

School of Business Option 1: Three Large Areas

This model structures the School of Business by consolidating existing departments into three broad areas. Each area will be led by an Area Coordinator elected by faculty, providing cohesive leadership while promoting collaboration across disciplines. The goal is to streamline administrative functions, improve faculty collaboration, and create scheduling, advising, and mentoring efficiencies. This model promotes cross-functional engagement while maintaining discipline integrity, balancing faculty workloads, and enhancing school-wide coordination.

Several combinations of disciplines to form areas are possible. Here is one example but we anticipate faculty discussion ahead of the October 4 vote to refine/alter how the areas are structured:

- Economics and Information Systems – 14 FTE
- Supply Chain, Finance, Accounting – 15 FTE
- Management, Human Resources, Marketing¹ – 17 FTE

The areas should combine disciplines that increase opportunities for synergies as well as be reasonably balanced in terms of size and complexity (FTE/number of students/number of programs etc).

Area Coordinators will be responsible for leading and organizing the faculty and academic programs within their purview. These positions are elected by faculty while performance is evaluated by the school director. Specific duties may include:

- Organize and lead regular faculty meetings in the area.
- Develop initial teaching schedules for the area.
- Work with other area coordinators to review the schedules across the school.
- Oversee and coordinate faculty advising.
- Participate in School Council
- In partnership with the school director, manage instructor staffing (identify needs, manage search and screen, hiring process, ensure mentorship and onboarding)
- Support school-level initiatives as needed

Additional school-level administrative roles may be identified, such as:

- Graduate Programs Director (includes CMBA)
- AoL Coordinator
- Faculty Qualifications/Research Impact Coordinator
- Accreditation Coordinator
- Online Programs Coordinator

In this model, formal curriculum and personnel processes could start at the area level, which would require discussions about how areas are organized.

¹ Includes the former OCE online programs, which have 3 FTE supporting the Bachelor of Professional Studies and Bachelor of Applied Studies, including Aviation Management. These programs and people can't be easily separated and have been managed by Sarah DeArmond and the MHR department during 2023-24.

Concerns/Questions to Resolve for Option 1

The following concerns and questions need to be addressed for Option 1:

- It is unclear how we are going to improve the curriculum, enrollment and/or budget by just merging departments together.
- It is currently unclear how we plan to promote each discipline within the area to potential students and current employers.
- What are the other reasons for merging the disciplines besides the attempt to balance FTE within the School of Business? Is this the root cause of our current issues?
- What are the plans to resolve internal conflicts within the area among disciplines? How do we intend to integrate the disciplines into the area?

School of Business Option 2: Disciplines and Associate School Directors

This model empowers Discipline Coordinators to manage the curriculum and staffing within their areas, while Associate School Directors oversee broader school functions such as student success, professional development, and graduate programs. By maintaining discipline-level focus and distributing administrative responsibilities to Associate Directors, this structure balances specialized academic oversight with broader, school-wide strategic leadership, enhancing operational efficiency and academic excellence.

- **Discipline Coordinator:** Responsible for a discipline area, which would in most cases be a major. The expected duties may be less than for the area coordinators in the Option 1 model:
 - Lead discipline faculty in maintaining and advancing the curriculum.
 - Develop initial teaching schedule for the discipline.
 - In partnership with the Associate Director for Student Success identify needs for staffing
 - Oversee and coordinate faculty advising.
- **Associate School Director:** Responsible for a particular school-level portfolio. The School Director would work with the Dean and seek input from faculty on defining the roles and responsibilities for each associate director, but an initial, preliminary list of Associate School Directors that is subject to change might be:
 - *Student Success* – oversee Assurance of Learning, Advising, Scheduling, Curriculum Development, student appeals/complaints
 - *Professional Development* – oversee faculty qualifications, research impact, grants, professional development, mentoring
 - *Graduate and Professional Programs* – oversee success of all graduate programs in the school, including recruitment, retention, curriculum, scheduling etc.

Associate Directors may be elected by faculty for perhaps 3-year terms during which they retain faculty rights, while being evaluated by the School Director based on performance relative to their portfolio, and by the faculty evaluation committee on their faculty duties.

In this model, formal curriculum and personnel processes would all start at the school level. While discipline faculty would of course continue to manage the details of the curriculum within their discipline, they would submit any proposals for changes to the school-level curriculum committee.

Concerns/Questions to Resolve for Option 2

The following concerns and questions need to be addressed for Option 2:

- Faculty mentoring should be done at the discipline level. Other tasks indicated above under the purview of associate school directors, such as scheduling and curriculum development, may best be handled at the discipline level too.
- Need to carefully design the distribution of tasks between the discipline coordinators, associate school directors and school director. For instance, the school may not need associate school directors after the school's iterative process of efficiency improvements has been completed.

- We need to better understand who has authority to do what and then build in checks and balances (e.g., if there is growing sentiment that the Associate School Director of Professional Development is making decisions which are not in the best interest of the school, how is that issue resolved).

Common Concerns/Questions Across Both Options

The following overarching concerns and questions need to be addressed:

- Unclear exactly which tasks will move from dean to school director, and which will move from department chairs to school director. And consequently, which tasks the associate dean is currently doing that would need to go to someone else.
- Ensuring strong disciplinary input on PRT decisions.
- Ensuring control of advising, scheduling and curriculum development at the discipline level. This is also about making sure we have highly qualified people in spots to answer questions and make decisions and that workload distribution is fair.
- Ensuring the voice of faculty for governance, decision-making, and policy changes is preserved.
- Any settled structure will require the school to manage its tasks with less administrative compensation. As such, the school will need to make serious efforts to reduce the administrative tasks or significantly refine them.
- The presented options are mere ideas of what the school could look like after it undergoes an iterative process of identifying the key tasks that need to be done, deciding how best to allocate those tasks, and then organize resources accordingly.