

The March 19 meeting of the Task Force was focused on a report from the research working group. The group presented various considerations and noted whether each issue was supported by the current structure, impeded by the current structure, or held neutral given the structure.

The group took a three-pronged approach: looking at factors that promote or impede research and scholarship, advantages and disadvantages of the current structure, and advantages and disadvantages of alternative structures. It then applied its work to four key factors that influence research, each taken in turn below: **resources, administrative support, local intellectual environment, and broader intellectual environment**. The high-level summary is that most factors that influence research are unaffected by the CAS structure or could go either way depending on budgeting. Overall, the group found that, of the factors that are meaningfully altered by structure, change resulted in a net drawback to research and scholarly activity.

The group thought about **resources that support research**. This part of the analysis included:

1. Personnel and FTE (e.g., faculty time, GEs, RAs, postdocs, etc.). The group noted that GE allocations, since they are distributed at the college level, are relatively neutral from a quantity standpoint, but that the current structure supports flexibility in distributing GEs across multiple divisions.
2. Funding (e.g., internal grants, bridge support, travel funds) was deemed mostly neutral.
3. Space (e.g., lab and office space) was deemed mostly neutral. One issue that would require thought if a split were considered is how you would create or allocate space and allocate budget for space upgrades or the like to a college focused on Social Sciences or Humanities (i.e., those with traditionally fewer space needs).
4. Faculty lines are centrally allocated, so this was largely neutral.

The group also thought about **administrative support necessary for research**. Included in this part of the analysis were (i) grant development and administration (e.g., pre- and post-award), (ii) finance and business administration, (iii) administration of graduate programs, GEs, RAs, postdocs, and (iv) development and external support. All of these were deemed neutral with regard to structure because things are handled elsewhere, such as within the Office of the Vice President for Research and Innovation. There was a brief conversation about an observation from the Research Advisory Board (RAB), which reflected that perhaps, in part, the OVPRI was built to fill a gap in research services that the College of Arts and Sciences was not providing. It was also reported that the RAB noted the lack of an associate or assistant dean focused on research within the College, which does not align with peer institutions. The administrative support analysis also included college-level administration, which was deemed as largely supported by the current structure due to resource flexibility within CAS and the opportunities for efficiency.

Another major category the group considered was the **local intellectual environment**. They discussed the desire and need for productive, research-active faculty, graduate students, and postdocs. The group determined that it was unclear whether or how reorganization would change that, largely because there is no CAS-level ownership or responsibility for research. Within this category, the group also discussed

the fact that fellow specialists were within departments or neighboring departments and determined that the current structure supports interdisciplinary collaborations, but that did not necessarily equate to an assumption that another structure would *not* support this. The group also concluded that the current structure impedes more targeted hiring, which could be remedied in a narrower college model (but acknowledged that perhaps the relatively new IHP is already addressing this).

Related, another category was the **broader intellectual environment**. The group discussed whether the current structure incentivizes support for basic inquiry and the liberal arts vision, noting that this might possibly diminish in a narrow-college model, but not necessarily. They also discussed incentive support for cross-disciplinary collaboration, and generally thought that the current structure supports this and that a narrow-college model might undercut the strengths. There was a reference here also to the idea of an associate dean focused on research within the current CAS model and some discussion about the role of co-location (e.g., the proximity of the divisional deans to one another) and whether the benefits of co-location are structural.

In summary, the workgroup noted that research is driven by faculty and supported at the department level or more centrally (e.g., by OVPRI or the Graduate school). Thus, most research activities are unaffected by the CAS structure. They also noted that there is a lack of direct research support at the CAS level, which may need to be remedied regardless of structure. The group also noted that the biggest impact of any structural change is not structural *per se* but rather a matter of how resources are ultimately allocated (e.g., faculty lines, GEs, development resources). There was some additional conversation about development in particular, and as an example for how structure—particularly the breadth of CAS currently—may impact the focus and attention of fundraising priorities and staff.

The group thought about **future considerations**. It noted that there was general support for interdisciplinary scholarship and that this should be factored into a conversation for any structure, particularly whether there is an enhanced role for divisional deans. There was also a suggestion that a future survey probe the level of interest for research collaboration, in an attempt to assess the latent desire for increased collaboration. The group also clearly identified that there needs to be increased support for research within CAS, which does not necessitate reorganization but could be obtained with a “dean of research” role or roles.

The Task Force engaged in a conversation about several different aspects of these considerations. There was a clarification that by “research” the group did not just mean sponsored or externally funded research, but that it meant to capture all scholarly work in its definition of research. There was also a discussion about whether the premise of a narrow-college model being based on the three existing divisions was flawed and whether, instead, there would be benefits to gain from colleges structured around issues or themes (e.g., environment). The task force discussed the impacts of the current and possible other structures on changing (for the good or bad) research opportunities, including the balance of hiring researchers who can also teach, the breadth of what faculty engage in, and curricular choices—and whether these types of issues are actually addressed at a college level (regardless of the structure) or the department level (the group generally agreed it was the latter).

The Task Force turned to quick updates from other subgroups. The **teaching group** talked about the overarching themes they intend to explore. These include, primarily, core education and the pressures facing different types of faculty. They have invited Lee Rumbarger from the Teaching Engagement Program and Sierra Dawson from the Office of the Provost to join one of their subgroups to talk more specifically about teaching. The **internal management** group reported on the core areas it intends to

focus on, which include but are not limited to: budget and resource allocation, space, communications, internal processes relating to development, human resources, and labor relations. The **external impacts** group is still working on getting together. Comparator information is still being gathered by the **alternative college models** group with an attempt to further our knowledge of what we know has or has not worked at other institutions.

Before adjourning, members briefly discussed the format of the overall submission to the provost and president with the **writing group**.