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The President’s Charge to the Task Force

Thanks to each of you for agreeing to serve on the Presidential Guidance team (PG-1) to explore the administrative organization here at Fort Lewis College. Over the years, the size of administration has increased, though admittedly federal and state regulations and the requirements of running an institution of higher education have also increased. The question of Fort Lewis College’s administrative structure is an important one, and it is worthy of review, especially in light of the financial situation. Attached you will find the current organizational chart for Fort Lewis College. Please review this document with an eye to organizational efficiencies. Look for ways of combining duties so that they could be done with fewer positions. Please consider the tasks involved with each of the positions and where these could be apportioned if a position were eliminated. If you need to see position descriptions, we will provide them.

"Here are some questions to consider as you engage in your deliberations:

- How can the work that we do now be carried out with fewer positions?
- Can some tasks or duties be done more efficiently?
- Are there even some tasks or duties that could be reduced in scope or even eliminated?
- Could some tasks that have previously been done by staff by performed by faculty?
- Is our administrative structure 'top heavy'—should we consider a flatter structure that incorporates fewer management levels?
- What administrative positions are 'mission critical' or essential for maintaining our accreditation?
- Do we have the right positions to meet the challenges the college faces in the 21st century—do we need to add some positions?

"It is reasonable for you to suggest two or three alternative organizational charts with different positions eliminated."
Summary of Task Force Meetings

Approach to the Charge
The task force has worked steadily through long meetings since discussing the charge with President Thomas on October 7th. Our approach to the issues at hand were studying Fort Lewis College organizational charts, comparing our organization with many of the COPLAC schools, and interviewing key personnel at Fort Lewis College. While some of the ideas described below came easily, many were complex problems that took considerable time to unravel and discover alternative paths to meeting the President’s charge.

While we put many hours into answering the President’s charge, time was our most severe limitation. We were unable to conduct information interviews with all parties affected by the recommendations contained in this report. Where appropriate, we took into consideration budget cuts to non-instructional departments that occurred in FY10 and will occur in FY11. Our campus-wide solicitation for input into this report only generated five emails.

This report details eight current recommendations and three future considerations. Some of the newly created charts are a mix of functions and offices. One particular question asked was, Is our administrative structure ‘top heavy’—should we consider a flatter structure that incorporates fewer management levels? In reviewing the current functional chart given to the Task Force we noted that it misrepresents the administrative structure at the College. For example, it places Deans on the same level as Vice Presidents, which does give the perception of top heaviness, however this is inaccurate. We have provided a more accurate chart in the Appendix, please see Attachment A.

Sources of Information
- Fort Lewis College organization charts
- COPLAC School websites
- Office of institutional Research
- Focused interviews of key Fort Lewis College personnel
- Shared knowledge and experiences

Overview of Task Force Recommendations

Current Recommendations

1. Health and Wellness Services
   - Combine Health Services, Counseling and Student Wellness under one director
   - Potential administrative savings
2. Health Services
   - Outsourcing Health Services
   - Additional services for the campus community and potential administrative savings
3. Student Union and Activities
   - Reorganization and consolidation of functions under one director
   - Potential administrative savings & efficiency
4. Multicultural Services
   - Collection of various cultural groups under the leadership of the Dean of Students
5. Enrollment Management
- Consolidation of enrollment oriented functions from admissions to alumni
- Enrollment Management reporting directly to the President
- Potential administrative savings & efficiency
- Potential revenue through retention and enrollment

6. Center of Southwest Studies
- Move under AVPAA
- Greater efficiency and benefits to faculty, students, and federal compliances

7. Reorganization of the Office of Associate Vice-President of Academic Affairs
- Orientation towards leadership in academic development
  - Online Programs
  - Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence
  - Center of Southwest Studies

8. Reorganization of Academic Areas
- Plan A1: Reorganize three schools into two with divisions. Cost savings via elimination of one dean.
- Plan B1: Reorganize three schools into six divisions with one academic dean.
- Plan B2: Reorganize three schools into six divisions with no deans

Future Considerations

- A cabinet-level position or Advisory Council be created that serves as an Advisor to the President for Native American Affairs. This position or council could be appointed from within or outside of campus.
- The Environmental Center be given more institutional support than as an RSO, and that it be linked more directly to the Environmental Studies program.
- Athletics & Foundation review for efficiency.

**Recommendations - Details**

**Recommendation #1 - Health and Wellness Services**
The task force recommends the creation of a Health & Wellness Services Department. This recommendation meets the charge of creating efficiencies with fewer direct reports to the VP of Student Affairs and reducing the number of manager positions. The Counseling Center, Health Center, and Student Wellness program would combine preventative and reactive healthcare under the leadership of one Director (See Chart 1 Below). Currently, the Counseling Center and the Health Center each has a director level position and an administrative assistant. Many other COPLAC schools have implemented this model in an effort to improve efficiencies and save administrative and support salaries.
Specific Assumptions
The newly formed Health & Wellness Center would be a one-stop shop for students with mental or physical ailments. The Miller Student Center could possibly house all three departments in one location.

Cost Analysis
In order to accommodate the confidential nature of the services offered, there will need to be some remodeling done to the physical space in the Miller Student Center. However, the long term saving in administration should offset the one time cost of renovation to the Center. There will be salary savings associated with the formation of a new Health & Wellness Services department as a result of administrative and support staff collaborations.

Recommendation #2- Health Services
The task force recommends that the college consider outsourcing Health Services. This recommendation meets the charge of creating efficiencies and meeting the challenges of the 21st Century. Outsourcing the Health Center functions may prove to be cost effective and would increase the amount of services offered to the campus community. The Director of the Health and Wellness Department would oversee the contract for health services.

Specific Assumptions
It is anticipated that an outsourced healthcare provider would implement a system of electronic medical records and Tel-a-Medicine delivery, which is crucial in a rural isolated community. As a contracted medical provider, an outside vendor would also have the ability to bill insurance. This would allow health services to include faculty and staff, as well as give the Health Center the infrastructure to contract with Indian Health Services (IHS) for the College’s Native American students.

Cost Analysis
It is anticipated that these services would be provided to the campus community without any additional costs, as student fees, health insurance billing, and Indian Health Services contracting will cover the cost of providing additional health coverage to the entire campus community and the operation of the facility.

Recommendation #3- Student Union and Activities
The task force recommends the creation of a Student Union & Activities Department. The implementation of a Student Union and Activities Department would combine the current Union
Operations and the Leadership Center under the guidance of one Director (see Chart 2 below). This recommendation meets the charge of creating efficiencies and reducing the number of manager positions.

Currently, the Director of Student Union Operations and Auxiliary Services reports to the VP of Administration and Finance and the Director of the Leadership Center reports to the VP of Student Affairs. Given the mission of the Student Union, it is recommended that the Director of Student Union and Activities report to the VP of Student Affairs.

**CHART 2**

![Diagram of organizational structure showing Director of Student Union & Activities as the top position, with branches for Student Union Operations, Skycard Services, Dining Services, Bookstore, Leadership Activities, and Post Office. Each branch includes further details like Facility Scheduling, Maintenance, Media Center, Union Programming, ASFLC & RSOs, and Leadership Programming.]

**Specific Assumptions**
The physical space needed to house all affected staff members within the Leadership Center currently exists. The proximity of Student Union and Activities staff members will improve communication and increase efficiency. Combining the two departments should limit the duplication of services and improve customer service.

**Cost Analysis**
Combining the two departments would provide the potential for salary savings. However, it is anticipated that some of these savings will need to be utilized to support operations of the new facility, including management of the Media Center.

**Recommendation #4 - Multicultural Services**
The task force recommends that all multicultural functions report to the Dean of Students (see Chart 3). This recommendation meets the charge of creating efficiencies with fewer reports directly to the VP of Student Affairs and providing a “mission critical” activity. Currently the Native American Center, El Centro, and the Gender and Sexuality Resource Center serve underrepresented population. Although
they have similar philosophies, these programs are housed in different locations and they fall under different leadership.

Multicultural services would combine the operations of the Native American Center, El Centro, and the Gender & Sexuality Resource Center under the leadership of one administrator. This structure would help to create an atmosphere of inclusion for all groups, as well as strengthen the efforts of Code Red and the Gender & Sexuality Resource Center.

CHART 3

Specific Assumptions
The Dean of Students & Multicultural Services would work with each program to identify the duplication of services, improve collaboration, and increase efficiencies between the areas involved. Decreasing the number of direct reports to the VP of Student Affairs would improve the division’s organizational structure.

Cost Analysis
There would not be any cost savings or additional costs associated with this reorganization.

Overall Student Affairs Organizational Chart
Chart 4 below is the Student Affairs Organizational Chart that incorporates all of the suggested recommendations for student affairs. The proposed Division of Student Affairs would increase the total number of services by adding the Gender & Sexuality Resource Center, as well as Union Operations and Auxiliary Services. However, the Office of Student Orientation and Family Programs would be moved to Enrollment Management. Currently there are eleven direct reports to the VP for Student Affairs and the chart below has only seven.
Recommendation #5 and #6 - President’s Office

The Task Force is in agreement that direct reports to the President reflect the top priorities for the near as well as long-term future. Over time these priorities may change, but given the dire state of the economy in which student enrollment/retention and fund raising are severely challenged, we recommend that the President insist on these direct reports, detailed below.

Recommendation #5: Reorganization of Enrollment Management

Stated Rationale

The suggested model creates an Enrollment Management division that positions Fort Lewis College to face the challenges of the 21st century. Fort Lewis College faces unique recruitment, retention and graduation challenges based upon our Liberal Arts mission, the economy, and the remote geographic location.

Marguerite Dennis in A Practical Guide to Enrollment and Retention Management in Higher Education writes; “To effectively develop a division of enrollment management, a coordinated system, one that cuts across the traditional boundaries of specific job and office functions, is necessary. Institutional
strategy, not one or two specific activities, is needed to ensure the success of the program.\footnote{Dennis, Marguerite. \textit{A Practical Guide to Enrollment and Retention Management in Higher Education} Bergin & Garvey, 1998, page 9.} Enrollment management spans all areas of the College and should be every faculty and staff member’s responsibility and concern. In order to meet such a broad responsibility at Fort Lewis College, the President’s Guidance Team recommends establishing a champion of Enrollment Management who is a peer to the Provost and Vice Presidents.

Chart 5 below, depicts the existing resources and functions available to form an Enrollment Management division that will enhance the student experience from recruitment through graduation and beyond.

**Division of Enrollment Management Organizational Chart**

**CHART 5**

---

**Specific Assumptions**

1. The driving assumption behind this level of organizational change is that Fort Lewis College strategically needs to significantly increase and sustain an increased enrollment.
2. Fort Lewis College has the potential to increase and sustain a higher enrollment.
3. The current organizational structure implies that enrollment management is solely a function (problem) of Academic Affairs.
4. Enrollment goals, vision, and plans have not been effectively communicated to the campus community.
5. The College lacks cohesive marketing expertise. The current marketing functions are dispersed between multiple individuals, without a director for the “Marketing Department.”

6. Collectively the departments represented in the organizational chart have enough staff to form an effective Enrollment Management division.

7. Enrollment Management encompasses a cradle to grave philosophy. There are missed opportunities to utilize alumni in the recruitment and career services areas. Alumni are defined as anyone who has taken a class at FLC.

8. Retention is as important as recruitment.

**Bottom Line Analysis**

This organization could be created with no additional personnel costs, depending on the salary level of the new Vice President position and the availability of existing salary savings. An additional position with marketing expertise is recommended to oversee the marketing division and to develop and implement strategic marketing plans.

Additional analysis is needed to determine the optimal reallocation of resources within the division proposed. Currently individual departments perform similar functions using similar staff. Examples are administrative support, data retrieval and analysis, event planning, campus visits, and student communications. Centralizing these functions within the Enrollment Management division may produce increased efficiencies. Within the current departments several part time positions exist, which should be evaluated to determine if fewer full time positions could be utilized instead. Any future vacancies should be evaluated for the optimum allocation of resources.

**Recommendation #6 - Center of Southwest Studies (move under Assoc VP Academic Affairs)**

The task force recommends that the Director of CSWS report to the Associate VP of Academic Affairs. This will improve communication and increase collaborations with academic departments. It would also provide much better conditions for collections management and compliance with federal NAGPRA (Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act) regulations, which requires close interactions between museum personnel, academic departments, and FLC upper administration.

Although no immediate cost savings can be calculated now, the following can be suggested:

- Shared grant writing, program planning, and internship management between CSWS, Anthro, and SW/NAIS;
- Coordination of fundraising efforts across the three areas;
- Coordination of public outreach and public programming across the areas;
- Combination of adjunct faculty positions and CSWS part-time staffing in areas of museum education instruction;
- Coordination of costly ongoing NAGPRA compliance activities (grants for upcoming phases of implementation, and housing and hospitality for tribal representatives viewing collections to make claims)
**Recommendation #7- Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs**

The suggested model, Chart 7 below for the Associate VP of Academic Affairs addresses two areas of the President’s charge in that it maintains “mission critical” positions for accreditation and adds new offices to position the College to face the challenges of a 21st century learning environment. The Center for Teaching and Learning feeds into assessment activities and supports them by providing additional professional development opportunities for faculty to strengthen student learning outcomes. Distance education opportunities can be phased into the current College environment by selecting courses that already lend themselves easily to the online environment, and in turn, allows the College to offer more courses in a variety of different formats. These opportunities were left as dotted lines, because ultimately they will require additional resources on the part of the College. The Center for Southwest Studies was moved out of the President’s division so that it aligns more closely with academic and library functions of Academic Affairs.

**Chart 7: Associate VP of Academic Affairs Organization Chart**

![Organization Chart](chart7.png)

**Specific Assumptions**

Previously the AVPAA office had a hodgepodge of orphaned offices. The alignment of these offices within Academic Affairs under the AVPAA creates a more appropriate alignment of academic affairs non-instructional offices.

**Bottom Line Analysis**

Positions changed: The proposed model creates room for growth within academic affairs to move the College forward to meet the challenges of a 21st century learning environment. Three additional offices will be moved to this area. The Center of Southwest Studies will be moved from the President’s office to the AVPAA, so that the activities and learning opportunities at the Center are aligned with academic departments and programs to provide an enhanced learning environment to students. The two dotted line boxes represent future areas of growth within Academic Affairs for Distance Learning and a Center for Teaching and Learning.

Five offices were moved out of the AVPAA area, which are Teacher Education, General Education, Office of Community Services, TRiO Upward Bound, and TRiO Talent Search. Both Teacher Education and General Education will report directly to the Provost. The TRiO programs will both report to the Associate VP of Enrollment Management, so that all of the TRiO programs are within the same division. Both Upward Bound and Talent Search are programs that work with area high school students versus on
campus academic programs. The activities and mission of the Office of Community Services seems more closely aligned with the Small Business Development Center, as such it is suggested that it report to the Dean of the School of Business Administration.

Cost Analysis – Will need further exploration.

Additional Information

Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence
The Associate Vice-President for Academic Affairs would be the lead (Director) of this center.

This recommendation meets the charge of a “mission critical” activity as well as meeting the challenges of the 21st Century. Through collaboration with faculty and administration, the Center would support a learning culture that values and rewards teaching, facilitates reflective dialogue about teaching and learning, encourages the development of teaching as a practice and a scholarly activity, invites innovation in curricular development, and encourages the creation of diverse learning environments in which all students can learn and excel.

The Center for Teaching and Learning (CTLE) is focused on the goal of promoting effective teaching and learning by providing professional development opportunities and support to faculty seeking to improve their classroom instruction. In carrying out this mission, the CTL’s activities would include:*  

- Identifying and providing resources for faculty to enhance their teaching.
- Promoting effective teaching practices in and out of the classroom
- Promoting the scholarship of teaching and learning.
- Providing technology training and consultation for faculty and staff.
- Supporting assessment of student learning by academic programs and support units.

In addition to assuming leadership in the area of assessment, the CTL would serve as the administrative center for activities such as the Teaching Empowerment Teams, Faculty Development Grants, new faculty orientation, and professional development seminars.

*The activities listed are from a concept paper, “Fort Lewis College Center for Teaching and Learning,” submitted by Dr. Jennifer Trujillo, Associate Professor, Teacher Education Department.

Online Course Development
Current plans call for a task force to be appointed to examine opportunities for distance learning at Fort Lewis College. Aside from a handful of courses offered in modern languages and business administration, the College has not developed a plan to systematically explore opportunities in distance or blended learning. While it is unlikely that we will make an institution-wide effort to institute distance learning across the curriculum, it is likely that certain programs will lend themselves more readily to implementing distance and blended learning coursework.

Recommendation #8- Academic Units (Schools)
Common recommendations
The common recommendations represent a general cost saving of $84,585 (Please see Attachment B). Each of the models can be apply these additional common savings. The suggested common recommendations eliminate the Director of Adventure Education stipend and consolidate the duties of that position under the Chair of Exercise Science. Further cost savings are foreseeable by utilizing existing faculty to perform the duties of the Early Advising position from SOBA and the positions of Theatre Manager and Publicist for Theatre and Music. We understand the usefulness of all of these positions but believe that existing faculty or support positions will be able to perform these functions. The common core also recommends delivering archaeological instruction more effectively by paying a summer stipend to a full or part-time instructor rather than maintaining a .33 exempt staff person.

The current position of Director of Teacher Education will report directly to the Provost rather than the Associate Vice President of Academic Affairs. This shift should free up the Associate VP for Academic Affairs for other duties, and we are convinced that Teacher Ed should have access to the Provost in a manner that is equivalent to the Deans. The demands of meeting State Education Guidelines and accreditation requirements support this position for the Director of Education.

We suggest that the Office of Community Services be removed from the Associate Vice President of Academic Affairs and be placed under the Dean of the School of Business, so that it is more closely aligned with Small Business Development Center and academic departments. We also suggest that a Coordinator of General Education be created to supervise Education for Global Citizenship courses, the Liberal Arts Core, Freshman Learning Communities, the Common Reading Experience, and Enrichment Courses and that this Coordinator report directly to the Provost.

**MODEL A: Reorganize threes schools into divisions with two deans**

**Rationale**

This model, Chart 8 addresses the President’s Charge, which asks us to explore whether some tasks or duties could be done more efficiently, reduced in scope, or be eliminated. This structure puts demands on our current Deans and Department Chairs or Departments to perform more efficiently, but it also creates Division Chairs who would assume many of these responsibilities in ways that would reconnect departments and program faculty and students who had been arbitrarily separated in 2003. It also fuses Adventure Education more solidly with Exercise Science.
**Specific Assumptions: Model A**

In this model, two Academic Deans, one Director, and one Coordinator report directly to the Provost. The three assistant deans that currently work for the deans of NBS and AHSS become division coordinators under the proposed School of Arts & Sciences dean, receiving a $10,000 stipend each and course release. Because the School of Business Administration is significantly smaller than A & S, its areas coordinators will be eliminated, their current duties to be assumed by an assistant dean of SOBA.

The A&S division coordinators would be available during the summer to do necessary academic and administrative work. Division coordinators would be elected by the faculty in the appropriate division and would serve in a three to five year rotating position. It is acceptable for the faculty of a division to re-elect a division coordinator. Even though it looks like a strict hierarchy on the chart, the division coordinators would be doing much more than simply reporting to the academic dean. Unlike the present structure, they would be working much more closely and directly with faculty members, departments, and interdisciplinary programs. The proposed release time would also mean that these division directors would be able to contribute to external fundraising initiatives.
Another advantage is that departments/programs would be more closely linked than they currently are. Programs split by the A&S/AHSS division in 2003 will be back under the same school, on the same mailing lists, and be attending the same meetings. This should also help overcome the competition for resources that has developed as part of our academic culture at Fort Lewis since with increased faculty leadership and communication there should be increased interest in the College as a whole.

This model separates Political Science and Philosophy and places them in divisions that seem more intellectually congenial to their disciplinary practices.

This model saves $132,238 (Please see Attachment B Cost Analysis).

**Model B1 and B2:**

**B1: Reorganize three schools into six divisions with one academic dean**

**B2: Reorganize three schools into six divisions with no deans.**

**Rationale:**

Models B1 and B2 creates the most dramatic revision of our current structure in Academic Affairs. This model creates Division Coordinators/Directors who would take over most of the work currently performed by Academic Deans. This model demands that the duties currently performed by Academic Deans be performed by the Division Coordinators. The approximate savings for this are $198,764 (B1) with one Academic Dean and approximately $366,078 (B2) with no Academic Dean (Please See Attachment B Cost Analysis). This model is used by several COPLAC institutions. None of them are identical but schools organized around the Division model include the University of Maine, Farmington; Wisconsin, Superior; and the University of Minnesota, Morris. Morris has one Academic Dean and Division Coordinators; Superior has no Deans but does have Associate Deans and Divisions; Farmington has no Deans but uses Division Coordinators as this model proposes. This model is also similar to that used at Lewis-Clark.
B1: Reorganize three schools into six divisions with one academic dean
B2: Reorganize three schools into six divisions with no deans.

Specific Assumptions:

Model B2: The Academic Dean (if that position continues) position would be filled by one of the currently serving Deans. An alternative proposal is that the Dean come from the ranks of current faculty and be a rotating three to five year position although this person could be reappointed. If this second alternative is adopted, the Dean would be elected by the faculty.

If one Dean is kept, then the division directors would report to the Academic Dean who would report directly to the Provost. If all Deans should be eliminated, the Division Coordinators would report to the Provost.

We have addressed the President’s Charge which asks us to explore whether some tasks or duties could be done more efficiently, reduced in scope, or be eliminated. This structure puts demands on the Division Coordinators and Department Chairs or Departments to perform more efficiently, but it also creates Division Chairs who would assume many of these responsibilities. If one Academic Dean is maintained, that Dean will also have to perform more efficiently as a conduit between the Office of the Provost and the Division Coordinators.
Another advantage to Models B1 and B2 is that departments/programs would be more closely linked than currently. Programs split by the A&S/AHSS division in 2003 will be back under the same school, on the same mailing lists, and be attending the same meetings. This should help overcome the competition for resources that has developed as part of our academic culture at Fort Lewis since greater faculty leadership should create greater interest in the good of the Division and the College.

One issue that has received discussion with this model is the argument that the College needs a School of Business with its own Dean for accreditation purposes. This issue was raised at one of our earliest meetings, and we asked Richard Miller if this was necessary. In an email dated October 12, he replied:

In general, the COPLAC near-peers do not have “Schools of Business” by themselves.

In several instances, I found a school of Social Studies, which included Business. These schools would absorb several programs that are currently under AHSS resulting in little, if any, change in the number of Dean-level staff.

While our specific composition of Deans might be different, compared to other institutions, I generally found the number of “Dean-Level” staff would not change.

Richard Miller then provided information on a number of COPLAC institutions and their administrations of Business Programs.

Since this issue continued to be a sticking point, two members of the Task Force investigated further. One called the AACSB offices and the person he spoke with told him, “The answer I received is that to be accredited, the unit needs to be a four year college in which degrees in Business are awarded. The person I spoke with said that increasingly smaller colleges are coming through with Divisions and Departments.” Another Task Force member researched the accreditation requirements of AACSB and found that no particular administration structure is required.

We are aware that our colleagues in the School of Business are concerned about accreditation, and we believe that accreditation is crucial for Business as well. With that in mind, this model proposes the creation of a new position in the Business Division that would be directed toward making sure that accreditation requirements are met.

*Division of Sociocultural, Area, and Behavioral Studies – FTE 36.73*

- Sociology FTE 5
- Political Science FTE 3
- Southwest Studies FTE 3
- Native American & Indigenous Studies FTE 5
- Anthropology FTE 4.5
- Environmental Studies FTE 5
- Psychology FTE 9.73
- History FTE 6
- Latin American Studies
Division of Liberal Arts Core and Interdisciplinary Studies

- Education for Global Citizenship
- Liberal Arts Core/lower division (gtPathways management)
- Gender & Women’s Studies
- Religious Studies
- Peace & Conflict Studies
- Forensic Studies
- Student Constructed Majors

Division of Natural Sciences & Mathematics – FTE 55.40

- Freshman Math FTE 6
- Mathematics FTE 6
- Biology FTE 11.5
- Agriculture FTE 1.4
- Physics & Engineering FTE 6
- Chemistry FTE 6.5
- Geosciences FTE 6
- Exercise Science FTE 9
- Adventure Ed FTE 3

Division of Arts, Letters, and Communications – FTE 48.25

- Writing Program FTE 11.25
- Art FTE 6
- English FTE 13
- Theatre FTE 2
- Modern Languages FTE 4
- Philosophy FTE 4
- Music FTE 8
- Honors

Division of Teacher Education (8)

- Teacher Education FTE 8

Division of Business Administration (FTE 23.5)

- Business Administration FTE 20.5
- CSIS FTE 3
- Office of Community Services
**Future Considerations:**

- **Advisor or Advisory Council to the President for Native American Affairs**

  It is beyond the scope of this document to outline all the reasons why such a position or council is necessary, appropriate, and long-overdue at an institution like Fort Lewis College that has a unique mission and mandate to serve its students, faculty, and Native American tribes in the United States. We also understand the unique and most likely difficult position choosing one person to represent all 126 Tribes within the student body. Those of us on this task force who have knowledge about the rationale for such a position would be happy to discuss it further with the President or with any other members of the campus community who would like to make it a reality.

- **Environmental Center**

  The task force would like to recommend for future consideration that the Environmental Center become a recognized department on campus. This “mission critical” activity meets the challenges of the 21st Century. Currently the Environmental Center (EC) is considered a Registered Student Organization and it reports through the Leadership Center.

  The scope of the Environmental Center goes well beyond that of any Registered Student Organization. Projects such as the Fort Lewis College Sustainability Action Plan and the President’s Advisory Council on Environmental Affairs are currently championed by the EC. In order to meet the challenges of the 21st Century, the campus’ Sustainability Action Plan has identified stewardship, consumption, and climate as performance priorities for FLC.

  In order to ensure that the campus’ environmental priorities get the level of coordination and support needed, the task force would like to recommend that the Environmental Center expand its role on campus by becoming a recognized department.

- **Athletics & Foundation**

  The Task Force did not have time to examine these two areas for organizational efficiency.

**Appendix**

**Attachment A – Academic Year 2010 FLC Organizational Chart**

**Attachment B – Detailed Cost Analysis Spreadsheet**
Attachment A – FLC Functional Organizational Chart AY 2011
## Attachment B Cost Analysis

**Presidents Guidance Team 1, Academic Affairs Schools (units) Restructuring Options**

### Common Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Eliminate</th>
<th>Add</th>
<th>Balance plus Common</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOBA Early Advising</td>
<td>-13,830</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater Manager &amp; Publicist</td>
<td>-54,306</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restructure Archaeological Field School</td>
<td>-6,449</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adventure Education Director</td>
<td>-10,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringe Benefits associated with SOBA advising, Theater positions and Adventure Ed</td>
<td>-20,159</td>
<td>-84,585</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Model A

- One Dean                                    | 115,000   |     |                     |
- Deans Benefits                              | -29,670   |     |                     |
- 3 Assistant Deans Stipends and release time | -55,500   |     |                     |
- 3 Assistant Deans Benefits                  | -14,319   |     |                     |
- Stipend for 3x Division Directors @ $10,000 | 30,000    |     |                     |
- Release time for 3x Division Directors @ $8,000 | 24,000    |     |                     |
- 3 Division Directors benefits for stipends & release | 13,932 |      |                    |
- **Total**                                   | 200,170   | 67,932 | **$132,238**        |

### Model B1 ~ 1 Dean

- 2 Deans                                    | 233,000   |     |                     |
- 2 Deans Benefits                           | -60,114   |     |                     |
- Assistant Deans                            | -83,000   |     |                     |
- Assistant Deans Benefits                   | -21,414   |     |                     |
- 6x Division Directors Stipend @ $10,000    | 60,000    |     |                     |
- Division Directors Benefits                 | 15,480    |     |                     |
- 6x Division Directors Release Time @ $8,000 | 48,000    |     |                     |
- Division Directors Benefits                 | 12,384    |     |                     |
- Director of Accreditation for SOBA         | 50,000    |     |                     |
- Director of Accreditation Benefits         | 12,900    |     |                     |
- **Total**                                   | 397,528   | 198,764 | **$198,764**        |

### Model B2 ~ 0 Deans

- 3 Deans                                    | 366,000   |     |                     |
- 3 Deans Benefits                           | -94,428   |     |                     |
- Assistant Deans                            | -83,000   |     |                     |
- Assistant Deans Benefits                   | -21,414   |     |                     |
- **Total**                                   | 353,166   | 104,336 | **$104,336**        |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6x Division Directors Stipend @ $10,000</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division Directors Benefits</td>
<td>15,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6x Division Directors Release Time @ $8,000</td>
<td>48,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Release Time Benefits</td>
<td>12,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Accreditation for SOBA</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Accreditation Benefits</td>
<td>12,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>564,842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>198,764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$366,078</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$450,663</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>