to TAMU. I am also now collaborating with researchers in the College of Engineering, which would not be likely if I was physically in Galveston because that collaboration was initiated by my colleagues in Engineering searching this campus for researchers with overlapping interests. This is also true of collaborations with members of the Department of Geology and Geophysics.

My research requires specific infrastructure that was purpose built for me to conduct my research. The cost of replicating this in Galveston would be high, and more importantly, spent bringing new expertise onto that campus that would elevate both campuses through quality researchers in Galveston and new opportunities for collaboration. As it is, I already have ongoing collaborations with faculty in MARB and MCES, moving to Galveston will not improve that any moreso.

In regards to teaching, I have taught 1960 students Introduction to Oceanography since 2016, a feat I am very proud of. Part of my career goal is to reach as many non-oceanographers as possible and teach them how the ocean works. The College Station campus has provided me an amazing opportunity to fulfill that goal and generate a lot of SCHs in the process. TAMUG will not be able to do the same and also has students who already know about the ocean. My teaching and outreach impact will be reduced by a move there.

On a personal level, all TAMU faculty and Sea Grant employees have personal ties to College Station that we do not wish to lose. Many of us have partners and spouses in College Station, and some of us cannot move due to familial obligations. It would be a loss beyond Oceanography to move us - spouses and partners that are superstar faculty in other departments would be forced to move as well, it is simply too far for a dual location living situation. The cost of moving Sea Grant and Oceanography is more expensive than the labs themselves and new buildings that would be required to house us (likely 10s to 100s of millions of dollars), many faculty could not move their partners, or simply will not

move to Galveston for other personal reasons, resulting in a loss of faculty from multiple departments and very likely not strengthening the Galveston campus in a meaningful way.

All this said, I am supportive of elevating the Galveston campus and am very much in alignment with several suggestions that would increase collaboration and teaching between the Department of Oceanography in College Station and the Galveston campus. This includes considering Oceanography-relevant faculty, particularly from the Marine and Coastal Environmental Sciences (MCES) department at TAMUG, or Full Joint Appointment status in the Department of Oceanography (e.g. 67% TAMUG, 33% OCNG). Full Joint Appointment faculty would gain resources and visibility from their ties to the flagship campus to recruit students and gain proper credit for their participation in the Oceanography graduate program, as well as voting rights, without having to change their adloc to College Station (as was done for Ocean Engineering). This strengthens ties while avoiding staffing and space issues associated with changing adloc to another campus.

I also support pathways to allow for real connection between curricula on the two campuses, including allowing minors focused at TAMUG to be part of the new BA degree in the Department of Oceanography (or in concert with the BS in Oceanography - the BA requires a minor so is a natural fit, but this is equally applicable for the BS).

Another way to strengthen undergraduate and graduate education on both campuses is to create 3+2 Bachelor's-Master's degree programs that link the two campuses.

Finally, a shuttle between both campuses would really increase interaction. As it currently stands, it takes 2.5 hours and significant gas cost to drive between campus. This is prohibitively expensive for students. Even faculty may take advantage of a shuttle - I endeavor to teach at least once per semester on the TAMUG campus for my graduate course that always has students from both campuses. A shuttle would greatly facilitate this, enhancing my teaching ability and the students' experience in class.

"

"I am receptive to this change, but it is likely to be unrealistic w/r/t infrastructure without significant development budget in Galveston.

I can imagine a few more modest ""sea grant"" initiatives that might be better suited to Galveston than College Station; for example,

I believe TAMU Galveston should be a destination for anthropology and oceanography students seeking expertise in field methods, particularly marine remote sensing, a crucial skillset for underwater archaeologists and marine geographers one in which both departments (G-LIST and CS-ANTH) are woefully lacking expertise.

Galveston has access to the boats, the water, and to remote sensing equipment. It would be relatively simple to either allow existing Galveston MAST and MCES faculty resources to



brush up their skills or recruit new faculty who are experts in this skillset. Such a training program would SIGNIFICANTLY increase the hireability of students of the Nautical Archaeology program on main campus and students of the MAST program here and would have interdisciplinary application for non-MAST/ANTH students interested in public safety diving, forensics, engineering, marine sciences, and marine biology.

This would not require the relocation of any entire programs, but rather simply that the MAST program, the MCES/MARS program, the ANTH program, and various Oceanography programs should work together to have an organized and facilitated pathway for CS based students to come down to Galveston for small portions of their academic work. "

I am strongly, strongly opposed to the move of Oceanography to the Galveston Campus. This will not contribute much to Galveston and will be significantly damaging to Oceanography. We should note that this department has been extremely successful and have a high profile nationally and internationally and they are successful because of their own prominence and their physical presence on the main campus. Note that our Oceanography colleagues carry out field research throughout the world and being located in Galveston would not make their field work more/less prominent. Moreover, one needs to consider the significant increasing flooding risk in Galveston and the potential damages to the department's research infrastructure.

I completely disagree with this recommendation. Oceanography has a lot of common educational programs and courses with many other departments in College Station. Moving them to Galveston would disrupt such programs significantly.

I have no objections, and moving Oceanography will benefit our campus, but I just get the feeling whoever created this report simply has no idea of the complexities and financial costs of moving a well-established department to a new campus as well as the disruptions on both campuses that will initially come with it.

I have to admit that I am stunned that an Oceanography department of a major university would not be located on its oceanside campus. I wonder how much that might have hurt the recruiting efforts of that department in the past.

I oppose moving the Oceanography department to Galveston. At CPI we heard from Galveston representatives as well as CPI representatives from Oceanography.

Oceanography has numerous on-campus ties on grants and equipment that cannot easily be repurchased or moved. No input from these department seems to have been incorporated. It's obvious that moving a department wholesale to Galveston will have serious negative impacts on faculty; it's hard to imagine that they would do so willingly and likely that top faculty would leave within the department and their partners across campus. It won't improve Galveston if the Oceanography department drops in rankings and prestige. Perhaps an alternative strategy could be considered that incorporates new hires having Galveston-specific appointments, space, labs, and partnerships.

I oppose this recommendation.

I recommend we start a small engineering program for the 300 and 400-level courses that can be taught by the Ph.D. faculty members. Most of our courses are aligned with engineering BS. This way, the department can become Marine Engineering and Technology

to offer licensed and non-license for the technology program and an engineering degree which will facilitate and feed our research purposes and enormously enhance the student's enrollment pipeline and the research funding status. With just a technology program, we do not have a chance for competitive FOA, and we can just count on our personal connections and negotiations for small contracts like less than \$200k a year.

I strongly believe that moving Oceanography department to Galveston will cause sudden drop in quality of the department, several faculty will leave, the student quality and the number of students will drop significantly. Instead of this, it might be better to have department presence both in Galveston and College Station such that the students will get exposure to main campus environment, we will be able to recruit top quality students taking advantage of the main campus attraction. However, we could provide several opportunities for main campus students to spend time in Galveston campus (a semester or a year) to get exposed to activities in the Ocean front (hands on labs, high impact activities, etc.)

I suggest making the Galveston Campus the School of Marine Science, Management, Policy, and Transportation and then put the departments in this school. Oceanography is the oldest academic Oceanography Dept. in the country. I agree with the idea of having the administration of this department move to Galveston, but this is where a two campus one program solution would be best. I like the idea of a single marine science (in the classic sense of the term, i.e. Geological, Biological, Chemical, and Physical Oceanography as well as Marine Biology and marine fisheries) within a single department. It is how most other programs are organized and makes the most sense. I would also like to see the merging of the associated graduate programs or at least most of the programs with a single, unified core curriculum that is appropriately science-based. Again, this is the model used by most other programs, which would result in better retention and recruiting as well as the greatest flexibility

I support moving Sea Grant and Oceanography to the Galveston campus. The TAMUG campus is ideally – and uniquely, given its location and world-renown faculty research on marine and coastal issues – to lead Texas A&M's marine and coastal education, research endeavors, and community engagement and outreach. I hope leadership can see this and align actions to support this.

If OCNG were to come to TAMUG this would be an incredible opportunity as well! I am assuming that a new building would also be in the works to accommodate the OCNG faculty which is an amazing opportunity for us to grow as a campus! Having all of the Marine Science disciplines in close proximity with the proper tools will allow us to grow exponentially in our research programs.

Instead of transplanting a successful department, the build up an additional Oceanography department a'la Scripps of the Gulf would be high impact and big headlines. If such an Ocean consortium be developed and promoted, faculty in College Station and the world would be interested. I fear the (in)voluntary move will decimate any departmental success on both ends.

It is a terrible idea to move the Oceanography Department to Galveston. It would disrupt the lives of all the College Station faculty.

It makes sense to have these coastal programs on the coast where they will be more effective.

"It may make good sense to move the sea grant headquarters to Galveston, but I do think that there are better ways of integrating Oceanography with TAMUG more than it is already.

Trying to move the department \*physically\* to Galveston would be counter-productive, because much of the research strengths of Oceanography come from collaborations and infrastructure in College Station that require physical proximity – e.g. the Radiogenic lab and Stable Isotope facilities, the Mass Spec core facility and the High Performance Computing Cluster. It is not realistic to try to recreate this infrastructure in Galveston, since it serves far more than just the department of Oceanography and some was provided by NSF major instrumentation grants - e.g. the mass specs in the Radiogenic lab. Faculty from Oceanography collaborate with faculty in Arts and Sciences - e.g. significant work on high resolution modeling between Atmospheric Sciences and Oceanography.

It is undeniable, however, that a closer integration would greatly strengthen both TAMUG and Oceanography. I think a better option would be to develop a collaborative program more like the program in Ocean Engineering, building on existing joint appointments (of which there are 7 now), but distributed across the two campuses. Galveston is the ideal place for oceanographic work related to coastal issues and features (e.g., geomorphology) and this strand of research and teaching could definitely be grown and developed, both at the undergraduate and graduate level.

Something to think about in terms of appeal to UG students would be degree programs that are split between the two campuses, with periods of residence on each. Developed the right way this might help TAMUG retention. "

Keep in mind that many faculty already have families and also have invested in College Station (Buying a house, having their children in the near school districts such as College Station ISD, etc). Do they have to stay in Galveston most of the time? Is the city of Galveston providing similar conditions and opportunities that College Station with not put an extra money from faculty's pocket?

"MGT has made a tremendously embarrassing error with this recommendation. The report alone jeopardizes Texas A&M's leadership of Texas Sea Grant, future funding, and federal relations activities by intertwining TAMU's academic and training goals with NOAA's Sea Grant program. Notably, Texas A&M does NOT have a sea grant mission - Texas A&M administers the Texas Sea Grant Program which must adhere to NOAA's Sea Grant Mission. The Sea Grant Program is funded via a line item appropriation to NOAA, is administered by NOAA, and must adhere to requirements as dictated by federal statute. In fact, in establishing the Sea Grant, Congress intentionally designed the program to function much differently than the land grant system.

Certainly, the Galveston campus can contribute to the Sea Grant mission, but it is only one of many areas of activity and research and extension conducted by Texas Sea Grant. In fact, only a minority of Sea Grant awards go to Galveston faculty.

While Sea Grant extension personnel work at multiple locations along the Gulf Coast, administration of the program is far better suited to the headquarters location of the flagship institution, and this type of change cannot be made without NOAA program approval.

It doesn't make sense to me to move Oceanography to Galveston, while Ocean Engineering remains, but that is a decision under TAMU control."

Moving an entire department isn't really realistic. That being said, there could be programs where the Oceanography students come for one semester or one year to the Galveston campus to get an experiential learning experience (including research lab internships and all their course credits - there is a lot of overlap in terms of teaching between Marine Sciences and Oceanography), something that follows the model of marine engineering, where students spend their freshmen year in Galveston. This could provide more uniformity between MCEs and OCNG and force collaborations, while providing the students an incredible experience.

Moving an entire department to the Galveston Campus would be extremely disruptive for the members of the department, many of whom are likely to look for jobs elsewhere instead. Is there not another way to emphasize the sea grant mission that would enhance what we already have, on both campuses, rather than risk losing the best of what we already have?

Moving Oceanography to Galveston seems like an ill-advised move. Oceanography is a key part of environmental science and moving this works at cross purposes with the stated effort to ramp up environmental research at TAMU. In addition, it will hurt the IODP re-compete: Creating a cohort of paleoclimate faculty (many of whom have been in Oceanography) was a major commitment A&M made to NSF to keep that contract when it was up for renewal last time.

Moving Oceanography to the Galveston Campus is a no-brainer. However, details on how to make this happen can be challenging.

"Moving OCNG to Galveston would require 100s of Millions of dollars for new infrastructure in Galveston. Ties could be strengthened without a move, too  
"

Moving Sea Grant to a branch campus will be viewed by NOAA as a downgrade in the importance of that program. This will jeopardize our ability to retain Sea Grant at TAMU. Additionally, moving the oceanography department to Galveston would be a huge expense. The report clearly states one of the issues is a lack of resources on the Galveston campus. Adding the tens of millions of dollars burden to moving oceanography seems like a poor use of funds. There are several shared expensive resources that oceanography currently uses that are not movable, thus would need to be duplicated if moved to Galveston. Additionally, oceanographers do not need to be on a coastal campus to do innovating and

cutting edge research. Most College Station oceanography faculty are "blue water" oceanographers, meaning their research is on the open ocean. Galveston does not have any long endurance (can be at sea for >30 days) research vessels, thus most TAMU-CS oceanography faculty have to fly to different locations to do their science anyways. Additionally, the oceanography curriculum is a valuable part of the Meteorology and Environmental Geoscience degrees. Moving oceanography will impact the reputation and workforce preparedness of those degree programs. The report continually stressed strengthening ties with main campus. Moving Oceanography and Sea Grant either in physical location or in ad-loc, would only further the isolation of that campus. Moving Sea Grant to Galveston would accomplish nothing. Many of the current programs are conducted well away from there. The small size of TAMU-G limits the number of contacts that could be made as well as limits access to vast facilities for genetic, chemical, electronic or other means of study readily available at College Station.

#### "MOVING TEXAS SEA GRANT WOULD REQUIRE NOAA APPROVAL

Texas Sea Grant is funded by the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), not Texas A&M University or the State of Texas. Moving Texas Sea Grant is not a decision that the university can make on its own – it is a move that would have to be supported and approved by NOAA and fit in with the agreements that set up Texas Sea Grant in 1966. It is presumptive (and poor research on the part of MGT) for the MGT report to treat Texas Sea Grant as if it were a university institute or department.

#### MOVING TEXAS SEA GRANT WILL BE A LOSS FROM MAIN CAMPUS

Having Texas Sea Grant on the main campus has advantages that outweigh the advantages for moving it to Galveston. Texas Sea Grant is better able to serve Texans through direct interactions with Departments across the flagship campus in a range of relevant disciplines (public health, policy, science, social science etc.). I have spoken with colleagues in the College of Agriculture who feel that the loss of Sea Grant from main campus would be a significant blow to the prestige of the university and the first step in NOAA moving Texas Sea Grant to another institution. Finally, Texas Sea Grant already is already active in Galveston, as it is in every coastal county, through its extension service. Texas Sea Grant could increase its activities in Galveston without moving the headquarters.

#### TEXAS SEA GRANT AND THE DEPARTMENT OF OCEANOGRAPHY ARE SEPARATE, BUT COLLABORATIVE, ENTITIES

My comments are written from the perspective of a member of the Department of Oceanography. The implication of the recent MGT report is that the Department of Oceanography needs to be close to the Texas Sea Grant offices to function. This is not the case. The Department of Oceanography and Texas Sea Grant are separate entities with different mission and goals. While they both have an ocean focus and are located in the same building in College Station, they are not intimately linked.

Research funding offers a clear example of how the Department of Oceanography is separate from Texas Sea Grant. Texas Sea Grant is a valuable partner (I have been PI on

Texas Sea Grant funding in the past), but not a major supporter of our research. Texas Sea Grant recently announced it call for proposals for its 2024-2026 funding cycle. The areas of research are very specific, and I would be surprised if more than 1 or 2 Oceanography faculty apply for this funding. The available funding will be \$800,000 per year for the two years, with a limit of \$200,000 per year per proposal. The research expenditures of the Department of Oceanography in 2020 (including GERG) was \$9.5 million – Texas Sea Grant can never be more than a minor source of funding for the Department of Oceanography. This does not mean that the Department of Oceanography is not serving Texans – we do every day through our teaching and research. For example, Oceanography faculty have been funded for research that directly benefits Texans through the Texas General Land Office (TGLO), Texas Commission for Environmental Quality (TCEQ) and the Gulf of Mexico Research Initiative (GoMRI). These efforts are not dependent on Texas Sea Grant.

"

Moving the Oceanography Department to Galveston will greatly disrupt, if not destroy, the quality of the work that Oceanography does. Many faculty and staff have spouses who work in other departments, or who cannot relocate from College Station. I can foresee deep decline in morale, loss of faculty, and a significant drop in the prestige and level of grant funding of the Oceanography department. In plain English, this is a dumb idea.

needed

Needs oversight.

no comment.

No concerns, and likely to increase research collaborations and impacts in a merged MARB/MCES and OCE departments.

None

Not all Oceanography faculty/staff need to be located by the Sea for optimum research. Research needs should be examined and commented on by those in the Oceanography Department to ensure that everyone is not being falsely lumped together.

"Oceanography absolutely CANNOT be moved to Galveston. I am an Oceanography professor whose major instrumentation exists in a shared laboratory with other legacy Geoscience departments that I co-manage with them. My multi-million dollar research program could not move to Galveston without investment of many millions of dollars to replicate my specialized laboratory equipment and instrumentation in Galveston. Not only would this be a major disruption to my research, but I would never move to Galveston because my partner is a professor in another department in College Station, and we will not be separated. It is not a good investment of monetary resources to move happy faculty to a new location, while TAMU-Galveston needs those funds to improve their infrastructure and elevate their faculty and students.

I will also say that Ocean Science research and academics are both elevated by keeping them visible on the flagship TAMU campus. I get contacted by faculty in other departments in College Station all the time to collaborate in some way, and this has only increased since our merging into the College of Arts & Sciences, which helped bring Oceanography to the

minds of other Arts & Sciences faculty. Please don't ruin that by further isolating all ocean science in Galveston, as visibility on flagship campus is extremely valuable.

I will add that Oceanography is highly integrated into existing curricular programs in College Station. Not only do we teach major components of the current Environmental and Meteorology degrees, but we are committed to the new Environmental & Sustainability Initiative in the College of Arts & Sciences. As the Sea Grant institution of Texas (one honor that elevates us above UT!), ocean science MUST remain a core part of that initiative.

Please do not move Oceanography to Galveston. While I can see how it might seem like "putting all ocean science together on one campus" might simplify things, it will ultimately decrease our visibility and reputation, it will disrupt/destroy our research (and you will lose strong faculty), and it will destroy the strong environmental initiatives and collaborations that we have been working towards. Oceanography is one of your strengths on the flagship campus, and while we always have room for improvement, we strongly want to stay and continue our good work in College Station, while collaborating with Galveston to elevate both programs."

Oceanography department should remain in College Station

Oceanography is an important academic field, and is an important part of the Texas A&M Academic community. Relocating the Oceanography department to the Galveston Campus will disrupt existing research relationships, and will relegate a thriving academic community to a small campus where they will be isolated from their related academic disciplines. This will not uplift Galveston, but rather will communicate to the oceanography department that they are not a valued member of the College Station academic community. Please do not follow this recommendation.

"Our Sea Grant mission is what makes us unique. The report emphasizes the need to celebrate this. But I will comment that many of the things they suggest in the report would have the effect of devaluing the Sea Grant Mission. For instance, they do not mention support for Maritime Studies. But these are the ways that students tie together the rest of their disciplines; they are the interdisciplinary humanities courses that help students find cohesion and importance in their degree.

It seems to me like moving the Oceanography department would make a great deal of sense; but this depends on support from College Station and a willingness of faculty and staff there to acknowledge our expertise in that subject. There needs to be some assurance/stratagems for making sure this is forthcoming.

"

"President Banks and Vice President Hartman,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments and feedback on the MGT Galveston report. We are also very appreciative of your extending the deadline so that we could take the time to further educate ourselves about the report, TAMU Galveston, as well as impacted units on the College Station campus. We have sought information from these

parties and appreciate the informative conversation we had with you and your team earlier this week.

To summarize briefly, our primary feedback is as follows: maintain Sea Grant and Oceanography on the College Station campus, develop new ways to support collaboration between the campuses to elevate Galveston through joint appointments and seed grants, consider the development of a satellite Sea Grant office in Galveston. Below, we outline our thoughts and feedback on the report in more detail, as pertaining to these primary key points.

1. The steps taken to improve working conditions for faculty and staff at TAMU-G are exciting to see. The improvements in pay that are already being implemented are a great positive step that will improve retention of outstanding faculty and staff on that campus. In parallel, many of the proposed changes to clarify business logistics stand to serve the campus well. This will have a positive impact on the research mission of the campus, but of course, also on teaching and service.

2. We strongly support the goal of elevating the Galveston campus. It has been suggested that the University invest in Galveston as a lab campus in the MGT Report. There is great merit to this idea – we would advocate for doing so, but doing so in a way that preserves Oceanography and Sea Grant on the main College Station campus. Instead, we would advocate for joining research efforts that allow for increased research collaboration and/or additional joint appointments. Having improved resources and infrastructure in Galveston would make it easier for faculty from the main campus to engage in research and/or research focused teaching practices in Galveston, though they remain primarily on the main campus. This stands to have positive research impacts for individuals in Oceanography, but also in other units across the College of Arts and Sciences and University as a whole.

3. Sea Grant College Program is a unique asset to TAMU. Our understanding is that their total funding stands at over \$9 million currently, as they have successfully competed for additional funding to support their mission. As part of their mission, they work with coastal communities serving the entire state of Texas, but also directly with researchers here on campus. The challenges that face coastal communities and our oceans require multifaceted solutions. This includes inputs from marine sciences of course, but also from engineering, meteorology, policy, biology, and behavioral and social sciences. We would also note that this is not an exhaustive list. Sea Grant Program funds transdisciplinary research and having direct access to the vibrant research community on campus is critical for remaining abreast of critical work as part of this mission. The Sea Grant College Program and Sea Grant Program are unique strengths of our University and the flagship campus, and the return on investment from this program has been high. There are also key interactions with Agrilife Extension, as many of the specialists working with Sea Grant are also part of that group, making the centralized location of the program in College



Station of logistical importance. We are concerned that if moves are made that violate terms of agreement with NOAA we may jeopardize this program and its presence as part of TAMU. We worry that a move to Galveston may be disruptive to their statewide impact (which is better served being located in College Station). The infrastructure for this program has been successfully in place directly on campus for over a decade and it is not clear that there is appropriate infrastructure in place in Galveston for maximizing their statewide impact. As a result of the recommendations made in the MGT Report on Galveston - there is added risk that this would be disruptive (short term and long term) leading to the Sea Grant operations being moved to another university in the state (the University of Texas is a prime candidate given their research profile and coastal collaborations). Such developments would be a great loss for our entire community. We recognize that TAMU has generously provided a substantial amount of matching support for the funds from NOAA (reported as approximately \$500,000 annually), which is a fairly significant annual financial commitment. However, we would like to highlight the fact that Sea Grant members also actively seek out additional funding and these funds have accrued a significant amount of IDC to our College Station campus (currently at a rate of 51.5%). As noted above, their total funding with these additional grants is, to our knowledge, over \$9 million, which means that substantial IDC is also brought in by Sea Grant, supporting a very strong return on investment.

4. We are particularly concerned as it seems as though Sea Grant was not consulted by MGT in the process of creating this report. It is also our understanding that NOAA was not contacted. This may have contributed to the recommendation, which stands to have far-reaching implications for both the future of Sea Grant and their operations. It is thus not clear how MGT derived their recommendations in the absence of proper consultations with multiple stakeholders (e.g., NOAA, Sea Grant, etc.). In addition, GERG [Geochemical and Environmental Research Group] may be moved to the Galveston campus without proper vetting or inputs from the stakeholders - which is disruptive to their research mission. While there is wonderful potential for GERG in Galveston, there are critical infrastructure investments that would be needed in order for them to maintain their continued success. These trends and modus operandi are not very encouraging for the PI community.

5. We would however emphasize the desire to strengthen connections between the Sea Grant College Program and Galveston. This stands to have bidirectional benefits for both campuses and Sea Grant. If budgets allow, one suggestion would be the creation of a satellite office that allows for a greater immediate coastal presence and for research and outreach practices on that campus. However, we would emphasize that with any changes made, it is critical that Sea Grant is able to continue to serve the entire state of Texas as a part of their mission from NOAA.

6. We advocate for the Department of Oceanography remaining in College Station. Oceanography has a strong research presence on campus, with many faculty members serving as PI on large research grants. These grants require many of the unique specialized

facilities available on campus here. Replicating that infrastructure in Galveston would likely require a multi-million dollar investment, the feasibility of which is unclear. It is also the case that these faculty/PIs benefit from the collaborative opportunities with other units in the College of Arts and Sciences and beyond. The move to the new college in particular, has spurred opportunities for collaboration which again have bidirectional benefits for Oceanography, but also for other departments. In particular, the new "Environmental and Sustainability Initiative" recently announced by the College is of great interest and an area where the department can be a key contributor to both research and teaching.

7. The Department of Oceanography is the oldest degree-granting oceanography department in the United States, and as such is a historical asset to our campus. This is also a great driver for the recruitment of outstanding faculty, staff, and students. It benefits from improved visibility in Arts and Sciences. Moving the department may hurt this visibility and in turn both the research and teaching efforts of the department.

8. As with Sea Grant, we recognize the need for greater engagement with Galveston which can elevate both our faculty in College Station, as well as those working in Galveston. We would encourage increased dual appointments and investment into laboratory spaces that can be used for research related to the coast in Galveston, that are accessible to faculty from both campuses. We would also suggest the development of specific targeted research funding opportunities (either via DOR or CAS) to seed collaborations between the campuses via seed grants. We imagine something analogous to ASCEND, but perhaps on a smaller scale, and specific to collaborative work that links the two campuses together. This would serve to build initial collaborations, that may in turn result in larger federal and private foundation grant applications. Such a move would serve to further elevate Galveston, and further develop strong links between researchers across disciplines and campuses.

We thank you again for extending the time to provide feedback on the MGT report. This is an important moment for our University as we move forward in exciting new ways. Our commitment remains, as always, to working to improve research excellence on campus. We believe that keeping Oceanography and Sea Grant in College Station is critical as part of this endeavor; however, we also hope to develop new ways to elevate the research mission in Galveston through improved infrastructure and collaboration with our colleagues there.

Thank you for your consideration.

██  
██  
██  
"

"Relocating all sea grant activities to Galveston is a very, very, bad idea. Risks far outweigh the potential benefits. Most faculty will oppose moving to TAMUG and would leave TAMU in

droves. -- then what? The report recommendation notes the far flung nature of the proposal, but for some unknown reason, suggests, what the heck, let try it:

""Relocating all sea grant activities to Galveston would present significant challenges and risks associated with existing research and funding to College Station as well as risk to relocate some operations and archival materials closer to potentially high-impact coastal storms.""

Ridiculous, terrible idea, you will lose top notch faculty members in Oceanography if you ask them to move to Galveston Campus, they will leave this university.

Sea Grant is an asset to the College Station campus. The Department of Oceanography is critical to building a full strength environmental science program in College Station. Loss of these units to Galveston would weaken the College Station campus, with no certainty that the Galveston campus would improve.

Sea Grant leadership needs to change. They are more focused on "guarding their territory" and on their own research program than truly working with TAMUG and faculty from other institutions on the coast.

-Sounds reasonable in my view.

"Texas Sea Grant College Program Response to TAMU-Galveston MGT Report

Relocating the Texas Sea Grant College Program's Headquarters office from the Texas A&M University flagship campus in College Station to a branch campus will be viewed by the federal sponsor, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), as a downgrade of the Program. This action jeopardizes Texas A&M University's Sea Grant College status, held since 1971. The Secretary of Commerce could suspend or terminate this designation. Suspension and/or termination would enable other Texas universities to compete for this NOAA Program.

Federal Regulations Govern the Texas Sea Grant College Program:

Sea Grant was first authorized by the National Sea Grant College Act of 1966, has been subsequently reauthorized on multiple occasions, and most recently reauthorized by Congress in 2020.

Sea Grant Authorizing Legislation and Regulations include the following:

- National Sea Grant College Program (US Code 2020 Title 33 Chapter 22, PDF)
- Code of Federal Regulations - 917
- Code of Federal Regulations - 918

Relocating the Texas Sea Grant College Program Headquarters office from the Texas A&M University flagship campus in College Station to a branch campus is likely to result in non-compliance with the authorizing legislation and regulations.

The Texas Sea Grant College Program is a Statewide NOAA Program:

The Texas Sea College Program is a NOAA Program, located at Texas A&M University's flagship campus, with a directive to serve the entire state of Texas including ALL institutions of higher education. The Program is funded through a cooperative agreement from NOAA Sea Grant to Texas A&M University and this agreement sets forth the terms and conditions of the relationship, providing very specific and detailed guidelines for the operation of each Program, including strategic planning, implementation, and evaluation by NOAA Sea Grant and an external site review committee. The external site visit occurs every 4 years. A successful review results in recertification of the program for the next four years. Recertification is required for a program to maintain its federal funding.

The next external site review will take place in 2024. Relocating the Texas Sea Grant College Program Headquarters office from the Texas A&M University flagship campus in College Station to a branch campus will be viewed as a downgrade by the external site review committee, threatens recertification of the Program, and jeopardizes Texas A&M University's Sea Grant College status.

"

The absurdist recommendation of moving the Texas Sea Grant and the Oceanography Department to Galveston Campus shows incredible ignorance and a complete lack of knowledge about Oceanographic research. Oceanography is an interdisciplinary science at the intersection of math, physics, chemistry, geology, biology, computational and data science, as well as engineering. Oceanographic research involves not only ocean observing, but also modeling ocean circulations and processes, as well as their interactions with the atmosphere, land, ice, marine and terrestrial ecosystems. The ocean is the most important component of the climate system; predicting how our climate will change in the future requires an advanced Earth system modeling approach that relies on close collaborations among oceanographers, atmospheric scientists, hydrologists, mathematicians, statisticians, data scientists, physicists, chemists, biologists, and computational scientists. This cross-department work cannot take place if the Oceanography Department is isolated and siloed from our colleagues. There are many ongoing collaborations among faculty members across departments on the main campus of this university, including Atmospheric Sciences, Geography, Geology and Geophysics, Chemistry, Biology, Civil Engineering, Ocean Engineering, and the Texas A&M Institute of Data Science. Moreover, many oceanography faculty members have joint appointments in other departments. Moving Oceanography Department to Galveston Campus will not only significantly weaken the very possibility of teamwork, but also potentially lead to the collapse of this historically strong research program. I strongly believe many of the oceanography faculty members will either choose to join other departments or leave this university all together. I would advise strongly against this recommendation.

"The department of Oceanography is the oldest degree granting oceanographic program in the country (75 years in 2024). As with other prominent oceanographic departments, the main oceanography department is located on the flagship or main campus and should remain there.

The faculty in the department of oceanography have world class research labs involving substantial infrastructure and instrumentation resources on campus here in College Station. Attempting to replicate the necessary infrastructure and other resources in a location prone to hurricanes, flooding and power outages does not seem fiscally responsible. Providing funding to the Galveston campus to provide improved/weather hardened infrastructure to allow faculty already in Galveston to grow and elevate their research endeavors is a more fiscally sound approach.

Moving Oceanography to another campus 3 hours away will result in the loss of high performing (therefore highly mobile) faculty. The department would take a large hit to their research productivity that may not be recoverable. This will not help address the issues cited in the report.

The university should find ways to strengthen the existing connections between the Department of Oceanography and the related faculty on the Galveston campus. The university should improve the ability to have research grants working collaboratively on both campuses (improve SRS functions across both campuses). In addition to better facilitating research collaborations, strengthening these connections will allow for improved connectivity of academic programs allowing students the flexibility to thrive on the campus that works best for them.

"

"The MGT Organization Review of the TAMU Galveston campus includes the following as one of its recommendations: Emphasize the priority of the sea grant mission activities existing in Galveston by moving the sea grant headquarters and the Oceanography department to the Galveston Campus.

The recommendation aims to elevate the Galveston campus, which is a worthy goal. But implementing the recommendation will also have implications for other departments located in the College Station campus, including the Department of Atmospheric Sciences. [REDACTED], I would like to describe some of the major implications.

Since air and water are both fluids, they are governed by the same mathematical equations. This can explain, in part, the strong academic and research links between the departments of Atmospheric Sciences and Oceanography that date back more than half a century. Together with land, the atmosphere and the ocean constitute the bulk of the physical environment that supports humans and other life forms on the planet. The two departments are currently co-located in the Oceanography & Meteorology building (which also houses the Geography department that studies land).

Co-location has the benefit of promoting research collaborations. In addition to weather, faculty in Atmospheric Sciences also study climate. Climate is strongly affected by the state of the ocean due to its large heat storing capacity. Therefore, one must study the atmosphere and the ocean together to understand and predict climate. [REDACTED]

██████████ work with oceanographers to build and test models of climate. Other Atmospheric Sciences faculty also interact frequently with faculty in Oceanography. We submit large joint research proposals and have active collaborative research projects. The Texas Center for Climate Studies recently hosted an international workshop on campus where both atmospheric scientists and oceanographers presented cutting-edge research on very high-resolution models of the climate system.

There are also academic implications for moving the Oceanography department. Undergraduate meteorology majors take elective oceanography courses elective to broaden their skill set. Some of our majors enroll in the accelerated 3+2 program that combines a BS in Meteorology with the Master of Ocean Science and Technology degree. Oceanography also plays an important role in the interdisciplinary Environmental Programs curriculum, and will likely be a key component of the new Environmental Initiative in the College of Arts & Sciences.

Moving the Oceanography department to Galveston will raise the barrier for collaborative academic and research activities with Atmospheric Sciences in the future. Although zoom meetings and remote instruction can help make up for some of the lost in-person interaction, it is unlikely that they can fully compensate. Before acting on the recommendation of the MGT Galveston report on moving Oceanography to Galveston, I would urge that the impact of such a move on academic and research activity at other units in the College Station campus be carefully considered."

"The Oceanography department is a very multidisciplinary department, and our faculty members have strong collaborations with multiple other departments on the College Station Campus, for example Math, Atmospheric Sciences, and Biology. To move the department would reduce opportunities for these collaborations and remove experts in environmental processes from the College Station campus. This seems antithetical to the goal of elevating environmental programs over the next few years.

The cost of moving Oceanography would also be very high, and this money might be better spent directly at Galveston, and on building connections between multiple departments on the College Station and Galveston campuses. The distance between the campuses makes collaboration more difficult, and some effort to lower barriers to collaboration, and even to incentivize it with seed grants, could help to start building more connections.

From talking to my colleagues at Sea Grant, I have become concerned that moving Sea Grant headquarters would be detrimental to the Sea Grant program, which applies to both campuses. I think moving Sea Grant would be viewed as hostile to the program. "

"The recommendation to move the Oceanography department to the Galveston Campus is a terrible one. This is akin to cannibalizing a successful department to serve a failing one, which makes no sense apart from the political. Our goal should be to strengthen our strengths and not to weaken ourselves. I fear that the university is embarrassed by the lack of success in the Galveston campus and is willing to throw good money after bad in order to save face.

Additionally, I am the partner of faculty member in the College Station Oceanography department. If a move to Galveston were approved, this would prompt us to leave TAMU entirely, meaning that the university would suffer the loss of two faculty members instead of one. Why create problems where none currently exist. Cut losses with Galveston and move on."

"The report suggested moving the Oceanography department to Galveston in its closing paragraphs, and it didn't weigh the considerable costs and losses that would come with such a move. A suggestion this large merits much deeper and more thoughtful consideration than this report presented. Here's why I think it's a bad idea.

Oceanography includes students and faculty who apply chemistry, physics, and biology to study the world's oceans. In College Station, the College of Arts and Sciences has recently been formed and has finally removed the artificial impediments to interactions that division into separate colleges had fostered. One benefit of this merger is the emergence of an environmental and sustainability initiative, bringing together natural scientists, social scientists, and the environmental humanities to study, research, and teach the interactions between humans and the natural world. Physically removing a core of this faculty after only having just brought them together undermines this and other future initiatives that may look at Earth and interactions holistically.

Texas A&M has a respected program in meteorology, and those students take electives in Oceanography, conduct research projects with those faculty, and can enroll in a 3+2 BS/MS degree. (Geology and geophysics students can do so through a separate track also.) What happens in and to the oceans has long term repercussions for the atmosphere, and having faculty housed in the same building in College Station has facilitated interactions that will be mostly lost if colleagues relocate to Galveston. Yes, they can maintain relationships remotely, but that isn't very much different from collaborating with colleagues at other universities. It loses what is special about having both atmospheric and oceanic sciences in one building on the same campus in College Station.

Finally, the report appears not to consider whether such a move will accomplish its goal. If the goal is to raise the stature of the Galveston campus, one needs to consider whether or not it is possible in the modern era to simply relocate academic jobs to another location without larger deleterious repercussions. Some faculty might welcome the move, but many others won't. Over time, A&M will lose some as a result---robbing Galveston of the potential gain, while compounding the loss at College Station as those with partners in other departments contemplate opportunities elsewhere. Without the other departments it does work with co-located, Oceanography will be less well positioned for success than it has been here. I think there are other ways to increase interaction between Oceanography and Galveston that are mutually beneficial to both than by taking the path hastily suggested here."

The Sea Grant mission is core to the entire university, and it is incredibly impactful for Texas Sea Grant as a unit to continue to report directly to the Vice President for Research. Texas A&M University honors its Sea Grant mission more holistically when components of marine extension, research, and education are housed on multiple campuses rather than all at a branch. Thus, my suggestion for retaining the Department of Oceanography and Texas Sea Grant's main office in College Station.

The Texas A&M Oceanography department has a well deserved reputation for excellence. Moving the entire department to Galveston carries a lot of risk, including the loss of productive faculty, endangering the reputation, and consolidating assets into a very vulnerable coastal location. It would also move the department away from the department of Atmospheric Sciences and diminish the ability to easily collaborate between these closely related fields.

There are obvious benefits to moving Sea Grant headquarters to the Galveston Campus. Moving the Department of Oceanography to the Galveston Campus is an interesting pivot; however, this will not happen anytime soon due to logistics (need for a new building), and it seems odd to even have this discussion without input from our colleagues on main campus.

There is little reason to believe input from faculty and staff is used in any way in these decisions. They seem like they are settled before any survey is distributed.

These are very necessary changes. I highly support all of them.

This campus should be utilized by college station like a "Marine Lab". Not all of the programs need to be housed here, but research could and should be conducted from the Galveston campus. It is a great opportunity for students to work with different professors and utilize the resources of a campus located on the ocean/bay.

This does not make sense and it is not a good idea. The sea grant mission of the Oceanography department can be fulfilled with the department being in College Station. It may be a good idea to have some facilities owned by the Oceanography department in Galveston, with the core of the program and their faculty still being located in College Station. The argument that Oceanography must be close to the sea does not have much weight, when considering that Oceanography faculty travel all over the world for their research.

This is a terrible idea. Many faculty in oceanography will probably leave for other universities. This will uproot so many people. There is no justification for this move.

This is a terribly misguided recommendation. All faculty I have spoken with in the Oceanography department communicate that this would be a tremendously negative move for the department. Notably, there is no clear rationale for this recommendation given in the report!!

"This is an intriguing suggestion, though it would require substantial resources to execute. There would be substantially more space required (likely a new building) for all of the OCNG faculty. Perhaps some hybrid model (maybe similar to the Ocean Engineering program) could work, with faculty on both campuses? After all, much of the OCNG research takes place in remote locations (outside of the Gulf of Mexico), so being headquartered in Galveston would likely have modest logistical benefits for research programs.



Moving the Sea Grant headquarters to Galveston is probably more feasible, though not without logistical challenges and personal upheaval, so there'd need to be a strong justification for it. Texas Sea Grant has personnel and offices all over the state of Texas, including extension agents on the Upper Texas Coast, so the relocation of headquarters seems like it would be mostly symbolic. "

This is complicated. It does make sense for oceanography and associated programs to have a stronger presence on the coast but moving all of these programs to Galveston is not a good plan.

This is controversial, especially for Oceanography. A large part of oceanography is based on remote sensing. It seems like this would be better done at CS where there is much greater synergy with experts in other colleges. This administration promotes transformational science and engineering. Moving the Oceanography to Galveston does not seem consistent with this mission.

This is fine.

This is the only good idea that has been suggested in the reorganization.

This plan is not considering the significant risk associated with moving key research facilities relevant to oceanography from College Station to Galveston. There is a significant risk of flooding and storm damage and this risk will continue to increase as a result of global warming. By moving this very important department, their faculty, staff and students to Galveston the university would be putting a significant research program at risk.

This proposal has dubious merit. The Sea Grant program serves needs throughout the Texas Gulf Coast and Gulf of Mexico. Headquartering it in Galveston might be interpreted as marginalizing scientists, students, stakeholders, etc. in other regions of Texas. This appearance is avoided by having the headquarters in College Station.

This recommendation is extremely disruptive, as it involves moving a strong program from College Station -- and all the affiliated individuals -- to a location far away.

"This recommendation is highly unfounded and concerning. The Oceanography Department brings a fantastic set of faculty, students, and minds to the College of Arts & Sciences on the CS campus. A major plus includes the connections with Galveston, and I am already positive many of the changes recommended above will enhance communication and collaboration among oceanographers and marine scientists across each campus. The access to Galveston needs an overhaul (do they have an ocean-worthy ship? is there housing for students or faculty to spend weeks to months in Galveston?) - mainly an investment in the infrastructure and streamlining of admin to more closely match CS.

Again the term ""Sea Grant Mission"" is not aligned with what this recommendation is stating. Sea Grant mission activities exist on both campuses, which is a positive. Moving the headquarters will send a message to students and researchers that CS does not want to be involved with Sea Grant activities. "

This seems like it will create so many problems for faculty and staff! Will faculty have to move to Galveston? Will current students need to live in Galveston? Galveston is not close and traffic tends to be bad to get there many times of year, so this seems like a very

unnecessary headache. Oceanography is also one of the top programs at TAMU, so why mess with something that is working?

This will be a big shift for Oceanography. It's probably a good idea, though the implementation consequences for the home department in College Station should be worked through carefully.

This will be difficult logistically but does make sense.

This would be a huge loss to College Station. The ocean covers more than 2/3 of the planet. Shouldn't our flagship campus have people studying it and teaching it? This move would have major negative consequences to every initiative about the environment, which is a major interdisciplinary area and a topic for investment and a key knowledge set for our students as future, highly desired workers. As a department head, the possibility of this move gives me significant concern about our inability to give students the learning experience they deserve and the faculty the opportunity to collaborate on major interdisciplinary grants.

This would certainly elevate the Sea Grant Mission of Texas A&M University! Having the Texas Sea Grant Program and OCNG on the TAMUG campus would maximize synergistic potential. OCNG is large department from a research perspective. Housing the laboratory needs of OCNG faculty would need to be addressed.

We DO NOT want Oceanography department to move to Galveston campus. We want to keep it in College Station or have dual presence like Ocean Engineering.

What a stupid idea this is! Is the university willing to pay for the cost of moving the oceanography department and associated facilities (ocean core facility, etc.). It is a waste of money. There is not much benefit from moving them except the engineering departments may benefit because of open space on the main campus. I am speculating that this review was done for this purpose (just to benefit the College of Engineering). If not, the reviewers are just ignorant (the university just wasted money on the consultation). Alternatively, the reviewers are doing favor for the president (who paid them). I am in COALS so whatever is done will not affect us directly. But I just don't want to see another embarrassing fiasco at TAMU (we have too many of those).

While this could be helpful, it could impact existing research collaborations that we have with faculty at Oceanography. For instance, I am currently developing a proposal with [REDACTED] that requires meeting in person every week. In addition, we also have the Environmental program initiative that we should meet faculty at ocean in person.

Therefore I believe it will be counterproductive to move ocean to Galveston and ocean should stay at College Station.

"Wow. Do you feel the need to cause even more of our best researchers to seek employment elsewhere? Do you not realize how many of our preeminent scholars have already been approached by headhunters offering opportunities to work at universities where their work and worth will not only be acknowledged but be appreciated?"

Our college was just dissolved, and our departments were merged with other departments through the creation of one massive College of Arts and Sciences, many of which do work that is not even remotely related to the type of work we do. We have had only one full

semester to process this change, and now you are considering taking away the department that helped Texas A&M University become a Sea Grant Institute. This rips at the fabric of our great institution and will surely destroy our standing in the nation in any and all metrics related to oceanographic research.

Not only that, removing the Oceanography Department will have an immeasurable negative impact on the College of Arts and Sciences. Our new college just announced an initiative to create an interdepartmental environmental faculty cohort. How can we do any sort of significant environmental research if we ignore 70% of the world's surface? If our oceanographers are all in Galveston, how can this new program be successful?

Finally, an appeal to the human side of all of this...what about the people in the Department of Oceanography and their families? Many faculty in this department have spouses in other departments. Will you accommodate all of these moves if they are willing to move? What if a family has children in local schools? Do the schools in Galveston offer the same services as BISD or CSISD?

I am so grateful that my department is not facing this potential upheaval. I promise you this--there is no amount of money you could pay me to rip my children out of CSISD where they receive world-class services for their disabilities. If I was faced with this change, there is no doubt in my mind that I would seek a faculty position in another university system.

"

Yes

Yes this will be very helpful.

Yes! The Sea Grant Mission should be represented at the coast!

Staff

"- Again, I think it makes more sense to combine the Oceanography and the Marine and Coastal Environmental Sciences departments than the MARB and MCES departments. This will also impact how current College Station Oceanography employees are compensated. Will they accept the lower pay in Galveston or refuse to move, quit their jobs, and go some where else because of the pay discrepancy.

- Having the Sea Grant headquarters in Galveston makes sense since the campus is near the ocean and would benefit the TAMUG students. "

""Emphasize the priority of the sea grant mission activities existing in Galveston by moving the sea grant headquarters and the Oceanography department to the Galveston Campus.""  
DO I REALLY NEED TO OFFER ANY FEEDBACK TO THIS POINT, REALLY?"

"\*Emphasize the priority of the sea grant mission activities existing in Galveston by moving the sea grant headquarters and the Oceanography department to the Galveston Campus. Are we receiving more students? With the push from engineering, we have already had housing issues, and it could lead to resource issues if there is not a plan of implementation. Sometimes there are limiting factors to growth, and College Station should have a sense of

responsibility when their growth on what is sometimes considered a different campus is not able to keep up with demand. Now I am saying this with no insight into how College Station has helped Galveston when trying to grow their programs on the Galveston campus. "

"About the Texas Sea Grant College Program

The Texas Sea Grant College Program is a program funded by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), in collaboration with the state of Texas and universities across the state.

- Nearly sixty years ago, expanding on the concept of research, education and extension activities gained at Land-Grant Universities, it was realized that just as critical, is the research, education and extension related to production from the sea, resulting in the creation of and by the congressional passing of the National Sea Grant College Program Act in 1966;
- The Sea Grant College Program for the state of Texas is headquartered at the flagship campus of Texas A&M University in College Station, with the designation by Congress and our prime sponsor, NOAA, as a Sea Grant College Program in 1971. The Texas Sea Grant College Program is a component part of NOAA's National Sea Grant College Program, a network of 34 university-based programs in coastal and Great Lakes states, Puerto Rico and Guam.

The Texas Sea Grant College Program is a non-academic program within the Division of Research. Carrying out the objectives of the Sea Grant College Program Act, each state Sea Grant College Program is mandated by the prime sponsor NOAA and the National Sea Grant Office, to use up to 40% of our omnibus funds by funding researchers at institutions across the state of Texas. This is accomplished by the Texas Sea Grant Research Program following the National Sea Grant Research Competition policy and conducting the required biennial research competitions. Texas Sea Grant also conducts multiple annual research competitions for graduate and post-graduate student NOAA and NMFS-Sea Grant fellowship opportunities and undergraduate internships for applicants at institutions across the state of Texas.

The federal omnibus fundings for the Texas Sea Grant College Program have been awarded since 1968, to the designated Sea Grant College Program at the flagship campus of Texas A&M University in College Station, with the Director of Texas Sea Grant, as the Lead PI. Research projects recommended for funding to Principal Investigators across the state of Texas, are funded with federal flow-through funds from our omnibus award, to sub-recipients at various Texas institutions, for those PIs who have been recommended to be funded, after a rigorous and transparent technical review process. Fellowship awards from NOAA and NMFS-SG are also awarded to the flagship campus of Texas A&M University in College Station, with the Director of Texas Sea Grant, as the Lead PI and the

student/faculty advisor at the applicant institution, provided a sub-award, as a sub-recipient.

National Sea Grant Program funding regulations require 50% non-federal matching by the institution that hosts the Sea Grant Program. The Texas Sea Grant College Program receives funding from both the state of Texas and from the flagship campus of Texas A&M University in College Station, to partially fulfill the cost share requirement. The balance of the cost share requirement is provided by the institutions across the state of Texas, for those PIs who have been awarded sub-awards from the biennial research competition. It is important to retain the Texas Sea Grant College Program designation at the flagship campus of Texas A&M University in College Station, to ensure the continuance of the state of Texas and the designated Sea Grant TAMU institutional sources of funds are received and are maintained, for the 50% cost share requirement as required by federal regulations, as per the Sea Grant College Program Congressional Act.

The biennial research and annual fellowship competition pre-award proposal guidance to applicants across the state, proposal management, peer review process, review of sub-award recipient contractual agreements and post-award administration, is conducted by the Texas Sea Grant Associate Director/Research Coordinator. Grant management of the multiple research projects is achieved by facilitation and partnership with the Texas Sea Grant Assistant Director/Fiscal Officer and the Texas A&M Sponsored Research Services proposal, contract negotiation and project administration staff.

The 3 main programs within the Texas Sea Grant College Program, the Administration Program, the Research Program and the Extension and Communication Program, follow the National Sea Grant Program funding regulations to establish "the Management Organization to carry on a viable and productive Sea Grant Program". It is important to retain the Texas Sea Grant College Program designation at the flagship campus of Texas A&M University in College Station, to ensure the continuance of the efficient Texas Sea Grant Research Program's management of multiple biennial research, annual fellowship and internship competitions, coupled with the proposal and grant management activities including business administration and reporting requirements facilitated with the Texas Sea Grant Administration Program Assistant Director/Fiscal Officer.

While the programs are managed at the flagship campus of Texas A&M University in College Station, many of the Texas Sea Grant Extension staff members are located at other TAMU locations, such as Corpus Christi and Galveston, as well as Texas Sea Grant Agents and Specialists, who are partnered with both Texas A&M AgriLife Extension Service and located at the county offices, in several other communities along the coast as far south as the Brownsville area, to provide the extension, education and outreach efforts of the Sea Grant Program. These staff perform the extension and educational component of the Sea Grant Act by facilitating the integration of the multiple research project results into the broader outcomes of extension, education and outreach.

"

agree

Agreed

Agreed.

"Due to the current limited physical space on campus, instead of physically moving the Oceanography Department to the Galveston Campus, why not set up a structure similar to Engineering with Galveston, where with a merger with the Marine and Coastal Environmental Sciences Department, Oceanography degrees can be offered at both locations. If in the future, campus is able to physically expand, physically moving the department can be explored further.

The Sea Grant Headquarters should be moved to the Galveston Campus, as we are the focal point of the university's Sea Grant Mission. But physical space does remain an issue and should be address with future buildings prior to moving the Headquarters to the Galveston Campus. "

"First ""Sea Grant"" should be capitalized in the above recommendation. That it isn't, takes serious weight away from this recommendation.

Second, I strongly disagree with moving Sea Grant from College Station, the flagship of the Texas A&M University System, to Galveston. I have well over ■ years with Sea Grant and this recommendation smells like a power grab! It seems this exhortation is based on the proximity of TAMUG to the Gulf of Mexico. In this electronic age, if a Sea Grant headquarters is not on the coast, which many are not, it makes no difference. National Sea Grant does not hint or outright suggest the location of a state's Sea Grant headquarters be located on the coast. The mission of Sea Grant ""is to enhance the practical use and conservation of coastal, marine and Great Lakes resources to create a sustainable economy and environment."" College Station has a stellar over 50-year successful history managing the program. The move would have a negative impact on this well-established program, which has had a huge impact on our economy and environment in Texas and the Gulf Coast. I have seen it and personally participated in it for most of my career.

TAMUG has a long fruitful past history with Sea Grant specialists and marine information services working out of Fort Crockett in Galveston. Galveston's researchers have had their share of Sea Grant funding and produced excellent research on the marine environment during their history with College Station. I'm sure their relationship will productively continue into the future with more focused research and extension on emerging issues which will benefit all Texans."

"First, it is clear that the creators of this report do not fully understand what is meant by ""sea grant."" The Sea Grant (proper noun) is a program through NOAA, not a university mission. The Sea Grant office is administrative and proximity to a coast is not necessary. Just because ""sea"" is in the name does not mean that it needs to be consolidated with the marine programs at Galveston. The Sea Grant works with several public universities in the state of Texas, so again, what is the logic in moving it to a different campus? Additionally, this is a NOAA office and I don't know if TAMU has the authority to move the office.

Second, I believe moving the oceanography department will be severely detrimental to the program. Uprooting faculty, researchers, and labs is not a simple task nor will it be popular amongst the affected. There is very little logic presented in the report that would support this move. Oceanography is closely linked to other geoscience disciplines, in addition to chemistry, biology, and physics. Many faculty in oceanography have joint appointments in other departments in College Station. Moving the department would deprive the students, faculty, and researchers from having easy access to all of the courses required for the degree programs, building collaborations among colleagues, and sharing lab resources. I would not be surprised if a move to Galveston would outright destroy the oceanography program.

While having all marine science related entities in one place may seem tidy, there is little justification for how this would positively impact Galveston and the main campus. What is driving this recommendation? Some transparency would be nice."

Fully support!

Galveston is positioned to be a top research facility and student exchange destination. How will TAMUG provide students and faculty global cooperation and experiences?

I agree with this recommendation.

I concur.

I think this is a great idea in theory, but unless a lot more money is pumped into the campus, we won't have the space to house and educate them.

I want to provide feedback on the specific aspect of the report that suggests moving the Oceanography Department to the Galveston branch campus. I believe that whereas 20 years ago would have looked as a great strategy to reconcile marine science programs along the coast, knowing what we now know about coastal hazards and experience these first hand in Texas coast, I do not support the idea of moving sensitive computing, modeling and other laboratory infrastructure to a location on the shoreline.

If a new department will join the campus, then resources need to be allocated to that initiative- Building/office space, labs, classrooms, parking, etc.

"I'm not sure the sea grant mission and purpose was fully studied prior to creating this report. They are not an academic program and they are not associated with the oceanography department.

The Texas Sea College Program is a NOAA Program, located at Texas A&M University's flagship campus, with a directive to serve the entire state of Texas including ALL institutions of higher education. The Program is funded through a cooperative agreement from NOAA Sea Grant to Texas A&M University and this agreement sets forth the terms and conditions of the relationship, providing very specific and detailed guidelines for the operation of each Program, including strategic planning, implementation, and evaluation by NOAA Sea Grant and an external site review committee. The external site visit occurs every 4 years. A successful review results in recertification of the program for the next four years. Recertification is required for a program to maintain its federal funding.

The next external site review will take place in 2024. Relocating the Texas Sea Grant College Program Headquarters office from the Texas A&M University flagship campus in College Station to a branch campus will be viewed as a downgrade by the external site review committee, threatens recertification of the Program, and jeopardizes Texas A&M University's Sea Grant College status - something they have held since 1971. Suspension and/or termination would enable other Texas universities to compete for this NOAA Program.

By moving the sea grant program, you may jeopardize Texas A&M status as a land, space and sea grant university.

"

It isn't appropriate to move oceanography to Galveston. There are four specializations in the oceanography program: Biological, Chemical, Geological, and Physical oceanography. Therefore studies in oceanography are highly connected with other departments. For example, studies in physical oceanography include hurricane studies, which need collaborations with people at the department of atmospheric sciences. The benefits of moving oceanography to Galveston could be more evident to me at this point. It makes sense to have ocean related programs located in Galveston and directly connected to the campus.

Makes total sense to move Oceanography department to TAMUG.

Moving Sea Grant to Galveston should be discussed with NOAA. TAMU alws brags that we ate a Land Grant, Space Grant and Sea Grant University. How will moving Sea Grant to Galveston be seen by former students? This Oceanography move to Galveston seems like a good long term goal but should be done over 10 years or more. Moving oceanography to Galveston was attempted once before and only a few staff were willing to move their research there (e.g. Dr. Gil Rowe). Many current faculty are likely not to move but retire or move to other universities.

N/A

No comments at this time.

Not sure the size of this dept, but is there room at the Galveston campus? Space, parking is becoming more of an issue.

Re-locating all marine departments to a campus positioned next to a large body of open water is a logical decision.

"Relocating the Texas Sea Grant College Program's Headquarters office from the Texas A&M University flagship campus in College Station to a branch campus will be viewed by the federal sponsor, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), as a downgrade of the Program. This action jeopardizes Texas A&M University's Sea Grant College status, held since 1971. The Secretary of Commerce could suspend or terminate this designation. Suspension and/or termination would enable other Texas universities to compete for this NOAA Program.

Federal Regulations Govern the Texas Sea Grant College Program:



Sea Grant was first authorized by the National Sea Grant College Act of 1966, has been subsequently reauthorized on multiple occasions, and most recently reauthorized by Congress in 2020.

Sea Grant Authorizing Legislation and Regulations include the following:

National Sea Grant College Program (US Code 2020 Title 33 Chapter 22, PDF

<https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/USCODE-2020-title33/pdf/USCODE-2020-title33-chap22-subchap11.pdf>)

Code of Federal Regulations - 917 (<https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/CFR-2012-title15-vol3/pdf/CFR-2012-title15-vol3-part917.pdf>)

Code of Federal Regulations - 918 (<https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/CFR-2012-title15-vol3/pdf/CFR-2012-title15-vol3-part918.pdf>)

Relocating the Texas Sea Grant College Program Headquarters office from the Texas A&M University flagship campus in College Station to a branch campus is likely to result in non-compliance with the authorizing legislation and regulations.

The Texas Sea Grant College Program is a Statewide NOAA Program:

The Texas Sea Grant College Program is a NOAA Program, located at Texas A&M University's flagship campus, with a directive to serve the entire state of Texas including ALL institutions of higher education. The Program is funded through a cooperative agreement from NOAA Sea Grant to Texas A&M University and this agreement sets forth the terms and conditions of the relationship, providing very specific and detailed guidelines for the operation of each Program, including strategic planning, implementation, and evaluation by NOAA Sea Grant and an external site review committee. The external site visit occurs every 4 years. A successful review results in recertification of the program for the next four years.

Recertification is required for a program to maintain its federal funding.

The next external site review will take place in 2024. Relocating the Texas Sea Grant College Program Headquarters office from the Texas A&M University flagship campus in College Station to a branch campus will be viewed as a downgrade by the external site review committee, threatens recertification of the Program, and jeopardizes Texas A&M University's Sea Grant College status."

Sounds great, but how do you uproot families as an entire department is relocated to a completely different community?

The relocation of the Sea Grant Headquarters and the Oceanography department to Galveston will benefit all parties.

"The Sea Grant Mission

1. Every single person working on this campus needs to know what the Sea Grant is, and why it is important. Without us, I don't know how TAMU retains the Sea portion of being one of the few Land, Sea, Air, and Space Grant institutions in the nation.

It should be included in every on-boarding experience, we should have it on plaques on campus, and it should be a standard slide in every presentation given on campus from

New Student Conferences to commencement. It is WHY we are what we are. It is why we are, and should be, a jewel in the TAMU System's Crown.

"

There are numerous benefits to moving Sea Grant activities to the Gulf of Mexico. This only seems logical. However, do not forget about TAMUCC.

This idea completely misunderstands how science, teaching, research, and collaboration works within the Oceanography Department, and what the Sea Grant office's mission and role is. There are many things that could be done to promote closeness and collaboration between scientists at the Galveston campus and College Station and increase student opportunities short of moving an entire department and disrupting current interdisciplinary collaborations and teaching opportunities in College Station. On the teaching side, having the Oceanography department situated on College Station campus allows integration of the Oceanography curriculum with other earth and environmental science programs. I think it is important that the department, its teaching, and its research, is visible and accessible to students in related programs. On the research side, faculty collaborate and share instrumentation across departments, including Geology and Geophysics, AgriLife, Chemistry, Biology, the International Ocean Discovery Program, and GERG. Removing Oceanography from the College Station campus disrupts these collaborations and ultimately limits student exposure to research and opportunities for undergraduate participation in research. While many faculty do conduct research in the Gulf of Mexico, many do not, and those who do often have broader programs, nationally and internationally. There is no research imperative for being located at the Galveston campus. My own Gulf of Mexico research is based out of Louisiana. Likewise, the Sea Grant office is a NOAA organization promoting coastal research, extension, and education. The "sea grant mission" of the University is different from the mission of the Sea Grant office. There can be changes made to increase its presence on the Galveston campus, certainly, but moving it does not promote its mission. If the goal of this suggestion is to save costs by losing faculty to the point where the department ceases to exist, then it makes sense. If the goal is to increase student interest and participation on the Galveston campus by increasing access to the departments and offices at College Station, do a cluster hire of faculty across the two campuses intended to promote teaching and research opportunities and facilitate transportation between the two campuses so that greater collaborations can develop.

This is an excellent idea. I 100% agree.

This makes perfect sense.

This move is unwise, in my opinion. It would force an entire department - one that, I understand, brings millions of grant dollars each year to TAMU - to move hundreds of miles away. This will decimate the department, as I imagine most Sea Grant and Oceanography faculty and staff will not be willing to move to Galveston. Such a move would thereby cripple campus agencies that employ many people and are major grant-funded organizations. How would that benefit TAMU? There is no reason, especially in this day and age of Zoom and ease of distance communication, to force the centralization of

departments. And it makes no sense to centralize all functions in College Station...yet still place the department in Galveston.

This move will demonstrate a commitment to the sea grant mission and will help to further emphasize the important work being done in Galveston in the areas of maritime research and education.

This needs more space, resources, faculty/staff, and infrastructure to become a reality. I agree with the idea of alignment but have major concerns about the proper infrastructure being in place to make the move feasible.

This only makes sense in regards to the proximity to the ocean.

This should be the very first question in this survey! What is the guarantee that the TAMU Oceanography department will benefit from showing SeaGrant about commitment by physically moving all activities to the Galveston Campus? I think this will completely ruin the opportunity to interact and work with people from other departments in the Earth science category. At this era of online communication and remote work, the idea of being "physically at the same location" do not make much sense beyond some point.

To my knowledge, Sea Grant Mission of Texas Sea Grant is fulfilled by multiple universities, county extension agents in partnership with regional, local, and state government agencies.

Also, Texas Sea Grant should not be clubbed with the Oceanography Department, and it has multiple partnering organizations in the Texas A&M University System and beyond.

While a physical presence on Galveston Campus is extremely desired (like the existing presence in Texas A&M Corpus Christi), the headquarter designation for Texas Sea Grant needs to be strategically located at Texas A&M University College Station flagship campus.

It allows the leadership of Texas Sea Grant to continue to work closely with not only the University leadership team, but with also the other major state agencies (TEEX, TEES, TTI, Texas A&M Agrilife Extension, TDEM) who have existing or planned headquarter operations in College Station. Moving away can severely hamper the access to the resources on main campus and meeting the mission of Texas Sea Grant.

Totally agree with this.

What about Ocean Engineering as well?

While I do not feel qualified to share recommendations regarding the relocation of the Oceanography department I will say that it sounds rational. I have encountered several students that have not been able to remain in Galveston and declare their minor, or second minor (a requirement of our very own Oceans & One Health program) without physically studying in College Station. The students are left to settle with a minor in English or some other non-Science second minor. To my mind it seems we should provide more cutting edge options for students that were originally drawn to our campus for its most unique aspect, our proximity to the Gulf.

While on paper this seems like a fiscally conservative move in the long run, I think there are aspects of this move that need to be examined in depth to ensure that harm will not come to the overall mission. For example, the core samples (archival area) is a vast and truly priceless unrecoverable resource that benefits from being inland where it is safer from sure and impending devastating storms.

Wholeheartedly agree. This would bolster the status and reputation of the Galveston Campus.

Why was this not done this way to begin with? Things that are geared towards Galveston should be in Galveston.

Yes

Yes move to Galveston Campus

YES YES and YES. After all we ARE near the sea.

YES!

Yes. Please. Both of these areas should have dedicated space on the campus. It may not be appropriate to shift the full departments but certainly to create more presence on the coast and synergy with other areas. There is greater opportunity to position Texas A&M nationally in marine and maritime affairs. We already have the most robust set of programs in the US but we are not fully messaging that to the public.

## Industry partner/affiliate

Fully Support

Sounds reasonable

TAMUG needs to see great improvement in the stewardship of the community and existing efforts by local NGO's that contribute greatly to the student's experience in Galveston such as marine debris, marine mammal and sea turtle research and rescue, and community education opportunities and internships. These NGO partners bolster the student's experience and are unique to Galveston and should be supported by the university. This makes a lot of sense....why it hasn't happened already should be the concern.

YES YES YES

Yes, move the SEA Grant to Galveston.

[REDACTED]

- This appears to be a logical move that would emphasize the importance of the sea grant mission as well as continue to boost the reputation of A&M Galveston.

1) Agreed completely. However, some Oceanography classes could still be taught in College Station. Moving the Oceanography department to Galveston may require a great deal of effort and should be carefully managed. Equalization of salaries between Galveston and College Station will be a requirement.

Agree.

Agreed

"Emphasizing Sea Grant and elevating Galveston will NOT be done by moving the Oceanography Department.

To elevate Galveston and prioritize Sea Grant Mission activities, more investment needs to be put into the facilities and programs. "

Excellent recommendation on moving Sea Grant and Oceanography to Galveston. And it seems like a "no brainer" - and one that would instantly bring more resources and people to Galveston. Having the Oceanography Department in Galveston would provide another strong, foundational program to Galveston that fits squarely within the mission of the campus.

I think this could be an excellent idea, but there are fabulous science and research done historically at TAMUCS and facilities with Texas Agrilife for aquaculture in College Station. My view is that research for sustainable aquaculture research (e.g. more sustainable feeds, less pollution, closed aquaculture systems that do not pollute, etc.) should be continued at TAMUCS. Putting comparable facilities at Pelican Island would cost millions and be vulnerable to the periodic tropical storm / hurricane flooding.

It doesn't matter what we have to say, you didn't even bother to read the feedback on the changes you made to college station. It's insulting that you would even attempt to try this again knowing full well you'll do whatever you want.

Sea Grant academic programs should be in Galveston, as stated above.

Strongly support

Texas A&M should make every effort to make the Galveston Campus and "all things maritime" best in class and competitive to the "top" colleges.

That's logical. All ocean maritime programs and anything related to the sea needs to be at Galveston

This seems to counteract a lot of the above recommended changes? Moving Sea Grant is problematic as it represents a key federal connection of TAMU/TAMUG as a whole to the nation-wide Sea Grant programs. Moving the Oceanography department is also quite counterintuitive, as students and faculty all benefit from Oceanography having links to TAMUG and the rest of the TAMU campus. The Oceanography department is more interdisciplinary than this report seems to recognize, the physical location of it at CS is actually quite important.

This sounds like common sense. Is there likely to be resistance from College Station Campus. Is so - how will this be achieved?

Unknown

Absolutely. Unless there are coastal areas and the sea in College Station

Again, the idea of moving Oceanography to Galveston is not just poorly thought out but potentially disastrous. Start a new program in Galveston if you want to, but do not disrupt careers and lives on an ill-conceived whim.

Agree with the recommendation

Does the Oceanography department want to move? Seems like that's more relevant than my thoughts.

"I have long wondered why Sea Grant Headquarters and Oceanography are in College Station when the Galveston Campus is supposed to be a special purpose institution for all things marine and maritime. I realize it is a great challenge to move Oceanography to campus and perhaps one of the largest hurdles outside of the research grants and equipment already in place is the fact that Galveston is already out of space even with bringing on two new buildings since 2017. We either have to get very creative with space (ie: allowing more remote work and sharing offices for those units whose work lends itself easily to a remote environment such as Budget and Finance) or a new building would be needed to help make this a reality. If Galveston is going to retain its special purpose designation, which was not even mentioned in the MGT report, A&M should work towards having the marine and maritime programs centrally housed on the Galveston campus whether Oceanography is part of the College of Arts and Life Sciences or becomes a Galveston major.

Being a separate line item at the legislative level frequently creates financial hardships for such as small campus with the rising cost of everything and having to operate an entire campus off the tuition generated and state funding received. College Station needs to take a stance on how important our campus is to the overall sea grant mission of A&M and recognize our excellence. Can we improve? Certainly, but we need to start on equal footing with the colleges and schools on main campus with the same resources and opportunities. Has anyone considered doing away with the special purpose designation and embracing us

as a School of Marine and Maritime? I would not like to see this happen as that special purpose designations gives us an advantage in the state funding formula, but at the same time, if we did not have it, main campus could help us more if we are all part 02.

"

I'm not sure the general population knows what the "Sea Grant Mission" is regardless of location.

Makes sense.

MGT report also recommends Oceanography Department be brought down to Galveston campus. This makes perfect sense given that Galveston is an island near the ocean, though Dr. Debbie Thomas (VPAA and Provost) told in the faculty/staff forum that relocating Oceanography Department is a stupid idea. Though Dr. Thomas said she is a close friend of Dr. Banks, Dr. Thomas disagreed with the MGT report for College Station and Dr. Banks' plan a year ago, and she encouraged faculty/staff on Galveston campus to write surveys against the MGT report.

Moving Oceanography Department to Galveston campus is a great idea though Debbie (VPAA and Provost) is completely against it. Debbie said in the forum that relocating Oceanography Department is a horrible idea. Since Debbie and President Banks are close friends and Debbie encouraged people to write against MGT report, perhaps President Banks obeys Debbie.

Moving the Oceanography Department to Galveston is a mistake. Oceanography faculty have close ties with other departments on campus, their labs are used by many researchers across campus, and their students also benefit from campus resources. Examples include Geology & Geophysics, IODP, and GERG. All these activities would be severely impacted.

No comment

"See above. We do not need to move sea grant head quarters to emphasize our sea grant mission. But if it was moved to Galveston, can we assume that all the resources and benefits it has with being in College Station will not be lost in the transfer? In the section above, you say ""Aggies are Aggies regardless of where they are, sharing similar values, hearts, souls, and amazing experiences. Aggies benefit from a variety of unique experiences at different campuses, centers and other locations in College Station, Galveston, Qatar, McAllen, Dallas, or anywhere"". If this is really the case, then why move seagrant? See above for comments on Oceanography.

If this is really important to A&M, then the university has made a significant omission. If the plan is to move sea grant and Oceanography, then they need to also move Ocean Engineering fully to Galveston too. Correct? All sea based programs? not just some?"

Seems fitting

Texas Sea Grant needs to be left in College Station. It should be directly associated with Texas A&M University in College Station. TXSG can work with TAMUG on a satellite basis if TAMUG wanted to put a smaller extension of Sea Grant on the campus.

The reason I chose to go to A&M was because I could have the full A&M experience in College Station, while majoring in oceanography. I would not have chosen this school if oceanography was only offered in Galveston

"This doesn't make much sense. First of all, Sea Grant is a much larger project than only A&M due to its main connection to NOAA. I'm not even sure if it's legal and would be a waste of time and resources even if it was. Sea Grant mission activities do not rely on its headquarters being near Galveston.

Furthermore, Galveston and College Station Oceanography departments are two distinct entities that function differently and study different things. Galveston oceanography holds much of its research into coastal ecosystems. However, College Station's oceanography has relatively little interest in coastal ecosystems, focusing largely on mid-ocean and deep-sea activities. College Station oceanography is the oldest degree-granting oceanography department in the USA and is well-established, not just for its legacy but due to its resources in college station. Both IODP and GERG are major attractions for TAMU Oceanography students, and they are located in College Station. Labs in College Station are already fully outfitted, many of which have special rooms (pressurized, metal-free, highly dangerous chemicals, etc.) and equipment (mass spectrometers, etc.) that either cannot be moved at all or would cost many millions to be transferred/replicated. Students join the Oceanography department at either of these campuses based on their interests and the resources provided. Encouraging collaboration between the two entities would be understandable, but this just doesn't make sense. Reducing Sea Grant, Galveston, and College Station departments into the same entity would be an expensive and pointless task that would likely discourage future faculty and students. "

This makes sense!!

This recommendation appears poorly informed and researched solely from the lens of what might serve Galveston best. Texas Sea Grant (note capitalization) recently undertook a strategic planning exercise; was there any participation of Galveston in said exercise? Was there any consideration of the ratings and commentary on Texas Sea Grant resulting from its recent site review conducted by NOAA in this report? Any decisions with regard to this recommendation should only be made after additional fact finding, including first-hand participation by Texas Sea Grant leadership and the National Sea Grant Office at NOAA. Acting on this recommendation without a better understanding of the needs, requirements, challenges, and purpose of Texas Sea Grant for the sake of boosting a branch campus risks degrading a successful 50+ year Federal/university partnership and its current service to Texans.

Though Dr. Thomas is strongly against the relocation of Oceanography Department to Galveston campus, this relocation plan could truly help with the sea grant mission.

Yes! And what's the connection between land and sea grant?