Issue	currently	Advantages	Disadvantages	Advantages if split	Disadvantages if split	Conclusion
Dean / reporting structure	Dean, Dean of Faculty and Operations, Divisional Deans	Div Deans represent divisions at Deans-level meetings, reflects large size of CAS	Multiple layers between Dept Heads and Dean. Can reduce Dean's knowledge of departments, representation depends on strength of Div Dean. Departments that cross disciplines have a Dean from one but not other disciplines	Fewer layers between Dept Head and Dean and better knowledge of departments	Representation will depend on strength of Dean to the Provost level, and not allow for cohesive / alliance among Div Deans	Not a good idea to split as decreases collaboration. Increasing cross disciplinary support for departments that do not fall completely in a division and allow more discussion of potentially moving between divisions if departments are interested
Budget allocation among departments	Budget is applied to CAS as a whole and divided at the Dean level between divisions	Allows flexibility of different kinds of support between divisions and variation if flow of support between funded and underfunded programs and departments	There is less transparency for departments who are denied funding in areas but "hear" of equivalent funding of same in other departments, can lead to resentment	This would force the situation to be completely transparent, but could be achieved in different ways	Reduce the ability to be flexible and cut flow of funds between funded and underfunded programs and departments	Not a good idea to split as reduces flexibility. Improve transparency and equivalence in budgetary factors, such as how departments are supported for: paying major advisors, supporting NTTF/ spousal hires, use of non-instruction GEs, level of staff support, allocation of
Other budgetary allocations: Application of summer tax	Complex sliding tax based on percentage income up to 45% of net dividends. Students often take Gen Ed classes in summer that they are scheduled out of in regular term	Allows CAS to get more money from departments for distribution to other units or to cover deficits	Disincentive to building a departmental financially strong model if revenue is redistributed and to offer a robust set of courses	Might let divisions have different tax levels but presumably fewer recipients / other departments?	Might let divisions have different tax levels institutionalizing inequalities and reduce summer offerings	Not a good idea to split if it increases inequality. Need improvement of current system to incentivize course availability for students to make timely progress.
Hiring	IHPs requests go to divisional Deans, discussion and coordinated response with single submission to Provost level.	Allows a Deans vision, with focus on certain areas	Some departments and programs will not be the focus of that vision	Each division can promote vision of hires	Vision of differential hiring will now occur at the Provost level which is less familiar with the departmental and divisional level view	Not a good idea to split as will create a blunter instrument hiring vision

Funding of startups for labs and hires	Funding from VPRI, etc with requests coordinated mostly by Science Dean	Efficient model	Creates difficulties for science hires in non-science departments		Would make current difficulties much worse	Not a good idea to split as would make difficulties worse. Improve current coordination to include departments that make hires needing startups
Support of departmental infrastructure: faculty service	Departments are provided with course releases that are used as the department decides	Allows departments to decide if they are going to give releases for internal faculty service	Allows departments to decide if they are going to give releases for internal faculty service resulting in inequalities	none	none	Not a good idea to split as no advantage. Improve the present system to increase inequivalent support for faculty service in departments
Dept Heads	Department Heads receive course releases and stipends depending on size and need.	Transparent	Metrics to assess "size and need" may be disputed	Would allow more differential support of Heads	Would allow inequitable support of Heads	Not a good idea to split
Grant Support / DGAs	Some departments have their own, some departs share, some have none, there is some CAS central support	Departments differ greatly in their need and CAS can provide a shared central person for low-need departments	Departments have different access that may not match their need and could do more with better access	Specialized DGS	Duplication of staff, reduces ability to share DGAs across units	Not a good idea to split
Departmental support	Similar to DGAs					Not a good idea to split
Allocation of GEs to departments	Single allotment to CAS that is divided up among divisions. Departments receive separate requirements for number admittees and some fellowship funding from Grad School. Graduate students that are only funded from grants have to request waivers or funds from CAS.	Grad student funding is no longer as tied to SCH.	Grad student funding is no longer tied to SCH (enrolled classes get cancelled) but numbers still capped by funding from CAS so grad numbers cannot increase. Allocation from CAS is now not coordinated with Grad School requirements. Departments can lose Grad School fellowship funding if CAS cannot	None	Would make difficulties worse and require separate solutions.	Not a good idea to split. Improve current structure and coordination of Grad School departmental GE setting numbers with CAS. Add additional non-instructional GE funding that does not results in current loss of instructional GEs. Improve coordination with VPRI to aid in supporting research funded graduate students.

			provide sufficient support. CAS may not have sufficient funds to support research funded grad students with Tuition Waivers, etc			
Curriculum oversight	One committee oversees all of CAS (CASCC) for faculty with single Dean oversight of programs and courses	Allows for coordination of curricular efforts and collaborative programs. Allows for knowledge sharing.	Heavy service load, especially for Chair. Steep learning curve. Currently under supported staff / administratively and in compensation of Chair	Perhaps a more specialized focus but associated loss.	Loss of collaborative courses and programs – creation of academic silos. Will require each unit to have its own curriculum committee for its Dean oversight of curriculum – duplication of effort, increases faculty service load, loss of expertise	Not a good idea to split.