Dear Provost Adkison,

In accordance with the Task Force’s understanding of your charge, the committee has endeavored “To provide suggestions for the underlying administrative structure for the 2 Dean model across the colleges.” Over the course of the past twelve weeks, the Task Force has met weekly as an entire committee as well as additional periodic College specific sessions. As a committee, we’ve made a concerted effort to embrace the innate importance and significant complexity of your charge. Our inquiry has been as rigorous and thorough as our time limitation would allow.

Through our deliberations, the Task Force determined that creating effective administrative models and saving money were incompatible tasks. The committee felt strongly that EOU cannot have a stronger, more effective administration with fewer administrators beneath the Dean level. Without full and adequate knowledge of all budget implications pertaining to the models within the document, we were unable to specify costs. However, we noted the anticipated administrative FTE for each model presented.

Notably, this document aims to reflect the deliberations of the task force. It should not be viewed as a consensus of the committee. The structural models, accompanying related “Pros & Cons” and narratives found within the document are viewed by the committee to varying degrees as options worthy of your consideration. We recognize that the details of implementing any selected model will be determined by a consultative process. We believe the proposed models and supporting documents will prove useful in your decision-making process.

One common variable across EOU’s Colleges is a historic issue of frequent turnover at the Dean’s level, particularly in the College of Arts and Sciences. The issue of frequent turnover has more recently been a significant concern in the Colleges of Education and Business. Most of the feedback the committee received suggested that EOU’s Deans are too often over worked and inadequately supported structurally. Second, the duties of our Deans are, by nature, multifaceted and complex. As a committee we endeavored to identify those duties with an eye towards making it more feasible for the individual to be able to accomplish those primary responsibilities.

By design, the diverse composition and varied experience of the Task Force members, coupled with multiple additional sources of information and feedback from campus members has guided and informed our concerns and deliberations. Fundamentally, our approach has been to learn from our current and past administrative structures germane to EOU as well as comparative institutions (see appendix). Our initial question to the committee and our colleagues was “What is broken?”. Committee members brought forth and solicited sincere, empirically rooted testimonies and opinions, with an aim towards making our administrative substructure more effective and efficient at serving EOU’s mission across all three colleges. The committee is fully cognizant that each College is, by nature, a unique organization. Understandably, the administrative needs of the Colleges will differ and is reflected in our various models. The issues coalesced primarily around evaluation of faculty, leadership, and division/distribution of administration and teaching duties.
Central issues that helped inform the committee’s deliberations include:

- **Faculty load and overload inequity within and across colleges and the cost ramifications for the University.** The committee discussed the potential for cost savings through an administrative examination of faculty load/overload policies.
- **Reoccurring issue of retention of Deans**
- **Faculty administrative FTE release inequities within and across colleges.** Many of the models attempt to standardize what has been perceived as release time inequities across the colleges. Via the committee’s deliberations, we were left with the impression that FTE release agreements have historically been grown “organically,” rather than being defined by a clearly established administrative system/structure.
- **Standardization of College wide promotion and tenure policies and procedures.** A common concern across colleges is a perceived disparity of tenure and promotion review processes. The committee made a concerted effort to clarify those responsibilities and authorities within the models.
- **Oversight and assessment of online and onsite offerings.** As EOU’s online programmatic offerings continue to increase, the committee (and campus members) recognize it is imperative that our leadership structure clarify responsibility for assessment of online and onsite classes and faculty. This is seen as a crucial issue as it relates to the quality and integrity of our academic community.
- **Review of adjunct faculty.** The committee believes our administrative structure must clearly assign the personnel related responsibilities of adjunct faculty review.
- **Holistic University wide class scheduling.** Coordination of scheduling within and across programs requires oversight by an administrator with the authority to ensure that the overall schedule maximizes student opportunities and minimizes programmatic conflicts.
- **Ambiguity stemming from blended faculty/administrative positions.** An example within the current Arts and Sciences structure, some of the personnel-related duties that once resided with the Dean have been shifted to the Division Chairs, as proxy for the Dean. This shift has created a contractual ambiguity regarding faculty authority in personnel decision-making processes. Another concern across all Colleges was that blended positions may lack the authority to effectively resolve student complaints.
- **Escalating administrative responsibilities of Discipline Representatives without compensation.** The responsibility of Discipline Representatives to coordinate assessment processes is one example of the escalation of administrative duties.
1-Current Administrative Structure for Colleges of Business and Education (5.33 FTE)

Structure omits two .5 positions at MHCC for administration of Education and Business programs and La Grande Math Ed. Position (.25)
### 1-Current Administrative Structure for Colleges of Business and Education (5.33 FTE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unified leadership through the Dean</td>
<td>Dean must administer two very different colleges. May lead to an inability to provide adequate leadership or vision to either college.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniform advocate for colleges across campus</td>
<td>Distribution of administrative duties amongst many faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potentially save money on the short term</td>
<td>Little separation between supervisory and teaching faculty – this causes peer to be responsible for personnel decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part time program administration positions provide leadership opportunities for faculty.</td>
<td>Does not provide enough administrative FTE to effectively evaluate regular faculty and adjunct faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Does not provide strong, fulltime leadership for the Business college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Removes teaching faculty from the classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of oversight for on-line courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tenure and promotion review expectations are not met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fails to provide for sufficient faculty oversight and accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Too many administrative responsibilities to consider and implement changes that are necessary to efficiently use existing resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1-Current Administrative Structure for Colleges of Business and Education (5.33 FTE) – Narrative
Narrative Provided by Darren Dutto

The current structure of the Colleges of Business and Education is a result of several years of administrative changes. With the current structure, a single Dean oversees the administration of two colleges, each with its own challenges and requirements. Additional administrative duties are spread amongst faculty within each college.

In addition to the Dean, the College of Education has, currently, one full time administrator a Director of Teacher Education. One of the primary roles of this position is to guide the college through the accreditation process. The implementation of accreditation guidelines and insure faculty compliance across multiple sites followed by creating the report is a time consuming task. The full time position was instituted just this year for the purpose of accreditation and will likely be reduced in the next academic year. The Director of Teacher Education oversees multiple program and sites, with administrative assistance from local faculty and CUESTE leaders. This release time for these different positions varies.

Each college has its own administrative challenges. In the College of Business, although faculty currently perform some administrative duties in the MBA program, in the Fire Services Administration program, and in the coordination of advising, the College of Business is primarily administered by the Dean. The Dean must oversee both Colleges, each with its own administrative challenges; however, the Dean does not necessarily have expertise in both disciplines. With large student populations on and off-campus, the College of Business generates a significant number of SCH. In order to fulfill the demand for business courses, the small business faculty must teach a substantial number of overload courses. While the efforts of the Business faculty contribute significantly to the financial health of the University, there has been little leadership in the College of Business for several years. This lack of leadership has resulted in serious issues with faculty evaluation, accountability, scheduling, and workload. These issues have created a division within the Business faculty that has eroded morale and created a fractious environment.

In the College of Education, the demands of accreditation are paramount followed by maintaining standards required by the state and federal guidelines. The Dean must be part of this process as required by accrediting agencies. The dispersion of onsite locations and the number of different programs that must meet accreditation standards make complete program oversight and coordination difficult.

The number of adjunct faculty spread across multiple sites makes it difficult to provide any systematic evaluation of their teaching performance. The significant number of online offerings further complicates the evaluation process as there is no clear procedure or “best-practice” to evaluate the online modality.

A second major concern is with the overall leadership of both colleges. Business and Education are both professional programs but very different. Expecting any one person to administer these two colleges (with multiple off-site locations) effectively and knowledgably is, we believe, an unrealistic expectation. This lack of consistent leadership, especially the last several years, has taken its toll on the morale of all faculty. Additionally, leadership needs to occur at the university, local, and state level, especially when both colleges have accreditation challenges.
2- Administrative Structure for Colleges of Business and Education (5.1 FTE)

**Dean of Education and Business, 1.0**

**Duties:**
- Supervision of Assoc. Dean, Ed. Chairs, PHYSH Coord. and Exec. Assistant
- Review of all Promotion & Tenure evaluations
- Leadership
- Community Building
- Public and University Relations (University, community and statewide)
- Budget

**Executive Assistant to the Dean: 1.0**

- Office Specialist - .75 Business
- Office Specialist - MHCC Business
- Office Specialist - .5 FSA
- Advising - UG/Licensure
- Office Specialist - MHCC Education
- MAT – MS – Graduate Advising
- Placement Coord/Ed Data Base
- Office Specialist - Ed/Business
- Office Specialist - Education
- Office Specialist - Education

**UG Chair: 1.0**

**Duties:**
- Program management and scheduling
- Accred.
- Adj. Eval.
- Student concerns

- CUESTE Core Leader Gresham, .17
- CUESTE Core Leader Coos Bay, .17
- CUESTE Core Leader Pendleton, .17
- CUESTE Core Leader Ontario, .17

**Grad. Chair: 1.0**

**Duties:**
- MAT
- MS
- Reading
- ESOL
- SPED
- Accred.
- Adj. Eval.
- Student concerns
- Coordinate Scheduling

- Special Ed Program .2
- School of PHYSH Coord. .2

**Associate Dean of Business, 1.0**

**Duties:**
- MBA
- UG
- Onsite programs
- Scheduling
- Load
- Student concerns
- Coordinate Faculty and adjunct evaluation
- FSA admin.
- Transcript evaluation
Proposal omits two .5 positions at MHCC for administration of Education and Business programs and Math Ed. Position (.25) at La Grande.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promotion and Tenure process assigned to Dean</td>
<td>Loss of program leadership opportunities for teaching faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean and Associate Dean structure allows for leadership for both colleges.</td>
<td>Recruiting and retaining an Associate Dean would be challenging at current budget allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear distinction between administration and teaching faculty.</td>
<td>Transition may be difficult for faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allows for systematic evaluation of regular and adjunct faculty.</td>
<td>May not realize a cost savings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean and Associate Dean can advocate for Colleges in the academic and local community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear and specific administrative assignments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allows teaching faculty to teach courses that are currently being taught by adjuncts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear and specific duties assigned to administrative faculty.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarifies and specifies accreditation responsibilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All CUESTE leadership release time is equitable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stabilizes leadership structure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduces administrative FTE in College of Education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Colleges of Business and Education (5.1FTE)**
2-Administrative Structure for Colleges of Business and Education (5.1FTE)-Narrative

Narrative Provided by John Martin-Knudson

Introduction:

This model consolidates the administration of the Education and Business colleges into essentially three full time positions under a single Dean of Education and Business. In this model the Dean of Education and Business (DEB) who will have primary experience and expertise in Education administration, will lead the College of Education, and oversee the administration of the College of Business. The Associate Dean of Business (ADB) will provide leadership and report to the DEB. Below, is a narrative addressing the key features of this proposed model.

- **Personnel supervision and evaluation.** In both colleges, regular and adjunct faculty need to be supervised and evaluated. In this model, College of Education regular faculty evaluations will be administered and approved by the DEB. Adjunct evaluations will be evaluated by the two Education Chairs (ECs). In the College of Business, regular and adjunct faculty evaluations will be administered by the ADB and approved by the DEB. By providing a clear delineation between faculty and administration, this model alleviates the authority/contractual ambiguity that exists in the current model.

- **Faculty assignment.** In both colleges, schedules and loads need to be equitably and efficiently assigned. This cannot be effectively done by a single dean and the current model using faculty as part time administrators for these tasks puts these faculty administrators into conflicted roles as colleagues and supervisors. The proposed model provides enough full time administrative capacity to accomplish these personnel duties and while removing faculty from their conflicted roles. In Education, the DEB, in consultation with the ECs, will administer schedules and loads. In Business, the ADB will make schedule and load assignments and submit these assignments to the DEB for approval.

- **Online and onsite program leadership.** Both Education and Business have large online and onsite programs. These programs require leadership, supervision and administration.
  - In Education, the MS (online), MAT (blended), and SPED (blended) programs will be led by the Graduate Chair (SPED will retain a 0.2 FTE program specialist to assist Graduate Chair). The four CUESTE onsite programs will be co-administered by the remote program leaders (at each site) and the Undergraduate Chair. All program leadership will be under the supervision of the DEB.
  - In Business, the online and onsite programs will be led by the ADB under the supervision of the DEB.

- **Physical activity and health leadership.** This program, while part of the College of Education, has its own curriculum and program requirements. This program will be led by a PHYSH faculty member receiving 0.2 FTE release time under the supervision of the DEB. This PHYSH administrator will recommend faculty schedules and loads to the DEB. The DEB will make these assignments. All regular and adjunct faculty evaluations will be done by the DEB.

- **Accreditation.**
  - **Education.** State of Oregon accreditation for Education programs requires substantial data collection and evaluation. This is an ongoing program and will require the leadership and supervision throughout the year. The data collection for the
undergraduate and graduate teacher licensure programs will be administered by the ECs. Evaluation of collected data, program changes in response to data (and to changes in State requirements) will be led by the DEB in consultation with the ECs.

- **Business.** Accreditation data collection and evaluation will be administered and lead by the ADB. Program accreditation will be overseen by the DEB.

**Effective program leadership and costs.**

This proposed model provides a clear and effective administrative structure for the Colleges of Education and Business. This model is a framework in which consistent program and personnel leadership from experienced administrators with expertise in the disciplines can occur. The costs of this proposed model is comparable to the costs of the current model. The proposed model, however, by providing effective administration of the two colleges, will set the stage for their future growth while providing effective education programs to the students of EOU. No doubt, this efficient administrative structure is the fiscally responsible and prudent course for the colleges.
### 3-Administrative Structure for Colleges of Business and Education (5.1 FTE)

#### Director of Teacher Education: 1.0

**Duties:**
- Accreditation
- Adjunct Evaluation (limited)
- Student concerns
- Program management (UG and G)
- Scheduling Coordination

#### Associate Dean of Business, 1.0

**Duties:**
- MBA
- UG
- Onsite programs
- Scheduling
- Load
- Student concerns
- Coordinate faculty and adjunct evaluation
- FSA admin.
- Transcript evaluation

#### Executive Assistant to the Dean: 1.0

- Office Specialist- .75 Business
- Office Specialist- MHCC Business
- Office Specialist- .5 FSA
- Advising - UG/Licensure
- Office Specialist -MHCC Education
- MAT – MS – Graduate Advising
- Placement Coord/Ed Data Base
- Office Specialist -Ed/Business
- Office Specialist -Education
- Office Specialist- Education

---

- Review of all Promotion & Tenure evaluations
- Leadership
- Community Building
- Public and University Relations (University, community and statewide)
- Budget

---

**School of PHYSH Coord.: .2**

**Special Ed Program , .2**

---

- CUESTE Core Leader Gresham, .17
- MAT Coordinator .17
- ECED Coordinator .17
- Reading Coordinator .17
- ESOL Coordinator .17
- CUESTE Core Leader Coos Bay, .17
- MS Coordinator .17
- CUESTE Core Leader Pendleton, .17
- CUESTE Core Leader Ontario, .17
- CUESTE Core Leader La Grande, .17
## 3- Administrative Structure for Colleges of Business and Education (5.1 FTE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provides leadership opportunities for Education faculty who want them</td>
<td>No additional savings realized from new structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allows for consistent leadership structure during a time when there has been a lot of transition and change</td>
<td>Limited time for Director of Teacher Education to do adjunct evaluations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All CUESTE leadership release time is equitable</td>
<td>Distinction between administration and education teaching faculty unclear.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading and ESOL Coordinators are provided release time</td>
<td>The Director Position would have the responsibility of the Associate Dean without the pay.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion and Tenure process assigned to Dean</td>
<td>Recruiting and retaining an Associate Dean would be challenging at current budget allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allows teaching faculty to teach courses that are currently being taught by adjuncts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean and Associate Dean structure allows for leadership for both colleges.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarifies and specifies accreditation responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allows for systematic evaluation of regular and adjunct faculty.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean and Associate Dean can advocate for Colleges in the academic and local community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear and specific administrative assignments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makes the Director position 1.0 FTE permanent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3- Administrative Structure for Colleges of Business and Education (5.1 FTE)-Narrative
Narrative provided by Karyn Gomez

Introduction:

This model consolidates the administration of the Education and Business colleges into two full time positions under a single Dean of Education and Business, a Director of Teacher Education and an Associate Dean of Business. In this model the Dean of Education and Business (DEB) will take primary responsibility for the administration of the College of Education and oversee the administration of the College of Business. The Associate Dean of Business (ADB) will provide leadership and report to the DEB. Below is a narrative addressing the key features of this proposed model.

- **Personnel supervision and evaluation.** In both colleges, regular and adjunct faculty need to be supervised and evaluated. In this model, College of Education regular faculty evaluations and some of the adjunct evaluations will be administered and approved by the DEB. The remainder of the adjunct evaluations will be evaluated by the Director of Teacher Education. In the College of Business, regular and adjunct faculty evaluations will be administered by the ADB and approved by the DEB.

- **Faculty assignments.** In both colleges, schedules and loads need to be equitably and efficiently assigned. This cannot be effectively done by a single dean and the current model using faculty as part time administrators for these tasks puts these faculty administrators into conflicted roles as colleagues and supervisors. The proposed model provides full time administrative capacity to accomplish these personnel duties. In Education, the DEB, in consultation with the Director of Teacher Education, will administer schedules and loads. In Business, the ADB will make schedule and load assignments and submit these assignments to the DEB for approval.

- **Online and onsite program leadership.** Both Education and Business have large online and onsite programs. These programs require leadership, supervision and administration. In the past, release time for faculty has been inequitably distributed for these administrative duties. The proposed model more evenly distributes Education faculty release time for essential duties (e.g. site scheduling, placement assistance, and site faculty meetings) while leaving the larger responsibilities of program integration and oversight to the Director of Teacher Education.
  - In Education, faculty coordinators for the following programs would receive approximately 0.17 FTE release time (6 credits per year):
    - MAT (Master of Arts in Teaching)
    - MS (Master of Science in Education)
    - ECED (Early Childhood program)
    - Reading Endorsement Course of Study
    - ESOL Endorsement Course of Study
    - CUESTE (Undergraduate teacher prep program) at all five sites—La Grande, Pendleton, Gresham, Coos Bay, Ontario
  - Also in Education, the faculty coordinator of the SPED (Special Education) program would receive approximately 0.2 FTE release time (7 credits per year). The reason for slightly more release time for this coordinator is due to the responsibilities required for admission to program and accreditation responsibilities for the SPED program.
In Business, the online and onsite programs will be led by the ADB under the supervision of the DEB.

- **Physical activity and health leadership.** This program, while part of the College of Education, has its own curriculum and program requirements. This program will be led by a PHYSH faculty member receiving 0.2 FTE release time under the supervision of the DEB. This PHYSH administrator will recommend faculty schedules and loads to the DEB. The DEB will make these assignments. All regular and adjunct faculty evaluations will be done by the DEB.

- **Accreditation.**
  - **Education.** State of Oregon accreditation for Education programs requires substantial data collection and evaluation. This is an ongoing program and will require leadership and supervision throughout the year. The data collection for the undergraduate and graduate teacher licensure programs will be administered by the Director of Teacher Education. Evaluation of collected data, program changes in response to data (and to changes in State requirements) will be led by the DEB in consultation with the Director of Teacher Education.
  - **Business.** Accreditation data collection and evaluation will be administered and lead by the ADB. Program accreditation will be overseen by the DEB.

**Program leadership and costs.**

This proposed model will have a similar cost to the first proposal from Ed and Business, so this does not include a cost savings, although there is only one full time administrative position below the Dean in the College of Education. The advantage to this model is that it allows the opportunity for faculty to take leadership responsibilities within programs. For faculty who are looking for leadership and advancement opportunities without having to move to a full-time administrative position, this model allows for faculty leadership within programs. This model also encourages faculty buy-in and ownership of programs as opposed to having a top-down model of administrative decision-making. A significant “cost” to this model is the work load that would be associated with the position of Director of Teacher Education. This position would have a great deal of responsibility, and it may be difficult to retain someone in the position for the long-term. Consistency in leadership is important, particularly in a period of profound change along with increasing accreditation pressures.

This model presents no changes to leadership in the College of Business from the first proposed model.
1-Current Administrative Structure for College of Arts and Sciences (2.5 FTE)

**Dean 1.0**

**Duties:**
- Supervision of Faculty and Exec. Assistant
- Review of all Promotion & Tenure evaluations
- Leadership
- Community Building
- Public and University Relations (University, community and statewide)
- Budget
- Advocate for the college

---

**Executive Assistant to the Dean**

- Office Specialist 1.0 - DSSML
- Office Specialist 1.0 – A&L
- Office Specialist 1.0 - SMT
- Office Specialist .5 – Dean

---

**Division Chairs (0.5 FTE) X3**
- Advocate a vision and the aspirations for the Division
- Help implement strategic planning, GEC and program assessment
- Help implement the integration of on-line/on-site educational delivery to the CAS
- Serve on the appropriate committees
- Chair Division meetings
- Keep the Division informed on matters of importance
- Evaluate divisional faculty
- Conduct post-tenure reviews
- Process student complaints
- Advise the Dean on Division equipment purchases
- Monitor Division budget matters as delegated by the Dean
- Initiate and oversee Division searches
- Facilitate curricular initiatives for the programs in your Division
- Develop annual course schedules and calculate workload allocations in consultation with the Dean
- Advise the Dean on divisional space allocations

---

**Discipline Reps (0 FTE) x 16**
- Monitor program budgets and inform faculty
- Purchase and/or replacement of equipment
- Approve all purchases for the department
- Advocate for program
- Facilitate curriculum proposals and changes
- Evaluate curriculum based on staffing, budget, and student needs
- Coordinate program assessment initiatives
- Coordinate program meetings
- Serve as discipline liaison
- Oversee program advancement, publicity, and web site
- Determine course equivalencies for transfer students
- Coordinate program admission reviews
## 1-Current Administrative Structure for College of Arts and Sciences (2.5 FTE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DCs familiarity with specific programs makes them effective advocates and advisors to the Dean</td>
<td>DCs dealing with student complaints without supervisory authority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The DC structure affords an opportunity for faculty initiatives to be advocated in an informed manner upward in the structure to the Dean, Provost &amp; President</td>
<td>Lack of consistent and formalized evaluation of on-line and adjunct faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oversight of program scheduling should reside with DRs.</td>
<td>Increasing administrative tasks and responsibilities being placed on DRs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRs have the expertise to organize assessment tasks within their program.</td>
<td>Disparities of DRs duties among programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership is organized in a manner that insures informed representation within divisions</td>
<td>Lack of clear guidelines in assigning release time to DRs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The scale of divisions relative to numbers of faculty is manageable for adequate DC representation</td>
<td>Lack of scheduling coordination across &amp; between Divisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCs represent their program interests to the Dean &amp; Provost</td>
<td>Lack of a central scheduling authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On a curricular level, this structure promotes and supports a “Bottom up” process. Faculty have opportunities to define the content of their programs.</td>
<td>DRs lack authority to ensure equitable distribution of tasks within a program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The DC role lightens the Dean’s personnel evaluation load.</td>
<td>Inequity between divisions of demands related to student complaints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased level of administrative responsibilities pushed down to Discipline rep and program faculty levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintaining current DC model does not address EOU’s need to save money within administrative structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recruitment of adjunct faculty to replace DCs FTE is challenging</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The current administrative structure originated at the time of President David Gilbert who created the position of Division Chairs (DC). At the time Dr. Jerry Young was the Dean. The purpose of the Division Chairs was to schedule non-conflicting class schedules and to make certain that students had the opportunity to get all of the courses they needed to graduate within 4 years. Later, to decrease the load placed on the Dean, DCs took on the duty of formally listening to student complaints against a faculty member. In addition, when budget cuts were inevitable, DCs were given the task to justify the positions within their divisions so they would not be cut or to minimize any cuts that needed to be done. DC did not have to write faculty third year reviews or tenure/promotion evaluations. No release time was associated with the Division Chair position until Sandra Ellston became Dean. At that time a release time of 0.33 was established (1).

Division Chairs continued to be mostly advisory, bringing to the Dean’s attention matters of importance, along with communicating tasks and information to the Division. However, as time went by, the responsibilities of the Chairs increased. Around 2004 a 0.5 FTE release was negotiated and the Chairs were given the task of conducting all classrooms observations for T&P as well as first and second year reviews, post-tenure reviews, and reviews of fixed-term faculty with 0.5 and above appointments. During the time that Marilyn Levine was Dean, she also started the evaluation of on-line courses and this duty was given to the Chairs. Students’ complaints became a major task, although this load varies from Division to Division (2).

In addition to advocate and communication tasks, additional current duties of the DCs include scheduling courses within and across Divisions, Colleges and partners (OSU and OHSU), monitoring program budgets, and ensuring that programs stay on task with assessment.

The major advantage of the current structure is that each DC supervises a limited number of programs typically close to the DC’s disciplinary background. This allows the DC to more clearly understand the issues that programs may bring forward and be better advocate for those programs. Familiarity with disciplinary background also makes DCs effective in personnel evaluations.

However, personnel review (on campus and on-line) and student complaints remain problematic as Chairs conduct these administrative duties without the authority that would come with a full-time administrative position.

The task force has received significant feedback from faculty regarding the ever increasing level of responsibilities for Discipline Representatives. Additionally, the task force gathers that there is a significant comparative disparity of responsibilities across disciplines. This issue seems to be a reoccurring faculty morale issue. Due to assumed budgetary constraints, this model does not address this pressing issue and is therefore a regrettable shortfall of this model.

(1) Information provided by Dr. Richard Hermens, retired chemistry professor, who held the position of Division Chair for the SMT Division from 1986 to 2001.
2-Administrative Structure for College of Arts and Sciences (3.0 FTE)

**Dean (1.0 FTE)**

**Duties:**
- Supervision of Faculty, Assoc. Dean and Exec. Assistant
- Review of all Promotion & Tenure evaluations
- Leadership
- Community Building
- Public and University Relations (University, community and statewide)
- Budget
- Advocate for college

**Associate Dean (1.0 FTE)**

- Advise and assist the Dean with daily management of the college
- Personnel oversight and management
- Coordinate all faculty and adjunct evaluation including Tenure, Promotion, and Post-tenure review
- Scheduling and Load
- Help coordinate strategic planning, GEC and program assessment
- Other duties as assigned by the Dean

**Executive Assistant to the Dean and Associate Dean**
- Office Specialist 1.0
- Office Specialist 1.0
- Office Specialist 1.0
- Office Specialist .5

**Division Chairs (0.33 FTE) X 3**
- Advocate a vision and the aspirations for the Division
- Help implement strategic planning, GEC and program assessment
- Serve on the appropriate committees
- Chair Division meetings
- Keep the Division informed on matters of importance
- Process student complaints
- Advise the Dean on Division equipment purchases
- Monitor Division budget matters as delegated by the Dean
- Initiate and oversee Division searches
- Facilitate curricular initiatives for the programs in your Division
- Advise the Dean on divisional space allocations

**Discipline Reps (0 FTE) x 16**
- Monitor program budgets and inform faculty
- Purchase and/or replacement of equipment
- Approve all purchases for the department
- Advocate for program
- Facilitate curriculum proposals and changes
- Evaluate curriculum based on staffing, budget, and student needs
- Coordinate program assessment initiatives
- Coordinate program meetings
- Serve as discipline liaison
- Oversee program advancement, publicity, and web site
- Determine course equivalencies for transfer students
- Coordinate program admission reviews
## 2-Administrative Structure for College of Arts and Sciences (3.0 FTE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintains divisional identities</td>
<td>Recruitment of adjunct faculty to backfill DCs FTE would continue to be challenging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of Associate Dean position standardizes faculty evaluation and load process.</td>
<td>Model does not address compensation and workload issues for DRs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidation, oversight, and coordination of scheduling</td>
<td>More expensive model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCs’ familiarity with specific programs makes them effective advocates and advisors to the Dean</td>
<td>Increasing administrative tasks and responsibilities being placed on DRs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Associate Dean lightens the Dean’s workload.</td>
<td>Disparities of DRs duties among programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On a curricular level, this structure promotes and supports a “Bottom up” process. Faculty have opportunities to define the content of their programs.</td>
<td>DRs lack authority to ensure equitable distribution of tasks within a program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRs have the expertise to organize assessment tasks within their program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership is organized in a manner that insures informed representation within divisions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The scale of divisions is manageable for effective DC representation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Model #2 maintains the current divisional structure while providing additional administrative leadership with the inclusion of an Associate Dean position. The Task Force generally believes that maintenance of the current divisional structure helps facilitate communication within and across the divisions as well as maintaining effective communication regarding programmatic concerns and initiatives across the college. It also continues to promote advisory opportunities to and from the Dean’s office.

Based on significant feedback from faculty and administrative staff, the task force understands that personnel responsibilities specifically related to tenure, promotion, as well as, review of adjunct faculty has historically been a stress point for previous Deans and a source of contractual ambiguity relative to Division Chairs’ duties. Under this model, the Task Force intends that the Associate Dean position would be responsible for organization and facilitation of personnel matters, while final tenure and promotion decisions will be made by the Dean. Additionally, the Associate Dean, in consultation with DCs and DRs, would be responsible for coordinating programmatic class offerings across the college. The committee believes that administrative oversight of class scheduling and related faculty load, would simplify, clarify and standardize the process.

Due to the model’s decrease in personnel related Divisional Chair duties, the FTE release per chair would be lowered to .33. This proposed FTE release reduction aligns with the historic DC release allotment before personnel duties were included among DC responsibilities. By centering the personnel facilitation responsibilities within the Associate Dean’s position, there will be a standardization of the processes. This will alleviate the contractual ambiguity relative to divisional chair personnel authority and responsibilities.

The task force has received significant feedback from faculty regarding the ever-increasing level of responsibilities for Discipline Representatives. Additionally, the task force gathers that there is a significant comparative disparity of responsibilities across disciplines. This issue seems to be a reoccurring faculty morale issue. Due to assumed budgetary constraints, this model does not address this pressing issue and is therefore a regrettable shortfall of this model.

Although this model does not save money and would in fact cost more administratively, it does consolidate and clarify administrative duties in a manner that should improve college level leadership while facilitating more senior level faculty time (DCs) in the classroom. The model also offers potential opportunities, in the form of both the Associate Dean and Divisional Chair positions, for qualified faculty interested in administrative experience.
3- Administrative Structure for College of Arts and Sciences (3 FTE)

**Dean 1.0**

Duties:
- Supervision of faculty and Exec. Assistant
- Review of all Promotion & Tenure evaluations
- Leadership
- Community Building
- Public and University Relations (University, community and statewide)
- Budget
- Advocate for college

**Executive Assistant to the Dean**

- Office Specialist 1.0
- Office Specialist 1.0
- Office Specialist 1.0
- Office Specialist .5

**Division Chair (1.0 FTE) x2**

- Advocate a vision and the aspirations for the Division
- Help implement strategic planning, GEC and program assessment
- Help implement the integration of on-line/on-site educational delivery to the CAS
- Serve on the appropriate committees
- Chair Division meetings
- Keep the Division informed on matters of importance
- Personnel oversight and management
- Coordinate all faculty and adjunct evaluation including Tenure, Promotion, and Post-tenure review within division
- Process student complaints
- Advise the Dean on Division equipment purchases
- Monitor Division budget matters as delegated by the Dean
- Initiate and oversee Division searches
- Facilitate curricular initiatives for the programs in your Division
- Develop annual course schedules and calculate workload allocations in consultation with the Dean
- Advise the Dean on divisional space allocations

**Discipline Reps (0 FTE) x16**

- Monitor program budgets and inform faculty
- Purchase and/or replacement of equipment
- Approve all purchases for the department
- Advocate for program
- Facilitate curriculum proposals and changes
- Evaluate curriculum based on staffing, budget, and student needs
- Coordinate program assessment initiatives
- Coordinate program meetings
- Serve as discipline liaison
- Oversee program advancement, publicity, and website
- Determine course equivalencies for transfer students
- Coordinate program admission reviews
### 3- Administrative Structure for College of Arts and Sciences (3 FTE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College administrative responsibilities including faculty personnel reviews would be shared among three administrators.</td>
<td>Faculty morale adjustment to a changed division structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divisional identity could be retained (compared with No DC model)</td>
<td>More expensive than current model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication structure would be retained (compared with No DC model)</td>
<td>No compensation for DRs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCs are less expensive than Associate Dean</td>
<td>Require revision of shared governance structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide more opportunity for faculty to have administrative experience</td>
<td>Required revision of collective bargaining agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCs familiarity with specific programs makes them effective advocates and advisors to the Dean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3- Administrative Structure for College of Arts and Sciences (3 FTE)-Narrative

Narrative provided by John Thurber

This model consolidates the current three divisions into two, providing each with a full-time Chair, resulting in a change of administrative FTE from 2.5 to 3.0.

The model addresses perceived shortfalls in the current structure by providing a strong framework across which to distribute administrative tasks. In particular, the responsibilities of personnel evaluation will be shared by three people. The model suggests that two Division Chairs with responsibilities similar to those of an Associate Dean will be more effective at managing the diverse programs within the College of Arts and Sciences.

In comparison to the Associate Dean models, distributing responsibilities across two chair positions may offer advantages in retention, providing positions less likely to result in burnout. This model provides opportunities for interested faculty to gain administrative experience, at a level of significantly greater responsibility than Division Chairs in the current model.

Several people have spoken of value in divisional identity, and this model provides for continuation. It may even result in stronger identity with the existence of a full-time leader for each division.

The primary obstacles to implementation of this model would likely be the increase in administrative salary cost, and the challenge of reorganizing the college. With regard to the latter, much of our internal governance committee structure is defined in terms of the current divisional structure; restructuring the divisions also means restructuring several committees. This work, while non-trivial, should be relatively straightforward.
# 4-Administrative Structure for College of Arts and Sciences (2.0 FTE +*)

## Dean (1.0 FTE)

**Duties:**
- Supervision of Assoc. Dean and Exec. Assistant
- Review of all Promotion & Tenure evaluations
- Leadership
- Community Building
- Public and University Relations (University, community and statewide)
- Budget

## Associate Dean (1.0 FTE)

**Duties:**
- Advise and assist the Dean with daily management of the college
- Personnel oversight and management
- Perform all faculty and adjunct evaluation including Tenure, Promotion, and Post-tenure review
- Scheduling and Load
- Student complaints
- Help implement the integration of online/on-site educational delivery to the CAS

## Executive Assistant to the Dean and Associate Dean

- Office Specialist 1.0
- Office Specialist 1.0
- Office Specialist 1.0
- Office Specialist .5

## Discipline Reps* x16

- Monitor program budgets and inform faculty
- Purchase and/or replacement of equipment
- Approve all purchases for the department
- Facilitate curriculum proposals and changes
- Evaluate curriculum based on staffing, budget, and student needs
- Coordinate program assessment initiatives and Strategic Planning
- Coordinate program meetings
- Serve as discipline liaison
- Oversee program advancement, publicity, and website
- Determine course equivalencies for transfer students
- Coordinate program admission reviews
- Advocate a vision and the aspirations for the Program
- Serve on College Council
- Develop Program schedules

* Equitable FTE release or compensation

Release or compensation applies to DRs of majors, not minors
### 4-Administrative Structure for College of Arts and Sciences (2.0 FTE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pros</th>
<th>Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compensation for DRs</td>
<td>Costs may be more expensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of divisional identity and leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Creation of Associate Dean position standardizes faculty evaluation process.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Increased responsibilities for discipline reps</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Keep tenure-track faculty teaching full time</strong></td>
<td><strong>Necessitates changes in collective bargaining and shared governance documents.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership is organized in a manner that insures informed representation of programs</strong></td>
<td><strong>Elimination of DCs positions reduces opportunities for faculty to develop administrative expertise.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DRs have the expertise to organize assessment tasks within their program.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Retention issues of Associate Dean re workload and salary issues.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>On a curricular level, this structure promotes and supports a “Bottom up” process. Faculty have opportunities to define the content of their programs.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Administrative bottleneck at the Associate Dean level</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consolidation, oversight, and coordination of scheduling</strong></td>
<td><strong>Challenging to allocate compensation equitably to DR due to varying size and complexity of disciplines</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Associate Dean lightens the Dean’s workload.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4-Administrative Structure for College of Arts and Sciences (2.0 FTE)-Narrative

Narrative provided by Jeff Dense

The proposed Dean/Associate Dean model for Eastern Oregon University’s College of Arts and Sciences enables the consolidation of key functions and potential for increased fiscal efficiency in comparison to the current Dean/Division Chair administrative structure. In particular, the proposed Dean/Associate Dean model centralizes course scheduling in both the on-campus and on-line environs, enables the consolidation of personnel processes (especially adjunct and on-line faculty), while providing an opportunity to recognize the administrative tasks regularly performed by Discipline Representatives.

This model would resolve the issue of three separate schedules being generated without a commensurate consideration of conflicts which may inhibit student progress. There has been minimal coordination of scheduling between programs within the same division, except for resolution over scheduling conflicts with regard to classroom assignments. Note, additionally the important administrative role performed by Discipline Representatives with regard to the coordination of program scheduling, and how Division Chairs lacks the program specific knowledge to maximize the best interests of students as part of the scheduling process. While the implementation of the ASTRA scheduling system, along with development of two-year scheduling blocks, is a step in the right direction, the central coordination of scheduling in one individual has the potential to overcome the problems associated with the course scheduling process under the current Division Chair model.

A particularly problematic aspect of the current Dean/Division Chair model that will be addressed by the implementation of the proposed Dean/Associate Dean model deals with the evaluation of adjunct and on-line faculty. The evaluation of on-line faculty is problematic. Moreover, the possibility of disparate treatment of adjuncts and on-line faculty, given the various personnel involved in the current evaluation process, presents a potential legal risk to the institution. Centralizing the evaluation of adjunct and on-line faculty in one individual, along with the commensurate development of policy and criteria as part of the evaluative process, is one of the primary benefits of the proposed Dean/Associate Dean model for the College of Arts and Sciences at Eastern Oregon University.

Another advantage of the proposed Dean/Associate Dean model is fiscal efficiency, especially when compared to the current Dean/Division Chair model. Please note that there was spirited debate among the Task Force members as to the overall fiscal implications of the current administrative structure, particularly with regard to whether the OPE costs of .5 release for Division Chairs should be calculated as part of administrative expenses, along with the very real costs and significant costs associated with the hiring of part-time adjuncts to backfill the Division Chairs .5 course release time (as stipulated in the AAP/EOU Collective Bargaining Agreement). By any calculation the cost of hiring an 1.0 FTE Associate Dean with an annual salary of $80-85,000 with 40% FTE (a total of approximately $125,000) pales in comparison with the estimated $175,000 for .5 release of three full professors for Division Chair duties along with the costs associated with the hiring of three .5 adjuncts (and their costly OPE contributions).

As part of the implementation of this model several questions should be contemplated. These questions include, but are not limited to:

• **Will the Associate Dean be a permanent hire or serve a (multi-year) term of service?** Limiting terms of service, will it may present leadership continuity issues, would provide expanded leadership opportunities vis-à-vis a permanent hire scenario.

• **Will the Associate Dean be a 12-month contractual term, or will a shorter contract be utilized?** The utilization of a shorter contract period may provide a more robust pool of candidates for the Associate Dean position, particularly with regard to current faculty who may be unwilling to give up their entire summer to become an administrator.

• **If the Associate Dean position is filled from within, will adjunct backfill or a tenure track line be utilized?** The “adjunctification” of the faculty has potential implications on the quality of instruction provided to EOU students.
One of the primary benefits to be derived from the implementation of the proposed Dean/Associate Dean model is an explicit recognition of the important and sundry administrative tasks regularly performed by the Discipline Representatives in the College of Arts and Sciences. Discipline Representatives have carried out a variety of administrative tasks, some of which are program specific, including management of facilities, program promotion, and public relations. Duties generally performed by all Discipline Representatives include facilitation of program curriculum proposals, and most importantly, organization of program assessment efforts. As the accreditation standards of the Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities become more concretized over time (especially Standard Four), it will be incumbent for these individuals to be recognized for their essential administrative efforts. To date Discipline Representatives have not received any compensation for performance of their various administrative duties. Hence, the Task Force recommends an annual stipend be provided to Discipline Representative in recognition of the performance of the various administrative tasks they perform. This stipend will only be granted for degree granting programs.

Given the charge promulgated to the Task Force to contemplate fiscal efficiencies as part of the examination of the pros and cons of various administrative structures, release time with adjunct “backfill” (e.g., hiring an adjunct faculty member to cover courses under release time agreements) is not a viable fiscal option, as it would result in significant additional costs. Additionally, release time for Discipline Representatives without adjunct backfill may provide a significant roadblock to students, as the decrease in course offerings may inhibit time to degree, a key institutional accountability measure that has been invoked by the Oregon University System. However, several issues must be addressed should the institution decide to proceed with this aspect of the proposal. As a comparison of the proposed models for the Colleges of Education and Business indicate, the Colleges of Education and Business have proposed release time varying from .17 to .2 for Cueste Leaders and College of Education Coordinators. This disparate approach to compensation for administrative duties in comparison with the proposed Dean/Associate Dean model discussed here presents a significant equity issue that must be addressed as part of the consideration of the various proposed models forwarded to the administration by the Task Force.
Appendix

An evaluation of EOU’s comparator institutions reveals that the current Dean/Division Chair administrative model is not in keeping with common practice utilized by sister institutions. With one exception (Fort Hays State) all of EOU’s comparator institutions (as identified in the AAP/EOU Collective Bargaining Agreement Appendix D) utilize a Dean/Associate Dean administrative model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMPARABLE UNIVERSITY</th>
<th>LEADERSHIP STRUCTURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cal State Stanislaus</td>
<td>Six Colleges, each have separate Dean; at least one College (Humanities and Social Science) has multiple Associate Deans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment: 8305</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan Flint</td>
<td>One College and Three Schools, each have separate Dean; Each has Associate Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment: 8138</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Washington College</td>
<td>Three Colleges, each have separate Dean; Each College has Associate Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment: 5203</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Wisconsin Parkside</td>
<td>One College and One School, each has separate Dean; Each has Associate Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment: 5160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY Fredonia</td>
<td>Two Colleges each has separate Dean; College of Arts and Sciences has Associate Dean (12 month) and Assistant Dean (10 month)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment: 5772</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Missouri State University</td>
<td>Three Colleges and one school, each has separate Dean; each has Associate Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment: 11033</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Washington University</td>
<td>Three Colleges, each has separate Dean; each has Associate Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment: 11534</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Utah University</td>
<td>Five Colleges, each has separate Dean; each has Associate Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment: 8024</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Hays State</td>
<td>Four Colleges, each has separate Dean; no Associate Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment: 11883</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Oregon University</td>
<td>Two Colleges, each has separate Dean; each has Associate Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment: 6229</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Oregon University</td>
<td>One College and two Schools each have separate Dean; each has Associate Dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment: 6441</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EOU Enrollment: 4137