2022

Causes, processes, and effects of academic reorganization at public master's universities in the United States

Brian Cherry

Brent Graves

Introduction

Modern organizations are under constant pressure to meet foreseen and unforeseen challenges. Higher education changes constantly, with each institution experiencing its own unique set of circumstances. As one current and pervasive example, the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on higher education have been far-reaching (Bhagat and Kim, 2020; Neuwirth, Jovic, and Mukherji, 2020), with unpredictable influences on organizational structure. Consequently, academic reorganizations are likely to be a frequent and recurring aspect for most universities. A greater understanding of the causes and effects of various reorganization strategies will allow better management of the process. An organization's structure plays a large role in its ability to evolve as the environment changes. Ahmady, et al. (2016) provide several definitions of organization structure which include, "a method by which organizational activities are divided, organized, and coordinated." Organizational structure is also connected to an organization's culture (Baligh, 1994) and decision-making (Fredrickson, 1986). Leaders must take into account these relationships as they prepare for the future, especially when they are considering reorganization. Reorganization does not occur in a vacuum; it impacts almost every aspect of an organization.

Universities, like most organizations, are organized hierarchically, with components that usually include colleges, divisions, schools, and departments. One might assume that there are "best practices" that guide the type, number, and organization of academic units at universities and that this would lead to some degree of similarity among otherwise comparable institutions

1

(size, funding, mission). However, this seems not to be the case; there are essentially as many organizational structures as there are universities. Similarly, one might think that, once a university has created the appropriate mix and interrelationships of academic units for their situation, these would be relatively stable. However, universities seem to reorganize frequently (Olson, 2010), perhaps because the environment in which the university operates has changed, or perhaps because the decision-makers have changed. Both internal and external factors lead universities to use reorganization as a reaction to organizational stresses.

Why do universities reorganize? Gumport & Pusser (1999) suggest that reorganization is almost always a response to the need to cut costs. Such a motivation is echoed frequently and often goes hand in hand with reallocation from low priority areas to disciplines with higher demand (Bealing, Riordan, & Riordan, 2011; Capaldi, 2009; Brousseau-Pereira, 2018; Eckel 2002; Mayer 2011). Olson (2010) asserts that responding to budget cuts and creating more efficient and academically sound units are common goals of university restructuring. It is also frequently claimed that reorganization will create interdisciplinary collaborations and synergies (e.g., Capaldi, 2009; also referred to in news releases and internal memoranda about restructuring at the University of Southern Maine in 2010, West Chester University in 2016, Utah State University in 2018, and Southeast Missouri State University in 2018). However, others would argue that these academic goals may be a façade erected to placate internal constituencies (Gumport & Pusser, 1999; Bealing et al., 2011).

Does university organizational structure matter? The short answer is, of course it does. The long answer is much more complex. Universities are unique from other organizations in both structure and purpose. In fact, they have been described as "organized anarchy" because of the high degree of goal ambiguity and unclear decision-making processes (Ruben and Gigliotti,

2017). Generally, the academic side of a public university is decentralized with multiple layers of administrative function including departments, schools, divisions, colleges, and other units depending on the needs, history, and politics of the institution. Such structures may constrain management attempts to meet university objectives or implement changes to meet societal shifts. Furthermore, the various hierarchical levels and subunits within them foment competition for limited resources, which reduces cooperation in achieving common goals. This "silo effect" (Tett, 2015) can impede communication, planning, and decision-making among the various units within the university. Mills, et. al. (2005) suggest that this tendency of universities to divide into insular, competitive, and even antagonistic components may protect outmoded practices and maintain barriers to synergistic cooperation between traditional disciplines. In addition, silos can create inconsistencies and inequities in resource allocation and management decisions, which in turn create angst among faculty and administrators. Academic reorganization has been a tool used to both create and correct these situations within many universities.

Martorana (1956) noted that social, economic and cultural developments were causing organizational change within universities during the 1950s. This included the rise of community colleges. It could be argued that similar upheaval in higher education is occurring today as a result of declining enrollments, the rise of online education, budgetary constraints, and the push for tuition-free community college in some states. Without a doubt, universities will continue to use some level of reorganization of academic units to address challenges from both internal and external pressures.

Systemic restructuring of higher education institutions has occurred in countries around the globe for a variety of reasons (Harmon and Meek, 2002). For example, massive reorganizations of European universities have occurred in recent years as they move to adopt

structures and processes more similar to the American system of higher education. These changes have been forced by both legislation and policy at the national level (Capano and Regini, 2014). Departmental mergers in Japan were attributed to "neoliberal thinking" focused on efficiency and market need (Yoshinaga, 2018). In this study, we focus on American higher education, where the historical background and societal context are unique. Surprisingly, there has been little research on the attitudes of academic administrators toward various academic organizational structures or the academic reorganization process.

<u>The Goals and Challenges of Reorganization</u>

Organizational structure influences several aspects of organizational function including efficiency, effectiveness, responsiveness, and accountability (Gortner, et. al., 2007, p. 111). Reorganization cannot change the past and, so, must focus on ways to affect these characteristics in the future. Consequently, a successful reorganization should rely on some type of strategic plan that looks toward the future, rather than continuously reacting to current or recent circumstances. According to Moran (1985), universities that actively plan for the future are in a better position than those that passively await a future that may never arrive. Unfortunately, universities are often not effective at strategic planning (Kotler and Murphy, 1981; Eckel and Trower, 2019). This can be rooted in several factors including internal politics, differences in academic disciplines, internal competition for resources, comfort with familiarity, and leadership turnover. One study of colleges and universities found deans, provosts, and university presidents had a turnover rate between 18% and 22% in just 18 months (HigherEd Direct, 2018). Similarly, it is estimated that university presidents turnover approximately every five years (Martin, Samels, & Associates, 2004). This could lead to focusing on short-term goals rather than long-term success. In addition, unlike the private sector, public universities do not serve a narrowly

segmented market; decision-making structures tend to be more decentralized and to prioritize independence (Fathi and Wilson, 2009). These elements can create challenges for strategy formulation and, consequently, restructuring efforts.

When dealing with organizational change, effective communication that includes all stakeholders is essential (Fernandez and Rainey, 2006). But as with strategic planning, universities tend to struggle with communication. One potential cause is that universities often believe it is better to disseminate as much information as possible. Bawden and Robinson (2008) indicate that information overload can become a hindrance and people can become overwhelmed. This could lead to faculty filtering out low-priority communications and critical information may be discarded as a result of information overload (Gratz and Salem, 1981). Faculty buy-in may be limited if they are not aware of budget, enrollment, or other issues driving a reorganization before the start of the process.

Reorganization in an academic environment is also impacted by issues of organizational culture and social identity (Mills, et. al., 2005). While higher education has historically been the catalyst for societal changes, it is often caricatured as an "ivory tower" that is insulated from "the real world." Masland (1985) characterized universities as organizations having weak explicit and implicit control mechanisms. Craig (2004) noted that higher education culture has traditionally been, "resistant to change and embraces the status quo." For example, academic departments are somewhat autonomous and develop their own rules (bylaws) to operate and develop faculty. These norms may not be shared by other academic departments or colleges. Therefore, reorganization can be seen as a challenge to longstanding practices that impact departmental functions, the tenure and promotion process, and leadership structure.

Politics and personalities are likely to have significant influences on the decision to initiate reorganization, as well as its outcomes. Stakeholders endeavor to increase the power and prestige of their academic units. Mergers and schisms may be welcomed or resisted depending on how they affect resource distribution and disciplinary autonomy. Titles of academic units and their administrators influence perceptions. Though not explicitly incorporated into judgmental criteria of either accreditation bodies (e.g., Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business, 2020) or ranking organizations (e.g., Luenendonk, 2019), leaders of academic units have indicated to us their belief that the title of the academic unit where a program resides influences the image that it projects to these entities. Accreditation could be used as an obstacle or opportunity to the reorganization process and must be given consideration.

The combination of assumed autonomy, traditions, management structure, and organizational culture makes it difficult for universities to readily adapt to both internal and external pressures for change. Research reported here examines various influences on the reorganization process and perceptions of its outcomes. We rely on survey data to explore associations between respondents' perceptions of what universities might hope to achieve in their reorganization efforts and the nature of the reorganization process. The goal of this research is to help universities to identify factors that associate with multiple goals of academic reorganization.

Methodology

We obtained data concerning factors impacting academic structure and reorganization using a Qualtrics survey distributed by email to a randomly selected academic department chair and a dean from each institution classified by Carnegie as a "public master's institution" in the United States. Carnegie Classification is the standard taxonomy for American higher education

and provides a framework for researchers to compare programs among peer institutions (Kosar and Scott, 2018). Participants were selected with the intent of obtaining a mix of sciences, humanities, and professional programs. Academic chairs and deans were selected because they are often a conduit between university policy-makers and the faculty for communication and change implementation. These middle management positions can also be the key to the success or failure of reorganization efforts. Rowley and Sherman (2003) identify the challenges for academic leadership in balancing administrative and academic roles. Department chairs and deans commonly return to the faculty at some point in their careers. Therefore, they may want to avoid alienating their colleagues while in administrative positions. These factors give these middle administrators a broad perspective that may not be apparent to faculty, who can ignore financial and administrative realities, and higher-level administrators, who may be insulated from the practical effects of organizational and bureaucratic decisions.

In total, we sent 374 email surveys and received 86 responses for a return rate of 23%. Of the respondents, 15.66% were from large programs, 42.17% medium programs, and 42.17% small programs, based on Carnegie classifications. We asked participants to respond to several statements characterizing academic reorganizations in their institutions using a seven-point Likert scale ranging from strong agreement to strong disagreement.

<u>Survey Data</u>

The first statement concerned the respondent's satisfaction with the current structure of academic affairs at their university. The distribution of responses is bimodal, with appreciable variation (Table 1). While fewer strongly agree (3.57%) with this statement than strongly disagree (10.71%), the sum of proportions that agree to some extent (48.81%) is greater than the

sum of proportions of those that disagree to varying extents (41.67%). We hypothesize that satisfaction level with associate with perceptions of the nature of these reorganizations.

Table 1. Satisfied with current academic organizational structure

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neither	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
3.57%	23.81%	21.43%	9.52%	16.67%	14.29%	10.71%

We next asked for responses to a series of statements regarding the effects of the current academic structure on various aspects of administrative functions and organizational culture. These included communication, budget practices, accountability, transparency, decision-making, and shared governance (Table 2). It is hypothesized that administrators reorganization processes with associate with perceptions that that an organizational structure supports these key areas.

Table 2. Your current academic structure promotes good _____.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Neither	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Communication	3.57%	25%	25%	17.86%	15.48%	8.33%	4.76%
Budget Practices	5.95%	17.86%	20.24%	14.29%	23.81%	9.52%	8.33%
Accountability	6.02%	21.69%	32.53%	12.05%	10.84%	7.23%	9.64%

Transparency	3.57%	16.67%	30.95%	14.29%	14.29%	7.14%	13.10%
Decision-Making	4.76%	19.05%	20.24%	20.24%	17.86%	10.71%	7.14%
Shared Governance	8.33%	29.76%	23.81%	20.24%	10.71%	2.38%	4.76%

Next, respondents indicated the extent to which various factors influenced the last reorganization at the respondent's institution (Table 3). The survey confirmed that reorganization is widespread and frequent. Seventy-eight percent of respondents' institutions had reorganized colleges or schools and 84% had reorganized academic departments in the previous ten years. Interestingly, only 16.67% agreed or strongly agreed that an explicit strategic plan had influenced the resulting academic structure. In contrast, 37.18% disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statement that academic structure was based on a strategic plan. This indicates that respondents' perceived reorganization efforts to have proceeded without this commonly utilized management tool. Indeed, budget issues and internal politics tended to be the two most-cited forces impacting reorganizations, which may suggest that internal or external influences often drive reorganization. Issues like highlighting academic programs, faculty management, and attempts to create synergy across disciplines were less frequently reported considerations.

Table 3. During your last academic reorganization _____ was an important consideration.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat	Neither	Somewhat	Disagree	Strongly

			Agree		Disagree		Disagree
Institutional History	10%	16.25%	23.75%	25%	11.25%	10%	3.75%
Faculty Management	0%	26.58%	31.65%	13.92%	10.13%	10.13%	7.59%
Budget Issues	21.52%	22.78%	24.05%	16.46%	2.53%	10.13%	2.54%
Highlight Programs	2.56%	14.10%	14.10%	28.21%	14.10%	20.51%	6.41%
Internal Politics	30.38%	13.92%	25.32%	13.92%	10.13%	2.53%	3.80%
Create Synergy	2.50%	22.50%	23.75%	21.25%	10.00%	12.50%	7.50%
Strategic Planning	6.41%	10.26%	12.82%	20.51%	12.82%	24.36%	12.82%

Model

To assess which elements of reorganizations were perceived to impact the broad outcomes of organizational restructuring efforts, we regressed the factors identified as important to restructuring (Table 3), as well as a traditional component of university structural change, reorganizing by traditional disciplines, on respondents perceptions of the quality of their organizational structure and its benefits (Table 2).[1] We examine the associations between dependent variable of interest; perceptions of restructuring; the nature of the restructuring, which

includes its perceived focuses and the processes used; and individual and organizational control variables.

We rely on ordered logistic models to identify associations (Long and Freese, 2014). Ordered logistic regressions provide a mechanism to evaluate associations between an ordinal dependent variable and regressors, assuming some fundamental assumptions are met.[2]   In the models below, these regressors include both ordinal variables capturing respondent attitudes, as well as several variables capturing organizational and respondent characteristics. These include the relative wealth of the organization (revenues per FTE), degree of hierarchy (FTE per college), reputation (Carnegie classification), and respondents' self-reported gender, age, status as a racial or ethnic minority, and experience (Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System, IPEDS). Using these models, we identified the associations between these elements of reorganization efforts and attitudes of mid-level administrators (Models 1-7, Table 4). While cross-sectional and incapable of demonstrating causality, we believe the associations revealed by this analysis have implications for universities' reorganization efforts.

The results for model 1 indicate that three reorganization-related factors, reorganizing by discipline, reorganizing with concern for the organization's history, and the use of strategic planning, are positively associated with satisfaction with the organization's structure. This is consistent with a preference for traditional structures among universities' mid-level managers, as well as for the use of a strategic management tool during this process. These associations are not surprising, as grouping individuals by expertise has been identified to reduce conflict and streamline the production of standard outcomes in bureaucratic structures (Walker & Lorsch, 1968), change can produce uncertainty and discomfort in organizations (Fernandez and Rainey,

2006), and strategic planning is both a useful strategic tool and a mechanism to facilitate communication and agreement (Mintzberg; 1987a, 1987b).

We can evaluate the substantive significance of the reported coefficients for each of these variables utilizing predicted probabilities. For instance, a one-unit change of a respondent's perceptions that universities reorganized by discipline was associated with a -3% chance they would be very dissatisfied with restructuring efforts; the same change associated with a 5% increase in the likelihood that they would be satisfied with restructuring. A one-unit change in the perceived impact of institutional history on reorganization efforts was associated with a -3% chance of being very dissatisfied and a 4% increase in satisfaction. Perceptions that strategic planning influenced reorganization also positively associated with satisfaction a, with one unit changes in perceptions of the use of strategic planning associated with a -2% decrease in the chance respondents would be very dissatisfied, and a 3% increase in satisfaction. Although a familiar tool, we do expect that strategic planning could cause organizations to deviate from traditional structures in some instances, so our results may suggest favor for both familiar forms and tools that could lead organizations to reconsider those structures. While we cannot explain the mechanisms at play, these results are consistent with respondent preferences for considered approaches to organizational design in higher education, as well as for the potential advantages of bureaucratic structure in the provision of this good. This seems intuitive, as formalized structures advantage the production of regularized outcomes and provide clarity for employees (Olsen, 2006). It is not surprising that they would be favored by those functioning as middle managers.

When we examine models 2 through 7, we see reorganizing by discipline is associated with communication (2), accountability (4), and transparency (5), helping to explain

respondents' apparent satisfaction with this design. This would be consistent with preferences for structure based on expertise. From an organizational theory perspective, we would expect the homogeneity of these subgroups should improve information flow within units and, again, favor regularized outcomes. Interestingly, institutional history is not associated with the same benefits and displays a negative association with perceived transparency.

Strategic planning is associated with several positive outcomes, including adaptive communication patterns (2), budgeting practices (3), accountability (4), transparency (5), and decision-making (6). While not causal evidence, this is consistent with the rationale for strategic planning. We posit that, at the least, it suggests that strategic planning is an established best practice for institutions focused on higher education.

Another important finding of this research is the potential for interpersonal politics to undermine satisfaction. This variable is negatively associated with general satisfaction with structure (Model 1) with a one-unit change (such as from agreement to strong agreement) that personal politics influenced restructuring associated with a 2% increase in the likelihood that a respondent will strongly disagree that they are satisfied with the organization's structure and the same change associated with a 3% decrease in the likelihood that respondents will agree that they are satisfied with restructuring. The more political the restructuring is perceived to be, the less satisfied respondents seem to be with it; these findings may shed light on the potential for interpersonal politics to undermine a number of the potential goals of restructuring efforts and are similar to the associations in our models of structures' impact on budgeting (3), transparency (5), decision making (6), and shared governance (7). The negative association (not presented) between this variable and both organization by discipline and the use of strategic planning may suggest potential remedies for interpersonal politics, while a positive association (not presented)

13

with reorganization shaped by history may suggest the potential for politics to arise when history guides organizational structure.

Of our control variables, only the Carnegie classification of the institution has a consistent effect, positively associating satisfaction with structure. A one-unit change in Carnegie classification decreases the likelihood of strong dissatisfaction by 5% and increases the likelihood of satisfaction by 8%. It is also positively associated with transparency (5), good decision making (6), and shared governance (7) suggesting that larger organizations may benefit from economies of scale or advantages of human capital when undertaking restructuring efforts. While not statistically significant, the consistent negative sign on our variable of self-identified racial or ethnic minority status merits further exploration, as individuals identifying as members of these minority groups express lower satisfaction with their organizational structures and with their structure's influence on communication, as well as other variables. Although our sample size and standard errors indicate these findings are only suggestive; we hope further work on representation and inclusivity in university restructuring efforts will shed additional light on this issue.

Table 4. Elements of Reorganization and Attitudes Regarding Organizational Structure.

Model#	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Independent Variable	Satisfied with Structure	Good Comm-unication	Good Budget-ing	Promotes Account-ability	Promotes Trans-parency	Good Decision Making	Shared Govern-ance
Coefficient/ T-value/ Significance	b/ t/ p	b/ t/ p	b/ t/ p	b/ t/ p	b/ t/ p	b/ t/ p	b/ t/ p
Reorganiz-ing by Discipline	0.484**	0.531**	-0.032	0.392*	0.376*	0.348	0.210

	(2.03)	(2.27)	(-0.14)	(1.78)	(1.70)	(1.63)	(1.00)
	0.043	0.023	0.887	0.075	0.089	0.103	0.317
Institutional History	0.386*	0.032	0.251	-0.026	-0.526**	0.002	-0.022
	(1.71)	(0.14)	(1.07)	(-0.12)	(-2.33)	(0.01)	(-0.11)
	0.087	0.888	0.285	0.904	0.020	0.993	0.915
Faculty Management	-0.066	-0.021	0.087	-0.006	0.351**	0.150	0.324*
	(-0.38)	(-0.13)	(0.48)	(-0.04)	(2.00)	(0.90)	(1.83)
	0.707	0.898	0.630	0.970	0.045	0.367	0.068
Budget Concerns	-0.209	0.232	-0.010	0.291	0.108	0.081	-0.082
	(-1.25)	(1.37)	(-0.06)	(1.64)	(0.65)	(0.50)	(-0.46)
	0.210	0.170	0.955	0.101	0.515	0.620	0.647
Interpersonal Politics	-0.279*	-0.138	0.467***	-0.164	-0.289*	-0.327**	-0.394**
	(-1.76)	(-0.84)	(-2.74)	(-1.02)	(-1.84)	(-2.09)	(-2.45)
	0.079	0.400	0.006	0.305	0.066	0.037	0.014
Strategic Planning	0.256*	0.294*	0.457***	0.531***	0.402***	0.430***	0.000
	(1.71)	(1.95)	(2.77)	(3.21)	(2.62)	(2.70)	(0.00)
	0.087	0.051	0.006	0.001	0.009	0.007	0.998
Revenues Per FTE	-0.000	-0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000***	0.000**	0.000*

	(-1.41)	(-0.37)	(0.14)	(1.30)	(3.32)	(2.08)	(1.66)
	0.159	0.714	0.892	0.193	0.001	0.037	0.098
FTE Per College	-0.000	0.000	0.000	-0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	(-0.56)	(0.50)	(0.27)	(-0.15)	(0.26)	(0.71)	(1.09)
	0.579	0.617	0.788	0.884	0.791	0.481	0.278
Carnegie Classification	0.770*	0.463	0.500	0.636	1.258***	1.140***	1.327***
	(1.94)	(1.11)	(1.31)	(1.57)	(3.06)	(2.88)	(3.24)
	0.052	0.267	0.191	0.117	0.002	0.004	0.001
Gender	-0.025	0.685	0.044	0.139	-0.750	-0.678	-0.756
	(-0.05)	(1.22)	(0.08)	(0.26)	(-1.35)	(-1.28)	(-1.41)
	0.963	0.222	0.935	0.794	0.177	0.201	0.159
Age	0.160	0.470*	-0.041	0.298	-0.184	0.069	-0.368
	(0.61)	(1.79)	(-0.16)	(1.13)	(-0.68)	(0.27)	(-1.37)
	0.541	0.073	0.875	0.257	0.494	0.785	0.172
Racial/Ethnic Minority	-0.257	-0.220	-0.037	-0.111	-0.074	-0.080	-0.014
	(-1.48)	(-1.43)	(-0.25)	(-0.76)	(-0.49)	(-0.56)	(-0.09)
	0.140	0.153	0.800	0.449	0.622	0.573	0.925
Experience	-0.038	-0.042	0.215	-0.229	0.114	0.269	0.148

(-0.20)	(-0.21)	(1.14)	(-1.08)	(0.57)	(1.38)	(0.79)
0.843	0.833	0.255	0.280	0.569	0.168	0.432
R2 0.163	0.156	0.144	0.154	0.158	0.192	0.127

$* \ p<0.10 \quad ** \ p<0.05 \quad *** \ p<0.01$

Conclusions

Broadly, our results suggest that grouping by expertise and the use of strategic planning tools may enhance satisfaction with reorganization efforts. While this research cannot account for the formal and informal effects of secondary structures in a matrix-style organization, it seems that respondents preferred a more traditional grouping of personnel by discipline. This would suggest that efforts to flatten or de-silo academic institutions are likely to be perceived negatively by their middle managers. As these employees are often judged by their capacity to generate regularized outcomes, such as student enrollments or aggregate research activity and funding, their preference for a traditional bureaucratic structure is consistent with our expectations.

This does not seem to be accompanied by a desire for stasis, as strategic approaches to change were also positively associated with many outcomes. Given the multiple purposes for and benefits of strategic planning in organizations (Mintzberg 1987a, 1987b), this result might not be unexpected. This finding does suggest that tools for managing change may produce their desired effects in the case of reorganizations.

While both of these results suggest the importance of formal elements, the potential for informal factors to impact reorganization is demonstrated by our findings associated with the variable interpersonal politics. As the literature on organizations suggests that informal structures

will emerge in the absence of formality (Deifenback and Sillince, 2011), we believe this provides further evidence in support of carefully managed reorganization and communication in academic institutions. Well-structured formal mechanisms can be used to directly inhibit negative informal structures, as well as to facilitate common understanding about the motivations, decision-making mechanisms, and outcomes.

Of course, this work is exploratory and comes with limitations. For example, relying on respondents' satisfaction with reorganization cannot inform our understanding of organizational performance. Given the nature of this survey research, a pre and post comparison of organizational performance is impossible. In addition, while the return rate is acceptable we would like to see a better response rate in future research. Future work could incorporate a broader range of stakeholders including faculty and staff. We hope that future work will explore the connection between universities' priorities during reorganization, their effects on employees and organizations, and organizational effectiveness.

The context of higher education changes constantly, with each institution experiencing its own unique set of circumstances. As one current and pervasive example, the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on higher education have been far-reaching (Bhagat and Kim, 2020; Neuwirth, Jovic, and Mukherji, 2020), with unpredictable influences on organizational structure. Consequently, academic reorganization is likely to continue to be a frequent and recurring aspect of university administration. A greater understanding of the causes and effects of various reorganization strategies will allow better management of the process.

References

Ahmady, G. A., Mehrpour, M. & Nikooravesh, A. (2016). Organizational Structure. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences.* Volume 230, No. 12, 455-462. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.09.057

Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business. (2020). Guiding Principles and Standards for AACSB Business Accreditation. https://www.aacsb.edu/accreditation/standards/business.

Baligh, H. H. (1994). Components of Culture: Nature, Interconnections, and Relevance to the Decisions on the Organization Structure. *Management Science*, January, Vol. 40, No. 1, 14-27. https://www.jstor.org/stable/2632842

Bawden, D. & Robinson, L. (2009). The dark side of information: overload, anxiety and other paradoxes and pathologies. *Journal of Information Science*, *35*(2), 180–191. https://doi.org/10.1177/0165551508095781

Bealing, W., Jr., Riordan, D., & Riordan, M. (2011). Institutional theory in college restructuring: Myth or reality? *Journal of Case Studies in Education*. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1057190.

Bhagat, S. & Kim, D.J. (2020). Higher education amidst COVID-19: challenges and silver linings. Information Systems Management 36(4): 366-371. https://doi.org/10.1080/10580530.2020.1824040.

Brousseau-Pereira, J.A. (2018). *Playing the Field: A Case Study of Restructuring at the University of Massachusetts Amherst*. Ph.D. dissertation. https://scholarworks.umass.edu/dissertations_2/1157/.

Capaldi, E.D. (2009). Intellectual transformation and budgetary savings through academic reorganization. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*,41(4), 18-27. https://doi.org/10.3200/CHNG.41.4.18-27

Capano, G. & Regini, M. (2014). Governance reforms and organizational dilemmas in European Universities. Comparative Education Review 58(1):73-103. https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/full/10.1086/672949.

Craig, C. M. (2004). Higher education culture and organizational change in the 21st century. *The Community College Enterprise, 10*(1), 79-89. Retrieved from https://nmu.idm.oclc.org/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/higher-education-culture-organizational-change/docview/218777038/se-2?accountid=2745

Diefenbach, T. & J. Sillince (2011). Formal and informal hierarchy in different types of organizations. Organization Studies, 32(11):1515 – 1537.

Eckel, P.D. (2002). Decision rules used in academic program closure: Where the rubber meets the road. *The Journal of Higher Education*,73(2), 237-262.

Eckel, P., & Trower, C. (2019, February 14). Stop Planning! Retrieved December 11, 2020, from https://www.insidehighered.com/

Fathi, M., & Wilson, L. (2009). Strategic planning in colleges and universities. *Business Renaissance Quarterly, 4*(1), 91-103. Retrieved from https://nmu.idm.oclc.org/login?url=https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/strategic-planning-colleges-universities/docview/212580008/se-2?accountid=2745

Fernandez, S. & Rainey, H.G. (2006). Managing Successful Organizational Change in the Public Sector. *Public Administration Review*. 66(2), 168-176. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2006.00570.x

Gortner, H.F., Nichols, K.L. & Ball, C. (2007). *Organization Theory*. 3rd Edition. Belmont, California, USA. Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.

Gumport, P.J. & Pusser, B. (1999). University restructuring: The role of economic and political contexts. In J.C. Smart & W.G. Tierney (Eds.), *Higher Education: Handbook of Theory and Research*. (pp.146-200). New York: Springer.

Gratz, R. D. & Salem, P. J. (1981). Organizational Communication and Higher Education. AAHE-ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No. 10, 1981. Retrieved December 12, 2020, from https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED217826

Haider.J & Bawden, D. (2008). Conceptions of `information poverty' in library and information science: a discourse analysis, Journal of Documentation 63(4), 534-557. https://doi.org/10.1177/0165551508095781

Harmon, K. & Meek, V.L. (2002) Merger revisited: international perspectives on mergers in higher education. Higher Education 44:1-4. https://www.jstor.org/stable/3447549?seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents.

Higher Ed Direct. College Administrator Data/Turnover Rates: 2016-Present. (2018, April 12). Retrieved December 11, 2020, from https://hepinc.com/

Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System. The Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System. (n.d.). Retrieved April 5, 2022, from https://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/

Jacques, Elliot. 1990. In Praise of Hierarchy. Harvard Business Review 90(1): 127–33.

Kotler, P. & Murphy, P. (1981). Strategic Planning for Higher Education. *The Journal of Higher Education.* 52(5), 470-489. https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.1981.11778119

Long J.S. & Freese, J. (2014). Regression Models for Categorical Dependent Variables Using Stata, 3rd Edition. College Station, TX: Stata Press

Luenendonk, M. (2019). Business school rankings: factors and list of leading universities. https://www.cleverism.com/business-school-rankings-leading-universities/.

Martin, J., Samels, J.E., & Associates. (2004.) *Presidential Transition in Higher Education: Managing Leadership Change.* Baltimore, Maryland, USA. The Johns Hopkins Press.

Martorana, S.V. (1956). Reorganization in Higher Education. *The Journal of Higher Education,* (27)9, 471-474 and 511-512. DOI: 10.2307/1977524

Masland, A.T., (1985). Organizational Culture in the Study of Higher Education. *The Review of Higher Education.* 8(2), 157-168. 10.1353/rhe.1985.0026

Mayer, L.J. (2011). *Assessing the Role of RCM in Decision-making About Discontinuing Academic Programs and Restructuring Academic Units.* Ph.D. dissertation. University of Pennsylvania. https://search.proquest.com/docview/868176825?pq-origsite+gscholar&fromopenview=true.

Mills, M., Bettis, P., Miller, J.W., & Nolan, R. (2005). Experiences of Academic Unit Reorganization: Organizational Identity and Identification in Organizational Change. *The Review of Higher Education 28*(4), 597-619. DOI:10.1353/rhe.2005.0046.

Mintzberg, H. (1987a). The strategy concept: five p's for strategy. California Management Reviewpp.11-24.

Mintzberg, H. (1987b). The strategy concept ii: another look at why organizations need strategies. California Management Review, pp. 25-32.

Kosar, R. & Scott, D. W. (2018). Examining the Carnegie Classification Methodology for Research Universities, Statistics and Public Policy, 5:1, 1-12, DOI: 10.1080/2330443X.2018.1442271

Moran, B.M. (1985). Strategic Planning in Higher Education. *Association of College & Research Libraries.* 26(6). https://crln.acrl.org/index.php/crlnews/article/view/20185/24275

Neuwirth, L.S., Jovic, S. & Mukherji, B.R. (2020). Reimagining higher education during and post-COVID-19: challenges and opportunities. Journal of Adult and Continuing Education 0(0):1-16. DOI: 10.1177/147797I420947738

Olsen, J.P. (2006). Maybe It Is Time to Rediscover Bureaucracy. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory.* 16(1), 1-24. https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mui027

Olson, G.A. (2010). Why Universities Reorganize. *The Chronicle of Higher Education* August 15. https://www.chronicle.com/article/Why-Universities-Reorganize/123903.

Rowley, D.J. & Sherman, H. (2003). The Special Challenges of Academic Leadership. *Management Decision,* 41(10), 1058-1063. DOI: 10.1108/00251740310509580

Ruben, B. D., & Gigliotti, R. A. (2017). Are higher education institutions and their leadership needs unique? The vertical versus horizontal perspective. *Higher Education Review*, *49*(3), 27–52. https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eue&AN=125676899&site=ehost-live

Tett, G. (2015). The silo effect: The peril of expertise and the promise of breaking down barriers. New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.

Walker, A., & Lorsch, J. (1968). Organizational choice: product versus function. Harvard Business Review, 46(6), 129-138.

Yoshinaga, K. (2018). The merger of departments across universities: the case of veterinary schools in Japanese national universities. International Journal of Educational Development 63:59-64. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0738059316304254.

---

[1] Highlighting programs and creating synergies were not significantly associated with our dependent variables and excluded from models for parsimony.

[2] A Wolfe-Gould (.718) test of proportional odds indicates that a parallel assumption for our ordinal variables is appropriate. Relative to other options, this test is reasonably accurate in the case of small samples and when the dependent variable is distributed across many categories (Buis and Williams 2013). In order to ensure reliability, Likert scale variables were collapsed into three categories, coefficients were consistent with those presented in Table 4.