

The CAS Task Force received a report from the Work Group assigned to think about internal management and stakeholder issues. The group distributed a matrix of the issues, identifying internal processes and indicating possible benefits and problems in different structures. The working group also gave a report about interviews with various UO colleagues who work with CAS (Employee Labor Relations, United Academics, Graduate Teaching Fellows Federation).

The first issue discussed was the general decanal reporting structure. The group noted that divisional deans have a seat at the Deans Council, which reflects and represents the relative size of CAS and provides additional voices. However, the group noted that the structure creates multiple layers between department heads and deans and also that the strength of representation depends heavily on the individuals in specific positions.

The Work Group also discussed budget allocation among departments as well as other budgetary allocations. An advantage of the current structure is the flexibility afforded to the college to allocate funding across divisions, in particular to programs and departments which may be underfunded or have deficits. One disadvantage of the current structure is that there is less transparency at the departmental level, particularly in explaining the perceived inequities that result from the differential allocations noted above.

The group talked about hiring processes, noting that the college as a whole sets forward a plan which allows a dean-level vision, but a disadvantage to the current structure may be that departments feel further away from the decision-making. It was also noted that splitting up the college may result in less coordination on hiring across divisions. Overall, the dean-level hiring vision was deemed as a disadvantage to smaller units. There was some discussion about whether the process as it exists truly comes from the deans (or is directed centrally) and, if not, whether this means a structural change would have an impact. It was generally explained that the visions are indeed forwarded to the provost by the deans. (The question of whether the provost follows those visions was a separate question that is not necessarily relevant to the structural question.)

Faculty service, and the ability to provide incentives this work, was deemed as structurally neutral. There was not a clear advantage to this in splitting, but it was not deemed a disadvantage, either.

Department head responsibilities and compensation were also reviewed by the Work Group. This was viewed with a split result, noting that more flexibility to differentiate among heads (a result of narrower colleges) may be good, but this could also lead to inequities that are problematic.

Support of DGAs was noted as being relatively neutral in that support here would likely not change whether there was a large college (current structure) or smaller colleges (a split), but that a split could result in greater administrative costs as there may be a need for administrative staff support in each smaller college.

The distribution of Graduate Employees (GEs) was also considered by the Work Group, and the current structure was viewed as a relative advantage to this process because CAS has a large pool of GE

positions/terms to distribute across divisions, and this flexibility would presumably be limited if there were some number of smaller colleges.

The Work Group also considered curriculum oversight, mostly looking at this issue from a workload perspective, noting that more colleges would likely result in more work because each college would need to have a curricular committee and process, thus duplicating (or triplicating) the number of faculty needing to serve.

The group talked to various people about the impact of structure—and possible changes thereto—on a department or other unit's ability to work through employee and labor relations issues. This is still in process, but early observations demonstrate that it's generally better to have a larger pool of information, experience, and knowledge from which to draw.

As a concluding point, the group noted that what they often saw was the potential for simply duplicating work in new, additional colleges, which would entail a financial cost.

The task force as a whole engaged in a discussion about advising, course releases, and budget processes. There was no specific sentiment about whether structure plays a role in these areas. It was also suggested that there could be improvements to administrative functions through shared services even if the college is not split.

The task force had a broader conversation about how the CAS deans work together and the relative benefits of this camaraderie to the units within CAS. There was also some conversation about how much this is structural versus personality-based. There was some broader discussion about communications, transparency, and the sharing of information within the college and across the university more generally and, again, whether struggles with communication are more about structure or more about individuals and personality.

The task force also provided an overview of the conversations held with Employee and Labor Relations (ELR), United Academics (UA), and the Graduate Teaching Fellows Federation (GTFF). UA noted that one advantage to the current structure is that CAS leaders have a broad perspective of labor relations situations that arise, providing useful context and background; a disadvantage of the current structure offered by UA was the large size and the lack of cohesion. UA noted that narrower colleges may make cross-unit collaboration more difficult, but that may provide for better representation by a dean who is more directly connected to the departments. The GTFF noted that, for the most part, GE work is done at the department level and is thus not entirely connected to the overall structure of the larger college entity. When asked about advantages to the current structure, the GTFF noted unity across departments. The GTFF pondered whether there could be improvements to the disparity in GE allotments or relative FTE assignments between colleges if there was a different CAS structure, and that perhaps a new structure could provide greater opportunity to provide more support for GEs overall. ELR did not generally have any perspectives on advantages or disadvantages of structure given that its work is more based on employee type as opposed to home unit.

The task force continued with a broader conversation about structure versus individuals, communication and collaboration, the premise of the structural conversation relative to institutional goals, liberal arts, broad support versus targeted support, and other overarching issues around leadership, standards, and general direction.