

CAS Task Force, Survey 3 Responses

Total number of responses	123
Alumni	0
Graduate Student	10
Non-Tenure Related Faculty	15
Officer of Administration	10
Staff	11
Tenure Related Faculty	77
Undergraduate Student	0

Work in CAS?	113
Yes	110
No	3

Division	107
Natural Science	35
Social Science	32
Humanities	29
Humanities, Social Science	7
Humanities, Social Science, Natural Science	4

Not In CAS	3
Conference Services	1
Clark Honors College	1
College of Design	1

Leadership Role	113
Yes	45
Response based on:	
Individual	44
Position	13
No	68

Considering the current organizational structure of CAS:	123
It should not be restructured	30
It could be improved without restructuring	2
It should be restructured	10
The issues I experience are at the university level and would not change by restructuring CAS	29
I don't have an opinion on this	12

CAS Task Force, Survey 3 Responses

To what degree do you feel the current structure of CAS positively impacts your ability to meet the goals and mission of excellence in teaching, research and scholarship, and service? 113

Very little	17
In some ways, but not significantly	39
Significantly	57

To what degree do you feel the current structure of CAS negatively impacts your ability to meet the goals and mission of excellence in teaching, research and scholarship, and service? 113

Very little	66
In some ways, but not significantly	31
Significantly	16

The most important aspect of the Dean's office without regard to structure is: 302

Acquiring external funding	20
Administrative functions	19
Advocating for new and innovative research (Humanities and other)	14
Advocacy for the department in goal setting both within the college a	68
Budget	36
Conflict resolution within departments	15
Hiring	18
Promotion & Tenure	26
Raise profile/advocate for all faculty regardless of rank	19
Really understanding the department strengths, needs and culture	59
Working relationships with faculty in each department	8

Would you like to see more overlap between CAS and the VPRI's office in terms of establishing research collaborations across disciplines? 122

Yes	52
No	18
Unsure	52

Are there other aspects of the Dean's office that are not included above that should be considered? If you provided comments in a prior survey, we do have them recorded.

Advising, communications, and Gen Ed: these are the three areas where undersubscribed departments can hope to (re)claim majors and minors. CAS has lost control and influence in these areas and needs to get it back!

Advocacy for Graduate Employees

advocating for graduate students within the college

Balanced view of scholarly excellence

Creating connections between leadership of all the different departments; also creations of broad-spectrum CAS committees

Donor development

Equitable funding regarding distinct departments (e.g. ensuring all the funding doesn't go to natural sciences)

Fully integrating the research mission into the fundamental DNA of CAS.

Funding for projects

I don't fully understand this list, as it seems to blend old and new capacities of the CAS dean/s. I see no reference to students here; I would want CAS to defend, not penalize, small classes and individual teaching as advantageous to students. I would want CAS to understand and defend the value of a comprehensive curriculum rather than going along with the popularity-contest model.

It would be helpful to select more than one. Both budget and Promotion & tenure are important functions.

Listening and supporting faculty

looking at the students from their own perspectives

Maintaining AAU standing for CAS/UO and balancing the current culture of runaway capitalism with the value of deep and reflective educational aims and accomplishments. Finding a good balance between Educational goals (regardless of field) and the self-interest of corporations and the top 1% and other individuals, groups, and disciplines with greatest power on campus or impacting campus.

Make it possible to select more than one of the above in any future survey.

Are there other aspects of the Dean's office that are not included above that should be considered? If you provided comments in a prior survey, we do have them recorded.

Many of these categories seem a bit off. Conflict resolution, yes, but more likely between than within departments. Advocate for faculty, yes, but why regardless of rank? That assumes that some other entity is advocating for faculty with respect to rank. College-level help acquiring external funding is not nearly as important as the college supporting/topping off external fellowships. Etc., etc.

mentoring; performance reviews of tenure faculty/admin positions

More efficient and comprehensive reporting structures.

NTTF are extremely important to the success of tenure related faculty. They are the life blood that makes programs like ENVS function.

Pro Tem instructors are asked to teach too many classes, without flexibility as to what a department may include as an assignment that is teaching-related but not in the classroom.

Promoting interdisciplinary research, team teaching and other collaborations between departments

promoting units within CAS to the president and the public

Providing a vision for goals, especially related to teaching.

Providing guidance to department heads.

Providing institutional memory and advice with respect to issues that need to be informed with respect to policy, best practices or common sense based on experience; providing "cover" for department heads faced with difficult tasks; serving as repositories of knowledge across departments

providing opportunities for advancement within CAS; innovative programs to help undergraduates maximize the benefits of their education; making school-to-career connections that are about highlighting the benefits of learning (not just the benefits of obtaining occupation-specific skills)--focusing on the importance of collaboration and analysis among students and faculty

Providing unified opposition to efforts by upper administration to turn UO into more of a vocational school

Providing us with the resources we need to be successful academics and do our jobs to our fullest potential. Be supportive.

Recognizing academic excellence among the faculty

Retention

Shared Services

Are there other aspects of the Dean's office that are not included above that should be considered? If you provided comments in a prior survey, we do have them recorded.

Support interdisciplinary research

Supporting the DH and Manager by trusting and listening to their needs

Teaching Loads on a College Wide Basis instead of the current department level basis

The dean's office really needs to work compensation for faculty and allowing faculty to do research rather than impeding research and looking for ways to pull money into the deans office

To hear/know what is actually going on in classes and students, rather than intimidating regarding budgets and profits only.

Very difficult to answer these questions in the abstract way they are presented.

Discuss the disadvantages of the current structure of CAS relative to the college's ability to deliver on its teaching mission.

None, not aware of, no disadvantages or similar (34 times)

When looking at department restructuring, I think the departure from the "silo" model needs to be looked into. While I don't know much about CAS besides the exposure I've had from a Conference Services scope (my position is under umbrellas of Scheduling and Event Services and Housing), I believe some redundancies could be looked at and a more centralized approach considered. Building off of and tapping into already existing resources would benefit the UO. I like the idea of a university as a whole vs. "my" department approach.

what teaching mission?

we waste way too much \$\$ on administration that could pay more faculty/graduate students. also wasteful spending on buildings

We really don't need more deans and the overhead attached.

Way too much bean counting on student credit hours - does not encourage the creation of new forms of teaching or new interdisciplinary classes

Very few

too large as is

There's too much concentration on the departmental organization of teaching and too rigid a system for the circulation of faculty out of their academic tenure homes. It seems that the role of the college to foment a more cutting-edge set of curricular offerings is stymied by the constant competition over student credit hours, faculty expectations and a budget model that scares people away from innovation.

There's no other place to give this feedback, so I'll hijack this question. This is a very poorly organized and phrased survey. In some of your questions you have alternatives that differ only slightly. In what sense does "It should not be restructured" meaningfully differ from "It could be improved without restructuring"? Whomever put this together should find a new line of work.

Discuss the disadvantages of the current structure of CAS relative to the college's ability to deliver on its teaching mission.

The teaching load (9 courses for three terms) for career instructors is too much heavier and difficult to afford. For a composition instructor, it is very difficult to enhance teaching and carefully advise each student if s/he teaches three courses and each course has over 20 students. Composition needs careful, detailed, thorough advising and discussion. Too many students and too heavy teaching load negatively impact learning and teaching quality. Moreover, the floor salary the University provides career instructors is even far away from the poverty line. The university should pay career instructors more to reciprocate their hard work and expertise.

The process for development and delivery of new curriculum is too cumbersome, but I'm not sure this reflects the structure of CAS

The problem is that everything has an effect on everything. Those of us in an office administration role know this. Our ability to do our jobs has an effect on how the department runs and how the faculty are supported, and therefore an impact on teaching. The current structure of CAS is not the problem for most of us. The problem is that there is a general lack of good policy at UO, workflow, GOOD and EFFECTIVE technology resources and software, and a development and enforcement of across campus processes.

The main disadvantage is a certain redundancy in the curricular review process between CAS and the university. The current structure is highly interdisciplinary in that it involves faculty in the substantive review of curricula about which they often possess little substantive knowledge, which is also the case at the university level.

The current structure should advantage the projects mentioned above. Despite a lot of talk about promoting interdisciplinary research and teaching as well as collaboration, there are still many obstacles that inhibit it related to the silo-like structure of departments.

The concern/incentives for large class sizes seems to me at odds with a successful teaching mission.

The College of Arts and Sciences is a very large organization?

Teaching opportunity for master's student

sucks! the college is now a business and gives two shits about students.

Seems to be a lot of conflict among the colleges at the university. CAS always seems under pressure from some changes that are afoot.

Discuss the disadvantages of the current structure of CAS relative to the college's ability to deliver on its teaching mission.

Sciences, Social sciences and Humanities should be kept together, such as in my dept Anthropology

Research requirements for faculty

Promotes interdisciplinary connections

Proliferation of programs: there are a lot of programs out there; many overlapping with each other.

Nonsupportive of more intensive health research methodologies.

None. This is a biased instrument: asking about disadvantages but not advantages of either maintaining our current structure or not. What is the problem that is leading to this push? Is it about putting a splashy line on an administrator's CV? Stop this. Faculty should be in charge of the UO. We need to return to a truly research-driven and education-driven curriculum and curricular structure. Administrators keep making changes that benefit them or build their CVs. We are left behind as they take even higher paying jobs elsewhere. Caring for our own core-community of people who live, work, learn, and teach here is primary.

None except for the inadequate language requirement: BS should have a two year language requirement. BA could have a math requirement also for balance.

My sense (somewhat speculative) is the CAS is too big for any one Dean to understand and serve it all. The cultures of the different subareas are different - how research and grad students are supported, expected teaching and research loads, how money is raised and moved within departments and programs, motivations and rewards, etc.

Most administrative roles are required to do a wide range of tasks including HR functions. We could use some specialists in areas such as hiring, visas, placing orders, accounts payable. With the various institutes taking care of their own, the Physics department staff (and institutes staff) end up each person doing all tasks.

Maybe it should be easier to cross-list courses?

Makes it difficult to collaborate across schools/colleges

limited ability to grow our faculty to meet the demands of the students.

Lay-offs of NTTFs have hugely reduced the ability of CAS to deliver on its teaching mission. Lack of discretionary funds has disincentivized creativity and research.

Discuss the disadvantages of the current structure of CAS relative to the college's ability to deliver on its teaching mission.

Lack of funding and inflexibility with regards to changes in the climate as a whole.

Its continuing efforts to find savings and efficiencies in teaching so as to fund research. Greater teaching loads, bigger classes, more automated grading will reduce quality of instruction and, incidentally, make it more difficult for students from outset the usual college track to do well. It is hard to help students individually when I'm buried.

It's too easy for a program, service, or even individual faculty and employees to get "forgotten," something that can be just as true for a larger department as I'm sure it is for smaller ones.

It's funding model has "redistributed" our budget to other schools/athletics

It isn't the current **structure** of CAS that entails such disadvantages; it is the current conviction, university-wide, that units that aren't saturated with majors aren't pulling their weight and don't deserve the resources they've had in the past. This attitude disregards many factors: the relatively greater numbers of in-state students in humanities majors (meaning, we're educating Oregonians, as we all thought it was a state school's job to do); the grossly disparate spending on advertising among colleges and among majors; the disproportionate emphasis in college ambassador visits on some units over others; the greater student-faculty interaction in the process of teaching language, writing, and interpretation; the fact that universities and disciplines benefit from a balance of continuity and innovation, not a periodic, spasmodic reshuffling of priorities and resources according to what's new and shiny, or popular, or a favorite with a new university leader. I could go on

Inequities in teaching load. I do scientific research but have a heavier teaching load in the social sciences than those faculty in the natural sciences.

If anything, the divisions within CAS mean that disciplines are still too siloed (a problem that would be significantly exacerbated if CAS "restructured"). More cross-disciplinary requirements would advance student's intellectual well-roundedness. Our society would be better if, for example, the science students had a stronger and deeper appreciation for the humanities and the humanities students had a stronger and deeper appreciation of the sciences.

Discuss the disadvantages of the current structure of CAS relative to the college's ability to deliver on its teaching mission.

I'm not sure if this is on topic: but sometimes siloing of administration of computer technology resources prevents me from providing computer support in a timely or efficient fashion.

I'm aware there are very different needs from departments in the sciences and humanities. Some feel the humanities are "ignored" - but I don't feel that way.

I think it works fine but if you want to focus on more interdisciplinary teaching/research, then more work is needed.

I think it is a university wide lack of valuing of UG teaching that is the issue.

I haven't discovered anything yet. The bureaucracy at the level of the university curriculum committee strongly discourages innovation, but that's not really a CAS issue.

I don't see much there -- if only there were more resources, I think it could become ideal

I don't see disadvantages of the current structure of CAS relative to its teaching mission.

I don't see any. The inability to team teach and to easily teach across disciplines/departments is an issue, but this is a UO issue, not a CAS issue.

I don't see any relationship at all between the current structure of CAS and our ability to teach students well. It is quite clear that restructuring, with all the disruption and dislocation that would inevitably occur, would significantly interfere with faculty teaching in the near term. It is unclear how it could help.

I don't perceive disadvantages, only possible improvements. CAS's current structure reflects our *liberal arts* university where disciplines are not separated but complimentary: this is an advantage.

I don't know that this is a structure issue, but we could do a lot more that's interdisciplinary than we currently do, and ideally that could generate innovative new ideas and courses and get students excited about new disciplines and cross-disciplinary questions.

I do not think that structure influences this

Discuss the disadvantages of the current structure of CAS relative to the college's ability to deliver on its teaching mission.

I do not think CAS focuses enough resources on teaching, period. Too much emphasis is focused on research. Graduate student TAs and faculty should be incentivized to participate in paid training. If you're really serious about teaching and education, investing in the educators should be a priority.

I do not perceive major disadvantages to the current structure. Regardless of any disadvantages it imposes, the unified College of Arts and Sciences serves a moral and philosophical purpose, in that it sustains the fiction that arts and humanities, mathematics, sciences, and all the other fields under its umbrella, have a common mission. This is, whatever its costs for administration, a net benefit to the teaching mission of the university.

From an outside perspective, it seems that the departments would receive more benefit from being part of a College that's more focused on similar disciplines, and therefore, better able to advocate for student/teaching needs.

Each department has its own needs. Combining or restructuring may not fit each department's needs.

Doesn't seem like such a problem. I'm sensitive to the challenges of funding GE positions and the challenges departments have trying to second guess what the best strategies would be.

Difficulties in supporting interdisciplinary co-teaching

Department structure gets in the way of innovative transdisciplinary curriculum and research, but this is true of all colleges.

Current structure does not adequately recognize interdisciplinary units, such as Anthropology, Geography, Environmental Studies (and possibly some that are interdisciplinary between social science and humanities). A unit tends to get pigeon-holed by the divisional dean it reports to. News of opportunities, planning for needed resources, etc., gets done within divisions, so interdisciplinary units lose out on some opportunities.

Consistency could be monitored more closely

close relation with sub-dean

Discuss the disadvantages of the current structure of CAS relative to the college's ability to deliver on its teaching mission.

Chemistry is a service course (serving far more than chemistry majors). But it seems to constantly be understaffed and staffed at a level comparable to other non-service undergraduate courses. This seems to indicate that on the CAS level administration either is unaware, or doesn't care, of the gross overwork/misappropriation of staff issues in chemistry teaching. Some teaching assignments are >10 hours per week and some are >20 hours per week for the same pay. Chemistry department has proven its inability to manage this long standing issue and CAS has done nothing to step in or mediate.

CAS may have difficulty understanding and working with the uniqueness of each department and its needs.

CAS is too big, so that dean's office staff simply can't remember the ins and outs of each program. This means that they sometimes forget crucial information when they are making decisions, or that too much time is taken with them having to be reminded of details before they can move on to synthesizing/using/responding to those details.

CAS is taking advantage of NTTF faculty at the AEI by increasing their workload regardless of the fact that the faculty provided ample evidence to support their claims. Those claims fell on the deaf ears of Bruce Blonigen. At the same time, CAS is supporting "contracts" for AEI instructors that include .5 FTE per term for the first year followed by .1 FTE per term for the following two years. This is shameful. Many highly qualified and experienced faculty have left the AEI and more are on their way. This is a disgrace to an institution that "values teaching". I invite any CAS employee to opt for the current contracts being offered to AEI instructors.

CAS has increasingly micro-managed the amount of teaching and who gets teaching relief. I suspect this has been driven by having overall policies set by CAS that apply to many disparate Departments.

CAS has a number of interdisciplinary departments and programs (Anthro, Geography, Linguistics, Psychology, Environmental Studies, etc. As long as we seem to be proliferating administrators at a breakneck pace, somebody that could oversee those programs might be a good idea. (This applies to research too.)

Discuss the disadvantages of the current structure of CAS relative to the college's ability to deliver on its teaching mission.

CAS does not support teaching innovation as a way to support improved student learning. Teaching innovations are dismissed as expensive or defined separate from the literature on best practices. I am unsure what it is in the current structure that creates this lack of respect for teaching innovation.

Budget limitations and restrictions impair departments abilities to thrive.

Being such a large college at UO may facilitate some depersonalization for both students and faculty. Restructuring will not necessarily fix that, and dividing the college into smaller units would have the disadvantage of making curricular connections across divisions less likely.

As someone who works between the natural and social sciences, it is difficult to move between the two divisions due to the differences in teaching load.

As far as teaching goes, I do not see any strong problems with the current structure of CAS. However, if we had some ideas of what any new structure would look like, it would be easier to determine if it was a positive or negative change.

As far as I can see, the structure of CAS is not the problem. Rather, it is policies that discourage or prohibit innovations in teaching (e.g., prohibition on team teaching, inability or unwillingness to allow collaborations across departments).

Arts and sciences are the foundation of the university since its founding in the Middle Ages. Interdisciplinarity is paramount.

Are we maximizing collaboration and cost-sharing opportunities to the fullest (across departments and other academic schools/colleges) to modernize academic offerings and manage budgetary constraints?

All the decisions are made with the top-down manners and someone who does not know the class makes a decisions. We, faculty in the bottom in the hierarchy, want to contribute to reduce a budget. However, they are not interested in hearing from us at all.

How might various changes enhance or, alternately, lessen those disadvantages (teaching)?

"Various changes" is a very vague term, but I prefer the current structure with regard to interdisciplinary opportunities for teaching.

A larger college with a diverse array of disciplines facilitates interdisciplinary teaching, particularly in areas like environmental studies that by their nature cross divisions.

A science-focused College ought to allow science Departments implicit flexibility in determining how its faculty cover teaching and coursework; merit criteria could evolve to encourage faculty to do more research and less teaching.

A small unit could provide better communication simply because there would be fewer people involved, and it would be easier for leadership staff to remember the specific characteristics of each department. Right now, I imagine it must be incredibly hard to build relationships with each department head, let alone with individual faculty. I don't think it is humanly possible to remember the personnel, structure, distinctive strengths and challenges, etc. of each program, so they have to be constantly reminded, and I think it's inevitable they would mix them up sometimes.

Actually focusing on improving student learning by listening to and talking to faculty would improve this.

Again, everything has an effect on everything. It's like dominos. And you need to start from the ground up to make effective long lasting changes. Just a small example; if we actually had an effective and user friendly software instead of Banner for scheduling, things might get done faster, mistakes caught quicker, and schedules produced for students faster maximizing flexibility in class options.

Allow even small departments to thrive.

Assuming that "various changes" would entail the elevation of the current CAS divisions to the standing of colleges, one can imagine that curricular review below the UO-level would diminish those disadvantages.

At the university level, be more supportive of interdisciplinary research and cooperation.

Bolstering the autonomy of CAS while enriching partnerships between CAS and other colleges would help the students and faculty focus on learning, research, scholarship and innovation.

How might various changes enhance or, alternately, lessen those disadvantages (teaching)?

Breaking up the college of arts and sciences will likely enhance the atomization of the academic departments into separate fields that just happen to share a few customers and some real estate. The logical extension is that, sooner or later we'll all just be a bunch of professional accreditation mills, and the original purpose of getting scholars together in a university will be forgotten.

Could start by NOT proposing class size increases, instructional faculty layoffs, and reductions in Gen Ed course offerings to offset the cost of hiring new research focused faculty.

Create bridges within CAS and the COB for healthcare administration instruction and research methods.

Fund pedagogy research and training.

Funds "borrowed" by the Law School & Journalism... should be returned to CAS. CAS should fight against its \$650,000 budget cut if the Knight Campus is cutting a laughable \$4,000. Equitable distribution of resources ACROSS all disciplines and schools is the fundamental change that needs to happen.

Giving autonomy to the sub areas should create more focus and understanding by deans and allow them to guide more astutely. Of course, if the top-down style of the UO leadership continues, none of this matters. So encourage a more distributed leadership organization, like we used to have.

Greater bureaucracy benefits no one; fragmentation challenges communication; greater competition for resources impedes success

I don't see that restructuring will help with all the cost-cutting that has to go on in higher ed. I think that cost-cutting should involve ELIMINATING the bloated administration on this campus. There are too many people in higher admin with high salaries. Severing CAS into 3 parts will just generate more admin positions and cost more.

I think more collaboration across colleges would be great, not only within CAS, but also yes lots more within CAS.

If it ain't broke, it don't need fixing!

If we separate the three divisions from each other, the education will gradually become diminished by virtue of further preprofessionalization at the undergrad level, and excessive specialization of students at that level.

How might various changes enhance or, alternately, lessen those disadvantages (teaching)?

Improve flexibility in the "bean-counting" measures to allow team teaching and more support for interdisciplinary collaboration. I work in both Humanities and Social Sciences, and it's hard to conceive and carry out projects across this divide.

Involve all the faculties from various ranks in the decision making process. Do not gather only "YES MAN"

It isn't clear to me that organization much matters on this question. My guess: different organizational structure plus same people and priorities = same outcomes.

Knowing that a "No" answer is a "No" and not open for debate

Make interdisciplinarity explicit in the structure. Expect divisional leadership to look beyond their assigned units and communicate with their true constituency.

more classroom time. less focus on money

More flexibility in assignments. Currently all classes are roughly counted as the same w.r.t. workload. Joint teaching assignments are effectively fiscally irresponsible. Not enough options for interdisciplinary. I have no idea how various changes to CAS might or might not affect this.

More funding for prof dev in regards to Teaching.

More funding for prof dev in regards to Teaching.

No, none, nothing and similar (8)

Not spread out some of the work into the institutes, but put more staff FTE into the Physics department.

Provide additional support for interdisciplinary co-teaching

Provide faculty more opportunity for team teaching across departments and more seed funding for transdisciplinary research projects

Reduce barriers (multiple steps/layers) to collaboration and cost-sharing.

Reduce emphasis on "one-size-fits-all" curricular policies (e.g. syllabus structure, content descriptions, etc)

Reduce students' cap, especially for the composition classes. Raise career instructors' salary. Reduce the teaching load of 9 courses per year. We need to hire more career instructors, not to ask career instructors to bear unreasonable work load.

How might various changes enhance or, alternately, lessen those disadvantages (teaching)?

Restructuring should not cause more difficulty in interdisciplinary groups...as it could tear them apart.

Reverse the lay-offs, provide funding for projects that include student-engaged qualitative research, encourage appreciation and funding for independent units involved in research, teaching, and public outreach/engagement.

Small departments like mine need CAS to group us together for the purposes of marketing our programs lest Journalism and Business, which present themselves in a much more organized and coordinated fashion, continue to siphon students away from the liberal arts.

Splitting will likely make this difficultly worse.

stop viewing the college through associate deanlet lenses

team-teaching could be made easier both within CAS and with faculty in other schools and college. Not sure that structuring CAS would make this much easier.

The current CAS structure facilitates the delivery of general education classes to undergraduates from across UO, giving them essential skills without which they would be very unlikely to succeed in their majors (in any college at UO) or their careers.

How might various changes enhance or, alternately, lessen those disadvantages (teaching)?

This question is bizarrely framed, I'm sorry. Is the parenthetical word (teaching) supposed to clarify / define the preceding word "disadvantages"? The question as written makes no sense until I look down to the next two questions.

---What could enhance teaching in CAS is greater respect and reward for teaching as a fundamental part of our mission. Attention to accomplished and effective teaching is rewarded only incidentally and collaterally; it's well known that it's a distant, almost invisible second to research, and faculty who forget this are reminded of it in merit raise processes and in the sheer symbolic capital that privileging research over teaching guarantees. We're encouraged to do more to promote undergraduate research: great, but that entails *teaching* students how and why to do research, right? (And in the humanities, that entails a lot more small classes or even one-on-one work than CAS enables or allows.) What in the world would changing the structure of CAS do to raise the prestige of excellent teaching? to give stability and support to excellent teachers? I'm a passionate researcher who believes that academia made a grotesque mistake when it began to reserve indefinite tenure for researchers alone.

UO doesn't recruit enough high-quality students interested in natural sciences. I don't know how restructuring would affect that.

Valuing and promoting teaching in smaller-sized classes with an emphasis on personal connections to students. Many of my undergraduates have professors who do not know their names.

We need a Dean of Teaching, and perhaps additional college-level support for the importance of 100- and 200-level courses. I trust departments to take care of their own upper-division curriculum, but I would like to see more interdisciplinary review and support for teaching General Education courses.

we need more money for TAs, graders, course releases to do research

What is the origin of this push? Who is pushing this agenda and why?

Discuss the disadvantages of the current structure of CAS relative to the college's ability to deliver on its research mission.

None, I don't see any, not obvious or similar response (30 times)

Institutes and centers are more interdisciplinary than the CAS structure.

Again, biased instrument. If there are problems inside CAS faculty or student driven on the ground, in the front-lines, let's figure a way to deal with that without taking everything apart.

Again, CAS structure has a negligible impact on the research mission from my standpoint. Structure has nothing to do with it. Everything boils down to the same thing I said regarding the teaching mission.

Again, I'm not sure it's a disadvantage, but we should identify more ways to collaborate within and across disciplines to put forth the most-compelling research grant applications, etc. Another way of saying this is to look for ways to reduce barriers to collaboration.

Again, not certain that any of the current disadvantages to the research mission of CAS faculty are a function of being all in one college: no, they appear to come from budget priorities and disciplinary prejudices that make faculty in the three divisions have disparate teaching loads (with no consideration given *within* divisions to having or lacking the advantage of repeat courses). I don't visualize humanities teaching loads coming down just because the faculty might answer to a College of the Humanities instead of a College of Arts and Sciences.

As mentioned before, I do not think that the structure is the actual issue at stake

Barriers to team teaching and interdisciplinary classes

Budget and space allocation.

By having such a breadth of disciplines, I would imagine it's more difficult for Dean's to focus in on what really is needed to support quality research. It seems the way CAS is currently structured, is not very different than how the UO is structured centrally. Where the President may not be as close to the research needs of an area, so too would the top leadership in CAS be more distanced from areas of discipline which fall under their portfolio and not be as well geared to advocate for the advancement of research initiatives.

Discuss the disadvantages of the current structure of CAS relative to the college's ability to deliver on its research mission.

CAS and VPRI are increasingly "passing the buck" regarding paying for administrative functions, such as post-award grant financial management. As CAS involves a large number of non-science Departments, with considerably reduced needs for post award grant management, it is likely that CAS as a whole does not perceive this as a major need or problem.

CAS could play more of an equalizing role in facilitating course releases for research across all departments. It is odd (some think unfair) that some departments buy out faculty down to 4 courses per year if they are research leaders whereas other departments do not do this.

CAS has a number of interdisciplinary departments and programs (Anthro, Geography, Linguistics, Psychology, Environmental Studies, etc. As long as we seem to be proliferating administrators at a breakneck pace, somebody that could oversee those programs might be a good idea. (This applies to teaching too.)

close relation with sub-dean

Dean has to decide between prioritizing science vs humanities

Departments are too fragmented from each other to allow meaningful contributions.

Does CAS have a research mission? The university does, and so perhaps the research mission of CAS is to support the research mission of the university. Adopting this interpretation of the question, the current structure of CAS appears to limit advocacy for specific research programs, at least to the extent that the CAS Dean is unwilling/unable to stand in support of a given program because that support will be viewed (perhaps correctly) as harmful, at least financially, to other programs.

evaluation of scholarship is very different across disciplines. Assessment for progress in areas of promotion and merit are therefore very vague and lack transparency. The leadership is not always in touch with the challenges each dept. faces with regards to funding, student and post doctoral recruitment.

Everything goes through the department (which is usually good) with the effect that departments feel competitive with one another when cooperative resources would be often preferred.

Discuss the disadvantages of the current structure of CAS relative to the college's ability to deliver on its research mission.

Failure to attain sufficient staffing levels in research intensive units, non-parity amongst departments re: funding causing deep morale problems, bottleneck for hiring on grants, failure to insure the research community is involved in sweeping changes at the University level.

From the standpoint of research in the social sciences and humanities, the disadvantages of the current system are not structural but fiscal. CAS does what it can to support the research by faculty in these fields. The problem is that it cannot do much with so little.

Funding

high teaching load; low research funding

I believe the most important aspect of the structure is the budget. Therefore [the answer cut off here - nothing was deleted]

I can imagine a separated college for sciences might be able to fast-track research developments with more focus and probably a different kind of funding model. A separated college for humanities, on the other hand, runs the risk of diminishing returns, as it would have to be a smaller administrative unit due to the current decline in humanities majors.

I do not think that the structure of CAS disadvantages research. I do think that some departments within CAS have to work harder for the attention of the university--but I do not see how restricting CAS would help them. If anything it would hurt them. Pitting departments, fields, colleges against each other is not the way to promote research innovation. Fostering opportunities for collaboration, rewarding all promising research, supporting faculty who excel according to the standards of their own field--that is the way you build a strong research program.

I don't see any. If the university wants to deliver on its research mission, it needs to offer faculty teaching loads that are comparable to similar research universities. The structure of the college, large or small, will make no difference in our ability to produce quality scholarship if our faculty are still competing with peers at other institutions who teach less and have greater support for fellowships.

I don't see the disadvantages -- CAS has done a nice job of supporting our departmental research, and so has the VPRI

Discuss the disadvantages of the current structure of CAS relative to the college's ability to deliver on its research mission.

I think individual faculty research is oblivious to the deans unless there are headlines associated with it. I have never had conversation with any Dean about what I do for research and what my research needs are to accelerate said research. NEVER!

I worry that too much funding is focused on natural sciences

If CAS is a liberal arts college, it needs to be treated like one. Small class sizes, resources to respond in depth and more frequently to more student work. We cannot do that right now.

Interdisciplinary collaborations are not recognized for their real value.

Interdisciplinary collaborations, programs and centers are starting to suffer a lot under a dried out atmosphere where resources and support are constantly changing and being the target of cuts.

It's somewhat overcomplex, so it's often difficult to anticipate the rules that CAS will put on departments. On the other hand, I'm more confident that these decisions will be made well within CAS compared to the UO as a whole.

Lots of caginess about topping up grants

Most administrative roles are required to do a wide range of tasks including HR functions. We could use some specialists in areas such as hiring, visas, placing orders, accounts payable. With the various institutes taking care of their own, the Physics department staff (and institutes staff) end up each person doing all tasks.

N/A. Difficulties connected with this are partly internal--a Sponsored Programs department that is fairly tone deaf about grants, etc., outside of STEM--lack of real support for the Social Sciences and Humanities in the higher administration, fewer and fewer external grants available for such programs.

Norms within CAS Divisions interfere with interdisciplinary groups that work across divisions.

not sure there is attention to the different funding possibilities available to the different units and different ways of evaluating scholarship (single vs co-authored, books vs. articles...)

Discuss the disadvantages of the current structure of CAS relative to the college's ability to deliver on its research mission.

Now the university hires more and more career instructors with expertise and doctoral degree. Which means that these career instructors are capable to conduct their research. The university and CAS should support career instructors to do more their research, provide more financial and teaching help, say, more funding opportunities and course release, to help career instructors produce significant scholarship.

Overall I have not observed disadvantages.

People are artificially binned into a division structure that has serious consequences for salary and teaching load. For example, psychology is a social science at most other schools. Likewise, there are many natural scientists stuck in the social science division

Research seems a key piece of faculty effort; key to VPRI; key to Pres. Schill - one the ground in CAS it seems to have little significance. Seems like an after-thought rather than central consideration

Same as above

Same as above: My sense (somewhat speculative) is the CAS is too big for any one Dean to understand and serve it all. The cultures of the different subareas are different - how research and grad students are supported, expected teaching and research loads, how money is raised and moved within departments and programs, motivations and rewards, etc.

Same as above. It behooves a faculty member in a university to be forced, once in a while, to share a committee or student or scholarly resource with faculty in unfamiliar fields, even in ones with widely different priorities and assumptions. The less we do that, the more we just degenerate into a bunch of contract institutes.

Same as for teaching: create more flexibility in interdisciplinary collaboration. UO has a strong tradition of area studies, for example, but recent policies discourage these programs (Latin American Studies, European Studies, etc.) in favor of departmental silos, which are a 20th-century model and don't support what we need to do.

See above - my point is relevant to research, teaching and service

See my answer above about lack of understanding

Sometimes research awards and grants judged across CAS are a challenge for humanities people to win/get recognition for compared to the physical sciences.

Discuss the disadvantages of the current structure of CAS relative to the college's ability to deliver on its research mission.

Somewhat difficult to collaborate across science, social science and humanities

sufficiently large to obtain a good amount of research grants

The ability of heads to meet and collaborate from across a wide swath of disciplines opens up dialog that would not otherwise occur. The central CAS budget also enables the deans to stabilize department budgets even when a major has large enrollment declines. Finally, a larger development staff opens up opportunities that would not be there if there was only one staffer per division.

The current policies on course buyout work against getting our research faculty time to do research. The cost of a course buyout should be based on 40/40/20, and should not require OPE payments. Get the money to the researcher.

The one issue I see as a faculty member "in the trenches" is that the departments are losing budgetary control of various pots of funds. This makes it difficult for the department to allocate those funds as they see fit. We need more direct control over funds.

The only major disadvantage might be the unequal distribution of financial resources and hiring priorities between the divisions.

the science associate deans are heavy hand and understand little about the depts under their control

The service burden can encumber time for research, but the reflections on CAS restructuring are themselves part of this service burden. It seems the university is inclined to try to reinvent itself every few years--just as we complete adapting to what was to be a new system. At the risk of sounding hyperbolic, this sort of permanent revolution makes settling and focusing somewhat challenging.

The stronger the cross-disciplinary understanding the better we can deliver on our research mission. The various deans do a good job of trying to learn from one another already, but even more interdisciplinary thinking would deliver even better results.

The three divisions are rather arbitrary and have become ossified over time. They are too big to be nimble and too small to be individually effective.

Discuss the disadvantages of the current structure of CAS relative to the college's ability to deliver on its research mission.

There is not enough interconnectedness, at least nothing in the infrastructure to make us feel like a unified whole. The left hand doesn't know what the right is doing, unless we happen to be sitting at the same table during the annual holiday party or for some kind of task force.

Too few IT Professionals and fragmented support

we don't even give office space to all our researchers? really? lets focus on people and research and education, not bottom lines

we waste way too much \$\$ on administration that could pay more faculty/graduate students.

Why is this question required? This question doesn't even make grammatical sense. How are the "disadvantages" "relative" to anything?

How might various changes enhance or, alternately, lessen those disadvantages (research)?

A science focused College could take over some administrative functions, and this could allow Departments and research units (Institutes and Centers) to avoid inefficiently duplicating functions (grant pre- and post-award), and instead allow them to focus their resources on research and teaching.

A sea change in higher admin. culture (ha!).

Again, putting more specialized roles into the Physics department would help with speedy hiring and people being able to work more on financial reports (instead of placing the order and paying the invoice also).

Again, we need mid-sized groupings -- and, I should add, not ASU or OSU-style "schools" -- for the purposes of advising, communications, marketing, etc. and possibly other administrative, teaching, and research functions so that individual departments don't always have to take on these functions themselves. I spend way too much time reinventing wheels (websites, emails to prospective students, etc.).

Allowing our academic units to focus on our work without constant demands for new policies and procedures would be helpful, but I also understand that shared governance makes this work inseparable from our mission.

assoc. deans could really learn about individual dept/fields and advocate and promote their strengths

Assuming, again, that "various changes" would involve elevating the current CAS divisions to the status of colleges, it is unclear how the change would enhance support of research in the social sciences and humanities. It is not difficult to imagine, however, that the flow of resources to those fields would diminish if each of the current divisions were in a position of having to compete with one another, the existing colleges outside CAS, and now also the Knight Campus.

How might various changes enhance or, alternately, lessen those disadvantages (research)?

Changes to CAS that might formally split the Social and Natural Sciences will add significant barriers to delivering on our research mission. Fluid cross-disciplinary research and collaboration among faculty and students is one of the most significant contributors to innovative and novel research. The current CAS structure makes these divisional barriers effectively invisible, such that the particular divisional and departmental home of each collaborator remains almost irrelevant. My own work involves people and labs spread across multiple departments, including those in both the Social and Natural Sciences, and the lack of institutional and bureaucratic barriers to such activities remains one of enduring strengths of this institution. This flexibility remains a powerful tool for faculty recruitment and retention, and I fear that this unique institutional strength will be diminished by the proposed restructuring to CAS, which would only fragment our currently unified structure.

Changing the current structure would impact me negatively

Consider faculty as individuals with different research trajectories. Stop trying to homogenize us and count widgets (aka "metrics") in such a de-humanizing way.

Develop clearer policies on salary replacement for outside funding, leaves for grants and fellowships

Dividing the college could raise questions about whether UO still aspires to be a liberal arts university, and that might have a negative impact on the many faculty (in all CAS divisions) who are strongly committed to that ideal.

hire better associate deans

Hire more career instructors, reduce career instructors' teaching load, and provide more funding and professional help.

I believe that breaking up CAS will weaken the liberal arts mission of the university as well as interdisciplinary studies.

I don't see any

I fear that the humanities will be further marginalized within the university if there is a split

I think a central admin hub of services would be extremely beneficial to research - grant submission support for all units; my track specialists; concur specialists; search specialists - support by key functions rather than 'jack of all trade' office staff trying to remember how to do one task that they do once a year.

How might various changes enhance or, alternately, lessen those disadvantages (research)?

I'm not sure. My inclination is to leave things along.

If the restructure would keep CAS intact, but would provide some platform for frequently overlooked departments to have some visibility then yes.

If you break up the college, then that decision would fall to Johnson Hall.

Increasing our funding and shrinking class size would make us distinctive among CAS structures of public universities

It would be wonderful to collaborate more.

It would behoove CAS to find ways to support all research more equitably

It's possible that splitting CAS would facilitate advocacy for particular programs; but splitting CAS is not necessary if the dean is willing to make the admittedly tough choices, and able to communicate the need for making them.

Knowing a particular unit more thoroughly makes it easier to respond to the unique needs of each.

may reduce the amount of grants received

More equal structure for course releases for research.

Moving people who work on similar things closer in space and closer administratively might increase research output.

No idea. I bet any changes made to CAS will have unpredictable consequences.

none

None

None. CAS should not be restructured.

Provide incentives and organizational ways of facilitating interdisciplinary scholarship, such as I3 grants and hiring of good people to facilitate grant writing, research activities, and shared writing of articles and books.

Provide research support for interdisciplinary research, especially since it requires substantially more time in order to be successful.

Restructuring may align and strengthen the research mission and ability to capture top graduate students in each discipline .

Restructuring would likely make these disadvantages much worse, unless people are accurately placed into a division that matches their research program and needs.

How might various changes enhance or, alternately, lessen those disadvantages (research)?

Same as above: Giving autonomy to the sub areas should create more focus and understanding by deans and allow them to guide more astutely. Of course, if the top-down style of the UO leadership continues, none of this matters. So encourage a more distributed leadership organization, like we used to have.

Same thing I said for teaching. Dominos.

Secure sufficient staffing levels for departments that experienced faculty increases, set a firm policy for items such as salary savings returns, so that researchers with >3.0 months of self-funding gain an equal advantage. Make this process easier to utilize, provide funds to staff for professional development.

Seems pointlessly disruptive and would lead to hiring more administrators and staff for no good reason. Seems like a no brainer to me that breaking up CAS, and spending this time discussing it, is a waste of time and money. Why doesn't the president even explain why it is being considered? The opacity is annoying and disrespectful and makes one think it is all about grabbing power.

They will not.

This question is so vague as to be impossible to answer, except to say that various changes will enhance or lessen various outcomes in various ways.

To divide the divisions makes interdivisional interdisciplinary more difficult, since it separates the faculties, and this impoverishes the intellectual culture of the university, at the research level as well as the teaching level.

Unable to answer without knowing what the potential changes would be.

Various organizational changes? None. Investments: an actual university press is a bare minimum for an R1 institution, and would be in a position to foster both individual and collaborative research. And for God's sake, could we cut it out with the endless imposition of cumbersome and expensive tech platforms that rob time from research? (I'm looking at you, Course Leaf, student advising tracker, Concur, etc. etc. etc.)

What are these "various changes?" This is the worst survey that I have ever seen!

Who is driving this question and push? Why isn't this an issue for the Faculty Senate rather than coming from Administration?

If you are in CAS, regarding teaching, do you want to collaborate more than you already do across divisions within CAS? If so, what are the current barriers to cross-division collaboration?

I'd like to, and when I meet colleagues from other divisions in committee service I learn that many of us are considering the same issues and opportunities, but there aren't many occasions for considering cross-division or even cross-department collaborations. I don't think CAS is presenting any barriers. The real barrier is that everyone is busy and nobody is going to take time out to find opportunities to collaborate.

- 1) Team-teaching is an excellent way to collaborate and students love it. Why is CAS not willing to support team-teaching by counting it as one full course per each faculty?
- 2) "Cross-Listing" of courses (called cross-publishing at UO) should be improved and facilitated: it would dramatically increase and diversify enrollments in classes. This is about collaboration among departments, which CAS should encourage.
- 3) Dedicate at least one classroom in the Knight Campus to Humanities courses and program a rotating list of Humanities courses to be taught there.

Absolutely. Currently there is no fiscal model for sharing classes other than assuming that each instructor does proportionally less work, which is absurd.

Already collaborating on teaching. There are no barriers in the current structure

As NTTF it is almost impossible to envisage cross-division (or even inter-departmental) teaching collaboration because of the way that work loads are calculated. Indeed, with centralization of nearly all decision-making, I don't even think I could do it in my department. I couldn't possibly agree, for instance, to team teach a course if it only counted for 1/2 a course against what CAS defines as a "normal" load. This is something, incidentally, that I have sometimes looked into in the past but the barriers always seem too great - let's just say that CAS's policies have hardly been encouraging in this respect. I don't even think about it anymore since it is so obviously a non-starter for someone in my position.

Barriers to team teaching and interdisciplinary classes

Credit for courses

Difficulty of trying new course arrangements, e.g. co-teaching, cross-listing, etc.

If you are in CAS, regarding teaching, do you want to collaborate more than you already do across divisions within CAS? If so, what are the current barriers to cross-division collaboration?

Don't know how to make connections across divisions.

For teaching... this is not much of an issue. Curriculum coordinators need to address overlap of course content. I would not want to see a lot more teaching outside of home departments.

getting team taught classes to count in courseload

I already collaborate freely, and I see no current barriers beyond the reluctance or inability of department heads to give up the FTE of someone who might otherwise teach a course in their curriculum. Which has also been true of my department head, by the way.

I do not.

I don't teach. But in my experience, interdisciplinary work can only enhance a student's experience and the mission of a college. Through joint grant applications to new and interesting courses prior unthought of, the potential is huge.

I feel that I do collaborate across CAS.

I have been impressed by the collaborative nature of CAS as it currently stands. The intellectual freedom across units has been one of the richest aspects of our current structure, and I have been grateful for the conversations across the humanities.

I have not encountered such barriers.

I think it could be beneficial for students' learning to collaborate more across divisions. In the real world, subjects aren't siloed like they are in universities. Educators need more flexibility to explore those cross-division collaborations, which have been successful in the Clark Honors College. It takes time and thought to put those courses together, and the university must be understanding of the need for time and staff funding to do that.

I would like to collaborate but don't see barriers with the current structure

I would like to collaborate more in teaching. There's nothing helping me meet people with similar interests or projects.

If you are in CAS, regarding teaching, do you want to collaborate more than you already do across divisions within CAS? If so, what are the current barriers to cross-division collaboration?

I would like to collaborate more, particularly in team-teaching arrangements. I'm not sure why UO makes it so difficult to team teach a course. I am familiar with team-teaching arrangements at other universities; one common model seems to be that two professors team-teaching a course just split the total student credit hours of enrolled students in their course. Could we make something like this happen at UO? (As far as I know, this is not just a CAS problem. This is a larger UO problem.)

I'm non-teaching staff. If I had to guess, I'd say uneven technology resources (e.g. multil-media resources, data source) and little training of faculty on collaboration between departments would be a barrier.

It's not clear to me how to do it or who I'd ask if I had an interesting cross-disciplinary idea. I'd love to do more.

Lack of communication between units. CAS faculty tend to work in silos.

Metrics used to determine funding discourage cross-division collaboration.

No, nope, not really, not at all or similar response (15 times)

No barriers that I know of, but as I am nearing retirement I no longer find this very interesting.

no current barriers to cross-division instruction

NO, the divisions serve my interests. (I am in science)

No. The barriers to collaborative teaching are and have been consistently budgetary, not the structure of CAS.

Reward system and competition

Scheduling

The absence of a culture that supports it. And I should add that this extends in spades to colleagues in the professional schools who are effectively liberal arts scholars themselves (e.g. in art history or music). As UO has grown in the last 15 years, it has become more balkanized in terms of faculty interactions and culture.

If you are in CAS, regarding teaching, do you want to collaborate more than you already do across divisions within CAS? If so, what are the current barriers to cross-division collaboration?

The current barrier for career instructors to have cross-division collaboration is we are all overwhelmed and busy teaching. We have no time and energy to think about interdisciplinary research and work. Moreover, knowing what other career instructors of different departments are researching is very difficult, even no access. We don't have good interactive accesses to know each other. If so, how could cross-division collaboration be possible?

The current barriers are understaffing, an apparent allergy to team-teaching (I should say, a belief that team-teaching a course = teaching half the work of teaching a course solo)

The only barrier is the SCH model and the problem with different (and I will say unfair!) teaching loads across departments and divisions. I team taught with a colleague in another division once, and it was one of three classes I was teaching that term, but the only class they were teaching that term. Obviously, our ability to invest was quite different.

The system of "buy-outs" is an obstacle; and the fact that grad students in most programs can hardly take courses in other departments, never mind divisions. Team teaching needs to be enabled. And cross divisional events needs to be organized.

There are no barriers

there are SO many barriers. We can't even co-teach effectively in our Dept!

This would be great if opportunities actually existed. It is my opinion that with respect to teaching, we are all so overwhelmed with work load we are mostly just trying to tread water. I would love to form new collaborations, but this is just not at all feasible since we often do not have any time to think of new or longer-term projects.

Thoughtful collaboration might happen if we weren't constantly patching a leaky ship with bubble gum.

Two fold: 1) self-identity with the dept; 2) lack of time (I can barely make meetings some weeks)

Variable teaching loads across divisions

Very few

If you are in CAS, regarding teaching, do you want to collaborate more than you already do across divisions within CAS? If so, what are the current barriers to cross-division collaboration?

We are actively discouraged from creating innovative projects with colleagues across campus. There should be incentives for innovation through collaboration.

Yes

Yes - barrier is overly strict adherence to disciplinary-based curricula rather than thinking about the evolving student and new directions.

Yes and I do, but its always harder than it has to be - again bean counting by departmental student credit hours

yes--no structured opportunities to do so. Very few departmental incentives--and often departmental costs in terms of teaching credit hours.

yes--time and course load distribution

Yes, collaboration is always good for everyone.

Yes, difference in teaching load

Yes, I would be delighted to co-teach courses with faculty from other departments. This would allow for highly innovative course development. As a junior faculty member, this has been difficult because I am not aware of available resources to support this, and there appear to be structural barriers to adding courses to the curriculum and practical issues of how co-taught courses would satisfy yearly teaching requirements for each instructor.

yes, too many people with blinders on that have no idea what their neighbors are doing, much less the university

Yes. Barrier: SCH/number of majors whipsaw.

Yes. Barriers are pressure from departments to build department SCH and not share with another unit, difficulty of cross-listing courses (especially 410, 610), failure of deans to recognize value of interdisciplinary/cross-disciplinary teaching and reward it.

Yes. Collaboration is important. Many humanities departments have just enough faculty to sustain core requirements and good advising for the major.

Yes. It is administratively burdensome to collaborate on teaching. Team teaching is practically unviable. Department heads are encouraged to be too jealous about loss of SCHs and are given no incentive to foster pedagogical excellence of faculty.

If you are in CAS, regarding teaching, do you want to collaborate more than you already do across divisions within CAS? If so, what are the current barriers to cross-division collaboration?

Yes. They're not supported (e.g. funded as a full teaching load to do disciplinary teaching)

yes. having cross discipline input/teaching in courses would enhance the program. Would help lessen the teaching burden in some areas.

yes. I don't know what others are doing, especially in other departments, even more so in other departments that are not in the natural sciences. cross-training between departments in CAS would be very beneficial. One day, on-campus CAS conferences that bring departments together under one topic would help break down barriers of physical or communication distance.

Yes. No funds, little to no recognition for this kind of work.

Yes. The main difficulty is that such collaborations require additional time for preparation and CAS does not offer ANY incentives to recognize this additional work or to support it.

Yes. The only way to team teach and collaborate is with a special one-time grant like that of the Williams Council or Oregon Humanities Center. Team teaching long-term requires special MOUs between departments. It should be easier to collaborate and not punish faculty who engage in team teaching by requiring that they do it with no credit.

Yes. Time and funding.

If you are in CAS, regarding research, do you want to collaborate more than you already do across divisions within CAS? If so, what are the current barriers to cross-division collaboration?

Almost the same answer as I gave previously with one addendum. There needs to be more of an effort for hires from interdisciplinary areas. Depth in a particular subject will always been necessary, but sometimes breadth is equally important.

Already collaborating on research. There are no barriers in the current structure

barriers are extraneous to CAS structure (disciplinary cultures)

Barriers are thankfully quite low.

Central place indicating the research interests of other faculty

Cross division works best with Humanities Center and CSWS. Buttress those
Don't know how to make connections across divisions.

everyone is too busy

Given departmental standards for research, there is no benefit, and I do not see it happening. We do need explicit and transparent standards for evaluating research and, if these are to promote interdisciplinary research, find a way to operationalize it in explicit standards

I am not particularly interested in formal research collaboration, but I do find informal conversations, and attending talks and conferences on campus to be extremely helpful in my own research.

I am one of two social science-oriented faculty in a mostly humanities department. My closest colleagues in another department have made hiring and curricular decisions without any communication with us. Everything happens in a silo, which creates missed opportunities and potential waste of scarce resources.

I do! I need to learn who is around/available for collaboration and find grants and programs that support that work on campus.

I don't think CAS has any barriers for this - this is just not frequent - most collaborations are with individuals at other institutions. I suppose better cost share on overhead would help, but I think VPRI totally controls this.

I don't see the College/division structure as an obstacle to this

I have not encountered such barriers.

Isolation of departments. I have no idea what events are occurring in other humanities/social science departments that might be of interest to me.

Metrics used to determine funding discourage cross-division collaboration.

<p>If you are in CAS, regarding research, do you want to collaborate more than you already do across divisions within CAS? If so, what are the current barriers to cross-division collaboration?</p>
<p>My collaborative research is cross-college, not cross-division, and it's only doable on campus with regularly scheduled campus-based projects.</p>
<p>No or Not Really (12 times)</p>
<p>No serious barriers to research across divisions in my personal experience. Funding of centers which can't bring in large grants is a problem.</p>
<p>No. For collaborative research, I see no major obstacles, though again there may be some budgetary ones that can be addressed without breaking structures and communities of people apart and increasing the administrative costs of separate colleges even more. Who does the idea of restructuring actually serve?</p>
<p>none that I am aware of, although maybe it should be simple to cross-list courses</p>
<p>Not knowing enough people to collaborate with</p>
<p>Not much barriers exist, and it would be important to not add barriers between divisions (else threatens interdisciplinary programs/departments). I do not like the idea of using the current divisions as the default way of restructuring. Use newer, cross-cutting, topics. The science-policy interface can be studied in the same unit as the science, for example.</p>
<p>Not really (but only because I have a full pipeline of research to work on)</p>
<p>Of course</p>
<p>repeated question- but less centralization and more collaboration less politics and bottom down approaches.....just stoppppppppppppp - you always make things worse, mr and mrs office of the dean</p>
<p>Research doesn't get discussed as a group</p>
<p>Research in my field is typically not collaborative and there is no intra-disciplinary incentive structure in place for that to change.</p>
<p>Same as above. We need to have more discussion. One drawback of the current structure of CAS is that faculty work in silos.</p>
<p>See my above answer and replace the work "teaching" with "research". IN a nutshell, yes, if there were enough time to actual sit back and think of ways to do this. In reality, no chance due to no time to think about longer term projects.</p>

If you are in CAS, regarding research, do you want to collaborate more than you already do across divisions within CAS? If so, what are the current barriers to cross-division collaboration?

The current barriers include overwork, lack of time, lack of real support (not lip service and sporadic small ad hoc grant opportunities), and lack of a space and structure where faculty can actually get to know each other. Siloing the divisions further is DEFINITELY not a strategy for increasing cross-division collaboration, btw

The main barrier is just discovering opportunities in an organic way. If someone in another division is doing something that I might be able to contribute to, or vice versa if someone in another division has particular capabilities and interests relevant to something I'm doing, the likelihood of us discovering each other is not high. I don't need some kind of formal initiative ... random coffee breaks with people from across campus would likely be as productive.

The question is what are the institutional incentives at the moment? None. I suggest creating institutional rewards to foster collaboration. For example, actually count cross-division collaboration as one measure of "excellence." For example, give *each department* a course release dedicated for faculty engaging in cross-division collaboration. Current barriers are lack of time and lack of institutional recognition.

There are currently few barriers to cross-division research collaboration. This remains a significant strength of our institution.

There are no barriers

Too many service projects to allow for Faculty cultivation of research collaborations, loss of departmental funds due to splitting F&A returns.

Yes

Yes - lack of time and lack of seed funding to promote such endeavors.

Yes I do. Again, it's faculty culture and to some extent a lack of administrative support or even verbal incentives. CAS needs to lead on this just by the power of convening and supporting interdisciplinary scholars. Doesn't take a lot of money, just a sign from the Dean's Office that this is valued (plus some pennies for cookies and coffee). CAS can't just function to mitigate budget cuts.

If you are in CAS, regarding research, do you want to collaborate more than you already do across divisions within CAS? If so, what are the current barriers to cross-division collaboration?

yes--no real structures to support this apart from informal networks. More money provided to research institutes would be great--places that support, encourage collaborative research and showcase the ways in which partnerships lead to innovation

yes--time--I am in a dept where we really do have a 5 course load while many other dept are effectively 4 (which is more appropriate for a research university)--we have strong publication record so I'm not sure why there isn't more equity

yes, although again it happens not to be terribly practical for me

Yes, but this comment is less about CAS, and instead: Institutes and Centers have become highly protective of membership (i.e., members of one Institute or Center joining another Institutes or Centers) in order to secure maximum F&A overhead return back to the home/primary Institute or Center. This Espy-era change to Institute and Center funding (funding follows how grants are routed) significantly discourages cross-division collaboration between individuals in different Institutes and Centers, and it follows, between individuals between different departments.

Yes, difference in teaching load and allocation of resources, (e.g., space and start up)

Yes, see above.

Yes. Barrier: Resources

Yes. Barriers here are not major, other than differences in teaching loads.

Yes. CAS needs to provide support in the form of time to incentivize this.

Yes. The research centers and RIGs need to be developed that would make this more possible. And they need university funding.

Yes. Who is going to pay for initial efforts.

Yes. As what I address above, we want to do more to enhance our professionalism. However, the help, assistance, and information are not enough.

yes. feel that the dept. vs. institute structure limits collaboration and understanding

If you are in CAS, regarding research, do you want to collaborate more than you already do across divisions within CAS? If so, what are the current barriers to cross-division collaboration?

YES. No future solution that intends to inform our social efforts with respect to major environmental issues can emerge from a single discipline. The major barrier to interdisciplinary collaborations is time. And, CAS does not offer any support (financial or otherwise, i.e. course buyouts) for such collaborations.

Yes. See above.

Yes. see previous answer.

Yes. The main barrier is the cloistered culture of departments, which is largely as an issue of proxemics (PLC especially makes its too easy to shut oneself off from others) and the lack of any mandatory college or division-wide meetings or initiatives that would otherwise widen our universe.