

# **Administrative Structure at Indiana University South Bend**

## **Analysis & Recommendations**

**By Dr. Alice Chandler**

September 16, 2002

Dr. Chandler is a writer, speaker, and consultant on higher education. She retired in 1996 after serving 16 years as president of the State University of New York at New Paltz. She had previously been acting president of the City College of the City University of New York. In 2000-01, she served as interim president of Ramapo College of New Jersey.

Dr. Chandler has been chairperson of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) and a board member of AASCU and the American Council on Education (ACE).

The author of 11 books and monographs, Dr. Chandler received the B.A., magna cum laude, from Barnard College and earned her M.A. and Ph.D. at Columbia University.

**Administrative Structure at**  
**Indiana University South Bend**

**Analysis and Recommendations**

**PREFACE**

*Indiana University at South Bend seeks to provide “a learning and working environment that attracts and retains students, faculty, and staff; fully develops and challenges individual talents throughout the community; encourages free and spirited collaboration; and maintains a commitment to quality.”*

*IUSB Campus Mission Statement*

Within the framework of this mission statement, the campus has identified six priorities:

- student access and success
- academic excellence
- community partnership
- public image
- diversity
- global perspective

Form follows function. Within the limits of budget and staffing, the managerial structure of a campus, should reflect and sustain the mission and goals of the institution. Form or structure should also be informed by a community of values: trust, teamwork, and a sense of stability. Without these basic values, an institution will not function well.

The advent of a dynamic new Chancellor gives IUSB the opportunity to review and revise its administrative structure in order support its stated goals and to fulfill its potential for future growth and development. This report is advisory to the Chancellor and, through her, to the larger IUSB campus community.

## BACKGROUND OF STUDY

After discussions with the Transition Team, Chancellor Una Mae Reck invited me, as a retired long-time college president, to serve as a consultant on the administrative structure of the campus. Prior to my visit on September 8-10, I reviewed a large number of IUSB documents. These included: the undergraduate and graduate catalogs, the academic handbook, the 1999-2000 Self-Study Report for the North Central Association, a local economic impact statement for the institution, fund-raising materials, and a selection of campus brochures, enrollment and retention surveys, and policy statements. The picture emerging from these reviews was certainly persuasive. IUSB is *the* public higher education institution for Northern Indiana--a major intellectual and cultural resource for its students and its region. It boasts a highly qualified faculty and a strong array of programs and activities.

Also emerging, however, were concerns about administrative structure and stability. The North Central Association "Report of a Visit to Indiana University South Bend" (November, 2000) cited the "lack of continuity in senior administrative positions" as hampering the campus's planning efforts. It also noted that "communication flow has been impeded" as a result of "administrative and staff changes and temporary appointments."<sup>i</sup> The Executive Summary for the Self-Study noted that "while change is valued at Indiana University South Bend, the reorganization and restructuring of administrative units and of student services have created feelings of uncertainty and anxiety."<sup>ii</sup> The full text of the self-study document itself noted the "lack of good data on how Indiana University's staffing levels compare to peer institutions."<sup>iii</sup> Clarifying and stabilizing the administration also ranked high as an institutional priority in many of the responses to the Transition Survey administered this summer.

My own visit to campus involved meetings with:

- Chancellor Una Mae Reck
- Transition Team members
- Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Alfred Guillaume
- Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration Mary Ann Zemke
- Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate
- Senior Associate Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs Jacqueline Caul
- Student Government representatives
- Campus Directions Committee members
- Acting Director of the Office of Information Technologies Beverly Church
- Academic Cabinet (Deans, Library, Enrollment, Registrar)
- Administrative Team (Human Resources, External Affairs, Facilities, Security)
- IUSB Advisory Board and Alumni Board
- Director of Development Jon Meyer
- Open Hearing attended by approximately 20 faculty, students, and staff

The following report contains a summary of my observations and a series of recommendations dealing with both the hardware (organizational structure) and software (human dynamics) that I believe IUSB must have in order to fulfill its mission and goals and to function as an effective, humane, and collegial campus.

I should like to thank Chancellor Reck for her unflagging support throughout the process. Many of the individual comments and concerns that did not find their way into the more generic content of this written report have been related to her in full. I should also like to thank all the participants in this study for their candor and courtesy.



### **INTERVIEW FINDINGS: BY MAJOR THEMES**

Two major themes that emerged from meetings with all the focus groups--students, staff, faculty, alumni, and the advisory board--were *communication* and *stability*. Messages were just not getting through, whether they were simply about the date of a club meeting or a grasp of the IUSB budget process. Neither day-by-day activities nor the larger purposes and directions of the institution appeared to be well understood. Many minor causes were seen as contributing to what some described as the “fog” on campus. The publication “Update” was praised. But other elements of normal campus information flow, written as well as oral, were termed inadequate. Messages were said to be garbled as they proceeded by from office to office by word of mouth, and some offices appeared to have hunkered down in isolation and did not communicate with each other, even when teamwork and information-sharing were vital. An absence of data hampered sound policy formation on topics ranging from student profiles to enrollment projections.

Much of the communications “fog” was blamed on administrative instability. The flattening of administrative structure in recent years may have resulted in cost savings, but the price seems to have been an excessive compartmentalization of functions and, at the same time, a confusion of responsibilities. Faculty and staff claimed that they often did not know which office did what, and some admitted that they sometimes shopped around among offices until they got an answer they liked.

The high number of acting or interim positions also impeded information flow. With 32 acting/interim appointees (now reduced to 24), a disproportionate number of administrators were new in their jobs and perhaps uncertain about their authority. A number of faculty and staff favored a return to the former over-all structure of four vice-chancellors: academic, administrative, student, and external. Most were pleased with the recent reorganization and consolidation of student services under the direction of a Senior Associate Vice Chancellor within Academic Affairs.

These two elements--inadequate communications and excessive acting/interim positions--also took their toll on *trust*. While this issue did not figure in discussions with students or external community representatives, a lack of trust was front and center with faculty and staff. The most frequent complaints concerned failures to follow standard search procedures and what appeared to many to be arbitrary changes in administrative personnel. But procedural failures in adhering to other stated personnel policies were also cited. Faculty appointments, reappointments, promotion, and tenure were not at issue. Those procedures were sound, it was argued. But the same rigor and fairness did not, many claimed, prevail on the administrative side.



### **INTERVIEW FINDINGS: BY CAMPUS PRIORITY**

Because the group discussions were candid and free-flowing, information and opinions were not necessarily addressed to the specific question of administrative structure. As noted, I shared a number of individual statements and concerns with Chancellor Reck in the course of my visit. But other statements were more generically applicable. The following salient comments are organized as they apply to IUSB's six priorities. (My inclusion of the following items does not necessarily imply my concurrence with them, but does at a minimum show that I think them significant.)

#### **Student Access and Success:**

- Insufficient data hampers enrollment management. The absence of marketing information especially affects programming in Elkhart and other satellite locations. One long-time chair complained that the absence of good projections makes planning for course offerings a matter of intuition.
- More comprehensive information on student profiles would strengthen retention efforts. The shift toward younger and full-time students requires an enhancement of student services aimed at the young adult.
- IUSB needs to maintain an adequate base of full-time students.
- The new department-based student advising system has led to some confusion. Although students were also critical of the previous freshman-year system, they are concerned that the best departmental advisers are seriously overloaded. Students recommended the expansion of orientation to cover all incoming

freshmen and transfers. They were pleased that student affairs was being given more cohesion and visibility.

- Increasing numbers of students are using the Counseling Center, but its purposes and priorities should be clarified.
- The relatively high number of international students is an asset for IUSB.
- Increasing the number of student jobs on campus would significantly help retention. A single office should serve as a clearinghouse for this information.

#### Academic Excellence:

- IUSB needs to decide whether it will be “all things to all people” or emphasize special areas of excellence as they relate to regional needs.
- General education requirements should be more consistent across the schools.
- The requirements for students to remain in good academic standards should be identical across the schools and should be implemented consistently.
- Graduate studies should be reviewed. Some existing programs may be too under-enrolled to remain viable. The desirability and feasibility of new programs should be studied. Accelerated degree programs for undergraduates might move students into graduate study more rapidly.

#### Community Partnership and Public Image: (these two items tended to merge)

- Community spokespersons underscored the importance of IUSB as the only public university in Northern Indiana. Several of them advocated greater attention to Elkhart and other surrounding communities.
- IUSB is “Northern Indiana’s best-kept secret.” The campus should develop a better and more extensive communications network in order to maximize enrollments and expand fund-raising capabilities.
- IUSB students tend to remain in the region. The Alumni Board and the Advisory Board will help with networking and in enabling the new Chancellor to become visible.
- Faculty experts are a strong asset. The speaker’s bureau should be revived.

- Outreach programs to the schools help “at risk” students make the transition to college. IUSB should work closely with local high schools.

#### Diversity:

- Residence halls could help expand the geographic range and ethnic diversity of the campus. They would also help sustain international student enrollments.
- The president of the Student Association urged still greater attention to student diversity.
- The Affirmative Action officer noted progress in faculty and staff diversity.
- This consultant expressed concern that the large number of interim positions filled without a search, while technically in accordance with affirmative action guidelines, nonetheless bypassed the traditional starting point for all diversity efforts: identifying a broad pool of qualified candidates.

#### Global Perspective:

- International students provide international perspectives for the campus.



### **INTERVIEW FINDINGS: BY ADMINISTRATIVE AREA**

#### Chancellor's Office:

- Everyone agreed that the Chancellor's main tasks at this point were providing leadership in the development and implementation of IUSB's strategic plan, restoring trust and stability, improving internal and external communications for the institution, and fund-raising. For these tasks, she would need a desk cleared of excessive administrative tasks and sufficient support staff.
- It was generally agreed that Safety and Security, Facilities, and Human Resources should not report directly to the Chancellor. Student Government has already been reassigned to the new Student Affairs division. Affirmative Action should remain at the Chancellor's level.

- A few discussants mentioned that the Chancellor might benefit from the services of a special assistant.
- Relations between the individual IU campuses and the University Central Administration are not always well-understood. This applies especially to financial relationships.

#### Academic Affairs:

- The consolidation of student services under a senior administrator within the academic affairs area is viewed as highly desirable. Such a reporting structure emphasizes the strong ties between teaching and learning and student support services.
- There appeared to be no support at this time for assigning academic affairs and student affairs to two vice chancellors. Such a division was seen necessary only if the current reporting structure fails.
- While graduate programs were discussed, the subject of a graduate director did not arise.

#### Administrative Affairs:

- Safety and Security, Human Resources, and Facilities were almost universally said to belong under the purview of the Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration. Several discussants were concerned over the physical state of the older buildings and the processing of work orders.
- Planning and budgeting for the campus are not well-understood. Many discussants recommended a return to previous budgeting processes, which allowed for more faculty input. There was consensus that the criteria and procedures for resource allocation should be clarified and opened up to campus comment.

#### Student Affairs:

- The organization of Student Affairs is discussed under Academic Affairs.
- A few participants wanted further information on the functioning of the Children's Center and advocated an expanded relationship with the teacher education program.

### External Affairs:

- Restoring the position of Vice Chancellor for External Affairs is universally seen as a high priority for IUSB. This vice chancellor would be responsible for internal and external communications, public relations and marketing, alumni and community affairs, and fund-raising.
- Event coordination is a problem on the IUSB campus. Some discussants thought that because it so frequently involved groups external to the campus community it would be most logically assigned to External Affairs.

### Information Technologies:

- I heard no objections to elevating the former position of Associate Vice Chancellor for Information Technologies to the Vice Chancellor level.

### Institutional Research:

- The position of Director of Institutional Research vied for highest priority with the position of Vice Chancellor for External Affairs. The campus was seen as “flying blind” in too many areas and as needing to develop a sound data base for decision-making.
- Less clarity existed on the reporting structure for OIR. More sentiment appeared to exist for placing it in Academic rather than Administrative Affairs. There were also concerns that the data being developed be useful rather than mere number crunching and that there be some consensus over the research priorities for such an office.



### **INTERVIEW FINDINGS: BY ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE**

- Failure to abide by existing search procedures was probably the single greatest irritant on campus.
- Some speakers criticized what they perceived as a lack of consistency and fairness in personnel actions for faculty and staff. These criticisms also involved claims

that appointees were not always notified as to the status or length of their appointments. The latter issue was also raised in regard to acting and interim appointees.

- The lack of performance programs for mid-management and professional staff is also a source of friction and concern.
- As previously noted, the differential standards applied by the various schools in establishing academic good standing for students was seen as problematic.
- The prioritization of work orders did not appear to be understood clearly.



#### **RECOMMENDATIONS: BY ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE:**

The following recommendations draw upon the campus opinions and concerns summarized in the preceding sections and also on my own long experience in college and university administration.

##### Chancellor's Office:

- Safety and Security, Facilities, and Human Resources: These three offices should be transferred to the Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration. These transfers should all occur within this academic year at two-to-three-month intervals to allow for the necessary adjustments. Safety and Security is ready to transfer immediately. The sequencing of Facilities and Human Resources should be at the Chancellor's discretion. In view of the importance of these areas, the Chancellor and the directors of each of these areas should conduct monthly progress meetings. The Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration should attend these meetings.
- Institutional Research and Planning: I recommend that a search begin immediately for this position and that the Director of Institutional Research and Planning--note addition of Planning to the title-- report directly to the Chancellor.

Many models exist for this office. The common denominator to all of them is the use of information resources to enable the campus to improve planning, processes, and outcomes; to set benchmarks and assessment goals; to provide a rich array of internal and external data banks; and to support the chancellor, vice chancellors and deans on specific issues as they arise. Such an office is essential for a campus currently engaged in a strategic planning process and possibly looking toward a new physical master plan as well. OIR is also essential to the development of a fact-based public image.

Organizational structures vary for OIR. It can be a separate vice chancellorship, reporting directly to the Chancellor (IUPUI model) or can be housed within academic or administrative affairs. My recommendation is that it report directly to the Chancellor: (1) because of the importance of the position at this juncture in the campus's history, (2) because of the benefits of fact-based information to a campus struggling with rumors and misunderstandings; and (3) because it will provide the Chancellor with some of the additional support she needs to operate efficiently.

I also recommend the creation of an Advisory Council for Institutional Research consisting of the Vice Chancellors for Academic Affairs, Administrative Affairs, and Information Technologies and one faculty representative chosen by the Faculty Senate from each of the schools.

It must be understood that the creation of an Office of Institutional Research will require at least one staff person and one clerical person if it is to function effectively.

- Special Assistant to the Chancellor: Creation of this position should be reconsidered before the start of the next academic year. Chancellor Reck at this point believes that she will function better without what might be viewed as an intermediary between her and the campus. I applaud her desire to be a "hands-on" chancellor, but believe that the press of her leadership duties, especially in the external arena, will eventually argue the value of such assistance.

#### Academic Affairs:

- Chancellor Reck has already made the most important changes here in organizing student services under a new Senior Associate Vice Chancellor for Student Services within Academic Affairs. These changes should be carefully monitored to assure that they are meeting student needs in the most effective manner.
- The responsibilities of the current post of Associate Vice Chancellor should be examined carefully before that position is searched. The question of title-- Associate or Assistant Vice Chancellor--should depend on the level of responsibility involved (see below for further discussion of this post).

- As indicated, no apparent interest in creating a Director of Graduate Studies and Research emerged in my discussions. Reconsideration of this position should await a complete review of current and potential graduate programs. One possible configuration would be to assign responsibility for graduate programs to what in that case would be an Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.
- The Child Care Center should continue to report to Academic Affairs, with appropriate fiscal input from the Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration. Its priority should be to serve the students, faculty, and staff of IUSB. As occurs on many campuses, the Center should be programmatically linked to the School of Education. Such linkages benefit teacher education students in giving them hands-on experience; they also enrich the resources of the child care center.

Administrative Affairs:

- Safety and Security, Facilities, and Human Resources should be transferred to the Vice Chancellor for Finance and Administration, in accordance with the provisions noted above.
- I see no need at this time to create an associate vice chancellor position to supervise these new units. It should be noted, however, the staffing requirements and levels of the Facilities office may expand as new construction gets underway.

Student Affairs:

- See Academic Affairs.

External Affairs:

- The position of Vice Chancellor for External Affairs should be searched immediately.
- Consideration should be given to a more expansive title, such as Vice Chancellor for External Affairs and Development or (my preference) Vice Chancellor for Institutional Advancement.
- Numerous models exist for organizing such an operation. None succeed unless without adequate support staff. IUSB should use the interview process with candidates for this vice chancellorship to clarify what the initial and subsequent needs would be in this area and develop a budgetary timetable for implementation.

- I recommend that the position of Events Coordinator be placed within External Affairs. In view of the large number of external organizations that use IUSB facilities, it should probably be part of the community outreach function.

#### Informational Technologies:

- This position should now be searched. Any reorganization within this area should await the arrival of the new vice chancellor.



### **RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES**

#### Searches:

- All searches must be conducted according to affirmative action requirements and existing campus guidelines.
- All current interim/acting positions should be searched. The current occupants should be allowed to be candidates if they so choose. In view of the extraordinary number of acting appointees at IUSB, a timetable should be developed for all these searches, with a few positions possibly not being searched until the next academic year.

#### Personnel Procedures:

- All leadership positions (vice chancellors, deans, directors) should have performance programs and annual performance reviews. The Chancellor herself should set annual performance goals for the vice chancellors and retain the freedom to make whatever changes she deems necessary. Establishing a regular schedule of self-assessment and external review should be considered for all senior administrators.
- The Director of Human Resources should continue with the development of performance programs for all professional staff. All irregularities in appointment, and reappointment should be eliminated within the current academic year.

### Official Communications:

- Now that “Update” is appearing weekly many of these problems should be resolved. Bulletin boards should be monitored more effectively. Broken TV monitors should be fixed.

### Budget Process:

- The Chancellor, in consultation with the Academic Senate Executive Committee, and the Vice Chancellors for Academic Affairs and Finance and Administration, should develop a timeline and process for budget planning and resource allocation. The flowchart and timetable for these activities should be shared with the campus community. Budget planning should begin in early fall rather than, as currently, mid-winter.

### Relationship with Indiana University Administration:

- Since this appears to be a source of concern, the Chancellor should at an early date discuss the fiscal aspects of this topic with the campus community.

### Facilities Management:

- The Chancellor should continue to clarify for the campus the current IU “hold” on renovations and repairs. Faculty and staff should be informed why what they perceive as needed facilities upgrades are being deferred in expectation of new construction or major rehabilitation funding. The timetable for repair and renovation (or demolition and replacement) of existing campus buildings should be publicized, with the understanding that all such timetables are budget-driven.
- The priority system for work-orders should be clarified and adhered to.

### Table of Organization:

- Once the Chancellor has, after appropriate consultation, determined the future administrative structure of the institution, the resulting Table of Organization should be shared with the campus community. Graphic devices, such as color-coding, should indicate the time-frame in which the changes will be made.

### Cost of Administration:

- IUSB appears to me to be operating a “lean” administration. In view of the additional positions that are contemplated, it would probably be useful for the campus to calibrate its administrative expenditures against the national data available through NACUBO. Such a survey, possibly among the first to be conducted by the Director of OIRP, would give the campus a good baseline from which to examine its future administrative structure and appointments.



## CONCLUSION

Most of the structural and procedural changes I have recommended overlap several different institutional priorities. The creation of an Office of Institutional Research would, for example, benefit all six of IUSB's stated goals to a greater or less degree. The same might be said of the Vice Chancellor for External Affairs, since the enhanced resources acquired through fund-raising would greatly help the institution as a whole. As I have tried to indicate, the *process* of change will be as important as the changes themselves. An open and transparent process of structural reorganization and procedural improvement will help restore the trust and teamwork so badly needed if the campus is to function at its best. A sense of stability, by definition, will take longer to achieve. But an open process of appointment and assessment for administrators and transparency in budget planning and allocation will help create a stable base from which the institution can move forward. Given the start that has already been made by the new chancellor and the good will and energy I perceive throughout the campus community, IUSB has every reason for confidence in its future.

---

<sup>i</sup> "Report of a Visit to Indiana University South Bend," South Bend, Indiana, November 13-15, 2000, p. 30.

<sup>ii</sup> Indiana University South Bend, NCA Self-Study 1999-2000, Executive Summary, unpagged.

<sup>iii</sup> "IUSB Reaching New Heights," Indiana University South Bend 1999-2000 Self-Study, 1999-2000, p. 23.