

## CAS Task Force, Survey 2 Responses

<b>Total number of responses</b>		<b>118</b>
Alumni		1
Graduate Student		6
Non-Tenure Related Faculty		12
Officer of Administration		15
Staff		8
Tenure Related Faculty		75
Undergraduate Student		1

<b>Work in CAS?</b>		<b>110</b>
Yes		102
No		8

<b>Division</b>		<b>100</b>
Natural Science		35
Social Science		28
Humanities		28
Humanities, Social Science		2
Humanities, Social Science, Natural Science		7

<b>Not In CAS</b>		<b>8</b>
admin		1
Clark Honors College		2
DGE		1
philosophy dept		1
Human Resources		1
Research		1
Within the Office of the Vice President of Research and Innovation		1

<b>Leadership Role</b>		<b>110</b>
Yes		53
Response based on:		
Individual		36
Position		22
No		57

---

## CAS Task Force, Survey 2 Responses

<b>Considering the current organizational structure of CAS:</b>		<b>118</b>
It should not be restructured		28
It could be improved without restructuring		44
It should be restructured		16
The issues I experience are at the university level and would not change by restructuring CAS		19
I don't have an opinion on this		11

<b>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?</b>		<b>110</b>
Very little		20
In some ways, but not significantly		26
Significantly		64

<b>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?</b>		<b>110</b>
Very little		62
In some ways, but not significantly		34
Significantly		14

<b>The most important aspect of the Dean's office without regard to structure is:</b>		<b>45</b>
Advocacy for the department in goal setting both within the college and at the university level		14
Really understanding the department strengths, needs and culture		15
Working relationships with faculty in each department		0
Hiring		2
Promotion & Tenure		2
Budget		7
Administrative functions		1
Advocating for new and innovative research (Humanities and other)		3
Acquiring external funding		0
Conflict resolution within departments		0
Raise profile/advocate for all faculty regardless of rank		1

## CAS Task Force, Survey 2 Responses

**Are there other aspects of the Dean's office that are not included above that should be considered?**

Vision for the kind of world we're equipping students to build

CAS Dean's Office is able to represent wholistically diverse departments, and this is important for external funding, and for internal budget and shared reseources considierations. For Research, having the ASsociate Deans and professional staff collaborate and share in planning and mnagement helps minimize time spent orgnizing and more time on facilitating highet administrative tasks and shielding faculty from more administrative tasks so they can focus more on teaching and research.

Working with administrators who serve faculty and students, and helping faculty and students understand the resources available to them across campus related to education, research, and innovation.

Strong development support - focused at the departmental level.

Advocate change at University level to improve processes, reduce redundancy, etc.

This whole process is being run by a small number of individuals in the "clubhouse".

the changing landscape and skills needs for undergraduate education; I seriously doubt most UO undergrads are getting their money's worthy anymore as we remain bounded by tradition most everywhere

For NTT it is quite demoralizing to work within CAS. Anything that improves the sense that permeates CAS, to wit, "You're doing a great job; we'll be happy to show you door the second we can," would be an improvement.

Under new and innovative research, I would especially consider interdisciplinary research.

Holding department heads accountable to UO rules/regulations/policies.

Excellent leadership

advocating for units withing CAS in the larger university setting

Promoting a vision for liberal education and the unity of the arts and sciences

## CAS Task Force, Survey 2 Responses

All of the items in the list offered above are crucial. I wonder at the logic that asks us to provide only one, and I appreciate being able to comment here in this section that the pressure to streamline/choose just one risks missing the point of why we need CAS --it is important at ALL levels, and that is why it would be a huge mistake to break it up.

Promote the Dept, and seek funds to build departments.

Conflict resolution between departments; members of some units are hostile to particular disciplines in ways that damage curriculum for students

The Dean's Office does not adequately support classified staff

Many of the items listed above are of equal importance.

Facilitate interdisciplinary scholarly and teaching objectives

Addressing diversity and equity in meaningful ways

Understanding the "big picture" in advancing human knowledge; that is, understanding what the humanities contribute to the sciences and the sciences inspire in the humanities and how the best social sciences integrate the qualities of both humanities and sciences.

Setting the goals for CAS, especially with respect to teaching. What sorts of programs, skills, broad educational activities do we want? What are incentives to departments and faculty that will achieve these goals?

Instituting programs that recognize excellence, regardless of rank/position

Advocacy for a rigorous liberal arts education (Science, Humanities, Social Science). We do not need more colleges competing to offer gen ed classes.

Avoid rules that restrict ability to meet our goals of excellence in research, teaching, and service

Ability to work collaborative accross units in humanities, social science, and faculty

More focus on research, less on administrative busy work, less on service requirements.

Ensuring the realization of the university's equity and inclusion policies.

I think our current deans are good. Better understanding of the various units under their jurisdiction.

The Dean's office has a special role in facilitating collaboration and communication among departments and among faculty across departments

cross-training

it is necessary to encourage more dialogues between humanities, natural science, and social science.

## **CAS Task Force, Survey 2 Responses**

Our problems center on lack of resources, not organization trees.

Ability to gain expertise in other areas of regulation, compliance, finances that can be used to assist other departments within CAS.

Retention of faculty and staff.

students' success and their relationship with other schools

## CAS Task Force, Survey 2 Responses

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

The current structure hinders the ability to create and deliver self-supporting masters programs. Undergraduate programs are neither strengthened nor hindered by the current structure.

The current structure provides united advocacy for liberal arts curricula.

One CAS has the advantage of lower administrative costs than splitting CAS into 3 administrative units with overblown costs for paying 3 times more administrators and staff. It's time to thin the management, not to blow it up more.

The current structure is a great advantage for students. It gives them the flexibility to experience so many areas of study which presents more opportunities to find their true vocation. It gives those going into the professional colleges a broader background.

bringing together left brain and right brain dominant students to go deeper in both sides of study

Advantages might be that the humanities, which don't bring in big gifts or grants, are benefiting from the dollars brought in by the sciences, if that's accurate. Not sure it is.

Including both the sciences and the humanities (and the one art field (theater) that is in CAS (why is that??)) in one very large college sets up an "underdog" vs "favorite" perception or scenario.

Collaboration and discussion opportunities with other managers

The liberal arts core of the university seems central to the mission of the UO and having a structural connection among programs and departments should allow more collaboration and interdisciplinary work (I think these things can be greatly improved, but breaking up the college doesn't seem like the way to improve connections among programs/departments in CAS).

Teaching needs/mission seem relatively uniform across departments, so I don't see an advantage in restructuring

## CAS Task Force, Survey 2 Responses

Having diverse disciplines that are not merged allows students to understand distinct trends in research and thought. It allows faculty to organize autonomously based on their professional organizational needs and standards. This way, faculty stay up to date with their field of expertise rather than trying to "catch people up" and in turn, can pass that knowledge down to students.

The structure reflects and reinforces the integral relationships among the sciences, humanities and social sciences in a well condensed and efficient administrative structure.

CAS allows students to take courses across disciplines and expand the scope of their intellectual inquiry.

Coordination, conversation, longterm planning

Collaboration, coherence, comity

None. All the structural initiatives in the world won't deliver on our teaching mission if the people key to delivering instruction have low morale. This may not be a CAS issue as much as it is a UO issue, but the fact NTTF instructors are the first to be culled when budgets cuts happen leads me to believe that teaching is no longer our first priority. These people are typically our best teachers and some of the hardest working people who are acutely aware of their place on the bottom of the University hierarchy. Additionally, I'm not aware of the degree to which instructional faculty are brought into positions of authority within CAS such that they can advocate for all facets of instruction and dedicate funds towards that end. Again, the message I've seen time and again is a focus on research.

None

CAS is the core of a liberal arts education, which is the backbone of a civilized, educated society. The educational mission of CAS only works when we think beyond silos and encourage students to think critically and logically beyond disciplinary boundaries to creatively innovate and solve problems.

CAS maintains a student when she switches majors within CAS—no college-level competition for majors.

Being ignored for 20 years minimizes my interest.

The Deanlet structure, thanks to Risa Palm, I think has decreased the ability for CAS to focus on larger issues.

## CAS Task Force, Survey 2 Responses

This is a stupid exercise. It is an enormous error to think that the "current structure of CAS" has very much impact at all on the college's ability to deliver on its teaching mission. The quality of the educators determines the college's ability, etc, not the structure.

The division of Natural Sciences and Social Sciences seems to be a good split between the subjects.

None.

why are "advantages" a required element, but disadvantages are not? does that slant the poll, or reveal a hidden agenda?

Makes cross-divisional teaching relatively easy to organize. But more importantly, it fosters cross-divisional thinking at all levels.

Can't answer w/o a description of the current structure

It's a powerhouse of the status quo.

I am not sure but I wouldn't have said CAS's "teaching mission" appears to be a particularly high priority. Quite the contrary - my sense is that CAS's approach has been consistently to slight instructional quality in order to allocate more resources to the university's research mission. Indeed, I was in a meeting a few years back where the previous said exactly that. But this isn't a question of organization. It is a matter of university culture and administrative priorities. No restructuring is going to fix that.

Ability of implementing courses that are interdepartmental, and between academic divisions

The large bloc of faculty members and students subsumed under the heading of CAS provide both strong and weak/less prominent departments to 1) interact with each other both in teaching and research; 2) provide cohesive support to advocate for liberal arts programs that are not currently STEM cell areas; and 3) let the State of Oregon public know that the UoO is still a liberal arts university and not just an appendage of Nike and the hard sciences.

Having the three divisions united in one college promotes interdisciplinary research & teaching



## CAS Task Force, Survey 2 Responses

CAS is currently run like a poorly centralized taxation system that constantly takes money away from departments but expects the actual departments to run decentralized with the minimal amount of money they allow to flow back into these departments. I am actually not sure of the advantages the current system allows for except to provide additional oversight and create departments that are redundant.

CAS reflects the liberal arts focus of the university. That's why it makes sense for CAS to be larger than other Colleges on campus. CAS allows close communication and collaborative projects between the Humanities, Social Sciences, and Natural Sciences.

Thus far, while it is sadly not a common practice, it might be easier with the current structure to promote interdisciplinary co-teaching.

?

CAS has always carried a heavy teaching obligation and does an excellent job, imo.

Strength of a Liberal Arts College

Dean's work together on shared initiatives

Excellent leadership team

Strong leadership and advocating for units and departments - large and small.

shows students that there are connections among the disciplines in CAS instead of further separating and siloing

A central CAS structure helps promote core curriculum goals around writing, numeracy, and basic skills (at intro and advanced levels) relevant to all disciplines.

Ability to advocate for the college

I don't honestly know.

It incorporates most (but not all) arts and sciences disciplines

Funding for CAS services that are necessary across the college is more stable in the current structure (IT/research/technology/etc)

The current structure serves students well in achieving a broad, liberal education.

## CAS Task Force, Survey 2 Responses

I am deeply concerned at the erosion of UO's commitment to excellent instruction in crucial areas is eroded by the instrumental, pragmatic needs promoted in the professional schools on campus. CAS is the place in which students acquire and develop proficiency in sustained, higher order thinking; imaginative and creative engagement with existing knowledge to yield new insights and new paths forward; careful reading and analysis; clear communication. To lose CAS's advocacy for these absolutely crucial practices, skills and methods would strike a terrible blow to UO as an educational institution.

None really. The CAS should not impeded teaching. This hould be done at the department level.

The ability of CAS schools to buffer one another's temporary shortfalls or encumbrances is a powerful plus for all units' abilities to attract and keep top faculty. Keeping that balancing within the Dean's office, instead of placing it on a distant opaque mountaintop, is vital to preserving morale among faculty and staff.

There is perhaps a better focus of science faculty on teaching excellence here versus other institutions with a separate structure.

It is not clear if the current structure has any real advantage over the proposed new structures. Most of the interdisciplinary activities come from individual departments, programs, and faculty members.

As a large college, CAS can ensure the scope of academics is sufficiently broad to ensure that the students are receiving a balance education.

interdisciplinarity

Most teaching operates within departments, and it is already fairly hard to teach across departments. I do not see the structure of CAS as related to this issue.

For our Graduate program it allows us to partner directly with other departments to cooperatively support our PhD and Master's students in a way that fosters the interdisciplinary nature of the program. Offering a broader selection of advising faculty and courses between multiple departments of CAS.

Wide breadth of topics and areas of specialty

There are no advantages. The structure negatively impacts our ability to thrive and distracts faculty attention away from teaching. Mixed messages are very distracting and stifle innovation.

The integrated nature of CAS makes organizing a coherent undergraduate program, across departments, easier.

## CAS Task Force, Survey 2 Responses

Current structure makes innovations in teaching challenging. That said, CAS provides generous GE resources to enhance teaching efforts in our department (that might be a consequence of structure).

Many opportunities to fuse student learning and course interconnections across the sciences, humanistic fields, and social sciences. These conversations really matter and are a long-term strength of the UO. For example, I have seen many students embrace the exchange of ideas from Earth Sciences, or Neuroscience and social sciences, or humanistic inquiries.

The diversity of teaching methods across departments can be a strength.

the structure enables disciplines to mix and collaborate. I became a professor b/c I enjoy interacting with philosophers, historians, and economists, to name a few. Those interactions happen during meetings and UO would become a much more silo-ed place if CAS gets broken up. I have been at institutions like that and it's not nearly as fun and inspiring.

Cross department interdisciplinary collaboration

The current structure provides students with the "big picture" understanding noted above.

None

CAS admin seems wholly disconnected from teaching issues, including curriculum; we get no advocacy at all vis-a-vis intransigent Senate committees or other departments

Top heavy with administration over numbers of students and teaching faculty.

The appeal and strength of UO is its structure as a liberal arts college with strong sciences. I feel we are under-selling and under-developing this, especially with respect to rigorous education that crosses fields. However, at least sciences + humanities are in the same college, which helps; it would be worse if they were not.

Facilitates interdisciplinary collaborations in teaching and research.

helpful

It works and is lean.

Due to the disempowering of Colleges vis a vis JH, it is even more important that CAS does not give away its leverage.

Ability to collaborate across departments; also minimizes the number of very expensive additional deans, assistant deans, finance officers, policy documents, etc.

## CAS Task Force, Survey 2 Responses

Ability to support smaller programs, with strong research mission, that enhance larger depts. and programs in the College

Collectively the structure ensures that potentially we have as much clout as professional schools.

Humanities education has fallen off considerably. Teaching is student-driven rather than faculty-driven. Consequently, my sophomores and juniors are mainly illiterate--cannot spell, punctuate, or use correct English grammar. A disgrace.

I don't feel qualified to answer this, as CAS's structure is very opaque and unclear to me.

I have collaborated with colleagues in the social sciences (I am in the humanities) in putting together team-taught courses. If CAS is broken up, such collaborations would inevitably become more difficult.

Have a better mix of medium-size and larger size classes. Too much emphasis on large classes for the bottomline. That is not the idea or mission of excellence in education.

Shared resources, common vision.

It allows faculty to easily teach across divisions. It eases interdisciplinary joint appointments for interdisciplinary courses. It allows graduate students the opportunity to easily teach across divisions. It allows students to easily take courses across divisions. It also encourages faculty to know faculty from other divisions and thus recommend their courses to both undergraduate and graduate students.

Innovative and effective teaching is accomplished through collaboration. Even though we all have expertise in our own disciplines, the current structure of CAS best fosters the type of collaboration, engagement, conversation, and mentorship that can positively impact student learning, regardless of discipline. People teaching in the sciences have plenty to learn from those in the Humanities, and the inverse is also true. The structure and resources of CAS offer the best prospects for true interdisciplinary approaches to our educational mission. We can't ask our students to believe in the value of a liberal arts education if the university undermines that value by silo-ing off every discipline.

## CAS Task Force, Survey 2 Responses

I don't know if this is what is desired, but I have two thoughts on teaching in CAS:

1) I'm not a huge fan of how teaching evaluations work nor how important they are for tenure / promotion -- I know other arms of UO are looking into this.

2) There is a degree of territoriality between depts whose skill sets overlap -- i.e. one dept wants to teach their students a set of skills that seems to infringe on the teaching mission / topical area of another dept ... the only reason this becomes territorial is because CAS optimizes (mostly) for total student credit-hours per faculty.

Having the main units that provide core education classes in a single unit will allow coordination of the learning objectives among those units in a way that would be much more difficult were they in separate units.

CAS decisions impact curriculum, teaching assistant allocation, resources for employing NTTF, and many other aspects of the teaching mission. These impacts can be advantageous or not, but on balance CAS is supportive of the teaching mission.

Many faculty, myself included, teach courses that are inherently interdisciplinary (e.g. spanning the "humanities" and "social sciences"). The cause of interdisciplinary teaching seems best served by a single college that houses the humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences.

The current umbrella of CAS can contain departments and programs that straddle divisions, and is supportive of cross-disciplinary collaboration and interaction in teaching.

The current structure and budget model allow for teaching across units and facilitates interdisciplinary work and teaching.

Hard to answer, as I don't really know the full structure of CAS. It's not something discussed, nor easy to find.

There is far too much overhead for students and professors. There needs to be a serious effort to cut back on all services not directly related to the university hiring excellent professors to teach motivated students. The overhead is costing professors valuable time and students their life savings for years to come.

## CAS Task Force, Survey 2 Responses

This is a poor survey. Ask pointed questions to which I can respond rather than starting a prompt with "Discuss 'blank'." It's not up to me to write your survey for you, nor is it my job to have to search for the teaching mission. This is far too open ended. After having read through the written results from the last survey, it seems that I am not alone in this sentiment and that little has been done to fix it. If you want useful answers take the time to write a useful survey and don't make me do your job.

No advantages

I don't know. It may perhaps may facilitate interdisciplinary teaching, but I'd guess this would be possible outside of CAS.

It provides an excellent umbrella for comprehensive programs such as anthropology and geography, which cross two or three silos, so that these programs can enjoy current structure.

Encouraging Interdisciplinary thinking benefits student learning.

Resources for physical space, resources for mentorship in faculty, resources to recruit. Negative teaching impacts is heavily due to budget restraints limiting faculty/student ratios.

Economies of scale with regard to be able to support smaller departments that may have difficulties if they were restructured into a smaller college.

Collaboration and sharing knowledge and experience among teams within CAS is more productive than isolating individuals within smaller units.

I have co-taught a course with someone in Humanities; would have been much more difficult if that were a different college.

Collaboration across CAS has been useful in the teaching we provide. I have seen budding collaborations between English and the sciences (to improve STEM students' ability to make cogent and coherent arguments and explain research), exciting interdisciplinary teaching in areas like medical humanities, philosophy of science, poli sci and English, and interdisciplinary programs that work across NS/SS/HUM divisions, like ENVIS, WGS, ES, CINE, all seem to depend on the relative ease with which faculty can collaborate pedagogically within CAS. It's hard for me to imagine that working as well outside of our current structure.

This is does well, letting Depts decide the teaching schedule

It reflects the "real world" integration of arts and science, a more holistic representation of their relationship in our lives.

General ed requirements may be met across multiple departments.

## CAS Task Force, Survey 2 Responses

I view a strong connection between the science and humanities as a positive input on the teaching mission of CAS.

We provide 70% of all UG education. We should remain together. The issue is that research supersedes everything in ways that do not center students nor the faculty that primarily teach them.

To articulate advantages I would need to know the alternative to which it is to be compared.

Breadth of vision, ability to draw on different strengths and resources to support units that are not (at the moment) doing as well as others)

The principal advantage is the bird's eye view of a liberal arts education in action and understanding the common educational enterprise across a wide swath of disciplines. An informed, competent leader brings an understanding of differences and commonalities and is best able to advocate for a big-picture vision for all areas of inquiry.

Promote interdisciplinary research and teaching between social science and humanities

Less room for budgetary austerity directed at particular departments; Interdisciplinary approach to teaching, i.e. including "the indispensable role that the study of history, languages, philosophy, and literary, cultural, and religious expression play in illuminating the entirety of the human experience (including in the natural and biological world)

## CAS Task Force, Survey 2 Responses

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

A College of Science could enhance the delivery of self-supporting masters programs by redistributing significant portions of tuition received to the unit[s] offering the masters programs.

A decision that we WANT CAS as one college could compel us to interrogate what we're doing to get the most out of this structure and, perhaps, to foster further collaboration, co-teaching, interdisciplinary work, and so on.

A particular danger is that Balkanization could encourage each new, smaller part to preserve tuition resources by offering (or even requiring) courses that would otherwise be taken in another part. For example, students in the social sciences might be encouraged to take more of their math within social science departments, and students in the natural sciences might be discouraged from minoring in a foreign language. A unified CAS does not completely protect against mercantilist tactics, but it helps.

A split structure might (would likely) diminish the effectiveness of advocacy for liberal arts curricula.

A tripartite division would make it much for difficult to teach and collaborate across units

Again, I assume inter-collegiate teaching collaborations would be more difficult than current intra-colleagiante ones, as they are now between CAS and professional school faculty. Moreover, the liberal arts assume we are building students' ability to learn flexibly, without being governed by the instrumentalist motive that a professional degree, by definition, cues students to expect. While CAS units work to professionalize our students (grad and undergrad) and to help them develop careers, we are able to keep learning and skills designed for flexibility more than -pure- pragmatism first and foremost with our students. I think the result is a superior education that, not incidentally, helps students prepare for a modern economy where people often switch fields. Focus is on skills that can be broadly deployed, not labeled as for one career only. Without that liberal arts rubric, the larger purposes and greater adaptability we teach will be obscured.

Any change without a growing pie can simply cause hatred and conflict. Under the current condition of budget stress, there is no need to launch a substantial restructuring.



## CAS Task Force, Survey 2 Responses

Break up the college and there will be fewer contacts across divisions.

Breaking up CAS further would decrease communication across departments, and likely lead to a less coherent undergraduate experience.

Breaking up CAS would create artificial barriers between departments and programs that are currently adjacent to the divisional boundaries.

Breaking up CAS would lessen the liberal arts focus of UO and make interdisciplinary work more difficult.

Breaking up the college would necessarily put pressures on smaller units and would potentially result in the homogenization of course and major offerings for students

CAS ought to consider focusing on core education courses and diverting resources to those, perhaps putting together a unit that focuses on those courses (math, writing). Remove the pressure of research output and instead build an emphasis on ensuring success for first and second year students. This is in alignment with what the state legislature would like to see, and go a long way towards garnering us better funding. The UO's focus on research and prestige as compared to our peers is doing very little for students who are desperate for a university education but cannot afford it. We have the right rhetoric but we simply don't follow it.

Change your priorities and maybe you'll get better results on the teaching side. Until nobody on the tenure-side is going to pay you any mind and the NTTF are going to be constantly looking over their shoulders.

Changes to the CAS structure are orthogonal to teaching.

Changes to the structure have the potential to negatively impact the quality of the teaching by serving as a wasteful, and needless, distraction.

Changes to the structure may silo faculty and disciplines.

Changes would pit departments against each other for scarce resources, encouraging tribalism rather than thinking of ourselves as a team accomplishing shared educational and research objectives.

changes would suggest greater division than is real or desired

Create more silos of excellence and emphasis, but perhaps at the expense of others

Cut the inflated administrator's salaries, reduce the amount of administrative roles and build only practical buildings

Depends on what changes we talking about?

## CAS Task Force, Survey 2 Responses

Depends upon new structure

Different departments have different approaches to teaching, and these differences should be examined closely to identify what elements can be improved at the departmental level. There is no one-size fits all arrangement given the differences in class content, class size, etc. For example, some departments may benefit more from the expertise of NTT teaching faculty contributing at different levels of the curriculum.

Dispersing areas within CAS to other schools or colleges would dilute a cohesive liberal arts teaching mission.

Disruption of the structure means things fall through the cracks.

Dividing CAS silos knowledge and therefore gives the impression that knowing one thing really well is the same thing as being well-educated. It is not. And if someone were to think that deep expertise in a very narrow topic is equivalent to or can substitute for intellectual engagement and familiarity with a broad range of topics, then that someone is narrow-minded by definition. It seems to me that the whole point a liberal arts university (as opposed to a professional school) is to advance a broad understanding of the world and our interactions with it. And, in fact, the one thing that a liberal arts education seems really good at imparting is open-mindedness through engagement with a wide variety of topics and perspectives on how to advance knowledge. This seems critical to me from a societal standpoint because it provides the foundation for engaging with others intellectually in society no matter the professional/occupational path one chooses to pursue.

Dividing CAS would create unnecessary competition among the current divisions and lessen the possibilities for shared research & teaching.

fewer resources for smaller departments, likely resulting in more overwork

Fracturing CAS would directly reduce the number of partner departments our Graduate program would be able to seamlessly partner with, reducing the number of courses available for use in the Grads course plans'. This could increase the numbers of barriers to our interdisciplinary mission by reducing the number of faculty leading qualifying courses to complete the program & the advisory pool for the Grads in our program.

Give more power to the associate deans who oversee the 3 divisions of CAS.

Harder boundaries between schools will likely change the teaching standards of each, so that interdisciplinary teaching becomes more difficult.

## CAS Task Force, Survey 2 Responses

Hiring, promotion, and retention are the biggest ways the college supports teaching. Any changes that make those tasks more easy or difficult will enhance or lessen that support. I have not heard what changes might be proposed.

I cannot say for certain that there would be any benefits with regard to teaching if CAS were to be split into multiple colleges.

I do not support splitting CAS up...it would likely create a lot more administrators and we need to use funds effectively for the education of our students: smaller teacher-student ratios, trying to equitably support intellectual projects and courses in all sorts of fields that use various approaches: this intellectual and pedagogical diversity strengthens students and helps prepare them for a varied world beyond the UO: varied employment, educational, national, global settings.

I don't know the specific changes that are on the table and it does not seem practical to contrast with the full spectrum of possibilities that can be imagined.

I have done team teaching with other depts in CAS and the common structure makes it possible .

I rather feel that, were the College smaller, with Sci/Soc/Hum deans more independent, and not just mid-level cogs in the big wheel, they could do their work more coherently and holistically--and not just put out fires piecemeal, whether sparked from above (JH) or below (problem faculty or depts)

I think it will reduce opportunities for interdisciplinary teaching

I think the first thing is making the structure more transparent (see above).

If CAS is split up into separate colleges, what incentive - let alone basic reason - would there be for a dean to commit the resources necessary to foster interdisciplinary collaboration focused on teaching with other schools? That time and money will stay in-house. More critically, the administrative bloat (which is already severe at this university) would increase to even more untenable levels with three new colleges, and the university has always focused on teaching faculty first to relieve budget pressure. By definition, more OAs, deans, vice deans, etc. will ultimately lessen the teaching effectiveness of the faculty because they will replace faculty in the budget, increasing course loads, reducing the number of courses offered, and slowing time to degree for students.

## CAS Task Force, Survey 2 Responses

If CAS is split up, and decision making continues to relocate upward for matters of consequence (as for hiring, course releases, etc), our ability to weather fluctuations will decrease dramatically even compared to the current crisis situation. This is not theoretical; I've seen it in action at a lower level when departments' autonomy was shifted to CAS. It WILL happen.

If CAS remains one entity, interdisciplinarity options will be maintained. If it splits, it will be harder to collaborate/cooperate across different silos

If there is not a coordinated leadership of the Arts & Letters, Social Science, and Natural Sciences, it will be more difficult to coordinate the teaching among the various core curriculum classes. Currently CAS does not do much to coordinate these classes, but several efforts are afoot to improve this coordination, and I am afraid that dissolving CAS would undermine that effort.

I'm not sure. The bean-counting has led to a severe deterioration of rigor, content, and literacy among undergraduate students.

In general, partnering with the Knight Campus is important to many units within CAS. (The Knight Campus was created, in fact, to enhance the impact of fundamental science education and research.) A change in structure to CAS should not negatively impact the humanities or social sciences. At the same time, it is hard to imagine how the sciences can most effectively partner with the Knight Campus in the current CAS structure. Prior to the Knight Campus, there were also many challenges related to launching new courses, receiving proper credit for team teaching, or innovations in teaching in general.

IN my experience, all CAS deans and deanlets ever focused on was budget issues. Changing that is the tide that lifts all boats.

It could be more difficult to implement this type of courses

It looks like the other colleges (e.g., Design, SOMD, SOJC, COE) are better advocates for their students' unique or field-specific infrastructure, etc. Separating humanities from sciences might allow more visibility for humanities and therefore set them up for garnering their own resources.

It will most likely complicate the course allocation.

It would allow for new and better thinking with more care for students and their outcomes.

It would be great if the UO enabled interdisciplinary co-taught courses--but we do not need a new college structure to make this happen.

It wouldn't

## CAS Task Force, Survey 2 Responses

keep arts and sciences together, but make a conscious effort to not drown out the voices and resources of the arts

Less cross collaboration options

Lessen opportunities for larger cross college initiatives

May be more difficult for students to satisfy requirements.

More colleges will result in more disparate graduation requirements, which will silo students in their departments and units and keep them from expanding their intellect and experience.

More funding for interactive/multi-disciplinary teaching and research among CAS departments.

new initiatives with funding for interdisciplinary social science and humanities initiatives

no change

Nothing worse than an over zealous dean trying to impact decisions of departments and instructors.

On the one hand, restructuring could concentrate resources in a way that might result in more support for departments. On the other hand, separating the college along the lines of discipline type could inhibit interdisciplinary education and research, and reproduce myths about discipline value; roles in our lives; and exclusivity.

Personally I think you need to stop taking money from the departments, and stop attempting to have redundant departments that only exist to add an additional admin burden but still require departments to teach those students. I.e. a general social sciences degree and a pre-law degree are ridiculous and students can take class across departments regardless. Also, this might be the only university I've been to that is actually trying to make a pre-law degree a thing.

Reorganization would create a long period of confusion, disruption, and turf-fighting.

See above; what we need is more educational integration across fields, not less.

The interdisciplinary conversations need to be enhanced, not cleaved apart. How might one enhance these exchanges. More robust support for area studies and cross-disciplinary centers.

The university leadership has in my opinion abandoned undergraduate education as a concern of the faculty and deans, so the biggest changes have already occurred.

## CAS Task Force, Survey 2 Responses

There could be a lot more squabbling about/competing for majors/attendance.

There may be more responsiveness to curricular and staffing processes.

They can remain the same, because collaborations are driven by faculty interests and motivations.

This is subjective, but any over-emphasis on teaching can detract from research, which is the primary strength of many science faculty. It can be argued that a separate structure can allow separate weighting of research versus teaching for faculty based on what will best serve the university and departments.

Well, it depends on what those changes are. The danger as I see it is a system that, by dividing oversight by disciplines or areas (Humanities, Social Sciences, Natural Sciences), does not provide equal opportunity for those areas to advocate for themselves and their teaching mission. Without a variety of stakeholders at a common table, there's a greater risk of decision making that will not bode well for the UO's educational mission.

Were the Social Sciences and Humanities be separated from the "hard sciences," there is a general fear--bolstered by rhetoric coming from the higher administration--that the status and treatment of these essential units would be weakened.

What matters, is allowing for flexibility in how teaching is done, and facilitating faculty to collaborate in innovative and new ways. The fewer deans involved, the easier, that is, it is easier to convince a single set of administrators rather than multiple sets of administrators with different priorities and policies. For example, it is already too complicated to work between the graduate school and CAS to organize graduate curricula, grad student support, etc.

Would break up a highly functioning college for no apparent reason

## CAS Task Force, Survey 2 Responses

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

The current structure, with research focused on the VPRI's office, provides little support for research in the natural sciences. Nearly all of the research-related activities in CAS provide support for faculty in the humanities and social sciences, where external research funding is less plentiful.

The current structure provides united advocacy for basic inquiry.

Currently the DAC has 6 members from all three CAS units and offers cross-discipline insights into tenure and promotion and facilitates research excellence.

Don't know.

The exposure given to students in CAS gives them a broader background that will allow them to have greater flexibility as the needs for careers change. As technologies disappear students that have been exposed to a liberal arts education will have an greater ability to adapt, than those that have trained for a specific speciality.

the budget can be flexible, money meant for CAS can go either way

Collaboration across DGAs and SPS

The core academic programs being housed together can and should serve as the research heart of the institution where innovative and engaging projects from various disciplines meet and enhance each other. As above, I'm not certain that always happens, but it could. It would be harder were the programs/departments broken into different colleges.

The current structure does not impair our ability to obtain research funds - the main mechanism the sciences use to achieve our research mission. Hiring yet more administrative staff (i.e. presumably increasing the money spent on overhead) to run separate Schools does not seem like it will do anything to enhance this effort.

Similar point as above, by staying in their field faculty and graduate students can focus on the specific demands of their field.

Interdisciplinary initiatives across divisions are relatively straightforward.

CAS allows for more direct faculty-administration relationships, allows the dean to advocate for faculty needs more effectively, and find opportunities for interdisciplinary collaboration

Integration and interdisciplinarity

## CAS Task Force, Survey 2 Responses

Cross-disciplinarity, robust institutional and administrative support

The current structure, with leadership made up of research faculty, does emphasize and facilitate the development of department research efforts. It's a question of focus and interest. We want research excellence and that's what we'll focus on, and we've structured it in a way so as to advocate as strongly as possible for the research mission.

You would think that with such wide scope there would be far more transdisciplinary research taking place, but there isn't.

I can think of none.

We share the fixed administrative costs and funding throughout CAS.

Stop hiring admins from outside.

Lack of IN house grant seed money, but this is more in the domain of VPRI than CAS. Still, CAS could advocate better in this regard.

Having a Dean of Natural Sciences can be positive when that person is familiar with the type of research done in the Natural Science departments.

no advantage

Same as above: it's a matter of intellectual breadth, which is important for the overall research mission.

Research could be better supported with course releases

N/A

Protects outdated thinking.

I have no idea - maybe that the sciences get to sponge off the humanities and social sciences?

Again, this structure helps the development of research for disciplines that are at the interface between social sciences and natural sciences (applying data mining in humanities?)

Promotes interdisciplinary research & teaching, allows for shared resources & services.

I don't see much support for the social sciences. Every time you take money that departments have earned from summer classes and savings you are taking money from research because that is what the money is to go to. Which would have given grad students opportunities to work with and publish with their advisors.

The current structure of CAS reflects the liberal arts focus of the university and facilitates interdisciplinary work between departments.



## CAS Task Force, Survey 2 Responses

I believe that the potential restructuring of CAS could be (should be) particularly worrisome to units that are less capable (for structural reasons; no external funding sources, etc.) to generate outside support. I fear that they would be limited to probably smaller and more drastic budgets, and their research will receive less - university \$ support (we already receive significantly less with respect to other units and this is not a function of having a lab vs. not having one). This is often the case of the humanities; and of some units in the social sciences. We are/ and will be even more dependent on budgets that are tuition driven and thus, our research (and the funds it needs) will always be tied up to our teaching & # of majors (I am not saying that those variables should not matter, but they should not be the unique variables by which we measure the value of our research). Our research should be supported on its own merits, as it is in other units - especially in the natural sciences (certainly, they have a higher pressure to generate grant \$ than we do, and generating grant \$ is particularly difficult even for top scholars).

?

already discussed

Cross collaboration

Combined SS, NS and Hum units and departments working together on shared goals

Strength of a Liberal Arts education

Size in this case is an advantage. Dividing the college will just lessen its importance and dilute its collaborative opportunities.

in theory each unit in CAS has an assoc. dean who understands the research needs of the specific division, but can also put this in relation to the other divisions and the university as a whole

CAS helps give the university its identity and strong sciences and arts research university. Without a central CAS unit, this will be lacking and UO will take on more of an identity within the professional schools. This will have EXTREMELY negative impacts on faculty retention and recruitment for those in the core disciplines across sciences, social sci, and hum.

It is irrelevant

I am not honestly sure.

The size of CAS has historically made it possible to allocate resources internally to areas of high priority. But the biggest resource of all -- TTF positions -- is now outside of CAS's control.

## CAS Task Force, Survey 2 Responses

I don't know.

CAS currently provides an excellent base from which to develop humanistic research. Witness the large number of CAS faculty in the Humanities who win highly competitive grants and funding: NEH, Guggenheim, Fulbright, Kluge, to name only a few. Note also the distinguished journals housed on the UO campus (Comparative Literature Journal, housed in COLT; Hypatia, housed in PHIL).

They can represent departments and do fund-raising.

If Nat Sci units need lab startup packages, tuition can cover those. Grant administration support can help Humanities and Soc Sci land prestigious grants. Although it is not an absolute requirement, the presence of units together within CAS serves as a net positive when creating collaborations. To look at the passive barriers that can develop, consider the disengagement of many if not most units in CAS from allied faculty in the same disciplines who are assigned to the Honors College.

I do not see advantages here.

I do not see advantages of the current structure in terms of delivering our research mission.

Some areas are not funded sufficiently especially if they are small in size; CAS & the Dean's Office seems to focus more on the larger research areas where there is more money

Interdisciplinarity, again.

CAS-wide initiatives have fostered interdisciplinary collaboration.

For our Graduate program it allows us to partner directly with other departments to cooperatively support our PhD and Master's students research in a way that fosters the interdisciplinary nature of the program. Offering more chances for spontaneous collaboration between departments and our programs Grad students. This strengthens the research throughout the departments of CAS.

Broadly represents a large portion of faculty and students on campus

There are no advantages. The structure negatively impacts our ability to thrive and distracts faculty attention away from research.

n/a

CAS's integrated nature helps with interdisciplinary hiring and other efforts, and also helps with occasional spousal hires, as both partners are often in CAS departments.

## CAS Task Force, Survey 2 Responses

Again, generous GE resources support classes in the sciences, which in turn ease the cost of supporting graduate students on grants. This could result from the current structure, but I do not know.

Resonance of a common commitment to knowledge, and this is supported and represented in the structure of the college, pooling diverse forms of inquiry toward that commitment. The immersion of the three divisions in CAS within the larger context of Arts and Sciences is an essential thread binding our intellectual communities to that shared conviction. Seeing colleagues, for example, in CIS interact with social scientists is inspiring. The fact that those conversations happen on equal terrain, as faculty in a common college, cannot be overstated as an asset.

The current structure allows for research institutes and centers to be established that include faculty from multiple departments. This increases opportunities for collaboration and facilitates dialogues between researchers from disparate areas.

dealing with perceived inequities

Very little advantages

The structure encourages interdisciplinary thinking, which has been a core strength at the UO. It also provides the Dean (through their Divisional Deans) access to expertise across disciplines. This is crucial for the operations of interdisciplinary departments. For example, it is crucial for negotiating, say, a startup package in the Humanities when the individual being recruited has a profile more similar to someone in the Social Sciences or Natural Sciences than to the typical humanist.

None

here again, more or less irrelevant--except insofar as they give approval to individual faculty needs (leaves for grants, and the like)

NA

The structure of CAS is not too relevant for research. Things like graduate tuition costs, GE positions, etc., seem quite randomly decided, but I have no idea if this would be better or worse with a different structure.

Knight campus and LISB are great examples of how the current structure allows for collaborative advancement or research.

n/a

It works and is lean.

## CAS Task Force, Survey 2 Responses

Showing that we have a coherent research/ pedagogical mission is fundamental to being competitive for Title VI grants. It will be much harder to get buy in for cluster hires if Humanities and Social Sciences spin off into different Colleges.

It is harder for the central administration to interfere in research

Encouragement of collaborative research across the college

On the one hand, association with Sciences and Social Sciences has the advantage of spotlight research to some extent. On the other, it also emphasizes enrollment counts, which have a deleterious effect on basic instruction in the Humanities, which demand smaller classes, more close attention to each student.

Again, I would like to say that I could speak to this, but I am unclear of what the structure actually is with regards to research. That I have witnessed support for faculty research - yes. That I have seen programs and centers offer opportunities for research and exchange - yes. But otherwise, I'm not sure what we are talking about here.

The current structure of CAS includes college-wide committees, including the DAC, that assess the research of colleagues applying for tenure, promotion, and different sources of funding. Built into CAS, then, is the expectation that faculty are able to communicate the importance of their research to a broad audience. This helps keep our research relevant. Of course, the system does not always work perfectly, but if we divide up CAS then there will be drastically diminished opportunities for faculty to communicate the significance of their research to people outside of their disciplines. As a result, I fear, research in the different disciplines will become more inward-looking and less relevant.

It is OK

n/a

It encourages faculty to develop interdisciplinary research projects across divisions. It encourages collaboration in a variety of ways (such as the CAS Program Grants).

The research mission will never suffer at this university, regardless of how CAS is structured. The current university administration has shown that it will always prioritize it above all other missions, including its mission that it provide quality, relevant education to undergraduate students.

## CAS Task Force, Survey 2 Responses

I don't really know. I do think that the process of research, on all levels, for humanities vs. social sciences vs. natural sciences are so radically different that it is unclear to me how one office (VPRI) or one schools (CAS) can possibly institute school-wide policies that help them all ... that is primarily why I'm in favor of breaking CAS into ~2 units.

Currently, CAS is organized so that grant-receiving and non-grant-receiving disciplines are all together in one organizational body. I am not privy to the structure of the budget in CAS, but it would seem that ICC returns to the college could then be used to support disciplines that are otherwise unsupported by the national research granting landscape. In this way, the overall research profile of the university is improved because ICC funds can be used to improve the research efforts of scholars who are in disciplines that do not provide direct grant funds, giving UO scholars an advantage over those at institutions where the funds are not shared in this way.

An important strength of UO is encouraging and supporting interdisciplinary research. Interdisciplinary alliances are often organic, starting from chance discussions that happen more often when faculty from across CAS share many kinds of tasks and activities, not all of which are specific to their research facilities.

The college's mission is to advance excellence in research in a variety of fields, including the humanities. The current structure of CAS recognizes the importance of, and supports, the humanities alongside the social sciences and natural sciences. Restructuring of CAS into three different colleges may enable the administration to enhance support toward certain fields (especially the natural sciences) while neglecting others. The current structure of CAS enables us to resist social and economic pressures to shrink and marginalize the humanities.

The current structure supports the importance of broad scholarship across divisions. It places the liberal arts at the core of undergraduate education and keeps the professional schools in the periphery

Hard to answer, as I don't really know the full structure of CAS. It's not something discussed, nor easy to find. Based on minimal experience, it appears very difficult to bring in external money and form research centers.

## CAS Task Force, Survey 2 Responses

There is far too much overhead for students and professors. There needs to be a serious effort to cut back on all services not directly related to the university hiring excellent professors to teach motivated students. The overhead is costing professors and students valuable time by forcing them to write grant proposals when they could be spending that time on research.

No advantages

Breaking up CAS would have the effect of leaving the social sciences and humanities more dependent on funding fluctuations based on enrollment and other matters, given the more limited funds to these areas accessible through grants or other external sources. While it may seem valuable to cut these divisions adrift from the funding of the sciences, so that they do not feel they are being exploited, in the long run this is a recipe for instability within those fields, and thus a greater risk of a profound drop in AAUP rankings. If CAS is broken up, ensuring funding for these departments seems difficult. My prediction is that a break up will lead to a drop in the quality and predictability of these divisions, with substantial long-term consequences.

n/a

No matter how we think about CAS, the primary mission is to promote excellence. The CAS now has much to say with a wide range of accomplishments made by our faculty members.

Restructuring takes time away from constructive and creative work.

CAS Dean's Office is able to better provide services and facilities and funding to faculty research. Having very strong research activity in many departments helps to promote and fund smaller department research. Awareness, familiarity and cross-discipline efforts.

Again, due to its size and scale I would imagine that being able to leverage on its size, CAS as it is organized, is more able to take on a variety of research goals.

Collaboration and sharing knowledge and experience among teams within CAS is more productive than isolating individuals within smaller units.

## CAS Task Force, Survey 2 Responses

It just seems so much more efficient to have a few people handling external funding requests, and I have received modest if important support from CAS for my research, which may or may not be available if funds have to spend on administrators for each of three separate colleges. The only downside is when CAS administrators from social sciences do not understand the importance and prestige of humanities-type fellowships, which come with not a ton of money yet are the only way forward for our research and careers.

It seems to me that numerous units in CAS are by definition profoundly interdisciplinary across the NS/SS/HUM divisions (geography, anthropology, ENVS, psychology, ES, CINE, WGSS etc). I can't imagine how their normal research could function well if no longer housed in a liberal arts framework that allows equal status to all such work, that effectively assumes all such work is conducted under the liberal arts rubric. It's one thing to be in a division that isn't fully aligned with one's work (e.g. a physical anthropologist whose dept is considered a social science) but still participating within a structure that includes one's scientific identity. Putting that same researcher in a college where they are structurally separated from similar researchers out of dept feels isolating. Speaking personally (I am not in one of those units), I would not want to be in a single divisional bunker. The liberal arts rubric is greatly important to me. Working with colleagues outside the humanities -- explaining my work to them, hearing about their work -- has enabled exciting progress in my own research. I do not wish to feel more institutionally distant and different from my scientific and social scientific colleagues. Concretely, having less contact with them will impoverish my work as I see it, as well as my academic identity.

Bluntly, CAS does not care much about the research mission.

Promotion of interdisciplinarity - in concept and practice. Moreover, it seems the current structure promotes some consistency across departments which is helpful when trying to apply university policy and access to resources.

Access to resources such as grants/research funds.

Better potential for interdisciplinary research.

I'm tired of the focus on the research mission. It seems to uphold tenure at all costs and obfuscates the fact that tenure in its current form is expensive, unsustainable, and unproductive.

To articulate advantages I would need to know the alternative to which it is to be compared.

## CAS Task Force, Survey 2 Responses

It's proven to be an effective backstop when central resources were not adequate or available.

Again, the advantage seems to be the bird's eye view and the collaborative work of deans representing a variety of areas in order to support faculty research.

In my dept (Anthropology) we cover all three divisions and interact a great deal. Being together enhances this!

interdisciplinary approach to research



## CAS Task Force, Survey 2 Responses

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

It precludes the university in answering the most important questions of our time.

It is helpful to have humanities and sciences research grouped together, it makes stronger inclusion in research and Research efforts meeting needs and funding faculty research. It has been more difficult to serve and prioritize research in schools and colleges with less representation and prioritization at the Dean level. It also greatly advocates to bring cross disciplinary research projects to fruition and reaching out knowing what faculty in the CAS make great matches is greatly beneficial.

It could create redundancy in research administration and services, and inconsistency in provision of the same.

A College of Science could significantly enhance research support for faculty in the contained units, especially with focused development activities for competitive research funds.

A split structure might (would likely) diminish the effectiveness of advocacy for basic inquiry.

Splitting CAS into three units creates disciplinarily & intellectually self-contained units and stifle intellectual stimulations.

Depends on new structure

The major liability lies in the complexity and scale of external funding in the sciences. Linkages and coordination between vp research and cas deans office need to be improved. This issue is more an issue with the autonomy and voice authority of bps research than with cas structure.

Splitting up departments would duplicate/triplicate many administrative costs and isolate departments depending upon the splits.

Its not possible to lessen the advantage ...

CAS is huge, and the Dean can't have the bandwidth to pay attention to what is happening at the departmental levels. But then the Dean is expected to advocate for the departments without knowing the full story.

A net separation of the academic division will decrease the flexibility in allocating strategic resources etc.

Unnecessary competition between the divisions & reduce the possibilities for interdisciplinary research & collaboration

I believe that the potential restructuring of CAS is particularly damaging to units and to researchers (or modes of research) that are interdisciplinary in nature. Both - the units and those researchers will not find a voice (or will find less of a voice) in a college (or colleges) where divisions are upheld on disciplinary basis. Interdisciplinary research is already difficult since it does not have the institutional and the \$ support it requires. So, in a university - divided by disciplines/ or group of disciplines - any work done cross-disciplinary or any work integrating multiple levels/ methods (interdisciplinary) will look out of bound. And, will hardly be integrated and promoted (it's already not truly promoted).

Ensuring adequate funding seems like the primary priority at the college level so faculty in departments can do research.

Please do not break up CAS: what exactly led someone to propose this? What exactly is the problem someone thought needed to be addressed? Why aren't we involved in that conversation rather than assuming something's wrong....of course improvement and adaptation is ongoing....but let's fix what is creating problems NOT by adding to the expensive collection of administrators and offices on campus....

See no advantages

Changes would fundamentally change the LA approach

I don't think structural changes would change this, but having divisions meet from time to time might help and then having CAS meetings of various reps (like we are doing with undergrad advisors right now) would start to build more community--it seems more effective use of the current structure should be tried before the pain and expense of restructuring that may leave the same disconnects in place

It is irrelevant

Again, the changes have already occurred, inasmuch decisions on the allocation of TTF positions, and therefore the research profile of the college and its constituent departments, are now outside of CAS's control.

I don't know

UO is not competitive, nationwide, with respect to support for Humanities research because our course load is out of scale when compared to other institutions. Specifically: we are assigned too much teaching. This issue simply must be addressed.

Breaking up CAS would only prove a net benefit if it resulted in a reduction of teaching load (which defaults to 5 across many Soc Sci and Humanities units, far higher than at virtually all peer or aspirational peer institutions on term systems). This does not mean we would teach fewer students, or mentor fewer, but it would permit dedicated time for research without damaging service needs. I'm just not sure how this would happen, however, and why it couldn't happen within the existing structure. If a breakup increased flexibility, that might be positive, but I could just as easily see it creating a straitjacket depending on what the budget model actually credits units for.

By restructuring, the research goals of groups with similar structures can be unified and decisions/initiatives can be coordinated to optimize productivity and highlight specific areas that can be improved.

The underfunded areas may receive more exposure and support

If CAS remains one entity, interdisciplinarity options will be maintained. If it splits, it will be harder to collaborate/cooperate across different silos

Interdisciplinary collaboration will still be possible in any structure.

Fracturing CAS would directly reduce the number of partner departments our Graduate program would be able to seamlessly partner with, reducing the number of faculty willing to take on advising for our Grads in our program. This could increase the numbers of barriers to our interdisciplinary mission and act as disincentive for collaboration between departments and our program.

Allow for expansion in speciality areas, but might also be a detriment to smaller speciality areas.

My answer to teaching also applies here: The Knight Campus was created to enhance the impact of fundamental science education and research. A change in structure to CAS should not negatively impact the humanities or social sciences (rather, we should invest more in research there). At the same time, it is hard to imagine how the sciences can most effectively partner with the Knight Campus in the current CAS structure. Prior to the Knight Campus, there were also challenges related to working with CAS to support technology transfer efforts, to secure cost-share requirements on grants related to 9-month appointments, and supporting growth of research (faculty receive the same CAS support/relief if they support 1 graduate student or 10, for instance). I am a definite champion of liberal arts education and scholarship. At the same time, liberal arts faculty working in sponsored research areas and non-sponsored research areas have very different responsibilities, reporting requirements, challenges, etc. (note, I am not suggesting these are any more time consuming or difficult!). A one-size-fits-all approach does not work.

CAS acknowledges, symbolically and administratively, the pillars of inquiry and knowledge, time-tested over 150 years. Doing more to really celebrate this, rather than fracture this, would contribute to the shared conviction of pursuing and sharing knowledge.

Follow the lead of these institutes and centers to identify potential research clusters that could be identified at the university level. For example, some institutes should be degree-granting entities to promote the recruitment of graduate students and align better with the overall research mission of the campus.

Advantages: Review of scholarship and research by somebody who actually understands the field. Focused attention on research and scholarship efforts. Less time struggling to prove research and scholarship validity.

It would depend on how the changes were implemented, but it is hard to see how any division of CAS would promote the kind of context-dependent thinking that we rely on as a unit. It seems clear that the administrative burdens at the level of the college (whatever that were to look like) and at the department would also increase. These burdens cost time and money that could instead go towards research. For example, I am taking 15 minutes to respond to this survey (because I care so much) instead of devoting those 15 minutes to the paper that is also open on my desktop.

again, it's a matter of focus and of really thinking about and cultivating a holistic approach to the research/teaching/service balance that departments cultivate among faculty

I have no idea why we have a separate "graduate school," and what purpose the graduate school serves, despite having been here for over a decade. Perhaps this should be integrated with CAS?

Spending time and resources on restructuring will introduce both a learning and a period of transition that will most likely reduce impetus and momentum for implementation of innovative ideas.

Reorganization would create a long period of confusion, disruption, and turf-fighting.

More administrative scaffolding will drain even more funds from our core teaching and research missions.

If CAS is divided into multiple units, it will be easier for the central administration to determine the budgets of different divisions based on the central administration's priorities than if they are housed within a unified CAS. Depending on the priorities and motives of the central administration vs. CAS leadership this may be good or bad for different units. However, dividing CAS into separate units will, undoubtedly, increase the number of staff and administrators, and therefore, costs.

Given the college's avowed commitment to research, there should be a Dean whose sole job is to promote research opportunities within the College. Alternatively, this task should be divided among the current divisional Deans and made a larger priority. Currently, it sometimes feels that the Deans main job is to manage budgets and find places to cut, and research priorities get lost in the shuffle.

I'm not at all sure. Structural change could emphasize more waste, ignorance, and high-handed administrative decrees. As for enhancement, I doubt very much that any change will enhance research opportunities, emphasis, support in the Humanities and Creative Arts.

Anything that further atomizes the faculty and centralizes decisions that should be in the hands of faculty members within their fields, or across inter-related fields, is negative.

Depends on the changes. Certain changes will create turmoil and overall unhappiness in many units.

I worry it will further silo and thus inhibit research collaborations across divisions.

In the end, there are a lot of moving parts in CAS, with some disciplines bringing in a disproportionate amount of tuition while others bring in a disproportionate amount of grant funding and the overhead that comes with it. If CAS is broken into several units, I could see issues arising where funds subsidizing one or another research unit might no longer be available, hurting those units' research profiles.

Conceivably smaller, more focused organizations could better understand and support the peculiar needs of each research unit. On the other hand, opportunities that combine strengths of multiple research units might go undiscovered or die early from organizational friction.

Breaking up CAS would further exacerbate the differences between disciplines that are well-funded and those that access more modest funding mechanisms.

Dividing CAS would empower the professional schools vis-a-vis the liberal arts and would accelerate the corporatization of the university.

Reducing the overall power of the Provost to control hiring decisions, and returning this capacity to CAS and to departments, would be very helpful. The provost is not, and cannot be, qualified to evaluate talented hires in fields beyond his or her own area of expertise. Reclaiming greater capacity for CAS itself seems likely to help with the improvement of many of its academic departments.

Without careful plan, various changes can just cause damage to those advantages.

If you can reduce costs by restructuring, fine. Otherwise, let's work on real problems and opportunities.

Without knowing more specifics of an alternative organizational structure, I cannot say for any surety there would be pros/cons.

breaking up would allow a dean to be more focused/advocate stronger for the natural sciences.

Smaller units may become neglected and their faculty's needs not met.

I don't know the specific changes that are on the table and it does not seem practical to contrast with the full spectrum of possibilities that can be imagined.

Fewer opportunities for smaller departments, especially in the Humanities.

If the change means separating the main research blocks, then it amounts to silo-ing: fewer conversations, fewer opportunities at interdisciplinary projects, financial and other favoring of disciplines to the detriment of others, with (un)intended, negative consequences for research and teaching outcomes.

Funding incentives are needed for interdisciplinary work!

restructuring will inevitably silo off departments and fields that would otherwise work together in research and in teaching. it would also inevitably result in budget cuts to smaller departments, making it incredibly difficult to teach and research effectively  
make sure one side isn't 'stealing' from the other

See answer to question #1 above. If you seek funding for projects you normally do not cover, you might find multiple new funding groups. They won't bring in the massive amounts that Nike does, but they will help continue the University's vision of being a liberal arts university.

Allow departments to allocate their money as they see fit, and stop taking savings away from them it's hurting the research and the ability to fund graduate students. Particularly when the graduate students otherwise have to go into a larger pool in which other measures of allocation might make it harder for students from some departments to get funding.

Cut the inflated administrator's salaries, reduce the amount of administrative roles and build only practical buildings