Faculty and Academic Staff Alignment Principles

1. The new administrative structure must improve the way we **Serve our Stakeholders**. We feel strongly that alignment decisions focus on stakeholders needs. We believe that efficiencies can be gained in the way decisions are made, but we must retain the value and quality of the education we provide. This alignment model will accomplish:

   a. Greater decision-making responsibilities of the faculty and staff regarding stakeholder needs.
   b. Streamlined interactions between our discipline's stakeholders.

2. The new administrative structure must foster **Interdisciplinary Collaboration**. We feel strongly about developing meaningful academic relationships with all scholars on campus. An alignment model that promotes cross-disciplinary interactions is necessary in our new polytechnic environment. This model will accomplish:

   a. Direct contact with faculty and staff from all disciplines. Together, we will interact with stakeholders to achieve our teaching, scholarship, and service obligations.
   b. A flexible, agile model that changes with stakeholder and societal need.

3. The decision-making process must allow for **Full Participation** of governance groups. We feel strongly that alignment should have the consent of the senates in the process and final model. This means that governance bodies have:

   a. The ability to review and comment on the models coming out of the summer retreat.
   b. The ability for the senates to vote on the final model (before the end of the fall 2007 semester).
   c. The ability for comprehensive involvement in the final model (i.e. to have a say in how programs, faculty and staff should be aligned and where they fit in the model).

<h1 style="text-align:center">Alignment Principles</h1>

From Faculty Senate brainstorming session on February 27.

- Enhance, not diminish governance (voice, power). Increase faculty power for decisions.
- Minimize obstacles/layers. ($, signatures, paperwork)
- Focus on <u>student needs</u>; add value.
- Units – size of 50 of below
- Facilitate interdisciplinary collaborations: Facilities, academics, resources, faculty.
- Retain SOE of departments
- Recognize departments but focus on interdisciplinary pursuits
- Business Model: Customers=Parents; Students=Products
  - Efficiencies and decisions
- Elect administration/leadership positions – term limits?
- Balancing, spreading, infusion of general education throughout/core abilities within programs, with program content.
- Retain Chapter 36 – Faculty roles and administration roles
- <u>Discipline</u> alignment at <u>university level</u>.

From Note Cards

Individual Faculty Senate member ideas recorded on February 27.

- Physical facilities – faculty input into design that supports collaboration.
- Communication – what is faculty role in any realignment? What, according to Chapter 36, or local policy, can faculty really influence? (Versus what decisions are administrative)
- What principles/guidelines were developed during the last time faculty looked at realignment? Can these be of value?
- Ease of team collaboration
- Increase quality of teaching and service being provided to students and faculty – through alignment and collaboration.
- Increase course offerings through collaboration of disciplines
- Collaborate across disciplines – but don't lose governance/faculty power.
- Facilitating interdisciplinary/collaboration.
- Secure funds for research
- Collaboration in designing classes
- Support departments with funds and tenure track faculty.
- Minimize hoops/obstacles (money, procedures, paperwork – the committee trail) to collaborate/accomplish goals.
- Realignment to programs (interdisciplinary alignment)
- Easy way to try new ideas (limit surveys) – allow experimentation.
- Balance realignment with cluster size (enough bodies) vs adequate representation.
- Enhance –not diminish – faculty governance especially at the department level.
- Share resources without losing disciplinary identity.
- Minimizing program hoops and obstacles

From Note Cards *(continued)*
Individual Faculty Senate member ideas recorded on February 27.

- Remove a layer of administration
- Divisions and departments of less than 50 people
- Have elected leaders
- Guide to decision making
-     Customers – students, stakeholders, etc.
-     Products – programs
- Make more efficient and provide better execution of programs and this should be a key element in decision making.
- Enhancing and affirming positive interdisciplinary   nature of a university.
- Breaking down barriers, physical, academic and intellectual boundaries
- Respect uniqueness to ensure collaboration is not forced – some things do not stand alone.

From Learn@UWStout Discussion Board

    * The Stout General Education committee is considering how the potential realignment affects us, and how we can affect it. This might be a good time for a deep look at the g.e. curriculum and whether it serves our students as well as it might; and if not, what changes might be made to improve that curriculum.

    A member pointed out at a recent g.e. meeting that the corporate model may not be the one we want to follow. Look what it's done for Ford, Chrysler and GM! The member recommends Arthur Harkins' "Leapfrog Learning" Outcomes, available at:
https:// wiki.umn.edu/twiki/bin/view/Leapfrog.
Harkins has 12 Learning Outcomes some of which resemble our 12 g.e. objectives.

    *I was quite taken by the member's impromptu speech on the failing business model and what implications that has for us as academics and especially academics who care about and recognize the value of a liberal arts education. Recently my wife and I were in Canada and were engaged in conversations with a VP of IT for a large European corporation. He told us that his company looks primarily for graduates with liberal arts degrees, even in IT. They want the candidate to at least have a minor in liberal arts.

    For me this is another example of what the member was suggesting. The basic liberal arts education will survive when other models rise then collapse as he indicated is happening with the business model now. I believe that the realignment the chancellor is suggesting is a wonderful opportunity for us to remind the community at large that liberal arts, what we now call general education, is precisely what makes a university, that without these courses of study we wouldn't be a university. Along with this, perhaps we can suggest a deepening and broadening of the gen. ed. offerings, including developing liberal arts majors or a liberal arts major so as to be fully on the cutting edge of university level teaching and learning.

    *There has also been discussion of the Alverno College model, whose g.e. program uses 8 skills -- communication, analysis, problem-solving, decision-making, social interaction, global perspective, citizenship and engagement. At Alverno each skill has a committee assigned to it. The

committee's role is to be sure that skill is represented not only in the g.e. curriculum but throughout all programs. They do this through continual assessment and improvement. There are other models for g.e. curricula.

We hope this forum will attract your thoughts on ways to improve the g.e. curriculum here at UWStout; this time of potential transition in program/discipline alignment offers a chance to talk about that.

My P.O.V. on the potential realignment is this:

It is the Chancellor's prerogative to set administrative structure. It is our role, in governance, to advise the Chancellor regarding potential structural realignment.

To me, this should revolve around:

1) What is the purpose of any realignment -- By defining the purpose we can answer:

2) What are the principles underlying the realignment, i.e. what are the structural/functional principles of an improved structure?

To me, such principles would include but not be limited to:

Increased permeability of silos, to better serve interdisciplinary efforts.

Flexibility --as the structure is designed, we won't foresee all possible effective permutations of it, so it needs to be able to bend.

Agility -- Rapidity of flexibility. Related to resilience. Maintaining governance oversight but not building in barriers to rapid change, as the rate of change of the larger society continues to increase.

Efficiency -- administrative and financial.

Others, I'm sure.

IMHO the Faculty Senate should decide on and define the Principles of Effective Alignment. The Chancellor will propose realignment. The Senate can overlay the proposed new structure onto the Principles to look for a fit. This seems much more effective and appropriate to me than the Senate trying to define a new structure per se.

We need to look for alignment that provides the most effective organization for the students and faculty. Any structural changes should provide faculty more control over their activities. As many decisions should be made at as low level as possible. When we look at processes, there should be a justification for each step in process, as to how it adds value.

Additional Feedback

*If this means all colleges will be like the School of Education model then absolutely NO
*Customers=Employers
*Realign based on departments and programs with highest student demand for courses.
*Emphasize the total student credit hours (SCH) in any decisions related to funding and faculty support resources.