Restructuring Recommendations

Report to President Moskus

Lane Community College

Presented by the Restructuring Steering Team

December 20, 2000

Through the course of the Restructuring Steering Team's work, it was affirmed that organizational structure is only one aspect of an effective organization. Any recommendations implemented must be in alignment with critical college work such as the strategic plan, the Vanguard project, and even the current bond construction to effectively support Lane's greatest resource–its staff. President Moskus expressed it well in *A Vision for the Future:*

> "Organizational restructuring is only the beginning of change at Lane. The vision outlined here requires changes in fundamental values, changes in the way we work and in our work relationships, and training for all employees. Fulfillment of this vision is a long-term project to which we must dedicate ourselves for years to come. Success in this venture will depend on our combined commitment to intensive on-going staff training; examining our internal policies and procedures, changing those that hinder service to students; and changing our reward systems to encourage behaviors that support the values of teamwork, quality, and service."

> --Jerry Moskus, 1994.

We, the undersigned, present our "best thinking" on the restructuring issues addressed.

Anthony Baronti   Andrea Newton

Chuck Fike   Lori Steger

Dennis Gilbert   Stan Taylor

Arne McLean   Rick Venturi

Bert Ewing   Ruth Wren

Donna Koechig

Acknowledgements

Table of Contents

Overview of the Restructuring Project

President Moskus at Lane Community College created the Restructuring Steering Team (RST) in October 2000. This team was charged with recommending improvements in the college's organizational structure and presenting a written report to the president by December 20, 2000.

BACKGROUND

One of the goals Lane Community College Board of Education developed for President Moskus in July 1999 was to review the college's organizational structure. In October 1999, the president presented the board with a report that included a background of assumptions and issues from which options for discussion were developed. In July 2000 the board requested specific organizational models be developed to address the structural issues that had been identified. Four models were presented to the board in September. The board voted to "accept Model Two subject to college revisions as it proceeds through the outlined process to be implemented by June 30, 2001" (*Lane Community College Board of Education Minutes,* September 13, 2000).

MEMBERSHIP OF THE TEAM

The Restructuring Steering Team includes representatives selected by President Moskus, unions and councils. The membership is constituted as follows (appointment indicated by parentheses):

Arne McLean and Anthony Baronti, students (ASLCC); Chuck Fike, faculty (President); Dennis Gilbert, faculty (LCCEA); Stan Taylor, faculty (Faculty Council); Bert Ewing, classified (President); Ruth Wren, classified (LCCEF); Lori Steger, classified (Classified Council); Rick Venturi, manager (President); Andrea Newton, manager (MSC). The president appointed Donna Koechig as the chair. The RST reports to the president.

CHARGE TO THE RST

- To review "Model Two" (see Appendix B), including the Criteria and Rationale (see Appendix C).

- To test the assumptions presented in the Rationale.

- To identify and suggest corrections for any error or omissions in the proposed table of organization.

- To provide answers to the president's eight questions (below).

- To note any other concerns about Model Two that RST deems appropriate which arise in the course of RST's work.

SCOPE OF RESTRUCTURING

The scope of the restructuring process should

- Focus primarily on Model Two, although the recommendations should also include suggested corrections for any errors or omissions in the proposed table of organization.

- Focus on structural issues rather than personalities or individual performance.

- To the extent possible, collect and consider input from all current and prospective people affected by the proposed changes.

DESIRED OUTCOMES

The proposed college organizational restructuring should meet the following criteria:

President's Criteria:

1. Support student and staff learning.
2. Organize around learners' needs from the outside in, so that users can easily locate their access point in the college.
3. Eliminate "silos" (increase integration and reduce fragmentation of departments and functions). Eliminate unnecessary duplication.
4. Address resource challenges if possible.
5. Reduce the number of people reporting to the president.
6. Keep bureaucratic hierarchy to a minimum to facilitate vertical and horizontal communication.

RST's Added Criteria:

7. Have an overarching reason and logic for departments being together, e.g. relationship.
8. Enhance the most efficient, effective, and high-quality product and flow of work.
9. Enhance staff quality of work in a manner that facilitates delivery of quality student learning.
10. Use data based on evidence, rather than personality, opinion or self-interest.
11. Take advantage of the opportunities presented and position for the future.
12. Do not make change for change's sake.

QUESTIONS

This report is structured around answers to the following questions:

1. Should the VP for Administrative Support also be an Executive VP? Please explain.

2. Do we need a full-time Evening/Weekend/Summer administrator? Explain.

3. How can our staff development needs best be administered?

4. Should Personnel Services, AA/EO/Diversity, Labor Relations and, possibly, Staff Development, be led by one superordinate? Why, or why not?

5. Should CIT and Business Technologies be separated? Explain.

6. Is the Business cluster appropriate? (See also Option B.) Explain.

7. What is the best configuration for Cont. Ed/Outreach/Workforce Development?

8. Which configuration is better, Option A or Option B?

Methodology

PROCESS

On December 20, 2000, the Restructuring Steering Team presented the following recommendations to President Moskus. Nearly 800 meeting hours were spent in gathering data and deliberation. In addition, each RST member spent 15-25 hours per week analyzing data and developing recommendations for a combined total of over 2000 hours.

The recommendations were based on significant input from

- More than 105 managers, faculty, staff and community members as well as departmental groups in response to items in *The Daily* and queries to specific individual and groups.

- A faculty-classified sponsored forum on restructuring.

- Two focus groups with current faculty, staff and students conducted by RST.

- Sixty-eight faculty, staff and individuals and 14 teams interviewed by the RST.

- Organizational models from Oregon community colleges reviewed by the RST.

- Best practices from other community colleges, e.g. League for Innovation colleges, examined by the RST.

CONSTRAINTS

The Restructuring Steering Team (RST) was assembled after the Board of Education had selected Model Two, and after the President had formulated the eight questions. Therefore, the scope of the RST did not include the early stages of the process, and it will not include the implementation and maintenance stages of the restructuring process.

The RST was also limited by the short length of time allotted to our project, which did not allow for a thorough exploration of all options. As a result, the Restructuring Steering Team does not feel comfortable making formal recommendations for the following areas: assistants to the president; Institutional Advancement; Foundation; Institutional Research, Assessment & Planning; Curriculum & Scheduling; Distance Learning; and the Library. Additionally, since it was beyond the RST's scope to address budgetary concerns, the team was unable to analyze the budgetary ramifications of its recommendations.

Furthermore, this report was written by the RST committee. While RST members agreed upon a general format for reporting recommendations, individual RST members were responsible to craft answers to specific questions or write specific sections. Individuals received significant input from the group and drafts were peer reviewed; yet the final product still reflects some differences in style.

Within these constraints, the RST worked very hard to produce the best report possible. RST regrets that many of the needs and wishes that were expressed during the restructuring process could not be resolved at this point. RST hopes that all of the issues raised will eventually be addressed in an ongoing process that will move the college toward the vision of team-based collaboration and shared governance.

Restructuring Steering Team's
Summary of Recommendations

Lane's Restructuring Team was formed through action of the Board of Education and the college's president, Jerry Moskus. The team's specific charge, process of information gathering, rationale and conclusions are given in some detail in the Restructuring Team's full report. A summary of the Team's recommendations follows (unless noted otherwise, these are consensus recommendations):

I. Should the VP for Administrative Support also be an Executive VP? Please Explain.

- There should be no Executive Vice Presidents.

- There should be one vice president with responsibility over what is now called College Operations (CO) and one vice president with responsibility over what is now called Instruction and Student Services (ISS).

- The College Operations staff should decide the College Operations domain name.

- Each vice president (VP) should have direct supervisory responsibility over some mid-managers in their domain of responsibility as well as supervisory responsibility over one or more associate vice presidents (AVPs).

- These vice presidents (VPs and Associate VPs) shall collaborate horizontally among themselves and with the Human Resources Director, Research and Planning Director, the Budget Officer, etc.

- On the issue of the number of Associate Vice Presidents in Instruction and Student Services.

    Majority recommendation: (7 of 10) There should be three.

    Minority recommendation: (3 of 10) there should be two.

- On the issue of reporting structure.

    Majority recommendation: (7 of 10) Three Associate Vice Presidents should report to the ISS Vice President (see recommended organizational chart, Appendix B.)

    Minority recommendation: (3 of 10) Strategic reporting by the Associate Vice President for Technology should be to both CO and ISS Vice Presidents, and supervisory reporting should be jointly shared as is feasible. Part of the domain of one of the new Associate Vice presidents may be similarly shared, if beneficial (see recommended organizational chart, Appendix B).

II. Do we need a full-time Evening/Weekend/Summer administrator? Explain.

- An Evening/Weekend/Summer administrator position should not be created.

- The responsibility for evening, weekend, and summer programs should be assigned to an existing administrator, who, along with other responsible people and units and stakeholders will collectively resolve issues and further develop the evening, weekend, and summer programs.

- Classified staff should be assigned as needed.

III. How can our staff development needs best be administered?

- Staff development should be assigned to the new Human Resources (HR) department (see IV.).

- "Grass roots" employee-led professional development teams should be maintained.

- Organizational development activities should be led through HR.

- Budgeting and staff support of professional development should be coordinated through HR.

IV. Should Personnel Services, AA/EO/Diversity, Labor Relations and, possibly, Staff Development, be led by one superordinate? Why, or why not?

- A professional, comprehensive Human Resources department should be established encompassing Personnel Services, labor relations, staff development, and AA/EO/Diversity.

- The HR department should have a unit director who is skilled in personnel, labor relations, organizational development, and AA/EO/Diversity.

- The HR director should report to the President.

- The HR unit should pro-actively collaborate internally among its separate functions, and be connected through strategic coordination with the vice presidents, employee collective bargaining representatives, and professional development teams.

V. Should CIT and Business Technologies be separated? Explain.

- Computer Information Technology (CIT) should be established as a separate division with a manager.

- In choosing a CIT division chair, alternatives to a full-time management position should be explored.

- Computer Industry-standard certificate courses should be mainstreamed into CIT, BT or other curricula when and as appropriate.

- An evaluation process should be established to assess the extent to which this structural change improves college performance in terms of student success and campus collaboration.

VI. Is the Business cluster appropriate? (See also Option B.)

- A new division should be formed that contains Business Technology and Business Administration, and could be expanded well beyond these two existing units into areas which include related transfer credit programs currently not explicitly served at Lane and new service industry programs.

- The division chair for this unit should ensure a visionary exploration and accomplishment of this potential expansion, collaboration with other parts of the college, preservation of existing diverse strengths and capacities and the solidification of its identity.

VII. What is the best configuration for Continuing Education/ Outreach/ Workforce Development?

- Continuing Education should be maintained and should collaborate with the rest of the college and, when possible, combine credit and non-credit classes, serve new markets, and mainstream successful programs into the core of the college.

- Business & Industry Services, Business Development Center, and Training & Development should be joined into one workforce development unit, which should be named by those in it.

- The workforce development unit should have a director who will ensure collaboration, coordination, and strategic planning internally and with the college as a whole.

- The president, the appropriate vice president, and the workforce development unit should decide the most effective management configuration.

- The new workforce development unit should partner with the newly formed division containing Business Administration and Business Technologies and mainstream successful, stable curriculum as appropriate.

VIII. Which configuration is better, Option A or Option B?

- A new unit (The Center for Learning Advancement) with two subdivisions should be created and composed of the following existing sub-units: Academic Learning Skills (ALS), Tutoring, English as a Second Language/International English as a Second Language (ESL/IESL), and Adult Basic and Secondary Education (ABSE), which includes Adult Skills Development (ASD), Adult High School (AHS), GED, Guided Learning Options (GLO), Adults with Special Needs (ASN), and the Literacy Program.

- There should be two managers for this large unit consisting of two subdivisions.

- One of the two managers should be the unit director responsible for ensuring existing successful team-based leadership, collaboration, coordination, and strategic planning among the subdivisions and with the rest of the college.

- This unit should be within Instruction.

- The unit should name itself.

- The Testing Office, TRIO program, and Disability Services should remain within Student Services.

- The ESL/IESL programs should remain downtown and maintain its team-based leadership and administrative support infrastructure.

- On the issue of sub-division definition*:*

  Majority recommendation: (9 of 10) One subdivision should be ALS, Tutoring, ESL/IESL; the other subdivision should be ABSE.

  Minority recommendation: (1 of 10) The management configuration and subdivision structure should be set by the president, ISS vice president, and the unit based on an assessment of the opportunities, challenges, and vision for the division.

Overall Recommendation

- New management positions should be hired according to Lane's hiring policies and procedures based on established skill sets developed for each position. It is recommended these positions be hired through an open process whenever appropriate.

Question I: Should the VP for Administrative Support also be an Executive VP?

CONSENSUS RECOMMENDATION

No. There should be no Executive Vice presidents. Both Vice Presidents should have the same title.

Differences in responsibilities should be handled through compensation. This, however, is not a simple "no." It reflects the recommendation of a set of roles and relationships involving all the Vice Presidents and Associate Vice Presidents. The full scope can be viewed in the organizational charts set forth in the answer to question eight (see recommended organizational charts, Appendix B).

The recommendations below include majority and minority positions. It should be made clear, however, that the two recommendations are variations on the theme of moving the college towards collaborative work at all levels. On most points the RST achieved consensus. On those points where disagreement exists, it is based on the question of what is achievable now versus goals for the future.

The RST by consensus recommends there be one VP accountable for Administrative Support and one VP accountable for Instruction, Student Services and Outreach. Both VPs will supervise Associate VPs and also be responsible for their own specific area of college functions. The idea is to create a "thicker" layer of administration as opposed to one with multiple layers.

The Vice President of Instruction, the Associate VPs of Instruction and Student Services, and the impacted departments acting in concert should determine the designation of specific responsibilities and functions allocated to the Associate VPs of Instruction and Student Services. These allocations of responsibility should be consistent with the recommendations of the RST set forth in the answers to questions 4, 5, and 6.

The consensus recommendation of the RST is that all VPs and Associate VPs should work horizontally, e.g. collaboratively, as a team. In addition, we recommend that the President, the Vice Presidents and the Associate Vice Presidents adopt a team-based model of management that provides for collaboration and exchange in performing important college functions and that ensures strategic planning for the college takes place effectively. The Human Resources Director, the Budget Officer, and the Research and Development Director should be included as an integral part of this team.

MAJORITY RECOMMENDATION (7 OF 10, 1 ABSENT)

A majority of the RST recommends that the VP for Administrative Support supervises the Associate VP of Information Technology and also oversees the units currently under College Operations. The VP for Instruction and Student Services should supervise two Associate VPs of Instruction and one Associate VP of Student Services, in addition to overseeing Continuing Education, the Outreach Centers and Workforce Development.

MINORITY RECOMMENDATION (3 OF 10, 1 ABSENT)

A minority (3 of 10, 1 absent) recommendation of the RST has two parts. First, there should be two Associate VPs reporting to the ISS VP. The minority recommendation increases the number of vice presidential level positions in ISS from two to three, rather than from two to four. Secondly, the recommended organizational design directly incorporates a specific element of shared supervision, strategic planning functions, and team-based management. To promote and enhance strategic integration between Administrative Support and Instruction and Student Services, the two vice presidents should share strategic alignment responsibility for the Associate Vice president for Information Technology, and part of one of the Associate Vice presidents for Instruction and Student Services if that is desired. The Vice presidents should collaboratively determine where strategic areas of overlap exist and in those areas they should share supervision responsibilities, to the extent feasible. Supervision of the remaining Associate Vice president would be the responsibility of the Vice president for Instruction and Student Service.

RATIONALE AND CRITERIA FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations outlined above respond to many of the concerns expressed by different people and groups on campus during the restructuring process.

Integration of Instruction and Student Services. Many people expressed that the current structure has helped to promote integration between Instruction and Student Services and were worried that a new organizational design might undermine this progress. The proposed organizational design addresses this problem in a number of ways at the executive level. First, one VP remains responsible for both Instruction and Student Services, providing for accountability and direction. Second, both Instruction and Student Services will be managed by VPs or Associate VPs who have an obligation to operate as a team to integrate their functions with each other and internally. Horizontal cooperation is encouraged at all levels.

Workload for both Vice presidents is expected to be reduced. One of the clear problems with the current organizational design structure is that all the VPs are overworked. This has occurred both because they have too many functions assigned to them and because many of the day-to-day operational issues for the college are brought to them when they might be handled better at a lower level if there was a more effective organizational design. RST's recommendation addresses the vice presidential

workload problem in a number of ways. In the Instructional and Student Services area, the majority recommendation creates three Associate Vice presidents - two for Instruction and one for Student Services - who will have primary responsibility for those areas. The minority recommendation creates two Associate Vice presidents for Instruction and Student Services. Either model should serve to reduce the Vice president for Instruction and Student Services workload. In addition, some of the workload for both Vice presidents should be reduced by the recommended creation of a Human Resources Department that will more effectively handle personnel problems currently handled by the Vice presidents.

Ensure strategic planning. Strategic planning should be enhanced by the recommended organizational design for several reasons. Reducing the workload for the Vice presidents should free time for them to engage in and ensure that strategic planning takes place. Further, the team based management structure provides that the President, the VPs, the Associate VPs, and the directors of Human Resources, Budget, and Research and Development will collaborate together on strategic planning and work to ensure that strategic planning takes place at all levels of the college. The minority recommendation would build an element of this collaboration directly into the organizational design.

Minimizes hierarchy. The two recommended structures keep the organizational design flatter by minimizing the number of layers. No new Executive Vice president is created. New positions are at the Associate Vice president level. This already exists in College Operations in the form of an Associate Vice president of Information Technology. This acknowledges the important role all parts of the college play in delivering college services and avoids the impression that one part of the college is more important than another. At the same time it recognizes the importance of Instruction to the college by allocating significant management resources to these college functions.

The VPs remain responsible for directly managing significant areas of the college. This serves to keep the VPs grounded in the daily operations of the college. This minimizes hierarchy by creating a "thicker" layer, rather than separate layers, e.g., having Associate VPs between the VPs and all the functions of the college.

Minimizes cost. As a group we are concerned about the potential added cost and priorities of adding administrative personnel at the top of the organizational structure. Our recommendations reflect our concern over cost and priorities. In making our recommendation we did not have budget figures to work from, although President Moskus indicated at the beginning of the process that he felt it would be cost neutral. We are concerned that any added costs not be at the expense of lower level management, faculty, classified staff, or programs.

Both RST recommendations call for two Vice presidents. Differences in compensation between the Vice presidents should reflect the different responsibilities of their job. The majority recommendation includes four Associate Vice presidents. This is comparable to

the number of positions created in either Option A or Option B sent to the RST by President Moskus. The minority recommendation has one less Associate Vice President.

Moves the college toward the future within the framework of collaboration based upon teamwork and shared governance. Finally, RST's goal is to create an organizational design that moves the college toward a future of increased collaboration embodied by fuller use of team based management and shared governance. RST feels this is an evolutionary process. We believe the proposed majority recommendation is an achievable interim step in this evolution. It is infused by these ideals at various levels and includes the team-based management recommended at the executive management level. At the same time we believe that the model recommended by the minority represents the direction the college should move towards as it strategically plans for the future of Lane Community College.

ADDITIONAL CONCERNS

Keeping the name. Concerns were raised by people currently in College Operations that they do not like the name "Administrative Support" and would prefer to keep the name College Operations. Feedback we received indicated 1) the name College Operations more accurately reflects their functions, 2) that the name chosen by the team is part of their identity, and 3) the acronym for Administrative Support Services is unacceptable. We recommend that the people within this area of the college decide for themselves what name they will adopt.

Strategic planning should be a college-wide process and not solely the domain of high-level administrators. Strategic planning should be inclusive and should include representatives from students, classified and faculty.

Question II: Do we need a full-time Evening/ Weekend/ Summer Administrator? Explain.

CONSENSUS RECOMMENDATION

> No. The Evening/Weekend/Summer program concerns would not be best addressed through creating a full-time administrator.

Instead, the RST recommends that the responsibility for the Evening/Weekend/Summer programs be assigned to a high-level administrator (VP or Associate VP), who, along with other responsible people or units, should work with a steering team of stakeholders. These individuals should meet regularly to address and resolve issues collectively. In addition, a classified assistant would provide administrative support and follow-through.

RATIONALE AND CRITERIA FOR RECOMMENDATION

Disadvantages of a separate administrator. A separate administrator has the disadvantages of: high cost; lack of integration among departments; potential for competition for students/FTE between day and night courses, and potential for competition between academic year and summer courses (criteria #1, 3, 4, 6).

Previous research. This has shown that community residents want evening/weekend/ summer classes (see *Community Perceptions and Needs Survey, 1996*), but the college has not yet allotted the resources and emphases required to make the program substantial and cohesive (criteria #1, 3, 4, 6).

Three different functions. We have identified three different functions (advocate/leader, evening/weekend/summer steering team, and administrative coordinator) relevant to question 2, and believe that these functions can be addressed without appointing a separate Evening/Weekend/Summer administrator. The task of developing the Evening/Weekend/Summer program should be a shared endeavor, not one Administrator's job (criteria #1, 3, 4, 6).

IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

Based on college-wide feedback, the restructuring team has concluded that the Evening/Weekend/ Summer program exhibits the need for: leadership, advocacy, infrastructure support, coordination among departments and college services, commitment to the community, marketing, coordination in programming and service delivery, innovative curriculum development, responsiveness to the needs of the various student populations served, and a help desk or point person during evenings and weekends. These needs would best be addressed by the collaborative, overlapping

work of the responsible VP, the steering team, and the classified assistant/ administrative coordinator.

Advocate/Leader. A VP should be given the assignment of developing the Evening, Weekend and Summer programs. This person could take on the responsibility to advocate for resources, coordinate budget allocation, develop marketing strategies, request and facilitate community feedback, analyze curriculum needs, track the relative success of the programs, and coordinate and implement the efforts and recommendations of the steering team.

The Evening/Weekend/Summer Steering Team. The steering team may consist of college-wide, cross-discipline stakeholders who meet regularly to: identify college services and adapt them to meet community needs; facilitate the integration and collaboration of evening/weekend/summer courses by developing a familiarity with the various policies that are used cross-campus; analyze strengths and weaknesses of methods, communicate findings to departments; act jointly as program developers; resolve issues and conflicts in scheduling; expand and clarify curriculum; discuss issues; facilitate curriculum decisions; and help plan community outreach and advertising.

Administrative Coordinator. Feedback indicates that instructors, students, managers, and the community would like to have a point person to handle questions related to evening and weekend programs.

ADDITIONAL CONCERNS

Unique characteristics. It should be emphasized that the three components discussed here each have their own unique characteristics. That is, the evening courses, weekend courses and summer courses may have differing needs, qualities, and areas of concern. It would be ineffective to lump them together as a simple homogeneous area. Differences among these areas, as well as their commonalties, should be addressed.

We need to be responsive to the multiple needs of the community. Evening/weekend/ summer courses may or may not be the same as the daytime courses and the traditional academic year. Some students work during the day and need alternative times for courses that are offered during the day to complete their educational goals. Some students seek modular courses for skills upgrading. Consequently, it may be necessary to integrate credit and noncredit courses and day and evening courses in order to accommodate community needs.

Integration. There was a large amount of feedback that emphasized the need for integrating the evening/weekend/summer class offerings with the daytime schedule and the traditional academic year, rather than attempting to build a separate Evening/ Weekend/ Summer college.

Current system of rotating managers. By itself, the current system of rotating managers for evening duty has not met the needs of the Evening/Weekend/Summer program because it does nothing to address programming and service delivery. However, some feedback reflected that managers might continue this duty, since it provides exposure to an overview of the college. This rotation could continue if it was beneficial, but it would not replace any of the three aspects outlined in Implementation Considerations.

Sufficient funds for daytime sections. Some people expressed the concern that evening and weekend classes not be developed at the expense of daytime sections. There is currently more daytime demand than sections available.

Question III: How can our staff development needs best be administered?

CONSENSUS RECOMMENDATION

> The function of staff development should be assigned to a newly formed Human Resources unit with a management leader who would report to the president.

The result should be a greater commitment to staff development and a more focused effort that would assist in maximizing resources. In this alignment, human resources would be responsible for coordinating staff and organizational development and its college-wide budget. Professional development teams should be maintained with special attention to better meet the needs of classified employees through this new Human Resources department. A more systematic effort should improve individual performance and advance the college.

RATIONALE AND CRITERIA FOR RECOMMENDATION

Maintain responsiveness and flexibility of current system. The staff in Training and Development should be recognized for their efforts. The RST heard positive comments about their ability to respond when a need surfaces. They were personally applauded for specific activities and the attention given to requests. It was noted that this responsiveness and flexibility should be integral to any organizational structure (criteria #8).

Need for increased commitment to staff development. There was a consistent message that there is a lack of college-wide commitment to staff development. There is a limited budget and lack of importance placed on it. A need for professionalism and elevated status in the organization was a key theme expressed around the restructuring process (criteria #1, 11).

The RST heard from many people that staff development is key to the success of an organization, especially a learning college. Elevating its importance as a separate function in a Human Resources unit with a superordinate who reports to the president should improve its success (criteria #1, 8).

Continue professional development teams. The "grassroots" efforts in professional development, which are administered by the faculty professional development and management professional development committees, were applauded. Continued efforts in these areas are recommended. Most of the dollars expended for staff development are concentrated in these areas.

Several respondents to this question made reference to the need for classified professional development funds to be increased and administered in a similar fashion to management and faculty professional development. It was pointed out that in the past

money that had been set aside for this effort had been removed by the classified unit to use for salary increases. This, however, does not diminish the importance of this need (criteria #8).

Increased and improved coordination. Stronger coordination is needed in the area of staff development. Consistencies of purpose and best use of resources are the pressing needs. Even though the efforts of the individual unit committees seem to be going well, coordination among these groups and efforts to combine resources could certainly benefit the college. There also appear to be problems making sure the outreach centers can be equally involved in college-wide staff development activities (criteria #3, 4).

Organizational staff development dollars could be used in a more cost-effective manner. Currently, there is not enough systematic targeting and assessment of staff development. The system should ensure that the dollars being spent are actually improving skills that are most needed by employees to better serve students. Ways of measuring effectiveness and targeting needs could be coordinated by a more centralized system (criteria #1, 4).

Issues surfaced around administering staff development in the areas of timeliness of training. If staff are trained in a skill and then do not have the means to use that skill in a timely way, the skill must be re-learned. For example, it was pointed out that staff attended e-mail training, but did not receive their "clearance" to use the system for an extended period (criteria #4, 8).

Professional development teams should be continued with increased interface and coordination among teams. Collaboration would maximize resources by reducing duplication. Staff development should be better targeted to improve staff performance (criteria #3, 4, 9).

IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

The staff development function should be transferred to a newly formed human resources unit. The responsibility for administration of the budget, coordination, publicity, and campus-wide programs should be assigned to the director of this department. In the process of the transfer of this function, it is important that the flexibility and responsiveness of the current system not be lost. Attention, also, should be paid to the professional development needs of the classified staff.

Question IV: Should Personnel, AA/EO/Diversity, Labor Relations, and possibly Staff Development, be led by one superordinate? Why or why not?

CONSENSUS RECOMMENDATIONS

A professional, comprehensive Human Resources (HR) department should be established. This department could provide smoother and more coordinated service to the staff and college as a whole.

RST reached consensus on all of the following recommendations:

1. A professional, comprehensive Human Resources (HR) department should be established.

2. A single individual should direct the Human Resources department. This director should be highly skilled in personnel systems, labor relations, staff development, and AA/EO/Diversity, with significant experience, competence, effectiveness, and vision in these areas.

3. The director should report to the president. The title of the position should depend on the scope of work and workload. This reduces the number of reports to the president by two individuals, which from the area presently includes the Personnel director, AA/EO director, and labor relations representative.

4. Staff development should be included as one function of the Human Relations (HR) department, separately and not under Personnel. Staff development includes organizational development and professional development. Organizational development is best led through HR to align it with labor relations, personnel services, and strategic aims of the college. Professional development for employee groups is best led and administered through those groups, (See question 3) with budgets and staff support provided through HR.

5. The HR unit should practice pro-active collaboration internally on a regular basis among its functions of personnel services, collective bargaining/work roles and relations, Affirmative Action/Equal Opportunity/Diversity support and compliance, and staff development.

6. HR should be connected to the whole college through strategic coordination with the vice presidents and with employee collective bargaining representatives, through practicing and supporting movement to a team-based work structure, and by providing infrastructure support for professional development.

RATIONALE AND CRITERIA FOR RECOMMENDATION

Establishing a Human Relations department. Feedback from the college community was strongly in favor of this change, and showed that the current structure is not able to keep up with the demands on it. The recommendation is based on supporting and managing human resources better, which are optimally served in an aligned, comprehensive manner. Feedback pointed out that other large enterprises have moved these functions to a Human Resources department in order to address the concerns identified at Lane. This restructuring provides an opportunity to more effectively position us for the future as well as the present. The new department supports efficiencies and effectiveness that will increase staff time across the campus to improve service to students and student learning. Staff learning will be directly supported. In addition, staff quality of work life will be enhanced by effective organizational and professional development, and also by giving staff more time and resources to better serve student learning (criteria #1, 3, 7,9, 10, 11).

More effective organization. A functioning HR department would increase integration and reduce fragmentation of existing functions, silos and duplication. An HR department would facilitate vertical and horizontal communication by reducing the complexity of upward reporting and increasing alignment in horizontal relationships, which makes communication simpler and more accountable. This change reduces the disruption and inefficient use of human and financial resources which comes from inconsistent, duplicated, fragmented, and isolated human relations functions (criteria #3, 6).

Best use of resources. The recommendations aim at using resources at an optimum level and addressing resource challenges. Our human resources are arguably Lane's most important resource. There are expected increases in effectiveness in the individual and collective capacity and morale of staff, since the change will enhance the workflow and align support for productive work roles and relations across the campus. This can be accomplished without adding a new position; however, this decision is left open. The RST encourages implementation that is effective and pays attention to costs. Additionally, the recommendations reduce reports to the president by two (criteria #4, 5, 8).

Decision process. The recommendations flow from evidence-based data, and were the end product of a process of gathering college-wide data including from people most affected, the selection of a diverse and representative RST, and a discussion process which reached consensus on all the recommendations. Further, the recommendations do not make change for change sake, but meet widely recognized challenges at Lane and integrate commonly implemented best practices (criteria #10, 12).

Question V: Should CIT and Business Technologies be separated? Explain.

CONSENSUS RECOMMENDATION

Yes. Computer Information Technology (CIT) and Business Technologies (BT) should be separated.

Consensus was reached by agreeing to the following stipulations:

1. CIT should be an independent unit with a manager as opposed to a faculty lead.

2. Any new CIT manager should be hired via an open process. Due to its size and costs, however, alternatives to a full-time manager should be explored.

3. Collaboration between CIT, BT, and other applicable areas is expected to continue to occur in the offering of computer related courses.

4. These parties must show mutual respect and professional behavior.

5. This recommendation should be evaluated for the next two years to monitor that adopted changes have actually improved performance and student learning. Within this evaluation process, FTE generation should not be recognized as the only indicator of "success." If performance and collaboration improvements have not occurred, this recommendation of separation should be reconsidered.

6. Computer Industry-standard certificate courses should be mainstreamed into CIT, BT or other curricula when and as appropriate.

RATIONALE AND CRITERIA FOR RECOMMENDATION

Discrete disciplines. The Restructuring Steering Team agrees with input which sees CIT and BT as discrete disciplines with largely disparate functions, philosophies, and target audiences. Support exists for viewing CIT as a discipline in itself, and not as a subset of BT or other instructional disciplines. BT is only one of many directions a student may proceed in obtaining and using computer training. Identifying CIT as a subset of a Business program is seen as potentially limiting (criteria #1, 2, 7, 8, 11)

Curriculum overlap is a concern. Duplication or overlap of courses is of concern. This is also addressed by the president as a possible rationale for leaving CIT and BT combined. The RST concludes that the issue of overlap alone is not sufficient to counter the primary recommendation (criteria #2).

CIT is a high growth, rapidly changing area. The RST accepts the rationale that CIT is a high-growth area paralleling the technology industry as a whole, and is likely to match or exceed the size of other divisions in the near future. The recommended separation aims to strategically position CIT for future expansion and responsiveness to changes in the computer industry, which will likely result in similar changes to Lane offerings. This should enhance student and staff learning in clarifying access to computer courses, though this is not meant to imply that all computer courses should be offered through or coordinated by CIT. Industry access to partnerships with the college should also be enhanced (criteria #1, 2, 11).

BT has high growth potential. While growth is likely in the CIT area, BT is also recognized as having a high growth potential. Growth into new fields should be managed in concert with BT and other departments that use computers and other technology to support learning. Business Technologies faculty have long been known for their ability to adapt to changing technologies in an office environment and for strong commitment to student learning. This recommendation is not meant to detract from that, but it is hoped that these recommendations give BT room to grow and explore these areas (criteria #1, 2, 11).

Cost concerns. Several concerns were raised regarding the costs of a new manager for CIT. The RST recommends that various alternatives be explored, including the possibility of a less-than-full-time manager (criteria #4).

Recognition of prior history, new expectations. Finally, the RST recognizes that current and historical conflicts between BT and CIT have influenced the current organizational structure. Our recommendations have striven to avoid personality-based conclusions, while recognizing the importance of staff quality of work (criteria #9, 10).

IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

In making these recommendations, the RST emphasizes the following:

Additional on-campus partnerships should be explored, including but not limited to cooperative arrangements with Computer Services and the Associate VP of Information Technology.

ADDITIONAL CONCERNS

A process to ensure collaboration among units across the college needs to be instituted to reduce duplication and confusion for the public

Question VI: Is the Business cluster appropriate? (See also Option B.) Explain.

CONSENSUS RECOMMENDATION

The configuration of the departments shown in the "Business Cluster" as shown in Option A or Option B is NOT appropriate. These departments could better function if a MODIFIED version of Option A was implemented (see recommended organizational charts, Appendix B).

A new division should be formed that contains Business Administration (BA) and Business Technology (BT) and could be expanded well beyond these two existing units into areas which include related transfer credit programs currently not explicitly served at Lane and new service industry programs. The division chair for this unit should ensure a visionary exploration and accomplishment of this potential expansion, collaboration with other parts of the college, preservation of existing diverse strengths and capacities and the solidification of its identity.

RST reached consensus on all of its recommendations:

1. BA and BT are of the same discipline, and should operate within the same division, but as separate programs.

2. A skilled division manager should be charged with the responsibility of organizing and supporting BA and BT so they effectively work together. This manager should also ensure collaboration with the Workforce Development Center and provide visionary leadership for these departments to work together. He or she should use the extensive involvement of staff in exploring future potential for these programs (criteria #1, 2, 3, 6).

3. CIT, BT, and BA serve individual students in academic disciplines, and should report to the same VP for Instruction.

4. BDC, BIS, and T&D work with both businesses and individuals and are often required to quickly respond to employers' needs as they arise. It is, therefore, logical that they all report to the same VP or Associate VP of Instruction and Student Services.

5. BDC, BIS, and T&D should be within one unit but may maintain separate program foci with a single point of contact for employers and businesses. This would enable employers and businesses to be directed to the most appropriate department for the type of training or services they need from the college.

RATIONALE AND CRITERIA FOR RECOMMENDATION

In the written and verbal feedback reported, the committee determined that there were four recurring themes:

The cluster as stated in Option B is too broad, and there is not enough commonality across all five departments to justify grouping them into a single cluster (criteria #7).

The populations served by these departments are very different, except between Business Industry Services, Business Development Center, and Training and Development (criteria #2).

The departments with academic disciplines (BA, BT, and CIT) should be located under the "Instruction" grouping of the organizational chart along with the other academic departments (criteria #3, 6).

It is not necessary to cluster departments together or put them in the same division in order for them to communicate and collaborate with each other (criteria #6, 7).

IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

The need for collaboration and communication between all these departments is extremely important! A system should be developed to enhance communication within overlapping areas.

Established programs should be considered for mainstreaming into the regular curriculum.

The President, the VP, and Associate VP responsible for these areas should ensure integration between the service activities related to these departments.

Question VII: What is the best configuration for Continuing Education/ Outreach/ Workforce Development?

CONSENSUS RECOMMENDATION

The best configuration for Continuing Education/Outreach/Workforce Development is to group them in one column in the organizational chart.

This column would include:

Continuing Education

Outreach Centers

Downtown Center

Cottage Grove Center

Florence Center

Community Learning Centers

Workforce Development Center

Business Development Center

Business & Industry Services

Training & Development

RST reached consensus on all of its recommendations:

1. The Business Development Center, Business & Industry Services, and Training & Development should be combined as a unit (Workforce Development Center).

2. The workforce development unit should be a team effort with someone from the unit held accountable to ensure collaboration, coordination and strategic planning between the parts.

3. This unit should come up with a name for themselves. The college as a whole is engaged in workforce development.

4. When possible Continuing Education needs to combine non-credit classes with discipline-specific strengths of credit programs to serve new markets (certificate programs, professional upgrading, "bridge' classes, etc.). This combination could test new and innovative programs that can be mainstreamed into the curriculum if proven to be able to withstand the test of time.

5. The President, appropriate ISS VP, and the Workforce Development unit should make the decision as to how the unit can work best and the most effective management structure. Possible options include: a unit manager from the unit on a rotating basis, add a director and keep the managers, one manager, or work as a team concept under the VPs supervision.

RATIONALE AND CRITERIA FOR RECOMMENDATION

Continuing Education is a growing field with great potential in FTE growth. The strength of Continuing Education is in the speed of response and flexibility to best serve the needs of the community. The expectation in the past has been that this area of development could get along by itself. In the future Continuing Education needs strategic planning and vision to focus on its ability to configure around markets, strategic markets, or large niches which are clearly advantageous to the college (criteria #2).

Outreach should include the Downtown Center, Cottage Grove, Florence, and all of the CLCs; they are all places in which instruction is delivered, and which exist to serve specific geographical areas of the county. Besides establishing relationships and a presence in specific communities, they share several things in common: such as, facilities maintenance, working with credit and non-credit sides of the organization to deliver instruction and accessing services from the main campus (e.g., mail and technology). This outreach grouping would be responsive in dealing with specific issues and coordinating communication, marketing, and direction. Strategic planning and simplified reporting are served by team management with the team reporting to the VP (criteria #2).

The Workforce Development configuration of the Business Development Center (BDC), Business & Industry Services (BIS), and Training & Development (T & D) in collaboration with each other will establish relationships with businesses in an optimum way. These three programs by being placed in the same unit will institute better strategic planning, big picture vision, and direct focus into the forefront of workforce development. They will cover the continuum of the workforce: self-employed, re-entry workforce, and incumbent workforce. This unit configuration will enhance the perception to the business community that Lane maintains and operates a " Business Center." The unit will have one point of contact for businesses and will eliminate the practice of businesses shopping for services. This configuration will bring synergy and collaboration between the groups rather than competition. This unit will provide an advantage for growth by generating more FTE, combining similar functions, and the overall point of services will become stronger (criteria #2, 3, 4).

Relationships could be strengthened between Lane's faculty and businesses. New innovative programs for the college could be started in these groups as non-credit and then integrated into the credit side of the college. This would give programs a "safe" space especially if there were built-in incentives for departments (criteria #4, 7).

IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- The entire unit needs more strategic planning, vision, and resources to optimize the potential growth in FTE.

- Outreach needs more attention from the college to fulfill the potential that exists.

ADDITIONAL CONCERNS

Some complexity and flexibility in structure will need to exist in the Workforce Development unit. Some services and administration will have duplication because of funding. These "bookkeeping challenges" will add complexity to the unit configuration, but are possible under a model of collaboration and unity.

The following describes the funding challenges above:

- BDC is on partial cost recovery. The college pays much of the personnel costs and about 55 percent of BDC's total budget. Some personnel are paid by grants entirely; other parts are paid by grants, other parts by the college; and some parts are paid by program income.

- BIS is on almost total cost recovery in regards to staffing and training offerings. This budget system does not create an environment for collaboration.

- T & D is almost completely reliant on grants. The college pays some personnel costs for T & D.

Question VIII: Which configuration is better, Option A or Option B?

CONSENSUS RECOMMENDATION

Neither of the configurations in Model Two Option A or B is appropriate. A modified version of the two options is recommended for implementation (see recommended organizational charts, Appendix B).

On most aspects of the Center for Learning Advancement, the RST achieved consensus as noted in the Consensus Recommendation. There was one point of disagreement in terms of the configuration within the two subdivisions and who should determine the composition of the subdivisions, which is reflected in the Majority and Minority Recommendations.

CONSENSUS RECOMMENDATION (10 OF 10, 1 ABSENT)

To more effectively address the needs of Lane's underprepared students, minimize duplication and assist in creating a more seamless system, it is recommend that:

1. A Center for Learning Advancement should be created with two subdivisions composed of the following existing departments: Academic Learning Skills, Tutoring, English as a Second Language/International English as a Second Language (ESL/IESL), and Adult Basic and Secondary Education (Adult Skills Development, Adult High School, GED, Guided Learning Options, Adults with Special Needs, Literacy Program).

2. The Center for Learning Advancement should be located within Instruction.

3. There should be two full-time managers for the Center for Learning Advancement, since it will be considerably larger than other current divisions.

4. One of the managers within the unit should be charged with and held accountable for ensuring collaboration, coordination and strategic planning within the subdivisions, and should report to an Associate VP or VP for Instruction.

5. The Testing Office, the TRIO Program and Disability Services should remain within Student Services. (Note: this recommendation is consistent with the Students First! Redesign recommendation for these areas.)

6. ESL/IESL should be combined with the Center for Learning Advancement, but only if the following concerns are adequately addressed:

   - The ESL Program needs to be housed at the downtown center for accessibility by the student population it serves.

- ESL and IESL need to be kept together to maintain budget integrity and program viability.

- The ESL Program needs adequate administrative office support for their large budget, complex federal reporting responsibilities and compliance mandates.

- ESL/IESL's successful, team based leadership model should not be disrupted by this restructuring process.

- Structure should allow for the ESL Program to remain flexible and responsive to student needs.

7. The Center for Learning Advancement should create its own name. Since its components are not all housed together in one center, the Center for Learning Advancement may not be the most appropriate name.

MAJORITY RECOMMENDATION (9 OF 10, 1 ABSENT)

A Center for Learning Advancement should be one unit with two separately managed, but integrated, subdivisions composed of the following departments:

Subdivision #1:   Academic Learning Skills (ALS), Tutoring, and ESL/IESL

Subdivision #2:   ABSE (Adult Skills Development, Adult High School, GED, Guided Learning Options, Adults with Special Needs, Literacy Program)

The departments identified in these subdivisions are only a suggestion. The RST would encourage the president to meet with the managers and staff in these areas to explore what composition for the subdivisions they perceive would be most effective.

MINORITY RECOMMENDATION (1 OF 10, 1 ABSENT)

The minority recommendation is that the two subdivisions not be initially established but be decided by the president and the ISS VP based on an assessment of the opportunities, challenges and vision for the whole division. This recommendation is based on dealing with a historical legacy of under-appreciation of staff in parts of this division and strong concerns about identity affected by association between parts of this unit. These attitudes affect both students and staff. Deeper resolution of these issues would be encouraged if discussion of these issues take place before subdivisions are established (criteria #1, 2, 3, 8, 9, 10, 11).

RATIONALE AND CRITERIA FOR RECOMMENDATION

Incorporating written and verbal input about the Center for Learning Advancement configuration, the RST provides the following rationale for the above recommendations.

The Assessment and Testing Office. The Testing Office should remain within the Counseling Department in Student Services to best support student learning and needs (criteria #1) for the following reasons:

- While the Testing Office works collaboratively with several college departments, its most extensive working relationship is with the Counseling and Advising Department. The Testing Office is in constant contact with the other interrelated functions of the Counseling Department and believes that if it were separated from Counseling the ease in which students flow between the offices and the quality of services to students would be negatively impacted (criteria #2, 7, 8, 9 12).

- A professional alliance exists between the Testing Office and the Counseling Office, since they are both governed by the same professional ethical guidelines, e.g. American Psychological Association (criteria #1 and 7).

Disability Services. To most effectively meet student needs, Disability Services should be located under Student Services.

- Disability Services is a support service to students providing services and accommodations to a wide range of students and impacting all areas of the college. It is not an academic or remedial program, and only serves a limited number of students involved in Academic Learning Services, ABSE, or similar programs. To combine Disability Services with unrelated programs would be confusing for students and would make accessing the services difficult for students (criteria #2, 12).

The TRIO Program. The TRIO Program should be placed with the Counseling Department under Student Services because

- It allows for effective and efficient workflow between counseling, advising, financial aid, disability services and TRIO enhancing student learning and accessibility (criteria #1, 2, 8, 9, 12).

- Regulations that govern the TRIO Program do not allow services to students who are in Adult Basic Education, Adult High School, ESL programs, and GED programs. TRIO participants must be enrolled in college courses and seeking college degrees at two- or four-year institutions. To combine these programs would be confusing for students, since some students would be eligible for services while others would not (criteria #2).

- There were concerns expressed that the combination of the TRIO Program with Academic Learning Skills, ABSE or remedial or developmental programs may jeopardize the continued funding of the TRIO Program. A remedial focus is incongruent with the US Department of Education (DOE) mission, goal and objectives for the grant (criteria #11).

- The TRIO Program is a successful model. If the college were to expand this model, it would clearly remain with Counseling because of its case management supportive environment (criteria #7, 11).

The Tutoring Center. The Tutoring Center should be placed with Academic Learning Skills (ALS) in Instruction.

- Since the new Tutoring Center will serve all students across most areas of instruction, it would be beneficial for it to be structurally connected to Instruction and ALS. A primary advantage for this connection would be so communication and coordination between individual departments, ALS, and the Tutoring Center could occur with ease and efficiency to effectively meet students' learning needs (criteria #1, 7, 12).

- Both Tutoring and ALS are bridge programs to other credit departments, presently have integrated budgets and similar goals, and will soon be located in close proximity. Therefore, there are some benefits for students and staff for the two departments being in the same unit (criteria #1, 7, 12).

English as a Second Language and International English as a Second Language. ESL/IESL should remain together as one unit and be combined with Academic Learning Services under Instruction within the Center for Learning Advancement, if the considerations noted above are met. This proposal would

- Strengthen current links; e.g., ALS has an ESL program, offers ESL classes and has employee ESL specialists (criteria #1,3, 7).

- Possibly enhance bridging ESL/IESL students to credit and non-credit classes and increase FTE for the college (criteria #1, 2, 3, 4, 11).

Adult Basic and Secondary Education (ASD, GED, AHS, GLO, Adults with Special Needs, Literacy Program) should remain together as a unit

- Due to budgetary considerations, e.g. joint funding sources at the state level.

- To maintain optimal utilization of resources and current integration of services and staff, e.g. several faculty in ASD also teach in AHS (criteria # 4, 7, 8, 9).

- Because all ABSE programs have specialized state (TOPS) reporting requirements which are captured and reported by the same clerical staff. The separation of ABSE programs would result in a duplication of effort (criteria #3, 8, 12).

Located within Instruction. To support effective student learning and enhance the delivery of quality learning services, the Center for Learning Advancement should be within Instruction (criteria # 1, 7).

Note: The criteria, rationale and recommendations for the proposed vice president structure and Business Cluster and the Continuing Education/Outreach/Workforce Development configurations in Options A and B have been outlined in questions one, six and seven.

IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

Credit and non-credit departments should work together to address the needs of Lane's underprepared students.

This configuration should be reviewed for effectiveness and revisions suggested by the Vanguard Underprepared Students Committee and affected departments, as appropriate.

Appendix A

Additional Feedback and Comments on Issues
Unrelated to the Eight Restructuring Questions

Additional Feedback and Comments on Issues
Unrelated to the Eight Restructuring Questions

During the restructuring process, the Restructuring Steering Team received a tremendous amount of information beyond the input focusing on the president's eight questions. The following is a sample of some of the additional input submitted:

- **Institutional Advancement, the Foundation, and the Library.** There were varying suggestions about the location of Institutional Advancement, the Foundation and the Library on Model 2, however, most of the suggestions focused on their reporting structure, , e.g. to report directly to the president or a vice president.

- **Institutional Research, Assessment and Planning, and Curriculum and Scheduling.** Several people suggested that Curriculum and Scheduling should be placed with Institutional Research, Assessment and Planning, since they work closely together and have some staff who work within both areas.

- **Distance Learning.** It was strongly recommended that in restructuring Distance Learning, the president, and RST utilize a process that solicits direct feedback from the individuals involved, , e.g. existing DL office, faculty who teach telecourses and on-line, the Associate VP for Information Technology who is preparing recommendations about the IT areas, etc.

- **Need for Administrative Support Positions.** When creating management positions, the president and the RST should not forget that the new managers will need administrative support positions.

- **Events Position.** It was suggested that the events position in Curriculum and Scheduling be moved to BIS in the new Workforce Development Center to assist in the coordination of college events and more fully utilize resources.

- **No More Layers.** There was a theme throughout the restructuring process that staff "did not want more layers" and a concern that more layers would create a bottleneck or increased communication difficulties.

- **Why Now?** There were several comments: a) questioning the reason that the college had decided to restructure prior to the new president being hired; and b) suggesting that it would have made more sense to wait until the new president arrives, so s/he could have had input into the restructuring process.

- **Alignment with Budget and Bond Construction Processes.** As the president and board proceed with restructuring, it is important for the restructuring process to be integrated into and aligned with the budget and bond construction processes and for other issues—FTE reporting implications, program completion and transcripting—to be considered.

Final Thoughts about Restructuring ……………

- "As with any organizational redesign process, the key to its success will depend upon the individuals who occupy the various positions within the structure. The organizational chart or structure is not as important as the quality of the people, and how they choose (or don't choose), to relate to each other and to everyone in the college." (Restructuring Participant)

- Consequently, the restructuring effort supports Critical Issue #4: The Central Role of Staff and Alignment of Internal Systems in Lane's Strategic Plan.

  "Lane's highly skilled and dedicated staff (managers, faculty and classified) play the pivotal role in Lane's ability to achieve its vision of a learning-centered environment. To support its staff, Lane must organize work processes and governance structures that: 1) encourage collective responsibility for the learning environment, 2) maximize staff participation and decision making, 3) support the design and implementation of new initiatives and innovations, and 4) align resources with priorities."

- "The primary goal of restructuring should be better collaboration" in which departments and individuals on campus work more collaboratively horizontally and vertically as one unified college. (Restructuring Participant)

- Organizational redesign should never be utilized or expected to eliminate or "fix" personnel problems or management issues.

- Once a decision about the new organization is made, it should be supported by the college, "which includes not caving into the inevitable pressures of people who think differently."

- Redesigning the organization is only the first step in implementing a new organizational structure. Successful redesign efforts include developing infrastructure to support the new organizational structure, providing the needed professional development for staff at all levels to effectively implement the changes, allocating funding specifically designated for its implementation and maintenance, developing on-going processes to evaluate its effectiveness, etc.

Appendix B

Organizational Charts

- Current Organizational Chart

- Model Two

- Majority Recommended Organizational Chart

- Minority Recommended Organizational Chart