

**Executive Summary: Reorganization Divisional Feedback**  
Student Engagement and Success, Central Washington University  
Winter 2023

## INTRODUCTION

During the Student Engagement and Success (SES) winter divisional meeting, the VP and Executive Team proposed three models for restructuring the division. These models were created as a result of conversations during the fall divisional meeting, and were developed as part of the wider initiative to restructure the SES division. The winter divisional meeting took place on Tuesday, January 10, 2023 from 8:30 to 11:00 a.m. in the SURC Ballroom. During this meeting, the new vision and mission of the SES division were also finalized and distributed.

The three models proposed included:

- **A traditional model:** More hierarchical structure, fewer direct reports for the VP, inclusion of AVPs, departments grouped under AVPs and a dean of students by broad function
- **A flat model:** More flat reporting structure, mostly executive directors and directors reporting to the VP, groupings by department function
- **A hybrid model:** Combination of features of the traditional and flat model

## METHODOLOGY

Staff from across the division were seated in groups and asked to provide feedback on each model. They were asked a series of questions, including the strengths and weaknesses of each model. They were asked to employ a deliberative process of dialog to come to a consensus as a group at each of the tables. Each table had a designated facilitator/scribe. Each group provided feedback on large sticky sheets as well as on printed copies of the organizational charts.

After the feedback was provided, staff were asked to look at the feedback and place a sticker next to comments that they agreed with.

The VP's executive team then transposed the feedback into a spreadsheet and coded the responses by theme. The resulting feedback is a coded and summarized version, but also includes all of the raw feedback received.

***All Feedback provided by the Division is available in the accompanying spreadsheet (raw as well as coded). The appendix also includes final coded data for strengths and weaknesses of each model (Appendix A) and most common comments (Appendix B).***

*Please note: The number of comments does not correspond to the number of groups or participants. There was no specified limit to the number of comments that each group could provide, and individuals were able to indicate agreement with several statements.*

## FINDINGS

### Main Strengths and Challenges by Model

Each group came to a consensus to provide the main strengths and weaknesses of each model. Participants then individually indicated the statements that they most agreed with by placing a sticker next to the statement. (Coded responses are available in Appendix A.)

Main strengths and weaknesses identified for each model:

- **Flat Model:**

- **Strengths:**

- More direct access to the VP (6 group responses, 19 individual confirmations)

- More specialization in teams and leadership (6 group responses, 15 individual confirmations)

- Distributes work evenly (5 group responses, 6 individual confirmations)

- **Weaknesses:**

- Too many direct reports to the VP (6 group responses, 9 individual confirmations)

- Too many unanswered questions in the model (6 group responses, 2 individual confirmations)

- Too many separate departments (6 group responses, 1 individual confirmation)

- **Hybrid Model:**

- **Strengths:**

- Balanced (8 group responses, 27 individual confirmations)

- Represents each area well (6 group responses, 12 individual confirmations)

- Model philosophically makes sense (3 group responses, 12 individual confirmations)

- **Weaknesses:**

- Uneven direct reports to AVP/Dean level (3 group responses, 0 individual confirmations)

- Marketing is not embedded (2 group responses, 6 individual confirmations)

- Need title equity (2 group responses, 2 individual confirmations)

- **Traditional Model:**

- **Strengths:**

- More units together with shared purpose and collaboration (12 group responses, 14 individual confirmations)

- Fewer direct reports to VP (4 group responses, 0 individual confirmations)

- Similar to current model (3 group responses, 2 individual confirmations)

- **Weaknesses:**

- Less direct access to the VP (7 group responses, 12 individual confirmations)

- Unbalanced between the 3 areas (6 group responses, 10 individual confirmations)

- Need title equity (2 group responses, 0 individual confirmations)

## **Most Common Comments**

There was a wide diversity of comments and questions, particularly related to whether departments are properly placed within each organizational model. (The coded response set can be found in Appendix B.)

The most common comments were:

- Disability Services should come back to Student Engagement and Success (33 group responses, 14 individual confirmations)
- The Recreation Center should move to Finance and Administration (9 group responses, 5 individual confirmations)
- There needs to be title equity (9 group responses, 4 individual confirmations)
- The Recreation Center should be in Health and Wellness (7 group responses, 10 individual confirmations)
- Auxiliary Marketing should move to Finance and Administration (7 group responses, 3 individual confirmations)
- We should create a Communication Center (5 group responses, 0 individual confirmations)

APPENDIX

Appendix A: Strengths and Challenges of Each Model

Model	Strength/ Challenge	Response	# Times Response Appeared	# Stickers by Response
Flat	Strengths	More direct access to VP	6	19
		More specialization in teams and leadership	6	15
		Distributes work evenly	5	6
		Logical structure	2	6
		Good structure for budget	1	2
		Overlap in expertise	1	0
	Challenges	Too many direct reports to the VP	6	9
		Too many unanswered questions	6	2
		Too many separate departments	6	1
		Need title equity	3	6
		VP does not have as much support	3	1
		Very different from current structure	1	2
		Representation more spread out	1	1
Not balanced at the lower structures	1	0		
Hybrid	Strengths	Balanced	8	27
		Represents each area well	6	12
		Model philosophically makes sense	3	12
		Distributes work evenly	2	8
		Centralized	2	2
		More direct access to VP	1	6
		Fewer uncertainties	1	0
		No strengths	1	0
		Similar to current model	1	0
	Challenges	Uneven direct reports to AVP/Dean level	3	0
		Marketing is not embedded	2	6
		Need title equity	2	2
		Dean of Students area not cohesive	1	8
		Uneven access to VP	1	8
		Has groupings that have a mixed purpose	1	1
		Department names need to be clarified	1	0
		No disadvantages	1	0
Similar to current model	1	0		
Top-heavy	1	0		
Traditional	Strengths	More units together with shared purpose and collaboration	12	14
		Fewer direct reports to VP	4	0
		Similar to current model	3	2
		AVP layer offers better representation	3	0
		Student-focused	2	11
		No strengths	1	1
		Balanced	1	0
	Challenges	Less direct access to VP	7	12
		Unbalanced between 3 areas	6	10
		Need title equity	2	0
		Less area specialization in leadership	1	3
		AVP areas too separate	1	2
		Departments within groupings have different purpose	1	1
		Groupings are confusing	1	0

## Appendix B: Most Frequent Comments Coded by Theme

Comment/Question	# Times Response Appeared	# Stickers by Response
Disability Services should come back to SES	14	33
Rec should move to F&A	9	5
Need title equity	9	4
Rec should be in Health and Wellness	7	10
Aux Marketing should move to F&A	7	3
We should create a Communication Center	5	0
Access and Equity should be organized differently	4	1
Disability Services should be part of this conversation	4	1
Hybrid model is preferred	4	0
Rec should not be in Access and Equity	3	6
Centers should move to SES	3	1
Centers should not move to SES	3	1
Rec should stay in SES	3	0
Slate should support current students	3	0

## Typical Responsibilities of Administrative Staff

### Associate Vice President:

Senior-level administrator. Involved in budgetary modeling and development, expense and hiring approvals, and strategic planning. Typically responsible for supervising individuals (often Director or Executive Director-level) who are responsible for direct day-to-day oversight and leadership of other university programs/services. Often represents the vice president's office or acts as vice president's designee in administrative-level conversations and meetings with other university divisions.

### Dean of Students:

Typically serves as primary administrator responsible for coordinating and overseeing resources and response to student crisis and behavioral concerns. Generally responsible for providing oversight and leadership to a variety of programs/services related to student development, support, and/or intervention, including supervision and budget oversight.

### Executive Director:

Typically responsible for providing direct day-to-day oversight and leadership of at least one specific university program/service. Includes supervision and budget oversight. Additionally, responsible for supervising individuals (often Director-level positions) who are responsible for providing direct oversight and leadership of *other* university programs/services.

### Director:

Typically responsible for providing direct day-to-day oversight and leadership of a specific university program/service. Involved in operationalizing the strategic goals generated by senior leadership, planning and coordination, and providing subject matter expertise to the AVP and VP above them. Generally, includes supervision and budget oversight and accountability. May provide budgetary input.