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I. Introduction/Charge

President Benjamin Allen appointed members to the Task Force on the Organizational Review of the Division of Educational and Student Services on August 14, 2006. The task force included members representing the Educational and Student Services (ESS) Division, Academic Affairs (AA) Division, and Northern Iowa Student Government (NISG).

The charge of the task force included the following:

1. Review the organizational structure of ESS to determine if all of the units now reporting to the Vice President of ESS should continue to do so.
2. Consider if units that are currently not reporting to ESS should do so in the future.

It was noted that the review should not include an assessment of how each of the units are functioning, except to the degree that its inclusion or non-inclusion in ESS affects its effectiveness and efficiency in serving students and the university.

According to the President, the ultimate outcome of the review is to “create an organizational structure for ESS that will ensure the optimal service to the students. This will allow us to attract the strongest candidates possible for the position of Vice President of ESS.”

II. Task Force Approach

The President stated that the approach taken for this review was the prerogative of the task force members. However, he noted “that benchmarking would be used and input would be sought from faculty, students, leaders, and staff members in each of the units of ESS and related units in other divisions.” The task force chose an extensive data collection and thorough interviewing process in examining the current practices of ESS. The goal was to involve as many stakeholders in order to identify strengths and weaknesses of the ESS Division, examine redundancy in services and staffing across Divisions, and make suggestions for an improved organizational structure to better serve students and their learning outcomes.

The task force began with an examination of the ESS website and a study of the organizational structure within the ESS Division. Additional units, not currently reporting to ESS, were identified for consideration of inclusiveness in the study. Organizational charts (with employee positions) were collected for the units in the ESS Division, Administration and Finance (AF) Division, and the AA Division. Included in the AA organizational structure examination were units in Academic Administrative Services (excluding Military Science) and an examination of each College’s advising structure.

All task force members examined the book, One Size Does Not Fit All: Traditional and Innovative Models of Student Affairs Practice, by Manning, Kinzie, and Schuh (2006). Subsequently, a consultant, John Schuh, was invited to campus to meet with task force
members to discuss student affairs organizational structures and historical/current models and practices.

Various national and university reports were collected for examination including the “College Student Experience Questionnaire,” “National Survey of Student Engagement,” “UNI Advising Study,” “Review of Academic Achievement and Student Support Services,” and “Stamats 2001 Survey on Advising-Student Perspective.” The task force reviewed previous student survey data to assess prior levels of student satisfaction.

Benchmarking occurred with multiple institutions, including Board of Regents peer institutions and other schools identified as being involved in effective student engagement and retention practices. Benchmarking also included schools identified as having best practices within the “Documenting Effective Educational Practices (DEEP)” initiative.

Four different letters/surveys, with requests for information and feedback questions from selected faculty and ESS staff, were developed and distributed to gather input. Additionally, the task force identified other faculty and staff members across the campus community in which the survey was most appropriate for feedback (see the appendix). Survey responses from the letters were compiled, distributed and analyzed by task force members.

Interviews were scheduled and held with staff members from the following departments: Registrar’s Office, Enrollment Services, Advising and Career Services, International Programs, International Services, Academic Services, NISG, ESS Interim Vice President, former ESS Vice President, ESS Directors/Deans, AA Deans and AA Interim Vice President and Provost.

Finally, the task force held multiple meetings to discuss data, make recommendations and issue the final report.

III. Results and Recommendations

The Task Force is recommending two institutional organizational models (see pages 8 & 9) for examination and consideration in future decision-making processes. The main priority of the membership of the Task Force was to ensure the optimal service to students, while maintaining or enhancing high academic standards.

Linked Departments
Prior to making a determination as to the movement of selected departments within the larger organizational structure, the Task Force determined that there are areas within the organizational structures of ESS and AA that should be linked more closely. These linkages include merging separate departments into one unit or aligning existing units under the same division.
The decision to recommend these linkages is based on one or more of the following criteria: 1) there is significant duplication in services and programs between the units, 2) there is considerable confusion among students and faculty as to the services provided by the individual units, and 3) the mission and vision of these units are or should be closely aligned.

Below are the organizational structure changes recommended by the task force:

1) **Merge Academic Services** (currently resides in ESS) and the **Center for Academic Achievement** (currently resides in AA) into the newly recommended department, **Center for Enhancement of Student Learning**. These current departments provide similar services, most notably academic support for reading and learning strategies, a math laboratory, and a writing center. Individual academic assistance and testing services are also provided. The Task Force noted a significant amount of confusion among faculty and students about the services provided in each individual unit. The task force recommends the departments be combined under one unifying name as noted above (also, see new models).

In both recommended models, the task force places the **Center for Enhancement of Student Learning** under the division of ESS. The task force believes the services provided by both departments are linked more closely with the ESS division. The new department will provide services that support the academic success of students, rather than being directly linked to the classroom experience. Furthermore, a strong student service philosophy is evident in the survey responses and discussions with staff in those areas, which suggests a close alignment with the mission and vision of ESS.

Rationale for the linkage:
- Physical integration has already occurred which will minimize cost implications
- The departments provide similar academic services to students and as a combined unit would be able to use existing resources more strategically
- A single identity encourages the development of a single mission and purpose
  This should facilitate the development of a more cohesive communication strategy for these services and a departmental name that more clearly illustrates the types of services offered

2) **Admissions, Financial Aid, and Registrar**

Feedback from the majority of survey respondents suggests a need for a heightened focus on recruitment and retention. In addition, President Allen has indicated that enrollment growth will be an institutional priority under his administration. A number of compelling reasons for a renewed focus on enrollment growth have been stated by the President and others throughout the university and are not cited here. However, it is clear to the task force that recruitment and retention requires enhanced prominence within the organizational structure. It recommends maintaining a close linkage between the offices that already provide critical leadership and support in the management of enrollment. It is with this in mind that we have proposed the linking of Educational and Student Service units concerned primarily with these
issues to serve together under one leader (specialist) charged to coordinate their efforts.

**Enrollment:**
- The desire to grow enrollment is a critical issue for the university. How we accomplish this in an increasingly competitive environment requires a comprehensive plan for recruitment, financial aid leveraging, market positioning, communications, and retention.
- This initiative will cross all Divisions and require campus-wide “buy-in”, understanding, and acceptance of the changes, which must be made in the allocation, or re-allocation of limited resources.

(See number 3 below for an additional linkage of International Programs and Services to the above linked units).

3) Departments involved in International Experiences/Activities/Programs/Services
The task force recommends the following departments and services: International Programs, International Student Services, Cultural and Intensive English Program (CIEP), and Study Abroad be merged into one consolidated unit, *International Programs and Services*. Services would include the facilitation of incoming and outgoing faculty relocation, transitions and needs; as well as immigration and visa services. Also, since many of these departments and services impact recruitment considerably, it is recommended that they be aligned closely with other Enrollment Management units (see number 2 above). This was done to reduce the redundancies of services provided and also to improve services for students and faculty.

The task force concluded that there could be significant benefit in combining all of the international programs and services under one umbrella. Currently, services and programs related to international programs exist in both the ESS and AA divisions. There appears to be a great deal of confusion among students, faculty, and staff on how and where to access international programs and services since these services currently are spread across campus. Also, there appears to be little collaboration or strategic use of resources, particularly in the areas of international recruitment and scholarship allocation.

A separate task force has been charged by the Provost to evaluate many aspects of these units/services on the campus. However, as it relates to organizational structure, our task force recommends that merging programs/units and services into one organizational unit will help to clarify roles, consolidate services and reduce duplication of services, efforts and programs. It should also reduce the tendency for some issues to “fall through the cracks” by making a single unit responsible for all of the programs and services. Faculty and students will no longer be confused and frustrated in trying to determine which programs and services will be received. This will also lead to improving the goal of the internationalization of the campus with a clear mission.
Development of Organizational Models
The task force discussed a number of organizational concepts after agreeing on the linkages described previously. During the final deliberations, the committee considered five models (see pages 8-9, 38) in addition to the current organizational structure prior to making its recommendations (note that administrative titles are given only as examples):

Model A – Creates a higher level administrator (e.g. VP, Assistant VP, or Dean) to be responsible for Admissions, Financial Aid, Registrar’s Office, and International Programs and Services. This administrator would report to the President. The newly structured Center for the Enhancement of Student Learning would report to current VP of ESS.

Model B – Creates a new Dean’s position (or re-structures/re-organizes the position of Dean of Continuing Education) to be responsible for Admissions, Financial Aid, Registrar, and International Programs and Services. The Dean would report to the Provost in AA. The newly structured Center for the Enhancement of Student Learning would report to current VP of ESS. Continuing Education programs and services was placed under the Dean for Enrollment Management and Academic Services as a strategy for Continuing Education to play an important role in the growth of enrollment. Additionally, combining these units could result in reduction of redundant services. The dotted-line relationship, indicated in Model B, should be more than lines on the paper. The expectations for the relationships should be defined and used to hold the persons involved accountable.

Consideration of Recommended Models
There were several elements to the discussion and decision-making process in developing the recommendation to submit models A and B for consideration. Enrollment, international programs and services, academic related services, and student advising were discussed most prominently. Open debate occurred as to the scope of responsibility that should be possessed under the enrollment management umbrella. The committee weighed the advantages and disadvantages of each model and proposed the two models it feels addresses the greatest immediate needs and offers long-term sustainability.

Both models A and B would encourage greater leadership, coordination, and partnerships between ESS and AA in the areas of recruitment and international programs and services. This should enable the leadership to be intent on developing more comprehensive recruitment strategies; the other models may inhibit the ability of the enrollment manager to maintain the necessary focus on enrollment because of the taller and more diverse reporting structures evident in those models. Also, the two recommended models would place the linkages described previously under the same organizational structure, which should lead to greater efficiency and effectiveness in service to students.
Additional Recommendations & Advising

Quality advising is a critical issue for students. It should be noted that the functions of the Department of Academic Advising and Career Services unit, under the “enrollment management” umbrella, was discussed considerably by the task force. While the topic of advising evoked great passion among the task force members, it is the decision of the task force to recommend the two models that do not include Academic Advising and Career Services under the “enrollment management” umbrella and thereby, recommending it remain in ESS. Given the complexity of the advising issue on campus, the task force agreed that this issue could not be addressed effectively at this time through organizational change. Rather, the task force feels strongly that the issue of quality advising needs further review, perhaps by another task force. Reassessment of the merits of the recommendations in the 1996 Task Force on Academic Advising Report and Recommendations (see Appendix 2) should be a place to begin. UNIACADA could be charged with this re-assessment; however, leadership must be involved in being sure a clear implementation plan occurs and to ensure accountability.

- There is not an institution-wide collective viewpoint on the philosophy of advising to guide the decision-making and resource allocation processes. The University first needs to decide how advising should be done to better serve the majority of students.

- Faculty members’ responsibilities for advising/mentoring performance are not adequately assessed. Faculty need to be held accountable for this important service in their overall portfolios.

- There is a lack of clarity about authority and latitude for decision-making in advising.
  - Some of AA faculty and staff are critical of ESS Academic Advising and Career Services for not providing stronger direction, support and assistance for the academic areas. ESS Academic Advising and Career Services has not been given authority to make decisions in the AA advising arena, nor do they have the resources to fully support each college.
  - Some Deans recognize that one model of advising does not fit all of the colleges and requires autonomy or special consideration in this area to provide a model of advising in the manner that best fits their college.
  - It is our observation that insufficient resources are available to support good advising. In two colleges, advisor positions have been lost, increasing the workload for others beyond what is reasonable. In other situations, program growth is placing a much greater workload on professional advisers. This impacts the quality of services and advising available to the students in the colleges, directly affecting 95% of the students at UNI.
• The UNIACADA representatives indicated that most faculty members who met with them were appreciative and appeared to value the collaborative effort and potential resources that could evolve from the work of the group.

• Differing views on how advising services should be offered to students exist between ESS advising staff and those in Academic Affairs.
  o Some of the college advisors believe it would be more helpful to the majority of students if all academic advisors reported to Academic Affairs (where curricular issues are addressed), be housed in the colleges, and be accountable to academic deans.
  o ESS advisors believe UNI should maintain centralized advising in ESS, but also have advising offices in each college.

• Conflicting advising priorities exist between some AA advisors and those in ESS causing a sense of frustration and friction for both sides.
  o Some college advisors report pressure from ESS advisors to put students in courses that run counter to the curricular flow and faculty intention.
  o Many of the college advisors indicated that program planning on the ESS side is done without consultation with college advisors who are expected to be available and serve students when ESS decides.

• For some academic areas the relationships with ESS advisors are viewed as collaborative and supportive.
  o ESS advisors are helpful in communicating information and getting the right students to the right colleges for advising.
  o ESS advisors are experts in student development theory and provide good services for undecided students and those in transition.

• It appears that there are some fractured and unhealthy professional relationships that exist between ESS Academic Advising and Career Services (AACS) staff and some of the centralized AA advisors. For some academic areas, these relationships with the ESS advisors are seen as collaborative and supportive. There also appears to be many effective partnerships established between AACS and AA advisors and faculty.

• The collaboration between AACS and AA is still in its early stages as a result of restructuring of AACS in 2004. The temporary closing of Gilchrist Hall may have impeded the establishment of effective collaborative practices.

**Value Stream Teams**

In the course of our decision-making, considerable discussion centered on whether a structure could be imposed that would ensure greater collaboration and integration of efforts. To this end, we propose that Value Stream Teams (VST) be implemented in addition to and regardless of any changes in the organizational structure.
Value Stream Teams should be formed to address and manage issues related to institutional strategic priorities that demand high levels of collaboration across Divisions. Selection of team members should not be limited to Divisional boundaries but rather should be representative of all of the essential various components (communication, service, technology, other functional areas, etc.) necessary to accomplish the goals and objectives of the Value Stream. The President and/or Vice Presidents would “charter” the team agreeing on the scope of work; accountability; budget; and decision-making latitude, authority and processes. The team and team leader would be held accountable to the initiator of the charter and to each other.

On an annual basis, the President and Vice Presidents could meet to discuss and designate the teams for the year. Value Streams with relevance at present might include: Student Retention, Marketing to and Provision of Special Services to Undecided Students, Student Recruitment, Internationalization of the Campus, Advising, the Role and Function of the Student Services Center, etc. The UNI Academic Advising Association (ACADA) is an existing organization that could be considered to become a potential VST.

We envision that a VST, established for each of the agreed upon value streams, would work together to develop approaches to address the Value Streams for which a designated team is responsible and outline an implementation plan as well. We believe that this structure will increase communication, focus people on issues, and break down barriers between units. People assigned to the VST should be evaluated in part on their work within the Value Stream providing accountability for the VST, while also highlighting the importance of working together to achieve common goals. The VST concept has the additional advantage of engaging the campus leadership to focus on the VS.

This is more than a task force, committee or structural change – it’s a new way of doing work in a collaborative manner that would not necessarily be finished at the end of a year. It would be ongoing throughout the academic year(s). The people in the Stream need to have authority to make changes across functional and Divisional lines. Understanding what decisions they can and cannot make without seeking higher authority will be critical to the speed of adjusting to changes in the environment professionally and key to making this work. The other key will be how people interact and work together to accomplish the objectives of the team. Finally, as part of the Stream, people need to be held accountable for their collaborative efforts and the outcomes of the processes.

**Future Review**

The task force recommends that a formal review process be established and conducted periodically (e.g. every five years) to review all currently and future consolidated units to determine if the goals for reorganization have been met or if environment/personnel changes would dictate a more appropriate model in order to improve services to students.
Furthermore, the task force recommends that, regardless of which organizational structure model is adopted, the leaders of the divisions in Models A and B attend meetings held with the divisional unit leaders on a regular basis. Additionally, the department head leaders of each of the areas in the Enrollment Management segment should regularly attend the meetings of the ESS Directors.

Limitations of this Study

Time Constraints
The Task Force was charged to complete its work in a short period of time. As a result, a more thorough review of the organizational issues was curtailed. A more detailed analysis, including a cost v. benefit analysis, was not completed as a result.

Benchmarking Did Not Include an Effectiveness Study
The benchmarking research included a review of the organizational structures of many institutions, including the university peer group, institutions with high levels of student engagement, and other selected colleges and universities. While the organizational review included an excellent compilation of the structure of student service units at those institutions, the review did not include interviews with administrators at those institutions to gain an understanding of the perceived effectiveness of those organizational structures.

Survey Method
The Task Force surveyed selected administrators and staff in the AA and ESS divisions rather than using a randomly assigned sample. No feedback was solicited from administrators and staff in the other Divisions. Also, few individual faculty members were queried, while many individual staff members in student services were surveyed. In making decisions about survey recipients, the task force limited its scope to ensure that it could properly interpret the large amount of data in the time allowed. Since the whole campus community was not surveyed, it should be noted that the survey results may not be reflective of the thinking in all areas of our campus. Additionally, not all of the directors in ESS were interviewed.

IV. Discussion

The task force members acknowledge that our surveys and interviews were not random, but instead focused on a large number of individuals in selected areas of importance or relevance to this study. Therefore, comments may or may not be reflective of the larger group of staff from other areas. Additionally, the content gleaned from the surveys and interviews may have bias and some of the issues may be “magnified” due to the audience selected. With that caveat, we still believe it worthwhile to share some of the themes we heard consistently. Many of the themes centered on the negative impact caused by the reduction of resources on campus, particularly among staff.
**Budget cuts:**
- The “across the board” rather than strategic budget cuts have created a very fragile organization. If someone is unexpectedly absent from their job, the lack of resources to support the absence causes services and program delivery to be stymied or cease. In some cases, budget cuts have created more of an “us” versus “them” environment.

- Extremely heavy workloads have not enabled staff to have time to support each other, collaborate, build or improve relationships. It has become more about extinguishing the “burning fires” than how to prevent them or implement new initiatives.

- Faculty and staff more critically evaluate how the resources are allocated across the campus and may not value or understand the decisions made in respect to resource allocation.

**Campus-wide Mission, Vision and Goals:**
- Although all Divisions shared in the budget reduction processes, there does not seem to be an overarching sense that we are in this together and that we should make the best use of our resources through collaboration.

- There are some unclear messages and applications of “Students First” message.

- The campus needs to have a compelling vision of the future that is shared and a strategic plan that supports moving toward that vision.

**Leadership:**
Leadership is responsible for guiding the mission and affecting the culture of the institution, determining institutional direction, ensuring that strategic priorities are met, communicating expectations, and holding people accountable for their actions and failures to act. Discussion on structure naturally evolved to a conversation of effective and ineffective leadership. Leadership impacts how well issues are addressed and resolved regardless of how the institution is structured. The task force determined that no structure can compensate for ineffective or poor leadership.

The next leaders chosen to lead any of the Divisions of UNI will need to be accountable to each other for effective leadership and collaboration, and hold their departments/units accountable for the same standards. This is regardless of any organizational changes realized as a result of the recommendations made in this report. Finally, feedback from our surveys suggests a need to evaluate the leadership of selected departments in ESS and Academic Affairs. Since the charge of the task force was more limited in scope, those concerns are not specifically addressed in the written report.
Community respect, understanding and trust:

- As a Division, ESS has a strong focus on students. They see themselves as advocates for students and work to ensure the welfare of students is at the center as decisions are made. The focus on students is a broad and longer-term view of what is best for students in terms of policies and services. “What’s best for students” can be framed in creating an environment for students to be academically successful in college and to develop skills to help them be successful in life after college.

- As a Division, ESS understands the importance of academics and the role their staff can play in supporting the academic mission of the university. However, that role and mission could be tied more closely to supporting the academic side of the institution. Some ESS departments have not always pursued opportunities for increased collaboration with AA to achieve greater benefits for students and the university. Consultant John Schuh noted that in facilitating collaboration between student affairs and academic affairs, student affairs needs to initiate and reach out to academic affairs two-thirds of the time.

- AA is a large entity divided into colleges and departments with varied cultural backgrounds and approaches. As a Division, they are strongly focused on the academic education of students, but also must be ever mindful of faculty issues that may at times deflect focus from students. The hierarchical structure of AA sometimes hampers communication and contributes to the multitudes of perspectives within this division. Most information received by faculty is filtered through as many as three layers of administration. Faculty may find themselves confronted by mixed messages that are difficult to decipher at times.

- The lack of comprehensive responses from AA regarding student services was problematic for the task force. It seemed as if many in AA think about issues with the ESS Division infrequently. In many organizations, student affairs takes care of co-curricular programs, logistics, and non-academic services for students; enabling faculty to concentrate on teaching and research. While the task force discussed this at length, we do not believe that the lack of responses about student services necessarily reflects a lack of value for the work done in ESS – it may instead reflect that ESS has been doing their job well or that AA has little knowledge of the priorities established in ESS. The unforeseen outcome of this is that ESS has taken so much responsibility for students that AA has not fully envisioned, nor pursued opportunities for increased collaboration with ESS to achieve greater benefit for students.

- In some cases, lack of understanding, miscommunications, failure to have true dialog, and lack of follow-through on the parts of staff in both ESS and AA, have led to an absence of shared ownership for some student issues. In this climate, lack of trust between divisions and diminished respect for some persons and areas in each division has developed. This appears to be exacerbated by funding
constraints and decisions regarding resource allocations. This has ultimately hampered many of the services provided to students.

- There is lack of clear authority for decision-making and an absence of shared responsibility for some of the problems facing the university. Coupled with the depletion of resources, the result has led to less than desirable communication or lack-there-of by some segments of the university community. Professional ethics must be a high priority and employees need to be held accountable for their actions.

- AA responses to the surveys and interviews indicate a desire to have more services and useful data for strategic decision-making from ESS. Obtaining these services and information has been challenging.

National Survey on Student Engagement (NSSE) results:
- The results for UNI on the 2006 NSSE survey indicate that there are many opportunities for AA and ESS to collaborate in order to increase student engagement at UNI.

- The results should be a “call to action” for the collaboration between ESS and AA. The Developing Effective Educational Practices (DEEP) institutions studied demonstrate a true, sustained collaborative environment on the issues that matter most for student engagement. DEEP institutions possess a shared vision, accountability, focus on student engagement, and innovative approaches that have created a campus environment with student who are highly engaged.

Academic rigor:
The President, faculty and student government leadership have highlighted the need to increase academic rigor at UNI, which was a priority of a recent campus committee. Addressing this area appropriately should have a positive impact on student learning, academic reputation, and the ability to recruit scholarly faculty. It should be measured by a numerical increase on some of the NSSE benchmarks.

Retention:
- The university community lacks a shared vision, value or message regarding retention across the Divisions.

- Increasing student engagement and support programs may lead to greater student satisfaction and may also improve retention numbers.

- The perception among some that retention numbers are already strong appears to hamper discussion on this issue.

- No one seems to be charged to study or make specific efforts to improve retention. It is recommended that this be considered an immediate Value Stream.
Collaboration:

- Collaboration between ESS and AA needs to exist on the critical issues that impact both students and the health of the University’s academic mission. These issues are enrollment (including recruitment and retention), advising, and student engagement. How can the two divisions foster a collaborative environment? How can they sustain collaboration?

- Structural changes in the organization can assist collaboration by bringing key stakeholders together. Having the voices at the decision-making table may foster communication in an effort to help others see and to understand a broader perspective.

- Committees and task forces across functions can bring voices to the table to discuss specific issues and form recommendations. Reviewing committee composition for student and cross-functional input may be beneficial, if the voices can contribute to the discussion in a credible way.

- The Value Stream Team (VST) approach we describe on pages 11-12 is an effort to improve communication, enhance collaboration between Divisions, and bring greater focus to our common issues.

- Vice Presidents, Deans and other administrators need to focus communication among relevant departments across Divisions. Administrators must also hold their employees accountable to sustain the collaboration.

Final Considerations:
Things to consider when evaluating the models for decision-making:

- Does the new model provide **better services to students**, which ultimately enhance student learning and development?

- Consider the **balance of workload** between the vice presidents of the divisions. What are the professional/social demands of the job, in addition to work load?

- Do the **priorities and resources** of the institution argue more effectively for one model or another? Is the mission and goals of the university enhanced by the change?

- What should the division **focus** on in terms of priorities? Does adding or removing a unit help with this?

- How should people be held accountable for reaching institutional goals? Should all responsibility rest on a single person/division or should it be shared?

- Is there **interest** on the part of the Division leadership in taking on this new organization? (we did not ask the interim vice presidents this question).

- Does changing the reporting structure help to address the **identified problems**? Are the identified problems/challenges of such magnitude that this is the best solution?

- Will the model increase **collaboration** in order to **benefit the majority of students**?
V. Consultant Input and Recommendations

The following summary of questions and responses is from a meeting the Task Force had with consultant, John Schuh, Distinguished Professor of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies at Iowa State University. Schuh is a widely recognized expert in the field of student affairs and co-authored the book, *One Size Does Not Fit All*.

- When looking at Student Affairs and AA a common denominator for communication and collaboration is the issue of student learning.
  - How does learning occur in and out of the classroom?
  - How can each area add value to the student experience?
  - If you move the area, can you provide a better learning experience for students?

- With the increased time pressures facing faculty members, how do you effectively increase student-faculty engagement? Review how these institutions handled the challenge:
  - University of Michigan,
  - University of Kansas and
  - Miami University of Ohio

- How do you distinguish between the organizational model and using structure to remedy leadership gaps?
  - What you do is more important than how you are organized.
    - You need to define what you want.
    - What goals do you want to achieve?
  - There is no perfect model - pretty good, paired with good leadership, will get the job done.
  - Someone has to be able to articulate what we’re trying to do in student affairs and how it complements the mission of academics.

- The structure should evolve out of the mission and vision of the organization.
  - Look at the mission of UNI and student affairs and the rest of the structure should flow from there.

- How are the philosophies of each area complementary?
  - The effectiveness of any approach depends on the ability of the provost to think holistically about student learning.

- Think about workload and the division of labor among senior administrators.
  - What are the qualities you need of a provost that may oversee student affairs areas?
  - The provost should not be a micromanager if areas are blended.
  - The provost needs to be able to ask good questions.
  - Consider the social nature of the job and the amount of entertaining that will be occurring.
    - How high touch of an approach is needed or desired by the community? What are the expectations to attend activities, receptions, etc? Will guests be happy meeting with a lower level assistant administrator or do they want to interact with the President or Vice President?
• If student affairs would report to AA, then consider selection of the provost before the hiring of the student affairs officer.

• To change organizational structure ask:
  o Can we provide a better learning experience for students?
  o Will the change add value to the student experience?
  o Philosophically, what is best for students?
  o Miami is a good example of communication across the silos.

• Consider the need to protect budgets (or services) of student affairs.
  o If they are moved into academics, what will happen to these?

• How do we get student affairs staff members to understand the lives of a faculty member and find ways to collaborate? Strategies to increase communication and collaboration between two divisions:
  o Student Affairs and Provost should talk regularly about ways to collaborate and increase communication between their organizations.
  o Identify senior faculty members who have students attending a college that doesn’t have a student-learning center and recruit them to connect with students in the residence halls.
  o Both VP’s should regularly attend the other divisions’ staff meetings.
  o Student Affairs leaderships should reach out to academic offices, introduce self to new faculty and welcome them to campus. Give them the names and contact information of persons in student affairs that could be helpful to the faculty member.

• The senior enrollment manager should be experienced in enrollment management and financial aid.
  o At private colleges enrollment management is so important they often reports to the president, they can’t afford to miss their targets.
  o Because we’re in a very competitive environment for students to attend UNI, it is critical to have a highly skilled enrollment management specialist.

• Schuh looked at our model – very standard model.
  o Enrollment management can work on one side or the other, but it is important to have together.
  o A case could be made for trio programs to be in student affairs. Our advising is typical of most campuses.

• Student affairs often are the voice for social justice issues and work with the un-enfranchised students.

• As to the future of higher education:
  o Continued or increased focus on learning and accountability
  o Institutions will be required to demonstrate empirically how things make a difference
  o Pressure will be on units to demonstrate how they make a difference
  o Think about the continuous cycle of:
    ▪ Mission
    ▪ Philosophies
    ▪ Organizational values
• Program initiatives
• Measurement
• Adjustment

• Every student affairs leader should have a constituent group of students who that person knows well, in order for the students to be able to tell the student affairs officer what they need to hear.
• Eliminate competitiveness and encourage collaboration.

VI. Review of Literature

The Task Force reviewed recent literature (see Appendix 2) on organizational models in student affairs and other literature pertaining to student engagement, leadership, and collaboration. Given the time constraints of this study, the review of the literature was limited. One Size Does Not Fit All (Manning, et al., 2006) and Good to Great (Collins, 2001), were discussed considerably by the Task Force. Additional articles and books from the for-profit and non-profit sector were discussed as well and are summarized below.

Mission, Culture, and Leadership
One Size Does Not Fit All (Manning, et al., 2006) was of particular interest to the task force since it synthesized the various organizational models present in student affairs and advocated that student engagement could be enhanced if AA and student affairs units could work collaboratively and be innovative together.

One important theme that emerged from the literature review is that there are many models of student affairs practice and not one model is perfect for every institution. As noted by Manning, et al., (2006) university mission and culture are key factors in the organizational structure of an institution. In fact, when considering new models of student affairs organization, the literature suggests strongly that institutional mission and culture should shape the organizational structure.

In addition to the presence of a unifying mission, placing employees in the right positions is critical. In Good to Great Collins describes this succinctly with his premise, “First Who…Then What.” Collins discusses the importance of disciplined, selfless leaders, strong core values and, “Getting the right people on the bus,” before deciding, “Where to drive it.” (The need for stronger leadership, redefined mission, and discipline were themes that emerged repeatedly in the responses of individuals surveyed by the task force).

Innovation and Collaboration to Enhance Student Learning
Much of recent literature on student affairs practice focuses on the role student affairs plays in student learning and student engagement. The National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) and the American Association for Higher Education (AAHE) collaborated on a project to explore institutions that had higher than predicted scores on
the NSSE. The project was called DEEP – Documenting Effective Educational Practices. Teams were sent to each institution to identify best practices regarding student engagement that may have positively impacted student learning and ultimately led to the exceptional survey results of those institutions.

“What sets DEEP schools apart is the range and quality of their initiatives, the extent to which all students are touched by enriched educational experiences, and the degree to which practices are integrated and linked to one another.” (Manning, et al., 2006, p. 32).

Student engagement can viewed as two-dimensional. The first dimension is the amount of time and energy the student puts into learning. The second dimension is how the institution supports the student in learning – this includes the allocation of resources, the architecture of the curriculum, and the availability of support services to facilitate learning processes.

Researchers observed that DEEP schools exhibited a collaborative and holistic approach to student engagement that involves faculty, administration, and student affairs in student learning. Their research noted a “seamlessness” experienced by students where faculty and student affairs worked together to provide learning opportunities for students.

In illustrating collaborative models of student affairs practice, Manning et al., describes the importance of viewing student affairs professionals as equal partners in student learning. They also assert that close collaboration is possible because the mission of student affairs, in focusing on student learning, is closely aligned with the academic mission of the institution.

**Review of DEEP Institutions**

NSSE identified five key benchmarks for measuring student engagement. They are:

1) level of academic challenge  
2) active and collaborative learning  
3) student faculty interaction  
4) enriching educational experiences  
5) supportive campus environment

Several of the DEEP institutions posted reports written by the review teams on their websites. These reports were reviewed by our task force for insights on the role of organizational structure, culture, and collaboration in facilitating the performances of the institutions. The institutional reports reviewed were the following:

- George Mason University  
- Macalester College  
- Miami University of Ohio  
- University of Kansas  
- University of Michigan  
- University of Texas at El Paso
DEEP Reports
Our analysis of the institutional reports on characteristics evident in the high performing DEEP institutions revealed several themes of interest to our task force. These were:

1) living the mission,
2) data driven decision making,
3) academic excellence,
4) commitment to student learning,
5) student centered philosophy, and
6) cross functional collaboration

These examples of how institutions fulfill their obligations to the students can be applied to UNI. Having a shared mission and vision will focus our efforts, energies and resources. Using data to drive decision-making can stimulate change without arousing suspicion and distrust. The commitment to academic excellence has been a message from President Allen this fall. Enhancing student learning was considered to be central in the work of our task force. ESS has a strong and visible commitment to a student-centered philosophy. The task force feels that cross-functional collaboration is imperative to our efforts to improve student learning. Essentially, we recognized that synergy between the academic and student affairs divisions could provide a synergy unattainable by either Division working in isolation.

Living the Mission
DEEP institutions articulate clearly who they are, whom they serve, and what they want to be. The messages they send are communicated consistently and the actions and programs they implement demonstrate that they allocate their resources strategically. The shared visions for the institutions are compelling and broadly embraced. The mission and visions reflect the desired culture, quality of students, hiring of people who facilitate the achievement of the mission and reinforce the culture and values of the institution.

Examples of this are:

- George Mason reported recruiting entrepreneurial faculty to fit their mission and vision of innovation.
- Miami of Ohio’s emphasis is on effectiveness in teaching and is reinforced in the recruitment of faculty. Additionally learning communities for faculty have been established to foster exchange of teaching innovations and mentoring. A strong message throughout the institution is that “choice matters” and thoughtful decision-making should be encouraged. (National Survey of Student Engagement, 2003c, p. 19).
- The University of Kansas reinforces the message that quality teaching is important by having senior faculty teach introductory courses.
- The University of Texas at El Paso went through a repositioning of the institution from serving a privileged population to serving students from the region.
- Ursinus College used a “campaign” model for strategic planning, reflecting its culture of innovation and scholarship. Student achievement is the focused
element in all their programs and decisions. The campaign model is used to initiate change and sustain programs.

Data Driven Decision Making
Several of the institutions report being organizations where decision making is data driven and information systems are open. Transparency of decision-making and openness with information fosters collaboration, communication, trust and respect.

- George Mason reported that data is readily available on the institutional website and used for strategic planning and continuous improvement. Information is used to support innovation and open discussion of problems.
- Macalester College and University of Kansas note the availability of data and information for decision making, policy formation and communication flow.
- Miami of Ohio and the University of Michigan use data for continuous improvement and program review.

Academic Excellence
Strong messages of academic excellence and rigor permeate through the institutions, to first-year students and admitted students. The messages are intended to set the tone for the type of student recruited, assist in the transition from high school to college and help prepare students for the rigor demanded of them.

- George Mason’s academic departments convey the rigor of the institution by engaging faculty in student orientation; offering academic departmental orientations which emphasize academic success, and identifying the support programs available. In communicating with incoming students, they are reminded of the importance of high school academic preparation.
- Macalester has a broad view of educational excellence which includes academic, social, interpersonal education and leadership training. Applicants to college expect rigor, and the first year experience and orientation reinforce this expectation. Classes are structured as dialogue, requiring preparation for participation. Classes have few prerequisites to allow both seniors and freshman to experience classes together. This strategy uses seniors to raise the level of dialogue. The philosophy is to teach at the level of the smartest students, or slightly below.
- Miami of Ohio and Macalester College both require students to read a book during summer for discussion at the beginning of the fall term.
- University of Kansas intentionally sets high expectations through admissions, orientation, and advising. Additionally, annually they assess general education experience by conducting 120 interviews with seniors about their experience using a faculty member from their department and two faculty members from outside the department. A high number of faculty members have participated in this process, learning about the effectiveness of the educational experience.
- University of Michigan seeks excellence in all they do, but the faculty set the tone for excellence as they are driven and motivated
• Ursinus faculty meets regularly with new faculty to foster community and help new faculty learn about the culture of the institution. The Common Intellectual Experience introduces the high expectations for academic rigor.

Commitment to Student Learning
All of the DEEP institutions demonstrate a commitment to student learning. They articulate a supportive philosophy and provide many programs to support students.

• George Mason states that they believe all students can succeed and it is the institution’s responsibility to bring out the student’s potential (high expectations coupled with support programs and initiative). They have a supportive campus environment with a Freshman Center. The goals of the center are to assist students in coping with academic, transitional, social and retention issues and develop a sense of community; while also familiarizing students with policies and services, and fostering student-mentor relationships. George Mason has a retention committee. (National Survey of Student Engagement, 2003a, p. 37).

• University of Kansas ethos is to challenge the exceptional students and support others to meet the challenge. First year courses have a research piece with librarians involved who teach about research approaches and provide individual assistance. An orientation, academic adjustment course includes library visits and research instruction.

• All of the institutions discussed strong programs to facilitate and support students’ success. Programmatic examples are orientation, first year experiences, first year seminars, transfer student orientation, transition courses for transfer students, intensive advising, residential programs, living learning programs, faculty in residence and theme communities, honors programs, tutoring, academic assistance programs, freshman summer institutes, summer fellows, pre-orientation seminars, early alert system for student at risk, faculty mentoring, student development center, Common Intellectual Experience, Independent Learning Experience, undergraduate research program, citizenship program, community service and learning center, course clustering, and writing and math centers.

• Undergraduate student research assistants, tutors, preceptors and advisors are used on many campuses.

Student-Centered Philosophy
A student-centered philosophy is evident in the materials for most of the institutions. Michigan is the only institution that did not espouse an ethic of student care. Their messages to students are that the students themselves are responsible for their learning and that the faster students figure out how to navigate Michigan the better. However, Michigan has identified a need to be more personal and supportive environment for all students to succeed.

• George Mason is a student-centered community. Student affairs staff members, including some newly created positions, play a key role in student learning and in collaborating to create a seamless learning environment.
Macalester has a supportive campus environment where the connection to the student is valued and intentional. Student affairs staff identified and created intersecting points for connection with students. (National Survey of Student Engagement, 2003b, p. 26). Listening to and responding to student needs and interests is valued.

Miami of Ohio values student involvement and the concept of the classroom goes beyond classroom and building. Student Affairs has a leadership commitment and are working to move student organizations to more inclusive models of organization structures. (National Survey of Student Engagement, 2003c, p. 45).

University of Kansas has a “collegial, family environment.” (National Survey of Student Engagement, 2003d, p. 8). Students come first and are important, valued participants. All policy committees are comprised 20% of students and a student serves as the vice president of the faculty senate. Students have voice due to “open” environment (National Survey of Student Engagement, 2003d, p.10).

University of Texas at El Paso has a student-centered philosophy, a nurturing environment and “ethic of care.” (National Survey of Student Engagement, 2003f, p. 40).

Nurturing is a common term in the report for Ursinus College, particularly as applied to first year students. As students progress through their college experience, independence is fostered.

**Cross Functional Collaboration**

Student affairs in these institutions have a close tie to the academic mission and see their role as supporting the academic mission. They are often at the table with faculty creating the programs that the institution values and which benefit students.

- George Mason has many examples of collaboration in the development of its programs and services. Several factors positively influence the collaborative environment. The newness of the institution creates an environment for innovation as they are not ingrained in their processes. They hire innovative faculty and staff and the innovative spirit is supported by a fluid organizational structure and use of data for decision-making. Cross communication and openness is intentional. Examples of collaboration:
  - between residence and academics for living learning programs, faculty in residence and theme communities
  - “seamless handoff with academic advising – undeclared majors work with Academic Advising Center, once major is declared – conscious effort to help them connect with their new academic home.” (National Survey of Student Engagement, 2003a, p. 38).
- Macalester College as part of the academic excellence initiative teaches collaboration skills in the first year courses. This collaborative spirit flows throughout the campus. Student Affairs and AA developed a document for faculty about the student development process. The high level of interaction among campus constituents is valued and fostered. The commitment to collaboration is strong at the top of the organization.
• Miami of Ohio collaboration begins at the top with shared direction among senior administrators. Partnerships between academics and student affairs are common in addressing the student first year experience, diversity, and enhancing student learning. The student affairs mission is to support the intellectual mission of university and their policies focus on intellectual growth and challenge (National Survey of Student Engagement, 2003c, p. 26). They desire to create an environment where students can focus on academics.

• The University of Texas at El Paso has a University College, which is an administrative unit responsible for enrollment and retention which reports to the Provost. The focus is on student transitions and simplifying and personalizing student services. Organizationally it is a hybrid of student affairs and AA. It coordinates admissions and recruitment, financial aid, new student orientation, registrar, student assessment and testing, tutoring and learning, visitor center, academic advising, and University Studies. University studies is an interdisciplinary unit charged with increasing student opportunities for success. The core of the program has learning communities (2 – 3 courses linked for same cohort) and University 1301, a three hour seminar in critical inquiry. (National Survey of Student Engagement, 2003f, p. 15).

• Collaboration between student affairs and AA is evident at Ursinus College. The mission of student affairs is closely linked to the institutional mission and focuses on guiding students to independence, helping students develop critical thinking, independence and responsibility (National Survey of Student Engagement, 2003g, p. 16). Communication is strong between residence life staff and faculty advisors related to academically struggling students. All at the institution understand their role in making sure that first year students are successful and cooperate and communicate to support the student. The Leadership Scholars Program spans both academic and student affairs.

Due to this examination, the Task Force believes that UNI has much to gain by studying the DEEP institutions. Our recent participation in the NSSE survey has revealed that student engagement must become a priority for UNI. What we have learned from this literature review, however, is that a holistic comprehensive approach must be adopted by our university. With this in mind, one of the greatest factors in our approach to our work as a task force was to identify ways to encourage collaboration between the divisions. The members also listened for suggestions of places where greater effectiveness might be garnered by increasing the voices that meet at Divisional meetings. In essence, flattening the structure seemed useful to stimulate greater communication. We sought to link services that relate to student enrollment because it is a critical priority for our university at present. Beyond this, however, in linking these affiliated offices, we believe greater focus on retention and enhanced student experiences are necessary. Finally, in consideration of our limited resources and the needs we identified for inputs of resources, we looked carefully at any redundancies or potentially confusing separations of services offered by the two divisions. We sought to unify such units not only for financial reasons but because we believe this will make the university easier to navigate for students.
VII. Summary of Feedback from Campus Stakeholders: Surveys & Interviews -- Relevant Themes by Department/Unit

The task force solicited feedback from employees through the dissemination of surveys in the ESS and AA Divisions. Subsequently, interviews were held with a broad spectrum of stakeholders, which included students, staff members and administrators (see appendix 1 for the complete information and documentation related to the letters and numbers identifying sources). Below is a compilation of relevant themes garnered from the surveys and interviews:

**Academic Affairs**

**AA Advising (AA 1, IAA 1, IAA 1.1)**
- Not enough professional advisors on staff; more resources needed for advising in the colleges; the college advising ratios of students to professional advisors is unmanageable.
  - The college advising ratios of students to professional advisors is unmanageable.
    - COE has 1800 advisees/1 FTE
    - Biology has 627 advisees/1 FTE
    - HPELS has 900 advisees/1 FTE
    - CBA has 2600 advisees/1.5 FTE
    - Industrial Tech has 500 advisees/1 FTE
    - Athletics has 420 advisees/1 FTE
  - There should be more of an investment in advising within the colleges.
  - Students want advising services within their colleges or departments.
- Sense of disconnect, lack of understanding, or conflicting priorities without a central focus between ESS and AA advisors has led to a lack of understanding and miscommunications (sometimes classified as unhealthy working relationships by some); although there still remains departments who report a good or very healthy working relationship or good collaboration with ESS (e.g. there is a very strong disconnect & lack of cooperation between the Business college and ESS advisors)
- Advisors reported the overwhelming majority of faculty do not want to do technical or prescriptive advising (perhaps due to time constraints or expertise); faculty should serve more of a mentor role
- Expressed concern with accountability, communication, and effectiveness of the Center for Academic Achievement and Student Support Services
- Expressed positive comments about the Registrar’s Office being helpful and supportive
- Some in AA believe the ESS advisors should be housed in each college and report to the Dean. Students need more access to advisors that are knowledgeable about major requirements, not just liberal arts core requirements
- More tutoring services are needed
- Lack of services for minority population
- Lack of coordination, collaboration and communication between AA and ESS Advisors
- Need united philosophies between AA and ESS advisors along with common goals
- Sometimes there is a duplication of effort/services between advisors in ESS and AA which is counterproductive
- Colleges should have the right to dictate the direction of advising for their majors and ESS should honor this right and be willing to support this effort through mutual partnerships, as well as willingness to provide needed services
- Instead of being independent, ESS should be more collaborative with AA advisors and more sensitive to their college advising priorities when planning programs and activities that require the college advisors’ participation
- Several college advisors intimated a lack of understanding about the role and purpose of advising liaisons from ESS with colleges

**College of Business – Minority Student and Diversity Program (IAA 1.1)**
- Eliminate redundancy
- Students are confused as to where to go for choosing a major
- Develop a united mission campus wide
- Recruit more academically qualified students
- There is too much focus on student engagement, needs more focus on academics and study habits
- Challenge students to work to their optimal level
- Advising between AA and ESS Career Services has been problematic; minority students were not well-served and there was no accountability on the part of Career Services. However, since housing a Career Service advisor in the College of Business Administration, there has been dramatic improvement
- Coordinate recruiting efforts
- ESS needs a new focus on service and being service oriented

**Academic Support Services and Equal Opportunities Programs (AA 2 & IAA 2)**
- Need to define the services provided and then separate according to whether the service is academic or co-curricular. If academic, needs to have close interaction with faculty
- The writing center is closely related and integrated with AA
- Center for Academic Achievement reports to AA and performs ESS type services, but a strong academic focus and integration needs to remain
- Disconnect in communication and collaboration between the services of ESS and AA
- Some acknowledgement that Center for Academic Achievement is clearly providing an ESS function but doesn’t have the close collaboration with ESS
- Reading and learning strategies service (currently under ESS) should be merged with the writing and math centers
- Recruit smarter students
- No benefit to move to ESS
- Move Registrar to AA
- Enrollment Management can report to either AA or ESS
- Admission could serve AA better if moved
• Get faculty involved in recruiting

**Deans and Colleges (AA 3, AA 3.1, IAA 3)**
• Areas of concern cited were advising structure and resources, scholarship administration, recruitment and student tutoring services. Two of the deans appeared to be focused on micro-issues
• Flow of communication for effective decision making purposes is desired to be increased, more timely and contextualized (e.g., course information on student backlogs of the Liberal Arts Core from Registrar’s Office)
• Understanding and appreciation for ESS mission, work, workloads and contributions appear to be limited. It appears that there are misperceptions on responsibilities, roles, activities and structure (e.g., math center reporting)

**Interview:**
• Day to day person-to-person interaction is good between ESS and AA. On larger scale issues (recruitment, data requirements, course management), where interaction is essential, structure may be hampering the ability to address these issues. When suggestions are given, implementation does not follow. Advising resources need to be used more efficiently. Placement information needs to be improved. Other schools have that information, but UNI finds it is difficult to collect current data about our graduates
• How are we going to coordinate our activities better? Restructuring doesn’t automatically increase efficiency and solve the issues. Reorganization in AA will be required to bring new units into the organization. There may be too much duplication of efforts, so we need to examine the structure to reduce duplication. Some Deans content that units affiliated with academic activities should be housed in AA. There may be problems under a new structure not seen. There needs to be careful analysis of who does what
• More communication, more data, more information to support academics is desired. Both Divisions could make more of an effort to communication.
• Students may be dissatisfied with their advising experience because advising is done in so many different ways it causes confusion. Placing resident advisors in colleges might help some colleges (although each college has different needs according to the disciplines involved, e.g. Humanities and Fine Arts). There needs to be tailor made advising solutions for different colleges or units
• Structure questions: advising, admissions/financial aid, information technology, graduate student recruitment and admission
• We are struggling to make a transition from a teaching university. We want to portray ourselves as having academic rigor with a caring environment. We have diluted our serious education message. We should not be known as a campus of fun We need to find the right kind of students to deliver a message of rigor and substance
• The academic side must join the recruiting effort

**International Programs (AA 4, IAA 4)**
• Helps to be grouped with people with similar mission
• Collaborations across campus are important and cross both divisions of the university
• The working relationships across units are not all equally strong
• Financial support limits the breadth of programs and new initiatives
• Competition for foreign students is increasing and we are not competing as well as we might like
• We lack some necessary infrastructure to accommodate foreign visitors, i.e. visitor residence and meal facilities at all times of the year
• International experiences need to be included within the curricula if we are really going to create global citizens
• Better facilities with more prominence are needed
• Significant duplication of efforts exists because services for international students and scholars are provided by multiple offices

Interview:
• Greater resources and a centralized location would improve services
• Staff providing international services are not coordinated
• Consolidating the services and programs could provide greater collegiality and enhance internationalization
• Clarification of mission and goals for international programs/services is needed
• What internationalization means to UNI is not known
• DOR and ESS services do not facilitate international visitors/students because of charges for services
• Internationalization is not the mission of both divisions
• International Programs (IP) do not appear to want to incorporate the international services (“that is not our specialty”)
• Curricula need to include international experiences
• International programs is perceived to favor the Russian program and that is believed by IP to be accurate
• Culture & Intensive English Program (CIEP), International Graduates and International exchange could be united, enrollment management and Registrar should be linked, as should Study Abroad

Survey – Director, Community College Projects (AA 5)
• A common office to coordinate 2+2 programs would facilitate the effort and heighten communication
• Work is coordinated with several units on campus
• Greater integration of campus units would facilitate delivery of services to students
• Advising done by faculty can be less effective than desired
• Continuing education may be providing services redundant with other offices on campus, i.e. registration, billing, etc.
• Include more information about 2+2 programs on the appropriate UNI web links

Educational and Student Services

Academic Advising and Career Services (ESS 1, ESS 1.1, ESS 1.1a, IESS 1, IESS 1.1, IESS 1.2)
• AACS views advising students from a holistic perspective
• AACS presently uses the developmental advising paradigm to advise students, but is in the process of exploring the more academically centered alternative model of advising
• AACS believes that the academically centered approach holds more appeal for faculty
• Academic advising at UNI is delivered through a combined centralized and decentralized system
• AACS provides centralized advising to undecided majors and students in transition
• Four FTE’s in AACS advise less than 500 undecided majors – 5% of the students on campus
• In addition to advising undecided students, AACS coordinates a variety of events throughout the semester to provide information to students and faculty
• A delivery of academic advising in each major is determined by each department or college in a way that best meets the needs of their area
• 95% of the students on campus are advised by professional advisors or faculty in the colleges
• AACS believes that faculty/staff advisors and academic advisors in AACS collaborate in preparing students for their professional development
• AACS believes they have one foot in Student Services and one in AA
• AACS believes there is no consistent support for Academic Advising at UNI
• AACS believes there is a great variety of advising delivery systems within colleges and this is confusing to students
• Under current conditions, if AACS were to move to AA, they fear they would not find adequate support from AA for advising. When budget cuts come, advisors would be the first to be cut. Also, it would be harder to keep their commitment to student development if moved
• The integration of Academic Advising and Career Services has gone well. The two areas complement each other
• The idea that “advising is teaching” connects faculty and staff advisors in AA to the academic advisors in ESS
• AACS uses CAS standards for self-assessment and the National Academic Advising Association’s Statement of Core Values as a framework to guide professional practice
• AACS needs to have direct representation at the ESS directors’ level to make coordination of services and activities easier
• The biggest constraint for AACS is inadequate budgetary resources
• ESS structure lacks a strong voice for academic advising. With the AACS merger, there is much more focus on career development and less on academic advising
• Most advising happens in AA. Over the past three years, Academic Advising has become buried within ESS and communication has become distanced from the advising that happens on campus. Academic Advising has not had strong support in ESS for several years
• AACS is working hard to develop relationships with each college. AACS initiates, integrates and coordinates advising across departments and divisions
• AACS supports having an advising center in each college with a centralized office on campus
• ESS advisors have a different philosophy than AA advisors
AACS believes they need a stronger connection to minority students
Academic advising is crucial to student retention

**Center for Multicultural Education (ESS 2 and ESS 2.1)**
- No authority to effectively implement programs and achieve goals
- Began in 1971, moved to ESS in 1991, renamed 97-98
- Poorly funded – (Student Service Fee). Need more staff, more money, more administrative support
- Services are primarily for students
- Not as much emphasis for faculty/staff/administration
- Realignment with Compliance and Equity Management reporting to the President might help this initiative and employee need as some issues are brought to this area. Integration of these objectives would enhance the program
- This program is not aligned with AA

**Department of Academic Services (ESS 3, ESS 3.1, IESS 3)**
- They like being in ESS and want to stay. Service is provided directly to students and only indirectly to members of the university community. Being in ESS is beneficial due to focus on student needs and resources not redirected to classroom instruction and physical plan costs. It is clear to everyone that meeting student needs is number one
- Focus is on meeting student needs. Collaboration with faculty occurs to offer special study programs/services for specific class needs and could be expanded if additional resources were available. There are strong linkages to Academic Advising, Disability Services
- Opportunity to collaborate more and reduce redundancy with Educational Opportunity Program segments. A vision of a single comprehensive student learning center was shared

**Department of Residence (ESS 4, ESS 4.1)**
- Whether or not collaboration works between ESS units and AA may be more an issue of leadership than reporting structure
- DOR functions well within its unit and interacts mostly with other ESS units but interaction is minimal with AA
- Dining might be separated from residence because its service to campus is broader than residence halls alone
- It is important to have representation at the division level
- When faculty members accept invitations to be involved in programming in the halls, the programs are well received by resident.
- We have excellent collaboration with other service providers
**ESS Vice President’s Office**

**Dean of Students (ESS 5, ESS 5.1)**
- The present reporting structure helps the Dean of Students attain the mission of ESS.
- ESS works closely with the Provost’s Office regarding student withdrawals and academic issues
- Student services in ESS are linked to other units in ESS through the Integrated Student Services Center
- Student services in ESS are linked to AA through the Orientation Program, Judicial Affairs, Ombudsman service, and the Academic Honor Code Hearings
- ESS needs a robust budget and monthly meetings with the AA to enhance their effectiveness
- ESS and AACS needs to coordinate academic advising across campus so all advisors are trained in the same manner and raise accountability to a new level
- The Department of Campus Activities and the Maucker Union should report to the Dean of Students
- The organizational structure of ESS is good, strong and in solid operational condition. The following areas are of high interest and vital to the preservation of ESS:
  - Reduction of Budget cuts
  - More Professional Development of Personnel
  - Increase Student Services
  - Increase Student Satisfaction
  - Increase Student Engagement
  - Increase Diversity
  - Provide Strong Leadership, Mission and Vision
  - Recognize and Reward Staff Achievements
  - Expand External Affairs (town/gown)
  - Officially establish a partnership with the Division of AA
- ESS and AA should have the same mission and goals

**Vice President for ESS Interim ESS Vice President – Jan Hanish (ESS 5.2, ESS 5.3, IE 5)**
- Enrollment Management needs stronger communication and collaboration to AA
- Need for role clarification regarding international services
- ESS Academic Advising and Career Services could coordinate all advising to allow for a comprehensive training program and increase accountability

**Interview:**
- Working relationship between ESS and AA has good and bad pockets
- Improving the relationship between ESS and AA needs to start at the top, but be carried out at the operational level
- Enrollment Management and Financial Aid don’t need to be connected structurally
- The institutional vision could support enrollment management reporting to the President
- Registrar could report to AA if the presence alone improves service
- If structural move takes place, will displaced department fit the mission, be supported, be valued, and be resourced appropriately to serve students. Change reporting structure only if it will enhance the talent of the people. Criteria for
changing reporting structure should be based on what serves the student best, where
the unit can be most successful, where their voice will be better heard and what is the
right thing to do
• We must address the next step as far as implementation after this report and changes
are completed
• Need for more systematic assessment campus-wide, which needs to be based on
concrete evidence rather than anecdotal evidence and assumptions
• Academic support services in AA may function better and be better utilized in ESS.
Where is the greatest supervisory expertise for that area?
• Dual reporting structures present a challenge to the individual and department
• Collaboration needs to be a part of the culture
• VP should not micromanage
• Concern about the size of AA to take on more reporting units
• There needs to be a hybrid system for advising – but they need support and resources
to be successful
• First Year Experience is necessary – ESS leads the initiative but AA needs to
participate

Former VP of ESS — Renee Romano (IESS 5.1)
• Could consider combining AA and ESS support services
• Enrollment Management shouldn’t report to AA due to time and attention it would
receive
• Could consider an assistant VP for Enrollment Management
• Previously considered moving registrar to AA in 1999, but chose not to for fear of
losing the focus on student services
• Registrar could be in Enrollment Management as they are very tied to Enrollment
Management through data
• Enrollment Services doesn’t have the number of people they need to do what they are
doing and obtain and analyze the data.
• We are thin at UNI, fragile in terms of numbers
• She felt ESS was too flat,
  o Too many persons reported to her (UNI)
  o Created the Dean of Students position with direct reports
  o Current position has a couple of associate vice chancellors (auxiliary services and
    DOR), which frees her up quite a bit
  o Dollars to hire a career services director not available
  o She thought about creating an auxiliary services position for UNI (residence and
    union)
• Consider combining Academic Services and Student Support Services and Center for
Academic Achievement
  o Very different cultures between the two areas
  o Difference is in type of support given to students
  o Time and attention not there in AA to give support
• Currently Advising – at UIUC, advising is done in the colleges
  o Advising at UNI doesn’t work too badly
- Maintain advising by ESS and AACS as they work with the undecided and new students
  - ESS has more consciousness of the student experience
  - President set expectation for collaboration
  - VP of ESS should report to President, given the mission of UNI and focus on students
  - Collaboration between ESS and AA is often initiated by ESS
  - The new Provost needs to make interaction an important aspect of SA and AA

**Enrollment Services (ESS 6, ESS 6.1, IESS 6)**
- Enrollments need top level commitment and support to get all aspects of the university engaged and committed to enrollment growth
- Clarifying roles, services and structure model for international programs and international services may offer opportunity to eliminate redundancy, leverage resources and improve services
- Transition to merge Financial Aid and Admissions has been perceived to be less effective and less efficient in serving students

**Interview:**
- University needs stronger leadership at the divisional level, resources (financial and human), retention plan, new student seminar, improved advising, and common goals
- Relationship with AA needs to improve to increase support, understanding and appreciation for work and a reduction of the “us” versus “them” mentality.
- Stronger support from the top and more focus for ES may help. A suggestion was to have ES report directly to the President
- Admissions deals mostly with high school students/transfers and financial aid deals with current students; these two areas are not always compatible

**Maucker Union (ESS 7 and ESS 7.1)**
- Focus is on services to support student activities and student learning experiences

**Office of the Registrar (ESS 8, ESS 8.1, IESS 8)**
- Without direct contact with the Provost, information flow is impeded
- Movement of ESS units to AA raise concerns about whether voices of moved units will be heard
- Ability to make progressive changes is hampered by lack of acceptance by AA
- Close physical proximity of units that provide services to students is important

**Interview:**
- Maintain collaborative nature of student services
- Lack of leadership from AA in addressing scheduling, staffing issues, curriculum sprawl, etc.
- Consistent staffing person important in Provost’s Office
- Two divisions, ESS and AA, are not in synchrony, have not agreed on priorities leading to a perception that leadership is lacking and no one can make decisions

**University Health Services (ESS 9, ESS 9.1)**
- There is strong support for University Health Services (UHS) to stay in ESS because it fits with the mission of serving students
• There are strong linkages of programs and relationships between UHS and others in ESS and AA
• Wellness and Recreation Services (WRS) should be a separate entity from the Health Center and Counseling
• Suggestions on structure include:
  o Maintain presence in ESS
  o Separate the units in UHS
  o Move the Substance and Sexual Abuse Program/Phoenix Center from the WRC to the Health Center to increase confidentiality for students
  o Disability services for faculty and staff are better suited outside of ESS
• The mix of departments with student service missions creates a positive invaluable synergy with the best possible outcome
• The departments in ESS with close ties to AA keep the rest of ESS informed about academic issues
• Move programs with more of a service nature to ESS
• Move Student Support Services in AA to ESS and consolidate that office with ESS Academic Services
• Move advising staff or programs in certain isolated areas to ESS for better collaboration and improve quality
• Decentralization of IT has not been cost effective and has led to a loss of standardization on campus, duplication of services and a less secure system

ESS Directors (IESS 11)
• Criteria for determining structural change:
  o Current resources available
  o History of priorities in regard to resource allocation
  o Fit of the mission
  o Extent to which there is understanding value of function and services provided
  o Unified philosophies
  o Optimal communication
  o Best fit for students
• Consider having Enrollment Management report to the President during this crucial time
• “Students First” concept is in operation in ESS
• VP of ESS should report to President not Provost
• Enrollment Management should report to President now that it is a critical mission
• Professional advisors in ESS more uniform than those in AA

Other – NISG (IO 1)
• How we can improve to foster student learning
  o Promote more educational movies and co-curricular activities more often
  o Provide more out of class learning opportunities
  o Offer a freshmen year experience course. One student in particular took a freshmen year experience pilot course at UNI and spoke in favor of continuing this type of class in the future
  o Provide more internships, particularly in the SBS College.
• How we can improve student services  
  o Continue services in Maucker Union after Gilchrist opens, particularly the Cashier’s office and registration services  
  o Suggestions for business processes, dining services, and IT passwords  
  o Not enough speed reading classes in academic services or enough sections offered for GRE preparation  

• Regarding the role in-class and out-of-class experiences play in learning  
  o There is not enough promotion of out-of-class learning opportunities  
  o Students are making the connection between in-class learning and out-of-class learning and value the out of class learning.  
  o Students are not aware of all the opportunities out-of-class and the student activities website  
  o Academic clubs are great for providing real world opportunities

• Describing their advising experiences
  
  • Two students liked that Advising and Career Services were combined, but one student expressed concern that combining these offices caused academic advisors in the department to be stretched too thin because of their new relationship with career services  
  • Four students expressed concern that there were not enough advisors in the academic departments. These students had majors in communications, biology, and elementary education  
  • Student in biology indicated she gets more assistance from faculty advisor than staff advisor and that the staff advisor was more interested in biomedical majors than those students interested in biological research  
  • One student stated that College of Business faculty don’t seem to be trained as advisors  
  • One student indicated he is a senior and has met with his faculty advisor on several occasions and has yet to have a productive meeting  
  • Two students expressed similar concerns about psychology advisors indicating that they would not meet with them even after a specific request was made for a meeting  
  • One student indicated he didn’t get much help from his advisor in College of Business Advising Center, but another student followed up and indicated his advising in the COB Advising Center was “to the point, straightforward, and was great”  
  • One student indicated that she would like to be able to change advisors without that person knowing in order to avoid any fear of retribution

UNI ACADA (IO 2)

• Goal is to facilitate communication to maximize cooperation, efficiency, and service to students  
• Group wants to be a resource to all advisors, especially new faculty and staff  
• They have the support of VP of ESS and Provost to provide a formal structure for advising although they have no power  
• No students are involved in the group
There is no incentive for faculty to do a good job advising
Advising is not discussed with recruitment and hire of faculty
Good advising equals good retention

VIII. Additional Data

Benchmarking Other Institutions

The task force decided early on to find out how other institutions of higher education were structured. We collected input on what institutions to consider for benchmarking through the survey process and also included the DEEP institutions.

The organizational charts were collected and distributed for the task force reference and review. A spreadsheet summarizes the variety of structures found. The spreadsheet and all of the organizational charts are included for reference in Appendix 1.

Other Models Considered

The following descriptions of three additional models were examined for consideration in making final recommendations for changes in the organizational structure. However, it was determined that they were not considered to be optimal choices by the majority of the Task Force members.

Model C – Created an additional vice-president under the heading of Academic Services and Enrollment Management to be responsible for: Academic Advising and Career Services, Admissions, Financial Aid, Registrar, International Programs and Services, and a Center for Enhancement of Student Learning (linkage described previously). In this model all other existing ESS and AA units would remain in their current divisions.

Model D – Moved Admissions, Financial Aid, Registrar, International Programs and Services, Academic Advising and Career Services, and a Center for the Enhancement of Student Learning under the Provost to report to a Dean or Assistant VP of Enrollment Management and Academic Services.

Model E - Created a Dean or Assistant VP to be responsible for Admissions, Financial Aid, Registrar, and International Programs and Services. The Dean or Assistant VP would report to current VP of ESS. A Center for the Enhancement of Student Learning would report to current VP of ESS.

Model C created a separate Academic Services Division, resulting in a minimized ESS Division. Model D overloaded the AA Division and minimized the role of ESS. However, it did move the ESS units closely tied to curricular issues into AA – the division most responsible for curriculum. Model E did not include enough change in structure to effectively improve overall services. This was especially true in regard to
Enrollment Management, which was not elevated for increased prominence and effectiveness.

IX. List of Individual Pros and Cons of Models

Individual Task Force members offered various perceptions in regard to pros and cons (see next page) to consider in making recommendations based upon the five models originally examined. This process was used as a means for points of discussion only (some are fact-based and others are opinions) before final agreement on the two models recommended in this report.
| Models for Consideration of Reporting Structures |
|---|---|---|
| Models | Pros | Cons |
| **Current Model** | • Leaves most people where they are comfortable  
• Groups peoples of similar culture | • Perpetuates lack of communication, us-them mentality  
• Leaves cooperation/coordination to vagaries of personal bonds  
• Does not affect culture change in university or foster collaboration between the silos  
• Does not provide intense focus on issues facing the university such as enrollment management  
• Does not address redundancy and confusion of services offered across the two divisions |
| **Model A: (Title TBD) Enrollment Management (new silo)) but Advising & Career Services and Center for Enhancement of Learning stay in ESS** | • Three silos may communicate better than two  
• Reduction in redundant services since more academic services are in one division  
• International programs could be united under this umbrella  
• Only those units with direct services to AA are moved  
• Establishes a coordinated and intense effort for important issues such as enrollment management  
• Puts the enrollment management leader at the same table as UMPR leader at cabinet meetings  
• Flattens the organizational structure  
• Spreads the work load over more leadership groups  
• Resource allocation to support student services may not be compromised  
• Greater importance of enrollment  
• Student services stays more intact  
• The academic affairs division focus remains on in class experiences rather than services | • Three silos may lead to further dis-integration and lack of communication  
• Requires new, high level hire  
• Does not resolve advising issues  
• ESS advisors may be disconnected from the curriculum  
• Advising resource allocations may not be efficiently managed to affect the majority of students  
• May reduce collaboration across divisions  
• Adds another direct VP report to the President. Does he have time for this?  
• International programs and services are removed from direct report on the academic side |
| Model B: Dean for Enrollment Management & Academic Services (including Continuing Ed.) reports through AA but Advising & Career Services and Center for Enhancement of Learning stay in ESS | • Fosters communication between many of the units that provide services directly to AA and AA itself  
• Possible that appreciation for Academic Services will grow when there is closer collaboration and a voice for these units in AAC  
• Dean for Academic Services can report to Provost but still sit on ESS council to maintain continuity; units under AS could meet with ESS leaders  
• Dean position not as costly as VP  
• Establishes a coordinated and intense effort for important issues such as enrollment management  
• Reduction in redundant services since many academic services are in one division  
• International programs could be united under this umbrella  
• Data for academic purposes resides on academic side  
• Continuing Education could report through this Dean and reduce costs  
• EOP remains on AA side and could also report through this Dean  
• Moving admissions to AA may give AA more control of recruitment | • People in units moved lose direct report to VP  
• Academic Services people may find culture challenging  
• Academic Services units have an additional layer in the reporting structure to what they now have though they are closer to the units they serve  
• Advising concerns are not resolved through this model  
• ESS advisors may be disconnected from the curriculum  
• Advising resource allocations may not be efficiently managed to affect the majority of students  
• Creates a disjointed effort to adequately serve the needs of the majority of students  
• Because enrollment management is critical to remaining ESS units, enrollment management in AA may completely remove ESS from enrollment issues  
• Creates a disparate division of labor for the VPs. Provost has increased reports.  
• There may be a dilution of focus on academics  
• Places more responsibility for student services on academic affairs |
<p>| Model C: VP for Academic Services and Enrollment Management | • Three silos may communicate better than two | • Three silos may lead to further dis-integration and lack of communication |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model D: Moved Admissions, Financial Aid, Registrar’s Office, International Programs and Services, Academic Advising and Career Services, and a Center for the Enhancement of Student Learning under the Provosts to report to a Dean or Assistant VP of Enrollment Management and Academic Services (including Continuing Ed.) – reports through AA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benefits:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reduction in redundant services since more academic services are in one division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• International programs could be united under this umbrella</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Establishes a coordinated and intense effort for important issues such as enrollment management and elevates academic services to a higher level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Flattens the organizational structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Greater voice for all of the units than is possible with a more hierarchical structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Divides the division of labor among three VP’s to provide more time to focus more intensely on the units under their charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Puts the enrollment management leader at the same table as UMPR leader at cabinet meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Issues:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requires new, high level VP – and budget implications of funding another VP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• May reduce collaboration with ESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ESS will contain fewer units and will perceive a loss of prominence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Adds another direct VP report to the President. Does he have time for this?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Question that there may not be enough reports to have a VP level position.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fragments student services, including the Follon Student Services Center, which provided (ADD BACKGROUND)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Areas under enrollment management not directly tied to recruitment may not receive adequate focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>People in units moved lose direct report to VP</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Services people may find culture challenging</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ESS will contain fewer units and will lose prominence</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Concern about maintaining quality culture of service to students</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Services and resource allocation under academic affairs for student services will lose emphasis</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic affairs gets more involved in student services and logistics than in the past and dilutes their focus on academics</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>May no longer need a VP level position for ESS and may result in merging remaining services into another division</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Makes finding a prominent person to lead ESS very difficult</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Division of labor for Provost becomes much heavier and places increased need for staffing in the Provost Office</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Model E: Dean or Assistant VP for Admissions, Financial Aid, Registrar, and International Programs and Services (Academic Services) - reports through ESS VP | • Leaves most people where they are comfortable  
• Groups people of similar culture  
• Reduction in redundant services since more academic services are in one division  
• The division title from ESS to SAS would imply a mission change for the ESS division to be more closely aligned with academic affairs  
• Creates a leadership position to facilitate conversation about enrollment management  
• Would create a robust division of ESS and create the potential to attract a strong candidate for VP of ESS.  
• Maintains strong connection between admissions and other ESS units  
• Would not require salary dollars for another VP | • Perpetuates lack of communication, us-them mentality  
• Leaves cooperation/coordination to vagaries of personal bonds  
• Does not affect culture change in university or foster collaboration between the silos  
• Does not address redundancy and confusion of services offered across the two divisions (International Programs can not reside here easily because of the faculty-focused international programs and services)  
• Academic Services units have an additional layer in the reporting structure to what they now have  
• Poor cost/benefit ratio  
• Enrollment management is buried below the VP level  
• Does not resolve advising issues since they remain in two silos  
• Advising concerns are not resolved through this model  
• Advising resources allocations may not be efficiently managed to affect the majority of students |
| integration, and resource allocation  
• Data for academic purposes resides on academic side  
• Continuing Education could report through this Dean and reduce costs  
• EOP remains on AA side but has closer ties to EM/advising services offered for the rest of the university | • Some ESS staff may feel that they failed in some way  
• Critical issues may not get all the attention needed  
• The need to collaborate with remaining ESS units is diminished  
• Advising issues may not be resolved through this model  
• Not enough emphasis on student development with limited student affairs division  
• ESS will fight this plan  
• Absence in personal buy in will take longer to make this model successful  
• Fragments student services, including the Follon Student Services Center, which provided a full range of services for students in one location  
• Areas under enrollment management not directly tied to recruitment may not receive adequate focus |
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• ESS advisors may be disconnected from the curriculum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Blank (for personal notes):
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