

President Evans.

JE

RECEIVED

MAY 10 1983

TRSC
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

TO: PROVOST, DEANS AND FACULTY

FROM: DEANERY REORGANIZATION DTF

SUBJECT: FINAL REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS
FOR REORGANIZATION OF THE DEANERY

DEANERY REORGANIZATION DTF

Carolyn Dobbs, Chair
Lucia Harrison
Walter Niemiec
Willie Parson
Barbara Smith
Larry Stenberg
Charles Teske
Bill Winden
Ron Woodbury

Introduction

On February 4, 1983 Provost Byron Youtz charged a study group to address reorganization of the Academic Deanery. Byron noted that the current system had been in place since 1976 and that since we as a college had made a decision to move into new academic areas, the workload had increased over that period. Because of the workload increase and need to improve continuity, Byron wanted the existing structure evaluated in order to make the "work less burdensome" and to increase the effectiveness of the Dean's team. Examples of the increase in workload include Teacher Certification, Graduate Programs, Outreach Programs, expanded Part-time Studies, and a variety of Special Programs, such as short courses for state government employees.

Specifically, the group was asked to "contemplate a variety of possible changes: a redefining of the title and the term of office of the Assistant Dean positions; considering the addition of a fifth dean to the group (perhaps partially paid from other than academic funds); addition of an Assistant to the Deans position (or, equivalently, the creation of an Assistant to the Provost position) with the transfer of certain of the deanly functions to this person."

We had seven meetings between February and April and gave a short interim presentation at the April faculty meeting. We also requested and received a listing of the activities each Dean does, reviewed the deanery questionnaire Byron had sent to the faculty in 1980, and interviewed a number of people we believed would be directly impacted by an organizational change in the Deanery. Those interviewed included the Enrollment Coordination Committee, academic support staff, and the other deans. Finally, in our interim report to the faculty in April, we asked for comments from the faculty; the chair received four responses in addition to those offered during the meeting.

Our recommendations are couched in the following premises:

1. We accept the importance of developing new programs while at the same time improving the marketability and quality of existing programs in order to keep enrollment at mandated levels.
2. We recognize that times of tight money required more careful management of our academic operation.
3. We believe that a strong faculty voice in the Deanery is essential for the continuation of a quality curriculum and supportive teaching environment.

To implement solutions to the problem of increased workload and lack of continuity, our recommendations would change the "Dean from the Faculty" position's assigned desk functions, recruitment and salaries, a reinstatement of an Assistant to the Dean position. Finally, we are rejecting the need at this time for the addition of a fifth dean.

Our final report will be presented to the faculty on May 11, 1983. Please come and comment; if you cannot attend, please send comments to Carolyn Dobbs, Library 2102, by May 18. These comments will either be incorporated in any final changes we send to Byron or will be sent to him as received from you.

Term Renewal for "Dean from the Faculty"

Background

Toward the end of August, 1982, the four deans then in office met with the newly appointed dean to discuss transition, planning, and desk assignments. In the course of that discussion, the question arose concerning longer terms for the deans from the faculty. All four of the deans then in office agreed that there was a serious problem of workload, continuity, and learning curves and that the possibility of extended terms would be a good idea.

In December, 1982, Ron Woodbury circulated among the other deans and the Provost, former deans, and some interested faculty, a short statement on the problems inherent in the two-year dean's position, arguing that the benefits of extending the term outweighed the potential drawbacks.

Recommendation

The terms of the deans from the faculty should be once renewable for another two years. After calling for comments from the faculty and upon the willingness of the dean to accept another two years, the Provost would be empowered, at his or her discretion, to renew the dean's appointment for one term only.

Rationale

The principal argument against renewability is the potential "professionalization" of the Deans, the concern that the longer any single dean and the Deans collectively have been away from teaching, the less sensitivity they will have to faculty concerns, the less well they will represent the faculty among the Deans and Provost.

The above point surely has merit, but it is just as surely unproven that four years are significantly different from two. Although individual faculty and groups of faculty perceive that as time passes, deans become less attuned to faculty concerns, it may only be that deans by definition have broader, more college-wide, concerns than any individual faculty or group of faculty. As a dean makes more and more decisions contrary to the desires of different faculty, more and more faculty come to see the explanation as a generalized separation of the dean from all of the faculty.

More importantly, it may be argued that a longer term is precisely what would give the deans from the faculty a stronger voice among the deans. The fact of having served longer enables a dean to speak with more authority. At the same time a dean with a longer term ahead takes more authority from that prospect, delaying the loss of authority attendant upon lame duck status.

Administratively, the arguments for a longer term are obvious. The two-year term makes it impossible to assign to a dean from the faculty any task requiring long-term planning and follow-through. This is almost equivalent to saying that it is impossible to assign a dean from the faculty any important administrative task. While the answer to the problem of not being able to give a two-year dean any important job has supposedly been met with assignment of part-time and summer school responsibilities, even these assignments now cry out for important longer term planning.

Finally, the most important reason for making renewable the term of the dean from the faculty may be the personal satisfaction of the individual who serves. Although there are an increasing number of important jobs for the Deans to do, some two year deans have been content to interpret their responsibilities narrowly, thereby limiting their influence on many policy issues. A longer term would not only allow a dean from the faculty to play a larger role in the Deans' policy-making and decisions, it would provide a significant opportunity for those people interested in greater responsibility, and indeed exactly the administrative training which was one of the original goals of the rotating concept. Maintenance of the two year original term allows a faculty to get out, but renewability enables another person who so chooses to grow more in that position.

Time Frame For Dean From The Faculty Position

Background

Under the current system the incoming Dean takes office in September and serves for two years through August. The bulk of budget, curriculum and faculty evaluation cycles takes place during Spring Quarter. During this quarter the Dean's workload is very high. Under the current system, the new dean does not get to observe or participate in these cycles until well into his/her first year of tenure.

Recommendation

We recommend that the Dean from the faculty take office at the beginning of Spring Quarter and that the term of the out-going dean overlap for at least Spring Quarter. This overlap might extend into Summer Quarter if his/her desk responsibility included Summer School and if there were funds available to cover the extra salary cost.

Rationale

Beginning the term of office in Spring Quarter would introduce the new dean to the major academic cycles immediately. Having an extra person in the Deanery would also alleviate the workload problem. The new dean would not be able to participate in the evaluation of faculty in either of the retention decision years, but could perhaps do some type of faculty development with those faculty not being evaluated that year. The new dean might also take on the correspondence and phone tasks focusing on "What is TESC all about?" questions. This task assignment would provide a good orientation device. A Spring Quarter beginning would enable the new dean to jump right into the heart of academic administration and thereby have a full two years to benefit from the learning.

Deans' Recruitment, Assignments, and Teamwork

Background

Despite the hard work, good intentions, and strength shown by the persons selected to serve as deans, both from the faculty and from outside the college, several problems recur in the functioning of the Deans' Office. These have included:

- lack of "interdisciplinary coverage" within the deans' team because of insufficient attention in recruiting to the need for the deans' academic backgrounds to complement each other;

-----lack of clarity, at least in interactions with the faculty, about who bears how much responsibility for the development of policies and the making of decisions in what areas;

-----lack of continuity in understandings about policies as the membership of the team changes;

-----lack of shared understanding within the team about why individual deans have made decisions or formulated specific policies ;

-----unevenness in the delegation of responsibility and authority to faculty members so that the deans are forced to spend time and energy on the development of specific projects which could be developed by faculty members but have upon occasion delegated major policy-making (e.g. in recent years, "what to do about the arts at Evergreen") to faculty members because of insufficient interdisciplinary coverage in the deans' team;

-----beyond the successful and valuable attempts in the development of faculty members as teachers, insufficient attention to the development of administrative skills in at least some faculty members so that the plan of recruiting at least two dean positions from the faculty will work effectively.

Recommendations

1. In the year before a dean's position will be opened to recruitment, the continuing deans and the Provost should assess both the range of academic expertise and the battery of administrative skills which the three continuing deans possess. The new dean should complement the experience and skills of the continuing deans. A major recruitment criterion should be divisional coverage. The job description should address the needs of the team, much as the addition of a faculty member to a coordinated studies team is made because of the nature of the problems which the team must deal with. Generally, the four deans should continually bear in mind the need for the kind of teamwork necessary among the faculty members in a coordinated studies program.
2. For more effective coordination and clearer understanding, each dean's team should draw up and publicize a covenant, along the lines of the covenants required of a program-faculty, indicating individual responsibilities, shared responsibilities, methods of decision-making and consultation, and methods of resolving differences.
3. To foster continuity in principles and policies, deans should regard their several "desk" assignments as involving not only current decisions and supervision but also the maintenance of the history of that "desk" at Evergreen-- how policies have developed and changed, and why-- so that a new dean can take over that desk with a minimum of wasted energy and disruption.
4. Although one dean should bear the ultimate responsibility for the development of the curriculum, each dean should bear specific responsibility for several specialty areas and make recommendations to the team as a whole and the curriculum dean in particular relating to the strength of these areas.
5. While retaining responsibility for the development and implementation of major policies, curricular decisions, faculty assignments, and faculty evaluations, the deans should delegate to specialty areas, coordinated-studies teams within those areas, and individual faculty members the carrying out of specific projects--- whenever possible using groups of faculty members and students already working together, rather than proliferating new groupings and diffusing energy.
6. In the evaluations of individual deans' performances by themselves, their teammates, the faculty members sharing evaluations with them, and the Provost, all concerned should pay attention to how well each dean has lived up to the team's covenant, has carried out desk assignments and maintained the continuity of work in those areas, has helped a new dean learn the ropes, and has helped faculty members not only in their development as teachers, but also in their ability to take administrative initiative.

Rationale

These recommendations have been designed to improve divisional coverage in the Deanery, make it easier to track decisions and insure continuity in policy-making through the years, and to increase the types and quality of administrative experiences in faculty development.

Deans' Salaries

Background

A decision was made after the 1976 reorganization which reestablished the two-tier dean structure, to place the Senior Deans on the Administrative Salary Scale while the two Assistant Deans remained on the Faculty Salary Scale. As the DTF discussed issues of sharing responsibility and authority more evenly among all four deans, we arrived at the conclusion that the differential in salaries should also be considered.

Recommendations

The DTF is in agreement that all four deans should be on the same salary scale; however, we are divided about whether that scale should be the administrative or the faculty one. Therefore, we ask the faculty to discuss and vote first on our recommendation that all be placed on a same scale. If the faculty agrees with this recommendation, then we ask the faculty to discuss and vote on which scale it prefers.

A. The faculty scale proposition includes the following details:

1. Deans recruited from the faculty should receive compensation at twelve-ninths of their academic-year faculty salaries, receiving twenty-two days of vacation annually. In addition to whatever cost-of-living raises which might apply, they should benefit from the step-increases for additional years of total experience which would apply to their regular faculty salaries.
2. Deans recruited henceforth from outside the college should be compensated on the same basis, their "total years of experience"-- education beyond the B.A., teaching experience, academic administrative experience, and other relevant professional experience -- having been calculated in the same way as faculty recruits' experience is calculated. They too would benefit both from cost-of-living raises and step-increases. (This recommendation should not apply to Barbara Smith and John Perkins, who should continue to work under the contractual arrangements made when they were recruited.)
3. Occasions may arise when a strong candidate from outside the college is offered a deanship but demonstrates that he or she has current financial obligations which would require a larger salary from Evergreen if the person is to accept the offer. Here the college should use -- with public justification -- the same exception which it can make in recruiting a faculty member whose skills are important to the college: The candidate will be offered a salary higher than "total years of experience" would mandate with the understanding that she or he, save for across-the-board cost-of-living raises, would stay at that salary until the total experience and the step on the salary scale would match, and would then receive step-increases in normal fashion.

A. The administrative scale proposition would bring a Dean from the Faculty onto the administrative scale at a level based on prior TESC teaching and other relevant experiences as negotiated at the time of entering the position. The faculty would then progress in a typical fashion on the administrative scale during dean tenure. When the Dean from the Faculty would rotate back to the faculty, her/his salary would be adjusted to the level that would have been reached had the faculty member remained in a teaching position instead of serving as Dean.

Rationale

There is considerable concern that placing all deans on the faculty scale would make it very hard to attract quality candidates from outside TESC. It was felt this was especially critical for Third World candidates. There is also a component of "hazard pay" in a dean's salary. Not only is there stress from internal events, such as curricular decisions and some faculty interactions, but the Deans are also expected to serve front-line duty when externally stressful issues, such as budget cuts and closure threats, arise.

Deans' Titles

Background

Presently, the four-year Deans are titled "Senior Dean" and the two--year Deans are titled "Assistant Dean". The difference in title has created confusion, both internally and externally. Some people perceive that the Deans have a difference in status because of the title and do not understand that the Deans work together as a team to coordinate academic affairs. Often people assume that the "Assistant Deans" work for the "Senior Deans". Some people look to the "Senior Deans" to approve decisions made by the "Assistant Deans". This situation makes the present "Assistant Deans" situation somewhat untenable.

Recommendation

We recommend that all four Deans be titled "Academic Dean".

Rationale

We feel that Deans share the responsibility for decision-making and that the rotating deans bring a strong faculty voice to the deanery. We feel that the titles should reflect this status.

Assistant To The Deans Position

Background

One possible change that the DTF was asked to consider the addition of an Assistant to the Deans position as one way to reduce the Deans' heavy work-loads. The idea for such a position is not a new one. Two similar positions existed in the Deans' area in the past. The first was an administrative assistant position to the Provost held by Sally Hunter from 1973-1976. The second position was created by Dean Clabaugh in 1978 and held by Dan Weiss until his departure from the College in the fall of 1979. Both positions lent administrative support to the Deans mainly in the form of special assignments and projects. Even though the need for staff support still existed, the position was not filled after Dan resigned because of budget cuts.

Recommendation and Rationale

We recommend that an Assistant to the Deans be hired. Examination of the current Deans' workloads revealed that they were spending a disproportionate amount of time performing tasks that could be performed and coordinated equally well by a staff assistant. The responsibilities in mind for such an Assistant to the Deans would include the following:

1. Perform background research, implementation and follow-up on special projects. These projects might be in the areas of continuing education, community services, special summer programming, educational partnerships with industry, and grant programs.
2. Oversee the academic staff.
3. Coordinate budget, space, and equipment needs.
4. Act as liaison between the Deans' area and other units on campus, such as the Facilities and Business offices.
5. Oversee off-campus facilities in Vancouver and Tacoma.

This additional administrative support for the Deans will allow them more time to do the developmental work, long-range planning, and evaluative follow-up that is required of their position.

Fifth Dean

Background

In a memo to the DTF, Byron Youtz suggested the need for a fifth dean who might be in charge of special programs at the College. The tasks assigned to such a dean might include organizing and running the part-time studies program, developing special programs, such as MPA short courses, Department of Personnel managerial training programs, continuing education programs for high school teachers, the creation of an Elder Hostel, and summer programs. A review of their work loads as described by the current deans (Appendix A) indicated that a fifth dean might function not as a coordinator of special programs, but simply as a peer to share the work load currently carried by the four deans, which has expanded due to the growth of programs now in place.

Recommendations

The DTF recommends against creating a fifth academic dean position at this time. We also recommend that the current deans study ways of delegating some of their responsibilities and that an audit of the deans' desk functions be done by a management professional.

Rationale

Discussions leading to these recommendations included a suggestion by Charles Teske that the development of special programs could be assigned to individual faculty members who might be compensated by release time or a partial summer salary; such responsibility could resemble a grants coordinator function. It was thought that a deanship devoted solely to special programs might be too isolated from the functions of the other academic deans.

The DTF also received a suggestion during its interviews that the overall TESC administrative structure might be examined before defining an additional dean level position since areas other than academics might also need administrative assistance.

The DTF believes that a desk audit might identify ways of relieving the workload pressures that all of the deans are now feeling.

Conclusion

We have completed our assignment as charged and see our recommendations as addressing workload issues, the need for strengthened continuity in administrative policy development and implementation, and equity among members of the dean team.

Evergreen is in a period of major transition; we have a new Provost taking office this summer, the possibility of a new President after next year, and the implementation of a new curricular structure, which also establishes a stronger convenor role. As we settle into this next level in our maturation, some of the deanery reorganization issues we studied, such as a fifth dean, or issues we did not address, such as an Assistant to the Provost, may be reevaluated. We hope that our work, in the best of incremental change tradition, has oiled the most squeaky wheels while leaving open options for future institutional modification as necessary.

Committee Members: Carolyn Dobbs (chair), Lucia Harrison, Walter Niemiec, Willie Parson, Barbara Smith, Larry Stenberg, Charles Teske, Bill Winden, and Ron Woodbury

P.S. Some committee members did not see the final editing; any peculiarities or glitches are, therefore, my responsibility.

Carolyn Dobbs