

**DATE:** July 14, 2020

**TO:** Stephen M. Wilson, Ph.D.

**FROM:** Steering Committee

**SUBJECT:** Phase II Final Report and Summary of Recommendations

On January 12, 2020, Dr. Stephan Wilson, Dean of the College of Human Sciences and Interim Dean of College of Education, Health, and Aviation, instructed the Steering Committee (the “committee”) to examine four key areas that he and the Cabinet (Dean, Associate Deans, Director of Business Operations, and Manager - Marketing and Communications) believed were important to moving the College of Education and Human Sciences forward. In no particular order of importance, they were:

1. Process and Guiding Principles for Academic Unit Alignment
2. Research Productivity and Visibility
3. Collaboration Improvements
4. Process for creating a shared vision for the College of Education and Human Sciences.

Following a fairly robust discussion among committee members, the areas were prioritized as shown below and subcommittees were formed:

1. Provide clear vision and/or purpose for the College of Education and Human Sciences.
2. Develop and implement approaches that allow faculty to be productive in their area(s) of scholarship; Continue to promote scholarly accomplishments.
3. Develop and implement opportunities that will enhance collaboration among academic units in the College of Education and Human Sciences.
4. Establish guiding principles and develop criteria/processes for academic unit alignment discussions.

Included below are the actions and recommendations of each subcommittee as well as a status report on the initial projected priorities and action items for the steering committee.

*Visioning* (Gazaway, Whitfield, Depperschmidt, and Clarke)

Action: In April, members of the Visioning subcommittee were invited to join the Leadership Team to participate in a discussion of the current identity in the College of Education and Human Sciences. In May, the Leadership Team used the preliminary identity statement as a basis for generating an aspirational vision statement. The results of these discussions were provided to the College of Education and Human Sciences Marketing and Communications team for further refinement before it is shared more broadly with the college. Overall, the Visioning subcommittee thought this was an important first step in trying to clearly articulate the identity and vision for the College of Education and Human Sciences

Recommendation: To better engage faculty, staff, and students in the process, the Visioning subcommittee **strongly recommends** that the Leadership Team **utilize a process similar to Appreciative Inquiry so that the identity and/or vision for the college be inclusive of all faculty, staff, and students in the college.**

*Research Productivity/Collaborations* (Jones, Brosi, Roberts, and Price)

See Appendix A.

*Guiding Principles/Processes for Academic Unit Alignment Discussions* (Duhon, Terantino, Farr, and Hammer).

Action: Initial conversations were focused primarily on facilitating academic unit alignment discussions. As these discussions continued through the spring semester and with guidance from external resources (i.e., Dr. Marjorie Kostelnik, University of Nebraska-Lincoln), it became clear that this topic is far broader than just developing and proposing guidelines for academic unit alignment. The information presented in Appendix B is representative of the evolution of factors that contribute to academic unit alignment discussions. In addition to this subcommittee, two additional groups were key to the development of the proposal that is presented in Appendix B. These two groups were (1) the Culture Club Growth Initiative Team and (2) the Transformative Interdisciplinarity Growth Initiative Team.

Recommendation: A major recommendation coming from the work of this subcommittee is that the College of Education and Human Sciences would

greatly benefit from **facilitated conversations around topical areas that are broader and more inclusive than a single academic program or unit**. There continues to be the need **for developing a shared understanding among the units** in the former College of Education, Health, and Aviation and the College of Human Sciences. The committee believes that these conversations will contribute towards **developing trust and a shared identity** for the college.

*Reflection on Projected Priorities and Action Items for the Creation of the College of Education and Human Sciences* (for more information see the Steering Committee Final Report, June 19, 2019)

<b>TEACHING AND INSTRUCTION</b>		
<b>Action Item(s)</b>	<b>Timeline</b>	<b>Status</b>
Develop, implement, and communicate apportionment recommendations for academic units	6 – 12 months	Ongoing; Dean Wilson established the “Faculty Roles and Expectations Committee”; this committee continues to work towards providing a set of recommendations and is expected to seek faculty input and review by the Faculty Advisory Committee in Fall 2020
Develop, implement, and communicate standardized processes for the assignment of Endowed Chairs and Professorships and how funds may be utilized	6 – 12 months	Ongoing; Dean Wilson established a the “Endowed Chairs and Professors Committee”; this committee continues to work towards providing a set of recommendation and is expected to seek faculty input and review by the Faculty Advisory Committee in Fall 2020
Develop, implement, and communicate standardized processes for Graduate Teaching Assistant/Associate and Graduate Research Assistant/Associate assignments (e.g., start dates, continuous employment, stipends)	< 6 months	Ongoing; Recommend Dean, Associate Dean of Research and Graduate Students, and Director of the Business Office work in coordination with School and Department Heads to establish standardized processes to be used across the college

Communicate expectations for minimum course enrollments (both on-campus and online, including OSU-Tulsa) and the reimbursement structure to be used in remunerating faculty for their instructional efforts that are outside their normal load	< 6 months	Ongoing; Recommend Dean, Associate Dean of Academic Programs and Services, and Director of the Business Office work in coordination with School and Department Heads to establish standardized processes to be used across the college; Review by the Faculty Advisory Committee is recommended
Develop, implement, and communicate processes for how faculty will be compensated for leading study abroad (or study away) courses	6 – 12 months	Ongoing; Recommend Dean, Associate Dean of Academic Programs and Services, Dean of Extension, Engagement, and Continuing Education, and Director of the Business Office work in coordination with School and Department Heads to establish standardized processes to be used across the college; Review by the Faculty Advisory Committee is recommended

**RESEARCH/SCHOLARSHIP/CREATIVE ACTIVITIES**

Action Item(s)	Timeline	Status
Develop, implement, and create a standardized process across academic units for faculty to “buy out” instructional time if awarded external grants and contracts	6 – 12 months	Pending; Will move forward after receiving final recommendations from the Faculty Roles and Expectations Committee; Recommending seeking input from Faculty Advisory Committee
Communicate the process through which generated salary savings are returned to the college or academic unit and how any generated salary savings may be used	6 – 12 months	Ongoing; School and Department Heads continue to work with Associate Dean of Research and Graduate Studies and Director of Business Operations to better understand how salary savings in the college can be utilized; Recommend that the process is communicated to the Faculty Advisory Committee

Develop, implement, and communicate processes for distribution of F&A among college, academic units, and individual investigators	6 – 12 months	Ongoing; School and Department Heads continue to work with Associate Dean of Research and Graduate Studies and Director of Business Operations to standardize F&A distribution among college, academic unit, and individual investigator; Recommend that the process is communicated with the Faculty Advisory Committee
---	---------------	--

**ADMINISTRATIVE**

Action Item(s)	Timeline	Status
Work with Financial Director to develop standardized budget models that can be implemented similarly across academic units	6 – 12 months	Ongoing; Academic units are working with the Dean, Associate Deans (as needed) and Director of Business Operations to develop standardized budgets
Establish a Space Allocation Committee (including faculty representatives) that takes a strategic approach in planning for expected space needs for units in the college	6 – 18 months	Ongoing; the committee has been assembled and are expected to begin their work in earnest Fall 2020
Establish standardized processes for the allocation of Graduate Teaching Assistants in the College of Education and Human Sciences	< 6 months	Pending; the Dean, Associate Dean of Academic Programs and Services, Associate Dean of Research and Graduate Studies, and Director of Business Operations will work with School and Department Heads to develop a method for GTA allocations that best meets the educational needs of our students

<p>Establish performance metrics to be used in holding academic units accountable for their instruction, research, extension, outreach, and community engagement; These metrics should be used as one factor in determining the allocation of faculty positions within the college</p>	<p>6 – 12 months</p>	<p>Pending; the Dean and Associate Deans will examine performance metrics that would be appropriate as allocations are made to units in the College of Education and Human Sciences; Recommend that, once developed, these are shared with the Faculty Advisory Committee</p>
<p>Clarify the organizational structure, including centers and institutes, for the College of Education and Human Sciences</p>	<p>&lt; 6 months</p>	<p>Pending; Recommend working with Institutional Research and Analysis and Human Resources to generate an organizational structure that is easily understood by faculty, staff, students, and stakeholders</p>
<p>Develop, implement, and communicate processes for computer-replacement program in the college (e.g., frequency of replacement, standard packages, clarification of financial responsibility for expenses above and beyond standard package)</p>	<p>Completed</p>	<p>The Director of Business Operations and IT Staff will work with administrative assistants, administrative associates, and unit heads to communicate the details of the computer replacement program and standard computer packages that are available to faculty and staff</p>
<p>Provide appropriate level of training for new staff and faculty (particularly as it relates to use of university financial, human resource, academic, and advising systems)</p>	<p>&lt; 12 months</p>	<p>Initial discussions started with the “Culture Club” Growth Initiative and additional work identifying key components of on-boarding and training is expected in Fall 2020; Recommend seeking input from Faculty Advisory Committee and Staff Advisory Committee</p>

## Appendix A: Steering Committee – Phase II Final Report and Summary of Recommendations

### College of Education and Human Sciences Steering Committee Research Productivity and Visibility Sub-Committee

Members: Taryn Price, Matt Brosi, Jennifer Jones, & Emily Roberts

#### Actions Taken and Recommendations as of 4/21/2020

- The Interdisciplinarity Committee developed and disseminated a Qualtrics survey regarding research interest areas, collaborations, opportunities, and barriers. We anticipate the results of the survey helping guide our work over the next few months.
  - Emily Roberts will be joining the Interdisciplinarity Growth Initiative Committee in order to serve as a liaison between the two groups.
  - Regarding visibility of research and building collaborations, we are discussing a research fair/event (in-person or virtual) in coordination with Interdisciplinarity Committee.
- The College Research and Graduate Studies office is working closely with others across campus (project lead: Clarke Iakovakis) to develop an online repository of faculty research interests that will be searchable and allow faculty to identify collaborators. We recommend continued messaging to faculty regarding how we can participate in this process.
- We recommend the creation of a Research Round-Up page webpage or repository that contains the information sent out by email would enable faculty quick access to the information, submission dates and submission links. Whether the opportunities are categorized or not, this will be a very helpful “go to” page that faculty can rely on for quick, up-to-date information on grant opportunities highlighted at our college level.
- We recommend a process be put in place that consistently ensures faculty are made aware of and nominated for, when appropriate, research awards. There appears to be confusion around the role of the FRDC and uncertainty as to who or what committee(s) might be consistently reviewing opportunities to nominate faculty for research awards at the state, national and international levels.
- We recommend that the college provide support to the faculty through a person(s) designated to assist faculty in identifying potential grant opportunities or information on RFPs that fit faculty areas of research as well as formulating potential collaborations with colleagues. This person could also assist in identifying potential faculty research awards and increasing the visibility of faculty research for the College and University.
- We recommend the College consider beta testing the recommendations for workload set forth in the Strategic Committee on Research Excellence (SCORE) report. SCORE has completed an 18-month assessment on research climates within program units and other research intensive universities to establish recommendations that allows for flexibility and innovative approaches to support research productivity at the College and Unit level. After careful review of the report and conversations with Dr. Brenda Smith, Associate Dean of the Graduate College and project lead, we believe testing the proposed model

## Appendix A: Steering Committee – Phase II Final Report and Summary of Recommendations

would be an excellent fit for units in the College and allow faculty to provide feedback, special considerations, and identify blind spots for an improved rollout for the University.

*The adoption of this approach supports the College's efforts to maintain alignment with the University's mission, vision, and research goals. We believe this approach also allows a degree of neutrality between the former Colleges as they become one new College. The function of this program is not the mechanism of EHA or HS and supports new provisions exclusively observed for the College of Education and Human Sciences. In doing so, the alignment for a new vision, mission and goals can further be realized.*

# Guidelines for College of Education and Human Sciences Alignment Process

## What is alignment within the new college?

Alignment is not simply reorganization of the existing structures, alignment is the positioning of research/grants, service, teaching, and structure in relation to each other with the goal of enhanced outcomes for students, researchers, faculty, staff, college, university, and the community.

## What outcomes do we expect from alignment?

<p><b><u>Research/Grants</u></b></p> <p>Enhanced research culture and increased collaboration on research and grant projects.</p>	<p><b><u>Service</u></b></p> <p>Increased sharing of resources and collaborative practice opportunities, including a potential shared clinic and community engagement.</p>
<p><b><u>Teaching</u></b></p> <p>More shared coursework across units with increased student interaction and efficiency and utilization of instructional resources.</p>	<p><b><u>Unit Structure</u></b></p> <p>Reduction in the traditional siloed approach to programs and instruction and an increase in collaborative educational activities with enhanced outcomes for all.</p>

## How should this process begin?

Before any college alignment can begin, we must develop a shared understanding of the programs, research, teaching, and service within the college. To accomplish this, the College Culture Club Committee, Interdisciplinary Committee, and the Steering Committee see the need to engage in a process of facilitated exploration among the CEHS community designed to develop a shared understanding of the new college in order to effectively move forward together. Faculty/programs who may have a common interest should be given the opportunity to explore these interests. This exploration should be open to all who are interested and be self-directed. These discussions will be the basis for exploration of alignment in the areas of research/grants, teaching, and service.

This process of facilitated exploration is designed to engage CEHS community in alignment based on shared understanding of what we do, who we are, and who we want to be. The process is also intended to support collegiality, relationship building, collaboration, and the development of a shared culture in CEHS. To accomplish these objectives, the CEHS will be guided by data driven themes when engaging in dialogues structured to explore the following:

- What we do?
  - Familiarize the college with what our CEHS colleagues in different programs/departments do.
- Who we are?
  - Identify the existing interdisciplinary connections/collaborations that exist in CEHS.
- Who we want to be?
  - Identify potential opportunities for new interdisciplinary connections/collaborations in CEHS.

A series of dialogues, referred to a “Collaborative Conversations” will be planned around a diverse set of shared interests identified by the CEHS community. A subcommittee comprised of representatives from the Culture Club, Interdisciplinary Committees, and Steering Committee will handle oversight, planning, and implementation of the dialogue series. The Center for Public Life at OSU-Tulsa (CPL) will consult with and support the subcommittee in the development of the programming.

## Appendix B: Steering Committee – Phase II Final Report and Summary of Recommendations

Proposed format for the Collaborative Conversations:

- A series of small group (no more than 15 people per group) facilitated dialogues around CEHS community interest in pre-identified topics. Multiple groups can be created for any of the topics, if necessary, to ensure the desired group size.
- Dialogues would ideally be held in person; CPL has the expertise and functionality to host virtual dialogue groups on-line.
- Facilitators will be trained to guide conversations
- Each dialogue will last approximately 90 minutes
- Note-takers will record key takeaways from the conversations. The notes will be analyzed by the CPL research team and select participants for themes and compiled in a report that will be shared with the CEHS community and with the CEHS Growth Initiative groups to inform the realignment process.

Proposed dialogue topics reflect themes identified in survey results from the Interdisciplinary Committee. The topics (tentatively) include:

- Health and Health Disparities,
- Family and Community Systems,
- Sustainability Practices,
- Educator/Teacher Preparation,
- Educational Policy and Leadership,
- Interdisciplinary Policy,
- Diversity and Social Justice
- Workforce Development
- Prevention Science
- Technology in Home, Work, and Practice

Timeline:

- Planning (July/August 2020)
- Facilitator training (August/Sept 2020)
- Dialogue 1,2,3 (Sept 2020)
- Dialogue 4,5,6,7 (Oct 2020)
- Dialogue 8,9,10 (Nov 2020)
- Evaluation (Dec 2020/January 2021)
- Final Report (Feb 2021)

## What about unit realignment?

If, through the process of facilitated exploration or any other pathway, opportunities for unit reorganizations are identified (new units or existing unit reorganization), these should be evaluated. Faculty and programs that believe realignment would be beneficial with regard to one or more of the areas described above should begin to evaluate the potential of restructuring.

As these explorations begin any proposed discussions regarding new or realigned units should be open to anyone interested and submitted to the Deans office and published for review by the larger faculty. After sufficient time for discussion and exploration, programs and faculty requesting realignment should complete the “Unit Alignment Proposal” to be submitted for public review and administrative evaluation. It should be noted that this must not be viewed as a one-time opportunity for alignment. As programs evolve and change, realignment of programs or activities if demonstrated to be beneficial should be explored.

## Unit Alignment Proposal

Proposals should be publicly accessible to avoid program/unit disruption. The template below is designed to facilitate the proposal process.

### TIMELINE



## Alignment Application Full Proposal

### Unit Size and Membership

Minimum of 10 faculty (tenured, tenure track, clinical/teaching faculty, and other full-time faculty) are required per unit with one additional faculty to serve as administrator resulting in 11 faculty per unit and one administrative assistant.

Member		Position	Rank	Primary Program Affiliation (list only one)
1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				
10				
11				
12				



### Shared Content/Coursework

Describe the current level of shared coursework across programs/degrees in the proposed or existing unit and proposed coursework to be shared as a result of any unit changes.

Course	Programs Sharing Course	Existing or Proposed Collaboration

Finally, identify how the proposed or existing unit plans to share/consolidate resources (facilities and equipment, staff, materials, technology and software, service courses, etc.) in an effort to increase efficiency and collaboration.

### **Logical Connections**

Where possible, units should be logically connected in ways that are easily understood to prospective students, the public, and existing and potential donors. Indicate how the proposed configuration leverages stakeholder knowledge and understanding to maximize recruitment of students and donors through a clear public perception of unit identity. Proposed units may wish to solicit input from the stakeholders mentioned above or consult with offices like Academic Programs and Student Services, Graduate Student Services, or the OSU Foundations to solicit feedback regarding how to articulate the identified logical connections.

### **Enhanced Student Outcomes**

Indicate how unit alignment will increase student opportunities. Programs within the unit should describe quantified quality program indicators (demand, accreditation standards, employment opportunities, certifications, projections of enrollment, graduation rates, growth initiatives, etc.) and how the new alignment will affect these indices. Impact of the new configuration on additional opportunities for students should also be highlighted by articulating the way the new unit will increase focus on research, field specialization, or professional pursuits after graduation. This could be demonstrated through examples from other universities, accreditation body standards, or discussions with existing college groups such as the PEU, Outreach, or International Studies.

### Effect of New Unit on Existing Programs

If proposing a new configuration authors of the proposal should also answer the questions below regarding impact on other programs.

Question	Response
List faculty who authored the proposal (everyone who contributed to and is in favor of the proposal) for the new unit configuration.	
List faculty in the proposed unit not in favor or involved in the development of the proposal.	
List all programs impacted by change (programs in current unit that have not been included in the proposed unit).	
Describe feedback from impacted units regarding change.	
Detail activities and outcomes associated with soliciting feedback and input from <u>internal stakeholders</u> regarding the impact of this proposed unit alignment (Academic Programs and Student Services, Extension and Community Engagement, Grants and Contracts, etc.).	
Detail activities and outcomes associated with soliciting feedback and input from <u>external stakeholders</u> regarding the impact of this proposed unit alignment (e.g. state agencies, accrediting bodies, OSU Foundations, etc.).	

## Appendix B: Steering Committee – Phase II Final Report and Summary of Recommendations

### Unit Structure

Describe unit support structure (staff, resources, etc.). Include any staff associated with specific grants or other projects.

Need	Number	Rationale