Admin Council summary comments - Department/Institute Relations

Key difference is that each institute operates under a different management and financial environment. All of these are also different from CEAS

- Unclear evaluations and accountabilities between the dept. and institutes (approvals, raises, performance evaluations, etc.)
- Doesn’t’ seem that there are terms in the fellows’ contracts (those with appointments in CEAS) to account for changes in their professional development over time (shifts in their research interests and efforts). Can this be revisited?

Specific feedback and key questions from breakout groups:

- The mission of Institutes is research. In order to develop more fruitful research collaborations with them, CEAS should consider aligning relevant research tracks with the institutes.
- What can we (CEAS) offer to attract the attention and interest of Institute research “superstars” to engage with and collaborate with the college?
- High importance on being involved in the hiring process to ensure that the right people are hired for the institute and the department. Consider intentional hiring that explicitly identifies institute/department role. RAISI model is good, in principle, - hire folks with intent that they will work in Institute. Strategic hiring of people – there should be more of an open forum between Institute Director and Department Chair. How can this be facilitated?
- Institute can provide collateral benefit for teaching; can potentially add to interdisciplinary teaching. This is an opportunity as well as a challenge.
- Business logistics – How is credit for awards and expenditures distributed between departments and institutes? Does it track ICR splits?
- The annual evaluation process for fellows with appointments in CEAS is not always clear.

Take-Back and Further Discussions for Blue Ribbon Committee:

- Develop specific recommendations and for CEAS leadership to:
  1) Determine best opportunities for alignment of CEAS research with a priority list of Institutes
  2) Arrange for regular strategic meetings with prioritized list Institute Directors to discuss strategic research alignments for medium and long term
• Survey institutes (through fellows on blue ribbon committee when possible) on their understanding of allocation of research awards, research expenditures, IDCR, etc. and compare this to the CEAS view-point.

• Ask committee members for their current thoughts on the annual evaluation process, then compile the responses and look for opportunities to clarify the process in the future.

• Ask committee members for input on how to accommodate changes in a faculty-appointed fellow’s professional development over time in light of a contract that is signed at the start of their careers.