

Karen welcomes and gives more context to the recalibrating-our-work memo she sent out yesterday.

Provide the opportunity to focus on the type of effort we really want to make on the task force, which is to work from what we do at UO and how we do it. Each working group (WG) will consider the CAS structure in terms of:

- What is working
- What is not working
- What is not workable

The WG's will determine the approach they wish to take.

Suggestion: Messaging about the beginning of the survey being the same for each.

Does the recalibrating memo change the way the WG should do their work? No, it provides more liberty for groups to do it however they feel is the best approach.

Should the development group come talk with the outside group or on the day of the presentation?

WGs should decide who they want to talk to that will best help them answer the questions they are exploring. Reports to the full task force will be provided by the WGs.

If WGs need help to schedule or get visitors, we can help. Contact Teri.

Karen reflected that many WGs have expressed concern they do not know where to begin. She emphasized again that the president and provost have chosen us for this task because we work and study at UO. She suggested we just meet and talk, and we will naturally start to figure out what approach we want to take. Those who want to do research should do it; those who don't should consult their own experiences and expertise.

Tina: what will the reporting-back process be? WG will send report in advance of the meeting; then walk us through it for 10-20 minutes and have open discussion.

CAS Dean's join the meeting:

Bruce Blonigen (Interim Tykeson Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences), Philip Scher (Divisional Dean for Social Sciences), Hal Sadofsky (Divisional Dean for Natural Sciences), Karen Ford (Senior Divisional Dean for Humanities)

Question of the role of the divisional deans and practically what difference would it make if each was a dean of a separate college; is there a sense of competition or collaboration between different colleges?

Hal: you can tell there is a difference when working with other deans within the college vs. outside the college. Finance, for example – CAS is financed as a college, so the deans understand each other's issues and concerns, and this broad perspective is valuable. This is not insurmountable, however, and deans could work toward more communication and collaboration across colleges.

Bruce: we work really well collaboratively. Everything is in conversation with the other CAS deans. Different points of view tend to be resolved because we are regularly together in a shared space. But we also recognize differences; budgeting is already done differently across different divisions.

Karen: CAS collaboration with other deans (external); in general, the UO is a very collaborative campus. Shared interest, shared resources, Andrew trained the CAS deans to care about the whole university not just about CAS; it is our ethos. Not territorial but rather how to thrive collectively. People seem ready to cross the sidewalk and come together.

Phil: large % of day-to-day meetings are with heads and/or faculty who are already collaborating with others both within and external to CAS.

Juan-Carlos: The deans are not really the collaborators; they are informed and can offer advice (conveyer) or knowledge to the faculty, who are the collaborators. Currently he is involved with cross discipline initiatives (with athletics and other), but in general it is not the dean who drives collaboration.

Richard: how many examples can we find of scholarly or research collaborations across divisions and disciplines? Can we find more examples of interdisciplinary teaching than interdisciplinary research?

Phil: ENVS is an example of bringing together for people for research as well as teaching.

Monica: ENVS builds community – which speaks to the value of an interdisciplinary unit; it requires compromise sometimes.

Bruce Blonigen: research agenda from deans is expressed through the hiring process.

Francis: infrastructure has a lot to do with this. Why are we doing this? The layers between the department and the deans. If the divisional dean is removed from the conversation to avoid a conflict of interest with their home department, there is no advocacy and representation for that department at the dean's level.

Bruce Blonigen: When do people recuse? Usually for personnel or P&T meetings.

Brad: think of recusal as not getting to vote twice; he doesn't attend personnel-decision meetings in Math because he shouldn't influence that discussion when he has an opportunity as a member of the Provost's Office to weigh in at another stage. We are perhaps too cautious about conflicts of interest, erring on the side of avoiding any situation that could present a conflict.

Budget: differences between divisions; how the flow of budget between divisions is so important.

Bruce Blonigen: CAS pulled back funds from departments when there was the \$12M budget deficit. That budget scenario required the department to determine what was needed to run classes and the rest got pulled. This does not work well in the sciences.

Francis: If there were a college split, there would need to be walls put up between budget connections.

Bruce Blonigen: example; GE allocations were initially provided by division, and CAS asked if they could be given with flexibility and allow CAS to make those decisions.

Hal: different perspectives; more autonomy, but less flexibility. If there are no longer divisions, you cannot move funds from one area to another.

Karen: divisional deans are not working in separate divisions; they go to the weekly leadership team meetings and discuss the entire college, learning from each other.

Karen: from budget point of view (POV), feels like she has been able to do more in humanities because of being in CAS. For ex. Maybe Hal needs more GEs and Karen needs money for events; they might trade resources so both get what they need.

Monica: upon hearing CAS is too "big"?

- How do Dean's feel?
- Second, what works/doesn't from the Dean's POV.

Hal: bigness: data request from the provost office takes a lot longer due to size; on the other hand, Provost regularly adopts a process/policy that is developed in CAS, so CAS work must have value.

Bruce Blonigen: example recently of Provost wanting to know all course releases and what the cost is. The Dean's office has been keeping track of procedures/policies that CAS developed that are now incorporated at the University level. Getting that information required a big effort because CAS is large, but we had collected most of it for our own processes already.

Phil: layers/political/where do you want management to come from and how hands on? At what point does a department get too big?

Hal: what works/doesn't work? OSU college of science and huge staff; doing a lot of things that are really good, but we can't do because we don't have dedicated staff to take on those initiatives. Communications, UG recruitment, grant administration. Grant admin centralized larger than a department but less than the size of CAS.

Bruce Blonigen: we are more reactive than proactive because we don't have the resources to be proactive.

Monica: is the lack of resources due to structure in some way, or is it allocation from outside the structure?

Hal: As an associate dean, you step into a heritage, like a history of being collaborative. You simultaneously try to preserve what's working in the division and what people value and introduce beneficial changes.

This is harder to do for staff: if you have a dollar to spend, you end up spending it on the faculty not staff, thus recreating the short staffing situation.

Spike: speculate a bit about the layers. Suppose the college is split into 3; what happens with the job that the mega-dean is doing?

Ben: what could be going better? Take away solutions that just rely on having more money. Do you experience structural impediments?

Karen: since I have been there, we don't pay enough attention to research. We have not made it structural in the college.

Hal: there are impediments that are external to the college. For example, cost and difficulty of getting minor and major construction projects done [administrative structure].

Juan Carlos: research – in other places it is thematic; in the future it will not be about the college but about themes to cross collaborate.

Juan-Carlos: Fellow deans believe CAS is too big. At Deans Council, other deans each represent their college, but four deans represent one college in CAS. Political influence that effects the conversation at the Deans Council. Re: staff, yes CAS is understaffed because it is too large. Other colleges are better staffed – is the question that they should not be so well staffed? Other colleges might have 20 departments; why does CAS have 40+ departments? What is the background/history of how we got here?

Juan-Carlos: Budget – believe UO can transition to models that more than one college can share resources. For example: SOJC & COD sharing admin resources.

Bruce Blonigen: About being too big a presence on the Deans Council; we are only 42% of the total deans on the Council; however, represent 60% of the UO.

40+ majors & programs; only 30 departments. Some programs do not have any faculty; they are interdisciplinary programs.

Sharing resources is a good idea. CAS is open to doing that as long as it doesn't degrade the service people are getting in our college.

Karen: The UO, not just CAS, has so many majors because the faculty have kept pace with student interest and disciplinary change.

Brad: 18-20 years ago, there was a 33% growth in UG students, which also contributed to the growth in majors.

Hal: many majors do not cost anything extra because they are managed within an existing department (except GSS).

Tina: first, pots of money for NTTF vs. TF and, second, who decides when a programs "matters"?

Bruce Blonigen: budget – provost is paying TTF and GE allocations to the college. Then CAS looks at how to allocate supplies, staff, NTTF. At this point they look at last year \$\$ then how are enrollments.

As for research, it is hard to evaluate; 80% of our departments are in the bell curve, hard to weigh where/what is the strength of each? How will a department be helped by adding resources?

Tina: supporting teaching doesn't seem as important to UO as supporting research.

Bruce Blonigen: because of budget cuts, there were many NTTF nonrenewals that felt like/perceived as a lack of support for teaching.

We care about great teaching and great research, but NTTF staffing got too high and is still too high; we must make adjustments.

Richard: themes; must be grown. Can't force it. Need group of people who are close enough but not too close – meaning diversity and a sense of culture. Incubator requires communication.

Mike: concerns raised that teaching is not high priority.

Phil: The very structure is difficult: we are entrepreneurial, yet with goals of collective organization, competing against each other and also on the same team. Course release is #1 request because people do not know where to put their energies.

One structure that is problematic is promotion and tenure; how we evaluate the purpose for being here? Common goals

Karen feels the need for more support for teaching is a university-wide problem. The merit and promotion reward are for research, and this feels in tension with teaching values to many.

Joe: how many CAS departments have involvement with natural science? Is NS so different that there is a natural fault line? Meaning is it different enough that it should not be in CAS?

Hal: pros and cons of both sides.

Bruce Blonigen: even if there is a fault line, it doesn't mean that is a reason to break up.

Betsy: if the college were split, would it make the teaching situation better?

Phil: plug for thematic – fastest growing areas.