



CASE STUDIES

2018 EDITION

Nothing highlights the dean's role as problem solver more than case studies. From a number of submissions, we have assembled a set of four case scenarios, posing a variety of challenges for the dean. You, along with the others assigned to your group, will have a chance to discuss and decide on solutions to each thorny situation. We hope you will find them to be worthy challenges to your decanal skills.

All registrants will be assigned to a specific case study session which will be held on Thursday afternoon at 1:45 or Friday morning at 10:45. Case Study Session participants registered their interest in the sessions during Annual Meeting registration. Registrants will not be assigned a room; ample seating will be provided and individuals will go to a room with seating availability.

Please familiarize yourself with the cases prior to this time. Who are the key players, what are the key facts, and what are the critical issues? The case study session leader will take the group through the set and, after discussing each case, share the actual outcomes.

Thanks in advance for your interest and participation!

CCAS Annual Meeting Program Committee

networking arts & sciences deans

CASE STUDY #1

Flagship State University is a large research-intensive institution serving a moderate sized Midwestern state. In an effort to serve geographically remote areas of the state, FSU has established a satellite campus some 250 miles from the main institution. This satellite campus offers a limited array of undergraduate degrees, primarily in Nursing, Education and Liberal Arts along with a few Masters degrees. The satellite campus is administered by a Dean. Enrollment at campus is drawn from a

There is concern that the satellite campus is actively recruiting and attracting students who would otherwise have matriculated to Flagship campus

limited geographic area, and primarily intended to serve the needs of that region of the state. Many of the 2,000 students enrolled at FSU-Outstate are nontraditional. A number of courses are offered online or in the evenings.

While maintaining close connections with the primary campus, FSU-Outstate has traditionally functioned somewhat independently. Faculty members are appointed locally with at least some input from related departments on the main campus. Tenure is established on the local campus, and does not carry over to the primary campus. FSU-Outstate is enjoying a growing number of transfer students from Flagship who wish to complete undergraduate degrees on the Outstate campus.

Through the years, a level of resentment has developed on the main campus with regard to FSU-Outstate. There is concern that the satellite campus is actively recruiting and attracting students who would otherwise have matriculated to Flagship campus. This concern has been exacerbated as enrollment at the Flagship campus has declined. Within some departments and colleges on the main campus there is also worry that Flagship students are enrolling in Outstate online sections and thereby reducing funds that would otherwise go to Flagship departments. These apparent tensions are heightened by the recognition that the satellite campus is locally well-funded. Flagship faculty want to see changes imposed at Outstate to protect the status of Flagship. As a result, there is a level of unhappiness between the two campuses.

Departments and faculty members at the satellite campus have recently identified several new areas of study that would be of particular interest to the region, and have proposed adding new programs addressing these interests. Some faculty, administrators, and Deans at Flagship have been unwilling to entertain the possibility of new degree programs on the satellite campus. Faculty members at Outstate chafe under what they perceive as unnecessary restrictions on their activities and initiatives. A new Dean is appointed at FSU-Outstate and is charged with responsibility to maintain quality and growth in academic programs and at the same time repair relationships with FSU's primary campus. Deans and some Chairs within two colleges on the primary campus have already made clear that they plan on managing activities within related programs on the FSU-Outstate campus and that the Dean's role must not involve oversight of academic programs. The Provost views any conflict as a result of an unwillingness on the part of faculty and administration at FSU-Outstate to cooperate and collaborate closely with colleagues on the main campus. In the Outstate region, there is an appreciation of FSU generally, but a strong sense of ownership of the local campus. ❁

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

1. What would you recommend to the new Dean of FSU-Outstate as an appropriate strategy in trying to continue growth and development of the satellite campus while at the same time rebuilding connections with academic units on the primary campus?
2. What is the appropriate role of academic units on a primary campus in guiding and overseeing related units on a satellite campus?
3. In trying to rebuild connections between the two campuses is there an appropriate role for local supporters of the satellite campus? How might their support and financial assistance be leveraged to reduce or eliminate resentment on the primary campus?
4. Did FSU make an error years ago in providing this level of autonomy to a satellite campus 250 miles from the primary campus?

CASE STUDY #2

Associate Professor Rose is an outstanding teacher and admired by students. His student evaluations are off the charts, and those in his classes are loud and public in their enthusiastic support. He has received two institutional teaching awards. Some students mention that Prof. Rose occasionally notes that “the administration wants to get rid of me,” or that “I get in trouble for the way I teach.” Prof. Rose is not comfortable with technology and only minimally

He has refused to participate in implementing any of the university-wide technology upgrades or programs available for course management or assessment.

uses the university’s course management system. He has refused to participate in implementing any of the university-wide technology upgrades or programs available for course management or assessment.

There is no tenure at Prof. Rose’s university.

Full-time, ranked faculty receive 3, 5, or 7-year contracts depending on their rank. It is very unusual for a faculty-member who has received a multi-year contract once to be denied subsequent contracts. Several years ago, Assoc. Prof. Rose came up for review for a multi-year contract and decided to apply for promotion to full professor as well, even though he had been counseled by his Dean and Chair that he did not meet the qualifications. While his teaching and service are strong, his advising is limited, and he has not done any level of scholarship or even attended a conference since coming to the university 10 years ago. He claimed in his multi-year contract and promotion materials that his work with undergraduates on their senior research projects and the posters and brief talks they present at the university’s annual Research Day festivities should count toward his research and scholarship requirement for promotion. In addition, he asserts that when he was hired, the research and scholarship requirements were not in force and so he should not have to meet the current standards.

Dr. Rose received a new multi-year contract but his promotion bid was denied, and all of those involved—the committee, Dean, and Provost—noted in their letters that he did not meet the standards for research and scholarship of a full professor. They also noted

in his letters awarding a new contract that he was not meeting the research and scholarship standards of an associate professor and wrote of their expectations that he and his Dean would develop a workable research and scholarship plan for completion prior to his next multi-year contract review. Faculty have \$1500 a year they can put toward professional development, and the Dean expressed a willingness to provide additional funding if needed to get Prof. Rose going on some kind of research project, either investigation in his discipline or using his successful teaching for scholarship in education. The goal is to have him attend an appropriate conference and work with colleagues to develop some kind of research activity.

Prof. Rose will be up for a new multi-year contract in two years. He has shown no movement toward conference attendance or working with his colleagues on any kind of research effort. In addition, he has expressed to anyone who will listen that he has no intention of implementing any more technology in his classes even though a minimum level of participation with some university assessment software is now mandatory. There is clear documentation of his failure to meet the requirements over many years. Given his strong student following, however, the administration is concerned about what will happen if Dr. Rose’s contract is not renewed. ❖

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

1. Prof. Rose is clearly not compliant with the requirements for another contract but gets outstanding teaching evaluations—should that trump any other contract requirements at a primarily teaching institution?
2. How can the administration respond to what is expected to be significant student protest if Prof. Rose’s contract is not renewed? Are there any proactive steps they can take?
3. The Dean and Provost have created a significant paper trail documenting Prof. Rose’s non-compliance and failure to meet expectations. How much, if any, of this should be publicly available? Should faculty only have to meet faculty expectations in place when they are hired? How do you increase or change those expectations?
4. Should the use of certain technologies be required of faculty? What should be consequences for failure to adopt or non-compliance?

CASE STUDY #3

Shortly after assuming the dean position at Countrified College, a small private liberal arts institution located in the suburban rolling hills of Country Club, and two weeks prior to finals, Dean Newbie receives an email from Professor Never-wrong late Friday afternoon. He informs the Dean that he wants to kick out Ms. Gray-haired, a student from his course, because he thinks she is “emotionally disturbed and he feels threatened for his life.” He refuses further contact with the student.

Dean Newbie immediately informs the Provost of the situation. Following the protocol response to concerning student behavior, the Provost tells Dean Newbie to contact Student Affairs who has a behavior crisis task force. The Dean files the documentation which triggers security and counselors’ involvement.

Dean Newbie indicates she will speak with Prof. Never-wrong on Monday. Both leave for the weekend.

On Monday, Dean Newbie receives a copy of the behavior form that Prof. Never-wrong filled out which states Ms. Gray-haired did not bring a draft of an assignment to class. After Prof. Never-wrong told the student she would not receive any points, she then “turned into an unhinged, ranting, female lunatic” and informed him that she “is a mother and working adult and had no time to complete the assignment.” The student said this is the worst class she has ever taken and complained that students do not know when assignments are due or what is required. Prof. Never-wrong told the student she was clearly “under some stress and she should go home and rest.” He inquired as to whether she “was stable enough” to drive home. The student gathered her things and replied, “I am fine, Toots” and stormed out of the class. Prof. Never-wrong states in the report, “If people are having emotional difficulties, they should not be in college. They need to put their education first. As a result, I do not want to deal with her any further.”

Early Monday morning the behavior risk team reports back to Dean Newbie that Ms. Gray-haired is not suicidal nor a threat to anyone. She is angry about being belittled by Prof. Never-wrong, but is willing to apologize for her sarcastic comment and will return to the classroom.

He informs the Dean that he wants to kick out Ms. Gray-haired, a student from his course, because he thinks she is “emotionally disturbed and he feels threatened for his life.”

Later that day, Dean Newbie meets with Prof. Never-wrong informing him of the risk team assessment. Dean Newbie offers to have security outside the classroom. Prof. Never-wrong says that would be ridiculous since College security don’t carry guns. In a yelling fit, he informs Newbie he refuses to have further contact with the student whom he calls “violent and mentally ill.” He declares, “I would rather lose or quit my job than risk losing something more precious.” He storms out of her office.

Unbeknownst to Dean Newbie, Prof. Never-wrong asks another faculty member from the department to teach the student as an independent study since, “Countrified College refuses to address the safety of faculty.”

Later the same day, another student from the class informs the Dean that she read a startling message posted on Blackboard from Prof. Never-wrong: “We will meet in a different classroom on Friday. Please check your email on Thursday night for where to meet. Also please, for your own safety, do not discuss the room change with anyone else, including other members of the class. If you have questions, please contact Dean Newbie.” The student is worried and she is not alone; the class has been texting and she reports everyone is afraid. The students are concerned that Countrified College is hiding something that is serious and is not being truthful. ❖

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

1. How should the Dean respond to the student who contacted her and the other students in the class?
2. How can the Dean prevent the situation from further escalation?
3. Would you recommend removing the student from the classroom?
4. What might the Dean do to address faculty concerns about lack of safety in the classroom?
5. Can/should anything be done with regard to a faculty member who removes students from the classroom?

CASE STUDY #4

Professor Times is a successful, senior member of the science faculty at Middle Public University. He is an internationally known scientist and one of the more successful faculty members at MPU. Dr. Times is known as a progressive and as a champion of diversity and equity. He is known as a good teacher and for being committed to the success of his students. In the last few years, Professor Times' research activity has declined and he is no longer supervising students. Professor Times has been assigned a senior level class with an enrollment of 90 students. The course is an advanced ecology course where species behavior and population dynamics are covered in some detail.

After grades are posted for the first two homework assignments, five students visit the department chair to complain about Dr. Times' behavior. They allege that Dr. Times has created a hostile learning environment in the course: he photographed a few of the students on the first day of class, he showed disturbing images of human famine and starvation, he showed images of animals mating, he made a sexist comment when describing a bird species, and the students were embarrassed for another student when Dr. Times 'purposely' mispronounced their name when he called on them in class. Finally, the students allege that when Dr. Times seemed to be having trouble standing in class one day, he said that if someone ever needed to do CPR on him, he hoped it was an attractive woman. The students are adamant that the only solution that will satisfy them is to remove Dr. Times from the class.

The department chair writes an email message to the dean explaining the situation and meets with Dr. Times to discuss the issues raised by the students. During their meeting, Professor Times informs the department chair that he explained to the students on the first day that he wanted to learn all of their names, so if their photograph was not in the student data base, he would like to take their photo to help him learn their names. He explains that he had been doing this for a number of years and students hadn't objected. He admits using disturbing images in his class, as he had in previous years, to stimulate discussion. He claims that the images of animals mating were directly relevant to topics covered in the course. He explains that he has worked hard to learn how to pronounce the student's name and he thought that student was not upset with him. He admits that he slipped and made a sexist comment when describing a bird species. He also tells the department chair that he has a degenerative condition and is now in constant pain; his comment about the emergency care worker was on a

day of exceptional pain. Dr. Times says he is very sorry and indicates that sometimes when he is in severe pain, he says things that he deeply regrets. With this admission, the department chair contacts the dean of the college and the Title IX/EEOC office.

The department chair meets with the dean and informs her of the issues raised by the students in Dr. Times' class. They decide it would be prudent to have one of the associate deans sit in Dr. Times' course for a while and observe his interactions with the students. Dr. Times agrees to this arrangement.

The department chair also contacts the five students and informs them that she talked to Dr. Times and did not believe there would be any further issues in the course. By this time, the five students had met with the Title IX/EEOC office at MPU. They reiterate their claims to the Title IX officer and insist that Dr. Times be removed from the course and that the associate dean's attendance is not sufficient protection.

After interviewing the five students and one other student who came forward, the Title IX/EEOC office determines that Dr. Times has created a hostile learning environment in his course and the five students who brought the original complaint are entitled to take the course from another instructor during the current semester. The department chair informs the dean that she does not have another faculty member qualified to teach the course, and whoever they find to teach the new section of the class for the six students will have to start the course seven weeks into the semester. Now it is the dean's problem to resolve. ❖

DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

1. How does the dean approach finding a solution that ensures the students have a safe and equitable learning environment for this course? Are there issues of fairness that should be considered for the students remaining in Dr. Times' class?
2. An associate dean has been sitting in Dr. Times' class for three weeks before the finding from the Title IX/EEOC office and has not observed any inappropriate behavior by Dr. Times. Does this matter?
3. Dr. Times admits making one sexist comment during lecture, and another unrelated to course material. He told the chair that he is ashamed, embarrassed, and would like to convey his deepest apologies to the students. What consequences should Dr. Times face?
4. What issues do you have with how the Title IX/EEOC addressed this case?