

CAS Task Force
Working Groups and Meeting Plans

WORKING GROUPS

- A. Research: Berkman, McGough, Paquette, Taylor
- B. Teaching: Boscha, García-Caro, Price, Sewall
- C. Internal administration and management: Brinkley, Russ, White, Zambrana
- D. External management and relations: Guy, Parsons, Stevenson, Sventek
- E. Other college structures that might serve UO better: Bowers, Gildea, Modella, Shelton
 - a. and their financials: Finance Team: Dorjahn, Krabel, Luiere, Nelson, Shelton
- F. Writing Group: Ford, García-Caro, McClendon, McGough, Rowe

Working groups will commence their work after the February 12 TF meeting and lead the TF discussion on the days assigned below. On the day that a group leads the discussion, we will save a half hour for all the other groups to give a five-minute update on their work. For example, when group A leads a discussion of research considerations, groups B, C, D, and E will offer five-minute updates on their work in the last half hour of the meeting.

CALENDAR OF MEETINGS/REPORTS

Working Group A: RESEARCH, Reporting Tuesday, March 12

Address how the UO can support research excellence considering four questions posed by the president and provost:

1. The advantages and disadvantages of the current CAS structure relative to its research mission
2. How various changes might enhance or, alternatively, lessen those advantages
3. How various changes might mitigate or, alternately, exacerbate those disadvantages
4. Additional solutions—apart from structure—that may help enhance advantages or mitigate disadvantages

Working Group B: TEACHING, Reporting Tuesday, March 19

Address this how the UO can support teaching excellence considering questions posed by the president and provost:

1. The advantages and disadvantages of the current CAS structure relative to its teaching mission
2. How various changes might enhance or, alternatively, lessen those advantages
3. How various changes might mitigate or, alternately, exacerbate those disadvantages
4. Additional solutions—apart from structure—that may help enhance advantages or mitigate disadvantages

Working Group C: INTERNAL ADMINISTRATION AND MANAGEMENT, Reporting [Date TBA]

Address the effectiveness of the UO's internal administration and management considering questions posed by the president and provost:

1. The advantages and disadvantages of the current CAS structure relative to its administration and management of internal matters such as hiring, budgets, other resource allocations, personnel processes, facilities and space, grants administration, communications, advising, labor relations matters, etc.
2. How various changes might enhance or, alternatively, lessen those advantages
3. How various changes might mitigate or, alternately, exacerbate those disadvantages
4. Additional solutions—apart from structure—that may help enhance advantages or mitigate disadvantages

Working Group D: EXTERNAL MANAGEMENT AND RELATIONS, Reporting [Date TBA]

Address the effectiveness of the UO's external management and relations considering questions posed by the president and provost:

1. The advantages and disadvantages of the current CAS structure relative to its management of external matters such as student and faculty recruitment, donor relations, grant writing/procurement, communications, publicity, government affairs, etc.
2. How various changes might enhance or, alternatively, lessen those advantages
3. How various changes might mitigate or, alternately, exacerbate those disadvantages
4. Additional solutions—apart from structure—that may help enhance advantages or mitigate disadvantages

Working Group E: OTHER COLLEGE STRUCTURES AND FINANCIALA, Reporting [Date TBA]

Given the discussions and information over the last several weeks about the advantages and disadvantages of the current college structure, what other structures might serve the overall mission of the UO better?

Address this question with reference to our four focus areas:

1. Research
2. Teaching
3. Internal administration and management
4. External management and relations

Budget and Finance Group: Financials of dean's offices in various structures

Working Group F: REPORT WRITING TEAM, [Date TBA]

Present (a week or two before the meeting) and discuss a draft of the Task Force report that will go to the president and provost. Revision and submission to follow this meeting by two weeks.

The Writing Team will also prepare (a) an executive summary and selection of survey comments and (b) an addendum to the report on issues and ideas raised during the process that the Task Force was not able to pursue.

GUIDELINES

Membership

Each working group should have

- At least one staff or OA
- At least one NTTF
- At least one TTF
- One dean or the EVP

- The two students should select their preferred working group (if they have time for this)
- The CAS Advisory Board member should select her preferred working group

Working groups should select a convener or conveners and meet in person, via email, in conference calls, and/or work on individual tasks determined by the group.

If working groups need information or support, please contact Karen Ford (fordk@uoregon.edu) and Teri Rowe (trowe@uoregon.edu).

Each working group will send a written document for discussion at least two days before they are scheduled to lead a meeting. Please post your document in that timeframe to the io.site.

While these groups are working, the financials working group will prepare information about three alternate college structures:

1. Two colleges of approximately equal size
2. One large college and one smaller college
3. Two colleges of approximately equal size and one smaller college