

CAS Task Force, Survey 1 Responses

Total number of responses	147
Alumni	1
Graduate Student	9
Non-Tenure Related Faculty	31
Officer of Administration	19
Staff	16
Tenure Related Faculty	70
Undergraduate Student	1

Work in CAS?	# each
Yes	120
No	16

Division	# each
Natural Science	23
Social Science	32
Humanities	49
Humanities, Social Science	4
Humanities, Social Science, Natural Science	9

Not In CAS	# each
PPPM	1
UO Libraries	1
VPFA	1
International Affairs	1
Student Life	1
Lundquist College of Business	1
Office of the Provost	1
Advancement	1
Library	1
Undergraduate Studies	1
Advancement	1
Clark Honors College	2
College of Design	1
Another College But Have Common Projects With Faculty In CAS	1
College of Design	1

Leadership Role	# each
Yes	58
Response based on:	
Individual	62
Position	15
No	78

CAS Task Force, Survey 1 Responses

Considering the current organizational structure of CAS:	# each
It should not be restructured	27
It could be improved without restructuring	57
It should be restructured	16
The issues I experience are at the university level and would not change by restructuring CAS	31
I don't have an opinion on this	16

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?	# each
Very little	27
In some ways, but not significantly	54
Significantly	66

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?	# each
Very little	63
In some ways, but not significantly	59
Significantly	25

The most important aspect of the Dean's office without regard to structure is:	# each
Advocacy for the department in goal setting both within the college and at the university level	30
Really understanding the department strengths, needs and culture	18
Working relationships with faculty in each department	3
Hiring	5
Promotion & Tenure	0
Budget	8
Administrative functions	11

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

Advocating new and innovative Humanities research
acquiring funding from outside sources

Ballooning administrative costs

Seeing the whole of how CAS (liberal arts) works together

The Dean's office is a very important resource for resolving issues within departments

CAS Task Force, Survey 1 Responses

I'm not sure if this question is written to ask about the current most important aspect or the ideal most important aspect. The current most important aspect (and what they do well) is the administrative functions of promotion and tenure, but I think that the most important aspect they should be really doing better that is very important is understanding the department (and programs) strengths, needs and culture AND supporting faculty as they develop and launch programs.

The relationships between those options, fundraising

Mediation. Problem solving across departments to find solutions to problems.

Ensuring that the Dean's office includes career faculty as part of the definition of a department, unit, and program as well as the term "faculty." We are key stakeholders and always have been, but the culture of the UO has not caught up to this reality in ways that other institutions have.

We should put more emphasis upon the impacts we would have upon students by subdividing the College of Arts and Sciences!

From my perspective, the single most important issue regards contract renewal and the uncertainty CAS creates with respect to long-term NTTF. Almost nothing CAS does impacts my teaching - seriously, the single most important thing that CAS has ever done is implement a program so that NTTF like myself get replacement computers. But they try to micromanage teaching levels to a degree that makes little sense and fail completely to give a sense that NTTF are an integral part of the university's mission.

Understanding of and advocacy for the rights and needs of all faculty, regardless of rank.

I don't feel confident to answer the above questions despite having worked in this college for more than a decade. I am baffled by the entire conversation and observe that colleagues I talk to feel the same. I answered "significantly" on both positive and negative so they would cancel each other out and the form would let me submit (Add "I don't know" option on future surveys?) "I don't have an opinion" response = I still don't understand why we are asking the question, it does not mean I am not invested or don't care.

The Dean's office provides an overall vision of our work across departments on behalf of student and faculty success. Departments cannot be islands or silos and be successful. It is through the Dean's office that shared vision, problem-solving, and connection between units can benefit our work. The list of choices above seems a minimalist and impoverished sense of the work the Dean's office accomplishes.

CAS Task Force, Survey 1 Responses

I don't think your questions allow for any realistic answers--For example, ALL of the aspects listed in the previous question are significantly impacted by the Dean's office!

Providing information on central administration priorities and broad changes

I don't understand the previous question, so did not provide an answer. Having social sciences, natural sciences, and humanities in one college allows for forms of interdisciplinarity and revenue sharing rather than competition that will become impossible if the natural sciences are siloed. The problem at UO has to do with resources, not structure. Changing the structure is likely to make the resource situation worse rather than better, especially for folks in the humanities and the humanistic social sciences.

Setting standard operating procedures
development/fundraising. Strategic vision setting.

Value proposition of most liberal degrees today

The Dean's Office should provide leadership

Strategic planning based on changes in base funding and demand for programs

Providing Department Head training & accountability

Working as an intermediary between the departments and the UO core goals and holding departments to the realistic expectations

The quality of student's education as a tool for leading a good, examined, and engaged life

Oversight of overall activities

streamlining and problem-solving for department issues with university structure and policy

Many administrative functions should be centralized so the Dean's office can focus on Service and Culture. Dean's office faculty and staff are for the most part talented and committed to serving departments, yet I have noticed a widespread negative perception. I think that more energy should go into understanding why this is and developing a plan to better align with departmental values. If departmental faculty and staff should be better engaged in decision making and ownership of CAS and were consulted more often, these perceptions may change.

Stop meddling in departments' affairs.

Setting a vision for the College and establishing processes and structures to achieve that vision; holding UO faculty, staff and students (and administrators) to high standards of excellence

Interdisciplinary collaborations across the humanities, social sciences and sciences has been a crucial element to the teaching and research

CAS Task Force, Survey 1 Responses

Ability to implement strategic visions for the arts and sciences without being encumbered by an outmoded division between the sciences and the social sciences/humanities.

Too many layers of admin in CAS & UO overall

Hiring should be at the dean's level, not the provost's.

Advocating for a comprehensive curriculum not hostage to the ebb and flow of trends

Yes -- advocacy for liberal arts and sciences, rather than "departments"

P&T is equal to hiring

better promotion of interdisciplinary programs

Promoting interdisciplinary research

Insuring that the curriculum in the various departments is effective.

Development

Acknowledgement of contribution of all academic disciplines to the deeper understanding of humanity and foresightedness to financially support all units even if they are not profit-generating at this instance

Deans should take more naps

The dean works for the faculty but the faculty does not work for the dean.

Current combined salaries of administrators and staff in Dean's office; for comparison with impact of breaking CAS into 2 or 3 units

Defending the humanities

Adjudicating the political and economic moves the inevitably arise between units and areas of CAS; maintaining equity, inclusion and balance among fields of study. Encouraging interdisciplinary inquiry and teaching

The problem is restricting us to 1. I'm curious about why the question was posed that way.

Advocating for the principle of a liberal arts education

Helping the department improve from their perspective as understanding successes and challenges in other units -- both those that are similar and dissimilar in discipline (in-division and trans-division)

Advocacy is dependent on knowing a department's strengths, needs, and culture.

CAS Task Force, Survey 1 Responses

What are the advantages of the current structure relative to the college's ability to deliver on its teaching and research mission?

I think current structure does effectively the CAS mission of teaching and research

One core issue facing departments is consistency of policy and process, and a restructuring of this unit, which only recently became a viable entity, seems to disregard the history of the situation.

The current structure may help support interdisciplinary collaborations.

historic; since it has been this way, everyone potentially knows how the college is run

So far, I see none. Seems like a complete shitshow to be completely honest. Excuse my language.

The issues the university experiences will likely not be remedied by deconstructing CAS and moving money elsewhere. CAS is currently being disciplined with cuts to subsidize the projected gap of funds that exist at the university level. Bifurcating the college and its subsequent departments may help divert money into other categories, however it will not improve teaching or research. If we want to improve things, change is needed at a higher level. For example, course instruction as given by professors and graduate students would benefit from a transition from a term to a semester system.

During the 1980-1981 school year, public and private institutions spent \$20.7 billion in total on instruction, and \$13 billion on academic support, student services and institutional support combined, according to data from the National Center for Educational Statistics. By the 2014-2015 school year, total instructional costs had climbed to \$148 billion, while the same grouping of administrative expenses had risen to \$122.3 billion. - "Bureaucrats And Buildings: The Case For Why College Is So Expensive"

Ability to conduct interdisciplinary research, centralized admin/resources

As a member of a department that spans the natural and social sciences, the current structure allows us to work well within the inherent interdisciplinary nature of our field.

Supposedly being centralized is more efficient and gives CAS flexibility.

Departments that bridge traditional disciplinary divides (ENVS, GEOG, ANTH, ETC) are supported.

So far as I can tell, CAS's structure enables programs that have less funding, representation, and institutional clout to make their cases for hiring and retaining the kind of faculty that promote excellence at the university. The structure also consolidates administration and drives down administrative costs that would be burdensome to units, like the Humanities, that have been less lucrative than their counterparts in the physical sciences and the Business college.

Not wasting time and resources to restructure for the sake of change.

Many programs and faculty who are interdisciplinary cross-cut between the three major divisions. The current set-up supports this. It also allows for departments to straddle the major divisions in their teaching. For social science/science in particular there are many departments that offer coursework in both divisions.

CAS Task Force, Survey 1 Responses

The major advantage of the current structure is that the college could pay dedicated attention to the undergraduate curriculum since thousands of students take courses throughout CAS for their General Education requirements and for their majors. The college structure is setup in a way that could REALLY make an impact on making this the best possible academic experience possible and promote interdisciplinary experiences. However, this is not currently happening.

none

Several CAS departments, which are considered social sciences, tend to have a course of study rooted in the hard sciences. For example, geomorphology is an important area of study and research shared between Geology and Geography. Having the departments in the same college allows for better oversight and budgeting when it has an affect on the same students and faculty.

It seems valuable to have many disciplines connected under one umbrella with the hope of creating a more cross-disciplinary and collaborative culture. As someone in a different College, I know that collaboration is often easier within a College than with other Colleges.

Interdisciplinarity and the liberal arts core

Unknown. I'd like to see examples from other institutions to compare. Not sure how to answer. I know a lot of us are bewildered about where this is coming from.

Interdisciplinary relationships are fostered; no one feels unnecessarily siloed; easier for all units to feel that they have equal standing, despite centralization of key decision-making in the Provost's office.

We can think how to balance three colleges.

Having arts and sciences together sends the message that they are intertwined and similarly valuable; it also enables them to enrich one another via a shared mission. Fracturing their union risks further devaluing the arts, which have already been marginalized and devalued in elementary and high school education via cuts and demotion to elective only status. To become well rounded and emotionally satisfied adults, as well as motivated and conscientious citizens, humans need the arts, even if they are not majoring in them!

The University of Oregon already has a long-established reputation for strong humanities departments, which attract many students. Fracturing links between departments could undermine those strengths!

unknown

No ideal

Preserve the integrity and importance of academics (teaching and research), the main mission of the university.

Inter-disciplinary cooperation, resource sharing, being better connected to a robust and diverse academic community that benefits our professional and academic goals, as well as the goals of our students.

Serving a high proportion of undergraduate students ensures a consistent, coordinated approach to undergraduate education. Having many departments under one administrative umbrella improves communication and coordination and reduces administrative costs.

UO is still a university, not a tech or professional college.

Unsure at this time

CAS Task Force, Survey 1 Responses

There is an intimate relationship between the college and the department I teach and administrate in. CAS has rescued our department from its own worst impulses more than once. CAS has been instrumental in saving us from ourselves. This is not an exaggeration.

The potential collaboration between humanities, social science and science at research and educational level (interdisciplinary courses and programs)

The university community as part of CAS creates a sense of general belonging and shared goals/purposes. We know these factors are important to student success, and they matter for teachers and researchers as well. The collaborative working relationship between deans, the shared staffing for their work with units all make our mutual responsibility for the good of the division visible. Creating separate units means so much more administrative work to coordinate and create coherent pathways between colleges. The liberal arts share values. More divisions nationally where ideologies (disciplines) are not able to see their responsibility to cooperate and do what is best for all need not be replicated here in CAS.

Intellectual domains are inextricably linked and that interconnection is fostered by a structure that recognizes that. Universities are less and less about inspiring life-long learning, broadening students' horizons, and developing critical and analytical thinking; it no longer has as its focus student learning; it is increasingly motivated solely by preparing students for a "career" and getting them through the system as quickly as possible. Breaking up CAS will only make this turn in direction and redefinition of the "university" more starkly evident and cement it in place.

The nominally even balance between the college's different branches

The Dean's office works directly with departments which serve core education priorities, and they understand the importance of teaching.

Departments have some autonomy, such that they can address needs at a local level in a discipline specific manner.

See above--interdisciplinarity, collaboration, sharing resources and resource-deprivation.

This is difficult to answer as their current staffing/structure is ineffective. If staff functioned at a higher level then having CAS would provide improved resources and stronger advocacy.

None

The college is able to run efficiently and effectively in its current structure. More efficiently than other colleges that are smaller. The college is innovative in its current structure and has improved on itself year over year, and shared those innovations and improvements with campus on the whole. The departments contained in the college belong together and the disruption and distraction of this assessment is counterproductive to the actual work that we could be accomplishing with this time. The insinuated problems seems to be externally imposed and the proposed solution not well thought through.

larger pool of resources to share across divisions.

That CAS, like many other liberal arts colleges is wide in scope and reach.

CAS Task Force, Survey 1 Responses

It's efficient and economical. CAS has been a leader in creating many processes and systems that are now used university-wide. We likely wouldn't have been able to do that if we were broken up into smaller colleges. Also, be prepared to spend more money on administration if you split up, because right now we have an excellent and very lean team where most people function in a role that supports all the divisions at once. Looking at the structure of Dean's Offices in other schools and colleges that are much smaller than CAS, I don't see how there's any way to avoid hiring more administrative staff in a two- or three-college structure.

It is the backbone of the university, serving all students and units.

It's size provides a larger budget than other Colleges.

Any benefit or harm from restructuring would be massively overshadowed by the time and money spent talking about the restructuring, forming committees about the restructuring, arguing about nuances of the restructuring, squabbling over resources in the restructuring, moving staff in the restructuring, protesting the restructuring, defending the restructuring, choosing paint colors for the restructuring, hiring for the restructuring, laying people off for the restructuring, etc.

I am at an utter loss to define or restate the problem(s) any proposed restructuring would solve that would make it worth this use of resources. What are the disadvantages some see, and who are the some who see them? Giving the Provost the benefit of the doubt, I could assume and appreciate that he doesn't want to prejudice the task force's findings, but in the absence of any stated or perceived problem(s) due to structure, it is easy to fear the time suck of "change for the sake of change," or something more nefarious. Certainly there are those who fear the demise of the humanities, while resources are lavished on the natural sciences. I am less of this mind, and more of the mind that the Provost's Office simply finds CAS too large to control. I could be dissuaded from this fear if there were any rationale at all given for analyzing the structure now. "It's been on our minds" and "The Dean left" are weak and vague answers. If we knew what problem we were attempting to solve, the task force could address it directly. (TR: comment continued to next field to fit)

The divisional structure of CAS does an average to good job of fairly allocating resources and advocacy for each of the three divisions. I see no problems in the College that are necessarily solved by its dissolution. In fact, from an administrative perspective, as compared with other schools and colleges, the CAS deans and their staff are highly functional, and our systems and processes are often looked to as models, and/or adopted outright by central offices (sometimes at the initiative and prompting of the Dean's Office). If the Dean's Office staff are broken up, this efficiency and initiative will be gone, and the Provost's Office staff, who are also highly competent, but small in number, will have to take it on. Part of the benefit of being the largest college on campus by far is efficiency and a good understanding of how UO processes work. Splitting up CAS would require the UO to hire and pay more administrative staff, who, frankly, would know less and be less efficient than current CAS deans and Dean's Office staff.

Broad experience and expertise of the CAS Deans Office leadership

Economies of scale

CAS Task Force, Survey 1 Responses

Not sure
Science and the liberal arts inform each other and needed to be coupled for the best human outcomes from research and scholarship
Diversity of funds
The college works well together, in terms of supporting large and small depts/programs, budgeting, admin processes. Many of the admin and budgeting structures that run UO began as CAS admin and budgeting structures. We have strength in having a broad base to manage and support.
Since I am in neither a research or teaching position it's difficult for me to speak to this. My inclination is that the current structure makes collaborative work accessible, at least within CAS.
CAS is currently considered more of a single unit than three silo'd colleges.
Interdisciplinary cohorts
Not sure: it would seem to me that the structure should allow students to make greater connections to be made between the trivium and the quadrivium, but I'm not sure that's the case.
college is so big that it can bring in a lot of research and other type \$\$
I do not know.
All programs are weighted the same, despite which programs bring in the most money
Deans specific to the units within the 3 branches of the college
The current structure supports interdisciplinary work.
Nearly exclusive representation of faculty in dean positions ensures that decisions made in CAS are made from a teaching and research perspective.
I think the current structure allows for a high level of support, collective knowledge, and collaboration (especially administratively) between the three divisions that may be lost if split up into three separate colleges.
In my position, I am at a low level of interaction with CAS Deans Office. I do not even know the structure, or how it works. I have a very few individuals that I contact when I have questions about specific things, and usually get helpful information. I direct anything that I don't know who to contact for to my departmental supervisor to deal with, as they know the CAS organization better.
decentralized with authority in individual departments
Consolidating CAS resources under a single dean creates a powerful voice for academic excellence that is largely unencumbered by university-level administrative challenges and transient politics. The unification of arts and sciences champions the values at the core of this university. We value producing broadly educated, critical thinking members of society over training lawyers, business leaders, journalists and musicians. We value basic research over applied science. While skills and applications are important - we are a liberal arts college first and foremost. Breaking up CAS would severely dilute this voice.
The ability to have some additional organization and systematic processes. Given that the university is such a large entity, there's great risk of every department and program doing things "their own way", which can cause a lot of confusion and frustration for students if they have to go in dozen different directions to get a dozen different answers to one question.
I don't have the information necessary to answer this question.

CAS Task Force, Survey 1 Responses

large structure allows for easier inter-disciplinary collaboration, shared resources
A true liberal arts education demands integration in structure in order to deliver integration in content and cohesiveness of vision. Dividing up the college would, I believe, have a huge and adverse impact on the quality of education we provide to students.
none
Efficacious with minimal cost and staff
There are no advantages to the current structure - it is toxic.
For interdisciplinary programs, like those I work in (Global studies, Global health, Latin American and area studies) we <u>must</u> have flexible administrative structures that allow us to foster and thrive in trans- and inter-disciplinary spaces
Pooled resources allow all three arms - humanities, social sciences and natural sciences - to advance their teaching and research missions
Advantages include, but are not limited to: reduced administrative overhead compared to breaking into multiple colleges/subunits; continuation of the traditions of a liberal arts education; the current structure does not provide needless disruption to the university.
Interdisciplinary collaborations with regard to both research & teaching is essential
Ability to develop cross-cutting visions and initiatives.
Due to its size, CAS has for years been able to hold an umbrella over its departments and faculty and shield them from problems originating in central administration. This was true both before Schill, when Johnson Hall was plagued by constant turnover and aimlessness, and now that it has regrouped and undertaken centralizing initiatives that, while defensible and even desirable in many cases, are not really being executed very well.
Seems to be working effectively.
It fosters the sense that the natural sciences, social science and humanities are part of a larger whole, that there are valuable connections to be made among them.
The arts and sciences belong together.
Balance of strengths, resources, and training for our students and scholars
Communication, coordination, decision making less proliferation of administrative and support positions,
Departments in CAS are in principle treated equally
The college is a. the liberal arts core of the university b. a community (which should not be fragmented) of intellectuals (who should not be siloed) who can illuminate each other and be illuminated in turn c. a stable matrix of historically important disciplines and d. a lively crucible of new and emerging disciplines
Lean administration/little duplication of effort
interdisciplinary efforts (ENVS, CHC) efforts would be harder in a fractured environment
The ease of interdisciplinary collaboration.
The most ancient: the liberal arts and sciences, the bedrock of "university" since its invention
It incorporates the three main areas of a liberal arts degree: natural sciences, social sciences and the humanities. Those should be kept together for excellence and integration.

CAS Task Force, Survey 1 Responses

CAS supports well the university's broad research and teaching missions. In particular, CAS supports creative scholarship in the humanities and the deliverance of a high quality liberal arts education.

While there is variation in the nature and requirements of research across departments, the basic conception of an academic position, teaching, and research is broadly similar across CAS. Generally, faculty members from any field in CAS can understand the demands and expectations for teaching and research in other Arts and Sciences departments. Further, undergraduate students take most of their classes across CAS, so integration across CAS is important to maintain a coherent undergraduate program.

I think CAS is, in general, aware of its program diversity and aware of the needs to better support that diversity. Separating out for the College of Sciences (its not an accident that the development of the Knight Campus plays into this) would make the alienation described below even worth. Without a college of Engineering, a separate college of science makes ZERO sense. Yet we have this process ... this is nuts

It allows coordination between departments that often share more in common than one might imagine. Although a social science department, for example, we often have students and faculty who overlap with the humanities and sciences (especially e.g. for environmental issues).

Promotes interdisciplinary research and teaching across the social sciences, natural sciences, and humanities, which is absolutely CRUCIAL for work on environmental issues.

In order to promote - for example, environmental issues, it is absolutely crucial to have robust and unitary institutional support across the social sciences, natural sciences, and humanities.

As an interdisciplinary department, we benefit from the intellectual and structural context that is provided by an integrated College of Arts and Sciences.

The interdisciplinary nature of the college is both insightful and relevant for scholars in all areas.

There is flexibility and those who need cross-departmental connections for graduate education and research collaboration are met with little resistance. Dividing sciences from social sciences could very well hurt this by enhancing the differences in academic cultures. Rather, reorganizing around the ways people actually work together across campus would enhance our work. The University of Washington created the School of the Environment which crosses many disciplines and includes some social science. But we don't want to make new units that look weak compared to similar units at other Universities.

capable of cross-subsidising among vastly different disciplines

Ability to share resources across units, ability to advocate effectively at the university level

The role of the CAS course committee is esp important. Research tends to be manipulated, unfortunately, from the Research Office

CAS Task Force, Survey 1 Responses

The collaboration and more natural conversations that are facilitated by joining faculty in Humanities, Social Sciences and Natural Sciences is advantageous to both of my departmental/program affiliations. My work and that of my closest colleagues involves core aspects of research that engage ALL THREE of these approaches to knowledge. Splitting any one current approach/set-of-departments off into a separate school or college will decrease cross-fertilization of ideas, getting to know colleagues and hence also student referrals to other faculty who might be important to their intellectual growth. We need more UNI-versity, not more silo-ing.

It facilitates communication between people from different fields, e.g. between natural science and humanities faculty. There is little enough as it is; there would be even less with a division into separate colleges.

Cross subsidization

CAS is structured as a liberal arts college: for me this is the signature quality of the university of Oregon--that it is the liberal arts university in the state of Oregon. I am concerned that "restructuring" CAS will mean that the mission of liberal arts at UO will be diluted, even lost. Given the social and political realities that we face, the importance of the liberal arts appears to me more urgent than ever before. I believe having a true liberal arts college at UO is the most appropriate and effective way to insure that UO continues to provide a true liberal arts education to Oregon's students.

i'm unclear what problem the possible restructuring is supposed to be solving

500 pound gorilla. CAS by far the biggest academic unit on campus.

Cross collaboration

Presentation of clear stance that sciences and humanities are the two equally essential parts of human existence

It's already in place, and we don't need to waste time, effort, money, and faculty and staff labor on a reorganization in order to focus on our teaching and research mission.

CAS is a liberal arts college and we share a mission. Disciplines should not be siloed or disciplinary interests viewed as a zero-sum game.

The understanding of the unity of a liberal arts education in fulfilling the pedagogical mission of the university.

Current structure empower the departments in creating their own goals and objectives without an unneeded bureaucratic layer.

encourages interdisciplinary research and liberal arts curriculum

Strength in number and cross disciplinary collaborations.

Oversight and integrated understanding of all disciplines within CAS, including as represented in Honors College; (relatively) fair and equal distribution of resources (budget; TTF lines; GE allocations); advocacy of balance BS & BA degrees to the benefit of all units.

CAS Task Force, Survey 1 Responses

The structure really doesn't impact my work here significantly, either for better or for worse. Instead, it relates to my perception of UO as a place to commit my academic career. I chose UO because it is a comprehensive research university, and the strength of the humanities and social sciences is as important to me as the strength of my own department. Through my administrative work, I was able to get a VERY good view of work in all areas, across the campus, and I will admit that while there is great excellence everywhere, there is also considerable variability. As an example, I never dreamed that faculty would take the summer off, and I don't think I would have earned tenure if I had done so. It continues to amaze me how difficult it can be to find faculty in some departments through the summer and term breaks. Maybe expectations really are so different that a restructuring makes sense, grouping "like with like" in terms of academic expectations.

Efficiency.

I think the Humanities have more hope of making ourselves heard as a division than we would be if subsumed into some other entity.

I don't know what you mean by "structure." If you are speaking about the organizational units within CAS, I would say departmental autonomy is a major advantage.

Departments should remain independent and autonomous.

The Liberal Art should be understood to be the core mission of the university, one which understands research and teaching in the Humanities as an indispensable aspect of that mission.

Secures more faculty initiative than will further centralization over a field of market-oriented disciplines.

Defending the humanities

A longer and more transcendent view of the liberal arts without falling into fads. Encouraging thoughtful innovation and interdisciplinary work within CAS; finding balance between different departments and fields' needs without ghetto-izing any one department or field of study.

The Dean of CAS is the best person to explain to the rest of the university (administration, professional schools) the fundamental importance of a liberal arts curriculum. Solid preparation in imaginative thinking, in creativity of expression, in clear communication in a number of languages (not only English, or the dominant tongue), a grounded sense of physics, chemistry and biology and a good grasp of algebra and geometry are indispensable, both to today's world and also to the University mission of preparing Global Citizens. Many of us here see that UO is losing sight and losing track of the value of the liberal arts. We need a Dean to speak clearly and forcefully to the significance of the liberal arts to UO.

We are a liberal arts & sciences university and as such we need a strong central CAS college. Without it, the identity of UO will be in the professional schools, which will suddenly be very large. This would negatively impact recruitment and retention of talented faculty in CAS disciplines. I'm mystified that the university doesn't understand that.

traditional links between units is already established.

CAS Task Force, Survey 1 Responses

The fact that all divisions are together in the college facilitates: cross-disciplinary activity and communication (which has positive implications for research as well as teaching); a sense of solidarity amongst CAS faculty (which may be exactly why the upper administration seems to be questioning this structure); a unified commitment of all divisions to the General Education curriculum and hence to the vision of undergraduate education as a whole at the UO. (There should be more unity between CAS, the J-school, and the Business School, on General Education matters and matters of undergrad education in general, instead of less unity within the CAS.)

It facilitates cross-disciplinary conversations, in research and teaching; facilitates solidarity amongst people of different divisions; it facilitates discussion of the general education values and core across divisions, and a more unified vision than would be possible if we balkanize further. The college faculty needs to stay unified in order to maintain its strength vis-a-vis the arrogations of decision-making authority and power that are currently being manifested on the part of the upper administration. This centralization of power would be served by a divide-and-conquer approach to the CAS, and this would be bad for morale, bad for education, and bad for research. We will lose more great faculty to other institutions if these incursions on academic freedom and faculty governance continue.

I appreciate the ease with which I can move between units. For example, my courses easily count for requirements in interdisciplinary programs and I can easily teach across units. As an interdisciplinary scholar, I don't feel hampered.

Regarding the undergraduate curriculum in particular, the structure is a reflection of the value of a liberal arts education and of access to study of a variety of disciplines as part of the core curriculum, where each liberal arts discipline is integral to the UO's public education mission.

The current structure helps promote interdisciplinary scholarship and collaborations. Some departments/programs themselves (environmental studies, anthropology, geography) combine the natural sciences, humanities, and social sciences; others combine two divisions of CAS (history, WGS, Ethnic Studies--humanities/social sciences; psychology (social sciences, natural sciences). In a world in which interdisciplinary collaborations are increasingly important, the UO seems to give only lip service to interdisciplinary work. Breaking up CAS will only make that kind of work more difficult. What's broken with CAS that this idea solves?

Every time I work with faculty colleagues from other units, perhaps especially those not in humanities departments, I learn about other ways of doing things -- in relation to research and knowledge production, research productivity (methods of writing, coming up with new projects, ways of communicating with journals and presses), teaching structures and strategies, administration, mentorship of undergraduates, graduate students, and colleagues. This comparative knowledge has been invaluable, invigorating my research, teaching, and admin work. I have worked on many committees at the university and college level, and this has been a huge positive result of those experiences. It is most useful within CAS due to the similarities among the arts and sciences that are often but not always present in some of the professional schools.

CAS Task Force, Survey 1 Responses

There is more potential for interdisciplinary work with various disciplines housed/connected under the "roof" of CAS, whether because the department's seek it out or because the deans can help identify those connections based on first-hand knowledge.

Its potential

The current structure would be less change to deal with so the focus could be on more immediate issues.

What are the disadvantages of the current structure relative to the college's ability to deliver on its teaching and research mission?

The size and complexity can make delivering on the mission

The size of the current unit is troubling, and acute problems in departments might be better managed with less centralization. Furthermore, budgetary concerns of specific departments may be ignored or receive less attention when the grander scheme fails to address them.

CAS does seem quite broad at the moment. How will the new mega science campus impact CAS? How will opportunities for the humanities and social sciences be effected by this change?

because of the large size, things are too diluted such as maintenance, IT, and funding

The centralization of power towards CAS destroys departmental culture and moral across all participants in the academic process.

During the 1980-1981 school year, public and private institutions spent \$20.7 billion in total on instruction, and \$13 billion on academic support, student services and institutional support combined, according to data from the National Center for Educational Statistics. By the 2014-2015 school year, total instructional costs had climbed to \$148 billion, while the same grouping of administrative expenses had risen to \$122.3 billion. - "Bureaucrats And Buildings: The Case For Why College Is So Expensive"

none

not sure.

It seems that many faculty that are "in the trenches" do not have any real input or influence at the level of CAS, maybe that could change with restructuring. However, "from the tranches" this endeavor sounds like yet another thing/process that the administration is doing that will likely not change the day to day issues we have as an institution.

The separation between the three branches of CAS in inhibits some cross-pollination

CAS's structure has made it difficult to create policies (regarding things like teaching loads, service requirements, contract lengths, and the like) that can be made consistent across units. Understandably, there can't be a one-size-fits-all policy for these considerations: different units teach and research differently, with changing student demographics. But the need to come up with a central rubric has resulted in ambiguous policies - for instance, regarding service that is expected but not required for Career Faculty.

CAS Task Force, Survey 1 Responses

I don't see any. I find the dean's office with its current size and structure very responsive to faculty concerns.

I don't think that the college really knows or trusts the work departments, programs, and individual faculty do to support high quality undergraduate education through student-centered research and teaching endeavors. Additionally the college has not been supportive of grassroots faculty innovation and in some instances have actively undermined work that faculty have undertaken to support improved undergraduate education--programs that are directly in line with the President's priorities. I cannot tell if this is related to the structure of the college or if it is related to a culture in CAS of a lack of trust of faculty (especially of NTTF) and an assumption that administrators in the college "know what's best" for faculty and students without actually taking the time to understand programs, faculty backgrounds, or success stories (qualitative and quantitative).

it's too large to be effective

Unsure

Lack of administrative capacity to serve so many different needs.

Humanities and social sciences may receive less attention, be measured using unhelpful criteria relative to the natural sciences

I'm confused about why we are considering restructuring. What problem are we trying to solve? It's hard to complete the survey without a concrete sense of what it would look like. Why so mysterious? Is there something going on we aren't supposed to know about?.

Overlooking and marginalizing (via lack of funding, resources, and attention) large programs that teach significant numbers of lower division students. Restructuring CAS doesn't necessarily solve this problem, but generally speaking, embedding teaching-focused programs in units charged with producing research exerts downward pressure on helping those programs grow and adapt to meet the needs of a changing student population.

Humanities receive few resources, budget, and opportunities

Perhaps if sets of two or three most linked departments had their own college, then individual needs would be better met, but it would also be unwieldy, administratively and economically, to have so many separate colleges, which is much of why CAS has existed for so long.

Significantly, this proposal is unclear on what kind of a split is envisioned, and we need to know that in order to accurately hypothesize regarding potential impacts!

unknown

No idea.

Transparency of goals / priorities, at times.

Johnson Hall and Schill have wrested away too much budgetary, hiring, and mission-setting control and oversight from the Deans, which has made them little more than policy-minders and fundraisers.

Being an interdisciplinary program within a single division of CAS has some disadvantages. However, breaking up CAS into separate disciplinary colleges would make collaborative research and teaching very difficult, and it would harm - possibly destroy - highly successful interdisciplinary programs.

CAS Task Force, Survey 1 Responses

I'm sure CAS does a lot of work we don't know, but perhaps the college shouldn't have so much power and decisions to make...?

I feel unequipped to respond to this with specificity as I am unknowledgeable about the structural makeup of all areas of CAS.

**This may indicate a failure on my part or somewhere in the system. As a first year career instructor, it takes a lot of initiative and effort to understand the workings of the system at this point in time. In general, I believe there could be more transparency and clarity in the dissemination of policies and procedures (i.e. clear language to define expectations, guidelines to fulfilling responsibilities/initiatives successfully, and explanations of how outcomes will be assessed). To feel successful at my job and for long term planning, this clarity can help me to identify, work towards, and fulfill goals that better deliver on the mission.

When CAS makes college-wide decisions, such as courseload and service expectation, this negatively affects those of us with the highest teaching and service load. In the case of my department and program, that is NTT faculty. This same teaching faculty is also disadvantaged when CAS selectively silos departments from each other, in terms of issues like fair pay. I don't think restructuring will solve these issues. I think only a full recognition of the strengths and backbone of NTT faculty will solve these. I am not hopeful that a restructuring will help with this, since the restructuring is coming from the Provost and President, both of whom are perfectly lovely people and employ equally lovely individuals in their offices. However, both the Provost and President recognize, champion, recruit and reward only tenured faculty, to the exclusion of thousands of teaching faculty who are on the front lines of excellence in undergraduate and graduate education.

No opinion.

It seems that CAS currently works within the "Managing by Objectives" and sees "leadership as management" instead of understanding "leadership as interdependent on management" - and leadership in education can be only collegial. There must be equilibrium between the need for clear and shared objectives (management) and working side by side with the teachers, students representatives and staff and appreciating their insight (leadership). Without leadership, accompaniment and communal discernment one would most likely arrive at insignificant objectives neither shared by all nor with any value for successful research and teaching.

CAS Task Force, Survey 1 Responses

I don't know of any. The reason for asking the question about CAS's structure has never been clear, which makes this whole process seem an exercise in lots of time and energy to answer a question no one has asked. No one has established a satisfactory or credible reason for all this time and effort. I distrust the motives behind this question about CAS's structure because they are hidden or so insufficient that the exercise borders on insulting to those who are required to take it up. The process is rushed, not founded in careful evaluation of the sort that a departmental or program review might require. Why put the community through this when we have so many other important projects to tend to that do contribute to the mission of the university? The process seems careless of those it purports to support. I cannot imagine a more disheartening way of proceeding after an abrupt change in leadership. The efforts and energies of those on the task force could be so much better applied to the important work of teaching and research. True excellence does not chase after big questions in such an under-resourced fashion. I fear that the structure and timeline of the task force set it up for exhausting failure that will do no good for our mission. We need to teach and do research, to be supported in that work.

CAS in its current form, has not been an effective advocate for the humanities or the social sciences, but I am not convinced that this is necessarily related to its "structure"; it may more be the result of the direction the upper-level administration has taken the university and individuals within CAS who have not effectively argued in favor of a different direction for both "arts" and "sciences".

The funding, staffing, and ideological devaluation of the humanities compared to the other branches of the college

CAS has many priorities, and limited budgets.

Too many department level committees.

Again, the college's ability to deliver on its teaching and research mission is disadvantaged by the State of Oregon's disinvestment in public education. Perhaps restructuring of the entire university might allow for some modest advantages, but that should be undertaken carefully, with an external consultant rather than stakeholders, and it should involve thinking about synergies and innovative combinations across schools and colleges and not simply the restructuring of a single college.

Natural Sciences are treated differently than Humanities and Social Sciences. Budget processes are unclear because of how the divisions are treated.

Precludes UOs strategic development, i.e., a school of engineering

I see no disadvantages to the current structure of the college relative to the college's ability to deliver on its teaching and research mission.

none that I am aware of

It is a mixed bag of genuinely scientific departments coupled with humanities and social sciences departments. All with varying levels of performance and enrollments.

CAS' size makes it challenging and sometimes time consuming to do things like create newly required CBA policies for every department or prioritize TTF line proposals. However, without the Dean's Office doing this work, the responsibility for coordinating and tracking these things will rise to the Provost's Office level. Unless you're prepared to increase staffing there (it seems like they just now finally have adequate staff for the structure as it is), it seems like this could be very challenging.

It is the backbone of the university, serving (at a discount rate) all students and units.

CAS Task Force, Survey 1 Responses

Competing priorities among disparate disciplines and programs. It's hard to see how having the number of disciplines in the same structure is equitable to all of them. The performing arts should be housed with SOMD, the Sciences as another school/college, and Humanities as another.

I don't know. Certainly the College isn't perfect, but I see the current model as a benefit to efficiency and collaboration, not a detriment.

None

All departments are evaluated by the same metric structure, regardless of their actual role and value to the university; related to the first point, departments and schools/colleges, have inherent problems with the often competing priorities of teaching and research. This issue plays out in many unproductive ways such as the ways in which TTF and NTTF are treated, resourced, evaluated, and the ways decisions are made regarding curriculum. And, because I don't see another place to say this, I'm worried that the survey design itself presupposes structure as the central issue or question. Structure is a historical and functional artifact that arises for a variety of reasons - some planned and some not. It would be more useful to start this exercise by trying to unearth the the concerns and problems in CAS writ large rather than framing the initial question in terms of structure. Framing the question in terms of structure will only produce answers related to structure.

CAS has a regrettable tendency to lord it over the other colleges and schools at the UO. 70% of the student body represented by one entity leads to inequities and professional schools/colleges are not given adequate respect, attention, budget, etc. because of the behemoth that is CAS. Restructuring would go some distance toward leveling the playing field for all colleges.

Liberal arts are under valued given current economic drives for STEM programs - which leads to ethical gaps that impact al of us

Research mission not fully honored. Required of TTF, not supported.

Size allows us to be slow to address changes, when quicker changes might be better.

It can be difficult to build collaborations outside of CAS. I'm not sure if a different structure would address this issue or not.

As a large entity, CAS sometimes acts as the 500-pound gorilla, assuming its choices will cause the rest of UO to fall in line.

competition with each other

college is too big and some smaller areas are not fully supported

The college might micromanage departments without adequate knowledge of the unique needs and culture of each department.

Too much frivolous spending

Deans unable to focus on their specific area, ie split between the college & upper administration

The current structure does not allow for efficient collaboration with other schools/colleges (architecture, law, education, etc.)

CAS Task Force, Survey 1 Responses

Nearly exclusive representation of faculty in dean positions ensures that decisions made in CAS are made from a teaching and research perspective without much regard to the actual administrative requirements of those positions. I'm not convinced many of the faculty serving in those positions have the inclination or temperament to focus on performing those administrative duties, leading to waiting several weeks, even months, for decisions or even just a signature. There should be a greater emphasis on roles within the CAS structure that clearly place decision making/authority into the hands of those focused solely on those tasks: tenure/hiring with faculty and budget/administration with OAs/staff, etc.

A little understaffed for how big CAS is currently. With more support staff, we could elevate the college in a lot of ways.

It sometimes feels like the CAS folks are blocking, rather than assisting, when the department has questions or concerns (administratively), particularly when you are reaching out with a general question, like who to contact.

lack of support for disciplines in the humanities

The current structure requires that a single dean understands the needs of all three divisions. This is somewhat augmented by the divisional dean structure, but may create the perception of unfairness related to budgets and policies. Having a powerful dean that represents 70% of UO students and faculty, may create a leadership imbalance among the colleges and may sometimes make it difficult for UO leadership to enact their priorities without complete buy-in from CAS.

This isn't a disadvantage so much as a comment -- I previously worked at another university that broke up CAS and the various colleges (with a few exceptions) and reorganized everyone into about six umbrella divisions. This change seemed to only affect people at the administrative level. Students didn't notice or particularly care; most staff jobs went unchanged; even the faculty adjusted with very little ripples. However, the reorganization didn't necessarily improve anything -- again, most people hardly noticed the difference, and a lot of people forgot that CAS was a thing that existed.

I don't have the information necessary to answer this question.

smaller fields and humanities are overshadowed by larger, more lucrative ones

The lack of integrated/interdisciplinary resources to support things like grant getting. Our current structural problems, as I see them, come from our decentralization. The issue is lack of integration rather than that we are too integrated. Splitting up CAS will only exacerbate these issues.

CAS disconnected

Powerless in the fact of central admin

The current structure consistently gets in the way of excellence in teaching.

In my view, there is a legacy of mistrust between faculty and administration. This is less structural than perhaps historical and personal and should be addressed through concerted, trust-building and community-building efforts. Furthermore, CAS and UO must develop much stronger mentoring and professionalism programs for women faculty and faculty of color to thrive at UO and to desire to enter administrative and leadership positions

I don't see the current structure as an impediment to the college's mission

CAS Task Force, Survey 1 Responses

Disadvantages with respect to what? There is nothing sensible with which to compare. This whole exercise is lacking a compelling justification for existing and seems like a waste of time at best (and cover for a pre-existing decision at worst). More generally, it is a fallacy of administrators to think that their actions to rearrange deck chairs can have a positive effect on the college's ability to deliver on its teaching and research mission.

None

Nothing that is not outweighed by my prior two answers.

Administrative rivalry and conflict are endemic to any structure in which CAS represents the majority of the university but Johnson Hall represents it all. These problems have been latent for years. But they came to the surface during the protracted period when CAS was stable and Johnson Hall suffered a parade of short-term presidents and provosts. Now that Johnson Hall is under firm new leadership, it's finally come to a head. Personalities play a big role. Under a president who in a campus-wide memo spoke candidly of the "balance of power," the inevitable solution seems to be "divide and rule." I don't welcome that outcome, but whatever the case, when the parents (administrators) fight, the children (faculty) suffer.

None.

None, as far as I can see.

Aside from the humanities and social sciences subsidizing the sciences, none.

Funding disparities

CAS is too large to effectively accommodate the very different needs of the different departments

The "current structure" isn't where the problems are; the problems lie in the centralization of authority, decision-making (for example, in faculty hiring), budgeting, etc., in Johnson Hall. Making higher education more hierarchical, more top-down, has been a mistake and a waste of faculty expertise and investment.

It is not capable of delivering on the research mission. All CAS seems to care about is the Dept budget and are the classes being taught. With the research mission basically coming from VPRI, there has always been a tug of war between the offices with regard to start up, space, ICC returns, etc.

It's already siloed enough through associate dean structure

I see none.

None

None.

Dilutes the power of the president

None.

The current structure and its deanlets promotes a level of increasing alienation among the CAS divisions with precisely zero recognition on the part of the Deanlets that this is even happening. The perceived zero sum budget game pits units against one another - it does not matter that this is not the reality - this is the perception so that ever unit builds a wall ...

CAS is often large and unwieldy. On the other hand, component units will lack much capacity to defend themselves against higher levels of administration. For this reason, I would prefer to see CAS remain intact in its current form.

none at this time.

We could strive for additional integration across our divisions.

CAS Task Force, Survey 1 Responses

I see no disadvantages.
It is big and can get challenging in terms of time and resources.
I think a top-down view on reorganization needs to start with viewing which units actually work close to each other, not based on the standard Humanities/Social Science/Science division. Interdisciplinary units have a lot at stake in such a division—indeed it could change their futures dramatically. Thus, when considering moving units with similar missions closer to each, one such combination is ENVS and GEOG. Geography has taught a lot of ENVS students but ENVS has grown in such a diverse way that such a merger might change each unit in some fundamental ways. But such a merger would be a big boost to the environmental-science/environmental studies oriented student and faculty. Data science would also benefit from such a merge. In summary, I think some kind of organizing around environmental sciences is warranted. UW created a School of the Environment in the last 10 years, albeit starting with a larger campus, but it highlighted what people are doing without greatly modifying individual departmental functions.
Different interdisciplinary combinations and areas are made invisible, etc
None
As noted, too many decisions about research are made outside the CAS. Restructuring the CAS will NOT solve this problem.
Not sure.
Lack of access of the divisional (associate) deans to upper administration.
Focused development activity.
Personally, I have not found the current structure of CAS as creating disadvantages for the college ability to deliver on its teaching and research mission.
none
Because it is so big, it is harder to be nibble. Plus, the needs of the humanities and natural science are drastically different.
None
none.
None
I can't think of any.
Occasional inability to articulate shared goals among the different units of the college.
it could be improved by having more representation of the departments at the deans level
Because CAS is the largest unit and provides core functions in teaching and research, it is not adequately appreciated at the Provost and President's level, and the smaller units get more attention and a more generous share of funding.
Humanities is still marginalized and underfunded.
Competition between departments and programs for funding. Survival of the fittest strategy vs. (actual) support for cross-disciplinarity. Lack of transparency about fate /place of Honors College in relation to CAS.
unclear
Perhaps size matters too much--difficult to support small programs, or smaller sectors within large departments.

CAS Task Force, Survey 1 Responses

This is a very difficult question to answer without knowing what you mean by "structure." The current structure could be seen as disadvantageous to cross-unit collaboration, but that also depends on financial models in place. Does "structure" include financial models? I have to say, unfortunately, that these are poorly-designed questions.

Too inefficient.

Centralization of power and decision-making at the Provost level.

Faculty need more support to create teaching programs and support research in the humanities.

The Administration controls the CAS. The CAS is powerless in the front of the administration. This is not right.

I don't see any pressing need for reform. Change for its own sake is not wise.

CAS is currently under tremendous financial pressure, in part, many of us think, because of decisions made under previous administrations to subsidize other units at UO with transfers of CAS funds. Another factor is clearly the shift in student tuition models: now that students are charged per credit, they experience pressure to pursue practical professional training instead of enrolling in the liberal arts courses that will prepare them for the less immediate future. Financial pressure has led to a rhetoric of scarcity that strains relationships between units within CAS. At the same time, departments and units have less say than ever regarding administrative decisions, which are becoming increasingly centralized. If CAS were funded at a level that reflects its significance to the UO mission, I don't think we would have a problem.

None.

Social Science is not just isolated to CAS--as CoD has it too. It would be great to group all in same unit to enhance collaborative and creative potential

There should be more collaborative research interest groups or centers crossing between all three divisions. Specifically, for example, a unit on philosophy and history of science (including the sciences of literature [Literaturwissenschaft] and the differences between science and art, etc.) should be established to connect scientists of different divisions with each other in common reflection on the structure of knowledge today (and in the light of the past and future). Similarly, on a smaller level, a unit on psychoanalysis and neuroscience could be established, to prevent group think and modish short-sightedness. . .

There are no disadvantages. Except that the CAS and the Schools of Journalism, the School of Design, the School of Music and Dance, and the Business School should be in conversation with each other more than they are.

These are such open-ended questions they are hard to answer. I'm very concerned about what changes to the structure mean for interdisciplinary research and teaching across units and for units that are themselves interdisciplinary but are housed in one unit (even though the scholars themselves may not be of that unit).

I don't see any disadvantage so great that it warrants a restructuring. Being under-resourced is the principal challenge for CAS and beyond, not poorly structured.

Frankly, I think History should be within the Humanities division, though there are at least three historians who define themselves as social scientists. But our book culture is more in line with the Humanities, and the Humanities dean best represents those interests.

CAS Task Force, Survey 1 Responses

I think I don't understand the question. To me this structure has always been what has made education in American universities desirable worldwide -- in contrast to many countries where post-secondary education is much more discipline-specific, the liberal arts format encourages both depth and breadth of perspective and skill among graduates, useful in a modern economy where people must often switch jobs and careers. Small changes I can imagine: art history in CAS? But probably they don't want to move?

Potential disparity in support across various units, but this might worsen if CAS gets broken (then there'd be less oversight and understanding of the varied needs of units).

Uneven distribution of resources

There are many different areas that CAS covers and some areas/units get much more attention and funding than others. CAS is too large and should be broken into different sciences. There are some degrees that seem completely off for the overall mission or value of the department. Some units have limited ability to offer teach and research at the level that they should be if there were not