Overview of the committee process

The Staff Synergy Group (SSG) was comprised of 3-4 representatives from Dyson/CALS, Johnson and School of Hotel Administration as well as a member of the Employee Assembly. The schools were represented by their lead administrative officer, their human resource director and an individual who represented either the budget, student or external relations perspective.

The committee met nine times over the period of February 2016 – April 2016. The group worked well together and quickly developed the trust necessary to share information openly. Members of the group worked with others in their schools between meetings to gather information so that they were able to fully understand how administrative and support functions run and what roles staff perform. This helped the group understand what worked differently between the schools. Everyone brought their school experience to the table while trying to understand the goals of the College of Business (CCB). Dean Dutta attended most meetings and actively listened and participated in the conversations around the ideas, concerns and recommendations that were brought up.

Major Topics Addressed

The group worked through their charge in the following manner:

1) Operation, administrative and support functions were considered against a “service intensity matrix” which allowed SSG to look at the degree of customization of the service required in relation to the intensity of human interactions. This helped consideration of the function as it related to the schools and the college.

2) After reviewing the services provided in the schools the group agreed on 18 areas of operational, administrative and support work that are and will be needed going forward.

3) For each area SSG considered the level of integration needed to the College of Business (CCB). The group also considered the appropriate sequencing for next steps.
   a. How integrated does an operational, administrative or support function need to be to the College of Business (CCB)? SSG created four different models and assigned each area to one of the models.
      i. Integrated under the CCB structure
      ii. Reside primarily in the schools, coordinated across CCB
      iii. Structure will follow decisions regarding academic governance
      iv. No change recommended at this time
   b. What was an appropriate sequencing for next-step review and implementation of the recommendations? SSG recommended four timeframes. SSG did not set dates to these time frames.
      i. High priority phase 1
      ii. Phase 1
      iii. Phase 2
      iv. To be determined by the CCB leadership team
4) SSG further refined the operational, administrative, and support areas for review, discussed the next steps that remained and the risks, concerns and opportunities associated with future changes.

Qualitative Summary of the group interactions

The group began by forming ground rules for the meetings to create a safe place to discuss sensitive topics and developed a process so all voices could be heard. Most of the members of SSG will continue to work on these topics due to the nature of their jobs so the trust was developed over the ten weeks will be important as the formation of the College of Business continues.

Framing principles were developed to guide the basis of our decisions. We believe these principles are enduring and should be considered after SSG ends its work.

We created a process for reviewing vacant positions understanding that work needs to continue during this period of change. The process includes a review for certain positions by all HR and finance leaders with the final approval by Dean Dutta. This process provides an opportunity to consider open positions and think about alternative ways of getting work accomplished. It also encourages cross-school conversations.