

University of Massachusetts Amherst

Reorganization Task Force

Preliminary Report to the Chancellor

March 6, 2009

Task Force Members

Douglas Anderton, Professor, Department of Sociology, and Acting Chair, Department of Communication

Andrew Barto, Professor and Chair, Department of Computer Science

Joseph Bartolomeo, Professor and Chair, Department of English

Joseph Berger, Associate Professor and Chair, Department of Educational Policy, Research and Administration (at large)

Samuel Black, Professor and Head, Department of Veterinary and Animal Sciences

Jeff Cox, Professor and Chair, Department of Music and Dance

Eric Decker, Professor and Head, Department of Food Science

Robert Faulkner, Professor of Sociology (at large)

Paul Fiset, Professor and Head, Department of Natural Resources Conservation

Jane Fountain, Professor, Department of Political Science, Task Force Chair

Julie Hayes, Professor and Chair, Department of Languages, Literatures and Cultures

John Hird, Professor and Chair, Department of Political Science

Shaw Ling Hsu, Professor and Head, Department of Polymer Science and Engineering

Jane Miller, Associate Professor, Department of Management (at large)

Melinda Novak, Professor and Chair, Department of Psychology

Danny Schnell, Professor and Head, Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology

Executive Summary

The University of Massachusetts Amherst is a major national public university with very high research standing, a land grant mission and strong orientation toward education. Amid serious economic setbacks, the campus strives to support students and to ensure future balanced growth by restructuring in order to leverage opportunities that maintain the core research, teaching and engagement mission in the present and that increase excellence in the future. The Chancellor has charged the Reorganization Task Force (RTF) “to provide advice about a proposal on college reorganization and to explore as well the possibility of a College of Arts and Sciences, or any other alternative organizational structure that it finds appropriate for the campus.” This preliminary report is focused on four colleges: the College of Humanities and Fine Arts (HFA), the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences (SBS), the College of Natural Resources and the Environment (NRE) and the College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics (NSM). In this preliminary report, developed on a brief timeline during the past month, we make the following recommendations:

First, we recommend strongly that the initial plan, conceived months ago, to form two colleges – the result of mergers between NRE and NSM and between HFA and SBS – be considered as two separate plans. The considerations and logic of each of these proposed mergers are completely different and must be considered separately.

Second, we recommend that the integration of life science across NSM and NRE, which appears to be a productive path for the campus, continue to move forward. At the same time, other forms of cohesion -- for example, among the physical, computational and mathematical sciences and among the environmental sciences and in the relationship of both to the life sciences -- must be considered carefully.

In order for an organization to be successful and sustainable, underlying principles have to be strong and adopted by all in the organization. Therefore, even as the campus moves forward with a new streamlined structure composed of fewer colleges and schools, we recommend that all potential moves of departments from one college or school to another be made only after further analysis and consultation with all relevant deans and faculty. We also recognize that a reasonable target date for making such changes be set in the near future. This date for such decisions should be established such that the reorganization process moves forward in an expedient manner while still providing for a more thorough examination of all aspects related to the impacts of departmental moves across schools and colleges.

Third, we have followed the Chancellor’s guidance to “explore as well the possibility of a College of Arts and Sciences” and recommend that a College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) be formed to advance the goals set out by the Chancellor. A CAS would house the core scholarly research departments, as well as related applied research units, on the campus within one administrative system. This administrative unity would break down bureaucratic stovepipes that impede collaboration across colleges for research, teaching,

faculty activities, programs for students and a range of other core tasks. A CAS constitutes a framework within which multiple strategic opportunities can emerge and develop.

A College of Arts and Sciences with a divisional structure, at least initially, allows the campus to co-locate the existing structures. Although a CAS would include a college and a set of associate divisional deans, this “additional” layer would substitute for having four deans of four separate colleges. It is argued that the benefits of horizontal integration outweigh the “additional” layer. Moreover, our colleges currently are organized with a dean and associate deans. We also note that many universities do not use a divisional structure in the sense that divisional associate deans are in place. These are options to be reviewed carefully. We view a move to CAS as a “process model” which would begin with the existing divisions (HFA, SBS, NRE and NSM) being put under one college administrative structure. New structures within a CAS, for example, a Life and Environmental Sciences focus, could evolve out of this initial structure. We recommend that the critical details of administrative structure within the CAS be worked out by the principals.

Fourth, a strong alternative to CAS is a "Seven College Model". In this model, the integration of NSM and NRE units would continue while the autonomy and strategic directions of HFA and SBS are preserved, in the short run, given their current strategic directions. While this fails to achieve the integrative potential that CAS promises, it permits the life, physical, environmental, and computational sciences to begin developing appropriate administrative structures to harness collaboration and integration. It also allows for the consideration of a future CAS if so desired, and so could be considered an interim step.

Fifth, we strongly recommend against a merged college combining HFA and SBS. Moreover, we do not recommend such a merger as a transitional step toward a CAS. This would entail two strategically different and labor-intensive transitions resulting in loss of productivity. Further, a merger of HFA and SBS works against strategic advancement of research, education and engagement for the campus.

INTRODUCTION

The University of Massachusetts Amherst is a major national public university with high research standing, a land grant mission and strong orientation toward education. Moving forward the campus strives to support students as the flagship university of the Commonwealth and to work toward balanced growth by restructuring in order to leverage opportunities that increase excellence in research, education and engagement. The Chancellor has charged the Reorganization Task Force (RTF) “to provide advice about a proposal on college reorganization and to explore as well the possibility of a College of Arts and Sciences, or any other alternative organizational structure that it finds appropriate for the campus.”

The Reorganization Task Force was created by the Chancellor and communicated to the campus community in a message of February 6, 2009.¹ Chancellor Holub, in consultation with the deans, appointed a representative body of senior faculty who are heads and chairs in each of the four colleges affected by the proposed plan. In addition, the Faculty Senate worked with the Chancellor to appoint three at-large members to the RTF. The Reorganization Task Force developed a blog (<http://blogs.umass.edu/reorg>) to allow members of the campus community to provide input concerning the reorganization. The input has been in all cases detailed, thoughtful and often the product of group deliberation. Task Force members also attended selected meetings of the Academic Priorities Council to which deans, chairs and faculty from the affected colleges were invited.

The RTF members have been asked, on a short timeline, to submit a preliminary report to the Chancellor. This preliminary report is meant to offer a basis to guide further analysis and deliberation. It is one contribution at the outset of a longer, broader process of transformation on the campus during a period of acute economic scarcity. The deliberations of the task force are guided by the importance of gaining economic efficiencies in order to protect the core missions of the campus -- research, education, and outreach – while also working to position the campus over the longer run for strategic growth in the present and future.

We welcome the Chancellor’s invitation for faculty expert advice on these critical strategic questions for the future of the campus. More broadly, we note the importance of the broad, consultative approach the Chancellor has taken to this and other issues given the external visibility, magnitude and importance of the research programs and national experience of faculty.

The task force members, as charged, considered the following organizational alternatives:

- College of Natural Sciences (or name to be decided)

¹ See Chancellor Robert C. Holub, “Task Force on Reorganization Members Named,” February 6, 2009. http://www.umass.edu/chancellor/budget_taskforcemembers_020609.html

- College of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences (CHASS)
- Arts and Sciences (including NRE)
- Seven College model (HFA and SBS remain autonomous; NRE and NSM merge)
- No change: retain current organization of schools and college
- Other

Our deliberations and analyses were wide-ranging but were guided, in part, by the following broad criteria:

- Efficiencies in administration: immediate and longer term
- Demonstrated responsiveness to the economic crisis
- Minimizing disruption to strategic planning or implementation processes already in progress
- Strategic opportunities/positioning the campus for the future. Potential effect of a reorganization alternative on the ability to position the campus to increase excellence in research, teaching and engagement.
- New research and engagement opportunities for collaboration and partnership within and across departments, schools and colleges and with other universities and research organizations
- New education and outreach opportunities for collaboration and partnership within and across departments, schools and colleges and with other universities and research organizations
- Other strengths and weaknesses

One of the chief criteria for the Reorganization Task Force is the necessity for the campus to reduce costs. It is imperative that cost reductions be carried out to the extent possible in ways that preserve the core mission – research and teaching – and that maintain our capacity to work toward strategic goals and objectives. The strategic rationale guiding the organization of schools and colleges on the campus must be clear and compelling. The RTF has operated under the premise that “structure matters,” that the organization of schools and colleges has a significant influence on research and teaching, on the coordination and other transactions costs of carrying out the mission, and on the ability of faculty, staff and students to work across boundaries to leverage new opportunities and to respond to contemporary challenges whose dimensions are cross-boundary in nature.

There is ample evidence that some staff functions can be centralized within larger colleges and schools. But the rationale for staffing must follow from strategic research and teaching needs in order to preserve the core functions of the campus.

For more than a decade, UMass Amherst has used a decentralized model similar to that of other universities with decentralized organization of schools and colleges. This model has served the campus reasonably well. In recent years, additional investments in the campus, including the Amherst 250 plan, have been guided by visioning and strategic directions developed in the four colleges considered in this report. These colleges now have strategies and momentum toward attaining strategic goals. Thus, any reorganization

should demonstrate its superiority to the status quo. Indeed, if budget reductions can be taken in the existing units with the same cost savings that would result from budget cuts taken in reorganized units, then the argument for cost savings fails.

ORGANIZING FOR EFFICIENCY, EXCELLENCE AND FUTURE GROWTH

The central and highly challenging problems and opportunities of contemporary society lie across the boundaries of disciplines and fields. Revolutionary developments in the life sciences, in information science and technologies, in developments within nanoscience and technology are themselves inter-disciplinary and demand study from other disciplines and professions to examine societal impacts, new modes of economic developments, social justice, international dimensions, and what it means to be a human being and a citizen amid such transformative change. Integration of knowledge found in different professional and disciplinary bases has become the guiding force for research and for education programs that today's students need to become equipped for the world they will enter as graduates. This integration extends from the arts to the sciences and professional schools.

While integration may serve the purpose of sharing and pooling resources and bringing greater efficiency to administrative processes, its primary purpose in today's excellent research and teaching universities is intellectual. With this context in mind, the RTF focused on integration as a key dimension of reorganization. We begin with integration across the sciences and then extend this reasoning to the arts and sciences.

Integration across the Sciences

The "revolutions" in the life, information and nano- sciences have led several universities to attempt to build greater coherence within and across research groups to facilitate new scientific advances, research environments that reflect current challenges, and collaboration required to bring together scientific expertise. Similarly, excellent research universities have sought to build a variety of new initiatives, institutes, research centers, graduate and undergraduate programs, concentrations, and courses to heighten the visibility of their efforts, to attract and retain outstanding faculty and graduate students, to provide undergraduate research and education opportunities, and to serve as catalysts to further innovation.

To further these objectives, RTF members support the continued deliberations of faculty and deans in NRE and NSM toward further integration of the life sciences. Their reports and input to the Chancellor and other campus leaders reflect the details of their deliberations. We note here some of the key issues to be resolved during the coming months:

- Further integration of life science researchers is highly desirable
- NSM faculty in a memo to the Chancellor explain clearly and emphatically the rationale for retaining the current proximity of the physical and computational

science departments and mathematics within NSM citing close integration of research

- NRE faculty in a statement to the Chancellor highlight the importance of retaining coherence between the applied research and practice-oriented departments within NRE and related research units whose focus is basic scientific research is an essential part of discussions of the merger between NRE and NSM

The Life Sciences and the Environment

Support from 14 department heads and program leaders in the College of Natural Resources and the Environment and the Department of Psychology was articulated in a memo to the Chancellor and the chair of the Reorganization Task Force on March 3, 2009. We quote below from key sections of this statement:

We support a reorganized administrative structure at the University of Massachusetts that brings together departments and programs into a unit entitled **Life Sciences and the Environment**. We feel that this brand is extremely important given the social, ecological, economic, and political importance of life sciences and environmental information in addressing human health and welfare and meeting the goals of economic and ecological sustainability worldwide. Branding of an administrative unit as **Life Sciences and the Environment** is particularly important to student recruitment, recognition politically in Washington, DC and in Boston, and in recognition among peer institutions. The form of the proposed reorganized administrative unit could be either as a

College of Life Sciences and the Environment

OR a

Division of Life Sciences and the Environment within a larger **College of Science**.

OR a

Division of Life Sciences and the Environment within a larger **College of Arts and Sciences**.

We feel strongly that departments and faculty would self-select to be within this administrative unit.

Justification:

There is a strong political, social, and economic justification for the formation of a **Life Sciences and the Environment** unit on this campus. Within Massachusetts, the Massachusetts Life Sciences Center (MLSC) was created by the Massachusetts legislature in 2006. The MLSC was established to promote the life sciences within Massachusetts. It is making financial investments in public and private institutions and is building collaborative ventures among sectors of the Massachusetts life sciences community. A new Massachusetts Life Sciences Initiative announced in 2008 includes a \$1 billion investment package to enhance and strengthen the state's internationally recognized leadership in the life sciences. Indeed, funding for a new Life Science Building on the UMass-Amherst campus is dependent on continued investment in the Life Sciences by the Commonwealth. In addition, "green" industry jobs are among the fastest growing sectors of the Massachusetts economy and they will only increase in demand given the local and global climate change and sustainable development issues that will be at the forefront of economies in the next twenty years.

Nationally, investments under the recent stimulus package in funding through NIH, NSF, USDA, and DOE make it very clear that we will see continued attention paid to life science and environmental issues. Research in life and environmental sciences is seeing expanded funding opportunities and students trained in these areas will find jobs in new industries focused around health care, environmental sustainability, sustainable development and renewable energy production. By bringing together units on campus to work collaboratively on these opportunities we stand a better chance of acquiring the resources needed to produce the information and train the cadre of students that will be needed these new economic sectors.

Presently, life and environmental scientists at the University of Massachusetts Amherst are dispersed among different colleges, with differing organizational structures, missions, and reward systems. Formation of a College/Division of **Life Sciences and the Environment** will merge groups of faculty with complementary interests into a common unit, overcoming administrative barriers and promoting new alliances among them. Alliances will be fostered by an atmosphere of greater awareness and better understanding among faculty, by increasing interactions in teaching and advising, and by developing new state-of-the-art facilities such as the new Life Sciences Building.

A key element of the new college/division will be the closer association of fundamental and applied scientists and design researchers. Discoveries by fundamental scientists may remain unused and unappreciated without collaboration with applied scientists/designers, and applied scientists/designers may miss opportunities to develop new technologies without a continuous flow of new fundamental knowledge. Together they can increase prospects, as well as shorten the time needed, for converting a new finding into a meaningful development for society.

The University community is committed to providing a quality education to all undergraduate and graduate students on this campus. The new College/Division will facilitate development of common core curricula among some life and environmental science departments and programs, and reduce duplication of courses and overlapping curricula. In particular, the College/Division will enhance opportunities for faculty to cross traditional departmental and disciplinary boundaries in their teaching activities. An improved teaching curriculum will achieve a more effective use of faculty expertise and resources and help provide the modern hands-on laboratory training that is so critical for preparing students for post-graduate education or employment in high technology industries. As a result, the overall quality of teaching and guidance in the life and environmental sciences will be substantially improved.

In summary, we feel that a **Life Sciences and the Environment** unit on campus would strengthen in all aspects of our land grant mission, and give us the regional, national and global recognition that the university deserves.

Life Sciences and the Physical and Computational Sciences and Mathematics

The argument for retaining cohesion across the natural, physical and computational sciences and mathematics is given below, particularly through a letter dated February 3, 2009 from the department heads and chairs of the NSM and related directors of the Interdisciplinary Graduate Programs: Molecular and Cell Biology, Neuroscience and Behavior, Organismic and Evolutionary Biology, Plant Biology, the Chemistry-Biology Interface Training Program, and the IGERT Program in NanoTechnology Innovation.

The Heads and Chairs of the Departments within the College of Natural Science and Mathematics and the Directors of the Interdisciplinary Graduate Programs wish to thank you for visiting last week and providing a summary of the budget situation and the rationale for reorganization on

campus. We have some further thoughts on reorganization that we wish to bring to your attention.

We agree with you that the consolidation of the life sciences is a worthwhile goal and has great potential for promoting curriculum advances and research collaborations. If the primary aim of reorganization is the consolidation of the life sciences and the reduction of colleges and schools, then to us the remaining question relevant to our college is how the physical, computational and mathematical science departments are organized. These departments have much in common with each other and we believe very strongly should remain together. Thus, to us it appears that the only two viable options that accomplish your aims are for the physical, computational and mathematical science departments to join the life sciences in a consolidated College or for these departments to join the School of Engineering. We are convinced that the option that has the most instructional and research benefits for our Departments and the University is for these departments to join with the life sciences in a consolidated college. We do not think that a merger with engineering is nearly as attractive, as we are very concerned over the radically different culture and goals of the engineering disciplines. Below we discuss some of the issues that we feel strongly favor a reorganization plan that keeps the physical, computational and mathematical sciences together with the life sciences.

In our previous letter to you we emphasized the importance of the cross-disciplinary interactions between the physical, computational and mathematical sciences and the life sciences primarily with regards to research. As we mentioned in that letter, we are uniquely positioned to take advantage of the synergy between these disciplines that permit us to exploit the opportunities that currently exist at the interface of these areas. In addition to the research arguments we made in that letter, we also believe that the instructional and curricular issues are equally compelling for forming a consolidated College that includes a broad range of sciences. Although we have been successful in bridging college boundaries in our research endeavors, the college boundaries are much more difficult to bridge when they relate to instructional and curricular issues. Bringing the life sciences together with the physical, mathematical and computational sciences has enormous potential for developing a modern multidisciplinary curriculum.

We already have many examples where we provide multidisciplinary education to our undergraduate and graduate students. One example at the undergraduate level is the very successful Howard Hughes Medical Institute-funded program that is largely predicated on bringing the physical and life science disciplines together to provide interdisciplinary introductory-level undergraduate courses. We think that this is a model for undergraduate education in the life sciences in the future, and it would be very unfortunate to separate these disciplines at a time when interdisciplinarity is finally finding its way into our undergraduate program. In fact, the ISB exists for the purpose of curriculum integration at the undergraduate level and it would be counter to this spirit to separate the disciplines into different colleges. Already faculty across the life and physical sciences teach as part of the HHMI program and many more faculty in our departments could well participate in this. There is also great potential for expanding the scope of interdisciplinary undergraduate instruction beyond the HHMI program to a broad range of other subjects (such as water, energy and the environment) that would encompass all of the physical, life, computational and mathematical disciplines. At the graduate level there is also already much interdisciplinary training that crosses the life/physical sciences interface. Examples include the Chemistry Biology Interface program (funded by a NIH graduate training grant), the Institute of Cellular Engineering (funded by a NSF IGERT grant), and Molecular and Cellular Biology, the largest of the interdisciplinary graduate programs. Developing these undergraduate and graduate curricula and assigning teaching are much easier to accomplish within a single college structure where instructional resources and one-time needs are allocated and where decisions concerning tenure and promotion are decided.

We also share some worries about combining the physical, mathematical and computational sciences with engineering. We believe that there is a large cultural difference in the educational missions; our instructional emphasis is different and is neither accreditation-driven nor primarily focused on professional training for the workplace ... We are concerned that combining with

engineering will produce a college that will not serve either group of students well.

In summary, we are convinced that the integration of the physical, life, computational and mathematical sciences has and will result in further significant changes and improvements to the science curriculum at the University. We believe that these curricular changes can be best accomplished in a college that combines these sciences. Finally, we wish to thank you for this opportunity to express our views concerning reorganization. We are ready to work with you during these trying times and would be glad to meet with you again to discuss these issues or others.

Deliberation concerning Departments

In order for an organization to be successful and sustainable, underlying principles have to be strong and adopted by all in the organization. Therefore, even as the campus moves forward with a new streamlined structure composed of fewer colleges and schools, we recommend that all potential moves of departments from one college or school to another be made only after further analysis and consultation with all relevant deans and faculty. We also recognize that a reasonable target date for making such changes be set in the near future. This date for such decisions should be established such that the reorganization process moves forward in an expedient manner while still providing for a more thorough examination of all aspects related to the impacts of departmental moves across schools and colleges. The following examples, a small number from many possibilities, reflect the specificity of department-level concerns.

Faculty in Polymer Science and Engineering (PSE) and Computer Science (CS) are hesitant to move from NSM, or from a merged NSM/NRE, to the College of Engineering (COE) at this time. While numerous arguments of merit can be made for and against these moves, the issues are complex and require careful study. Before a decision is made, there should be substantial discussion among the relevant parties with attention to strategies for mitigating concerns and with adequate time for reflection. Although the situations of PSE and CS are not identical, there is a shared need to clearly identify the synergies and benefits of these moves for the departments and the colleges. Among the most significant is the definition of a compelling vision for future promise of not only sustained excellence, but new opportunities for growth.

In the case of PSE, the following two key concerns must be addressed. First, the polymer communities within physics, chemistry, and biology are large and expanding. These connections must be preserved. The polymer related efforts within the engineering subcommunity are smaller and less connected. Second, most PSE faculty members were trained as scientists, not engineers, and thus believe at this point (without yet having adequate time for discussion and reflection) that they will have a less successful engagement in teaching within an engineering college. Because the PSE Department curriculum is widely recognized as world leading and has been built over the last thirty years, PSE faculty believe it is important to maintain the integrity of this program. Given commonalities and synergies in style between CS and PSE, PSE strongly believes that these departments should remain together under any rearrangement

Related concerns have been raised by the CS department. Although historically there are strong connections between the fields of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, there are substantial differences in research focus, educational mission, curriculum, and culture. Computer science as a field has been moving away from engineering, with increased emphasis on key roles that computational systems and computational thinking are playing in other disciplines. While engineering is also engaged in reaching out to other disciplines, the positioning of CS on our campus within a science college has been a facilitating factor in establishing multi-disciplinary activities, both in research and teaching. The CS department's recent efforts to revise its undergraduate curriculum by increasing its flexibility, and to introduce a new BA degree, are aimed at serving students with more diverse backgrounds, particularly students also working toward science degrees. A move to COE could work against these goals. In some ways, engineering is even less diverse than CS, and its instructional emphases differ from those of CS in being accreditation-driven and more focused on professional training for the workplace. Moreover, because synergies between CS and Electrical and Computer Engineering (ECE) on this campus are already very extensive, moving CS to COE will do little to strengthen these connections or facilitate their extension. Although CS is housed in a COE on many campuses (through alignments made mostly in the 1980's and 90's), on many others it is housed in a CAS.

Food Science also has concerns over the proposal to move into Public Health. Food Science is a multidisciplinary field that combines engineering, microbiology, chemistry and nutrition to develop technologies to produce food products. The UMass Food Science Department research program is tied strongly with the Food Industry to accomplish these goals. This research focus is not consistent with Public Health, which concentrates on biostatistics, community health education, environmental health sciences, epidemiology, and health policy and management. In addition, major areas of research growth in Food Science are in areas such as nanotechnology, packaging, biosensors, physical chemistry and molecular biology. Separating Food Science from the rest of the Sciences would inhibit collaborations with other Science Departments that are critical for future growth and success. We are also concerned about how Public Health accreditation will impact our teaching emphasis and future hiring directions. The fact that there are no Food Science Departments in Schools of Public Health in the U.S. is likely due to the major differences in these fields. While Food Science supports the consolidation of the Sciences, it sees no benefits and many detriments in joining the School of Public Health.

Similar concerns are reflected in reorganization as it affects some of the departments in NRE. In a letter to the Chancellor dated February 19, 2009, from the Department Head of Landscape Architecture and Regional Planning (LARP), the following concerns were raised:

Core strength – Our core strength as a department, in both of our accredited disciplines of Landscape Architecture and Regional Planning, is in our focus on sustainable development, including the aspects of climate change, green infrastructure and greenway and economic development planning. Our historical core focus has a long history and national visibility, developing out of the origin of landscape architecture on this campus, from the old Agricultural College, and the programs in horticulture and landscape

planning that existed at the beginning of the last century. Established in 1903, the department has three professionally-accredited programs, the landscape architecture bachelor's program accredited in 1959, the Master in Landscape Architecture accredited in 1971 and the Master in Regional Planning accredited in 1974. When looking at landscape architecture and planning programs nationally, a small group of them have this type of focus, versus the art, architecture and design focus of many of the programs, particularly the one at Harvard. ...

... In addition, we led a proposal team with the Department of Natural Resources Conservation, the Department of Resource Economics, the Department of Public Health and the Center for Public Policy to the MacArthur Foundation to provide \$1.1 million in support for the development of a new interdisciplinary graduate degree program in Sustainable Development Practice. If successful, this program will also bring new students and revenue to campus.

In this preliminary report, it is impossible for us to include all of the input received from many departments regarding reorganization. We note here that these concerns should be addressed through a deliberative process.

In a section below on transition processes, we offer recommendations to guide continued deliberations concerning the issues raised by NRE and NSM faculty. We next turn to opportunities for broader integration across the scholarly research disciplines and related applied fields.

Integration across Arts and Sciences: A College of Arts and Sciences

Integration plays two roles. First, integration of knowledge that lies across existing disciplinary boundaries is the guiding vision for innovative research and education on campus. Second, integration is a powerful vehicle through which to gain efficiency and productivity by pooling resources where feasible and, more importantly, by decreasing administrative barriers to research and collaboration across administrative boundaries. Stovepiped administrative processes developed during a pre-Internet era impede integrative research and education with excessive red tape, multiple layers of signoffs and other processes that effective large organizations have left behind.

The dual importance of integration has led us strongly to recommend that a College of Arts and Sciences be formed in order to most effectively work toward the strategic goals advanced by the Chancellor. The collaborative and integrative potential of a CAS is precisely what is attractive about this widely used form and outweigh the potential disadvantages of its size. In its divisional form, it would serve as a vehicle for HFA, SBS, NRE and NSM to continue to work on the details of reorganization. We view a CAS initially as a laboratory within which the four colleges are brought under one administrative umbrella in order to deliberate toward productive reorganization. Specifically, this would mean initially including a life sciences and the environment group which would encompass most NRE departments and would allow for program

continuity while, at the same time, colleges are working toward forms that may develop further in the future.

Efficiency Gains

This recommendation alone would reduce the number of colleges and schools on campus from nine to six. It would reduce four colleges to one. It would follow an organizational form used by 75 percent of the public universities in the American Association of Universities, an organization of the country's top universities. It would reduce multiple deaneries to one college deanery with divisional associate deans who would be appointed from within rather than recruited through national searches. A College of Arts and Sciences would also retain cohesion and shared communication through a series of college-level faculty committees and advisory groups. (Several examples of these groups and their organization within colleges of arts and sciences nationally are available from the task force chair.)

We recommend that the CAS would start with the existing college units – and their deans -- as the transitional structure with a clear statement that there is a timeline for these units to organize into the most effective form for the campus. This integration cannot be successfully dictated from outside, including from this task force. Under this model, the faculty, chairs and directors and deans of these colleges work out the best paths forward given their specialized knowledge of critical research areas, education programs, and related trends nationally at leading universities.

We base this recommendation on a detailed examination of the four colleges involved and on a benchmarking process which examined the organizational structures of the 34 public universities who are members of the American Association of Universities, a group of ten peer universities developed by campus administrators, and the universities categorized by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching as having “very high research, no medical and veterinary school.”²

Potential to Enhance Research and Education

Colleges of arts and sciences typically are referred to as the “heart of the teaching and research mission” and “the intellectual core of the campus.” A liberal arts education, drawing from the arts and humanities, and from the social, natural, and computational sciences and mathematics is meant to teach students what it means to be human, how to think, how to compute, how to write and how to engage in civic, economic, social and scientific life.

Colleges of arts and sciences house the scholarly disciplines and related applied fields across the spectrum from arts and humanities to the sciences. Housing this broad range of departments within one college is viewed widely as an impetus for innovative research and program collaborations and for the type of undergraduate education required by

² Please contact the RTF chair for sources and details of benchmarking.

young people venturing into an increasingly complex and technological world. Such breadth is particularly important for a public university in Massachusetts, a high technology state that demands highly educated citizens and a workforce conversant with science and technology and their relationship to society in areas as diverse as health, finance, education and high technology.

A College of Arts and Sciences affords wide scope for development of affinities across departments. Computational linguistics is located in HFA, but is more like computer science along some dimensions than it is similar to other departments in its college. One might surmise that more teaching than research is conducted in HFA and SBS, yet there are departments of “education” in NSM. Ethics in science and engineering brings together faculty from the humanities and social sciences with natural sciences and engineering. Anthropologists work in the field but are also lab scientists. Sociology has more collaborative research relationships with NSM and NRE than it does with HFA, but more teaching partnerships with HFA. Landscape architecture and planning has equal affinities with architecture, design and natural resources conservation. Other departments combine aesthetic, even artistic, perspectives with highly scientific modes of inquiry. And throughout disciplines and fields, the explosion of digital data, tools, infrastructure and computation is transforming the production and communication of knowledge.

Colleges of Arts and Sciences are the core for a liberal arts education, the rationale behind our General Education requirements. As the General Education Council members wrote in a memo of March 2 regarding reorganization:

The assumption behind General Education—and behind the idea of liberal education in general—is that our students will be encouraged to integrate the various dimensions of their education. Developing a student’s abilities to think across disciplines, to bring different disciplinary perspectives together in thinking through a problem, to forge interdisciplinary syntheses, and to write across the curriculum, are the core goals of General Education. From this perspective, we ask that any proposed reorganization provide clear and explicit administrative support and coordinating structures for a curriculum that challenges disciplinary divisions, such as those between the “two cultures” of science and non-science. For example, we note that challenging questions in bioethics, cognitive science, the relations between religion and science, the neurophysiology of creativity, the evolutionary psychology of art, the poetics of physics—and so on—call upon knowledge and skills taught in various distinct departments, schools and colleges. For an interdisciplinary General Education curriculum to address these and similar questions calls for structural and administrative relationships that facilitate and sustain such a curriculum.

National Benchmarking

In the American Association of Universities, which is a membership organization by invitation only for research universities, 75 percent of the public university members are organized using the arts and sciences model. Among the private universities, the percentage is even higher. The pervasiveness of the form among excellent universities suggests that it is robust, able to grow when the economy permits and able to contract by sharing and pooling across its divisions. Moreover, there are several examples from a variety of excellent universities that may be usefully examined for their value.

The AAU public universities and several variables of interest are presented in Table One at the end of this report. This table indicates that 75 percent of these campuses use a College of Arts and Sciences. Further, it demonstrates that within most colleges of arts and sciences in this group, the dean's office is organized using associate deans, who are appointed rather than selected through a national search process. Two predominant forms are used to organize the dean's office in colleges of arts and sciences. At some universities, divisional associate deans provide coherence within a group of departments and report to the dean of the college. At other universities, although the number is fewer, the dean's office at the college level is staffed by "functional" associate deans, that is, associate deans for budget, operations, undergraduate education, etc. At one university, a combination of these forms is used. The use of divisional deans, rather than associate deans, is rare. Importantly, at most universities, a strong role is played by cross-cutting faculty committees and advisory groups with members elected or appointed from across the college and with staff participation. These cross-cutting roles and groups are imperative for communication, cohesion and coordination across divisions. They prevent the fragmentation that can occur in divisionalized forms. Currently, the UMass Amherst campus has four deans of the four colleges under consideration, each of whom is assisted by at least two associate deans and related administrative staff.

Some might argue that a large College of Arts and Sciences, by its sheer size, would wield more influence than its counterparts. However, this potential imbalance could be managed easily by a provost who would ensure that the resource needs of all schools and colleges are considered equitably for the good of the campus and the university. This is a key role played by a provost who has oversight of the campus's academic budget.

Table Two below presents those public universities in the AAU and UMA peer schools for which the college of arts and sciences enroll 40 percent or more students. A potential point of resistance is that there would be too many students as a percentage of the total enrollment in a CAS. Yet at many excellent universities, a large proportion of undergraduates matriculate in arts and sciences. At two campuses presented in the table, all undergraduates spend their first two years in the college of arts and sciences and then move to their majors either within CAS or in another school or college.

Selected AAU and UMass peer comparison schools: CAS forms and enrollments

Institution	CAS	Form	ugrad enr	grad enr	total enr	% enr CAS
University of Delaware	CAS	div assoc	15,407	3,448	18,855	40
Rutgers, State University of New Jersey	CAS	div deans	28,019	8,010	36,029	41
Indiana University	CAS	functional	19,182	7,370	27,466	44
The University of Kansas	CAS	div assoc	20,555	5,471	20,811	50
University of Connecticut Storrs	CAS	functional	16,459	6,583	23,042	62
<i>University of Massachusetts Amherst</i>	<i>CAS</i>	<i>div assoc</i>	18,717	5,150	23,867	<i>-64</i>
University of Colorado at Boulder	CAS	div assoc	25,080	4,629	29,709	68
University of California, Santa Barbara	CAS	div deans	18,892	2,976	21,868	69
The University of Iowa	CAS	functional	20,079	6,405	20,823	70
University of Virginia	CAS	div assoc	15,208	7,608	22,816	73
University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign	CAS	div assoc	30,895	10,421	41,316	100/50*
The University of North Carolina Chapel Hill	CAS	div assoc	17,895	8,275	26,170	100/50*

* All first and second-year students are enrolled in CAS; 50% continue in CAS.

It may be argued that there are too few schools and colleges that would be outside a College of Arts and Sciences to make the form feasible at UMass Amherst. Our campus is distinct from many of its peer institutions because of the relatively small number and size of its professional schools. The UMass Amherst campus lacks a medical school, a law school and a large, semi-autonomous agricultural school which are characteristic of some of our large peer institutions. The response is that colleges of arts and sciences are the core of the university. An organizational structure that fragments departments into separate administrative units to balance resources and enrollments serves no strategic purpose, is likely to be unproductive and counter to the promotion of interdisciplinary research and training. We recommend that as the economy recovers, the professional schools be strengthened to increase both their research and teaching capacities. In sum, the problem is not that a College of Arts and Sciences would be too big but that the other schools and colleges are too small. It is imperative that we reorganize in order to build on strength – the CAS model clearly achieves that objective in an efficient and integrative manner.

A Seven College Model

The Reorganization Task Force considered a hybrid, seven college, model. In this model, the proposed merger of NRE and NSM would continue, but HFA and SBS would remain autonomous, at least for the present. Although this model lacks the full integrative potential of arts and sciences, both in possibilities for research and education as well as for sharing services and resources, it may serve as an interim model on the way to formation of a college of arts and sciences. It would allow visioning and strategic directions set by the deans of HFA and SBS to continue along the productive paths currently in motion and would not impede potential for partnerships with the sciences, although these would be best fostered under one administrative college.

Under this model, we would recommend some redistribution of funds, either from the curriculum fee or research trust fund accounts, in order to provide for a “margin of excellence” in HFA and SBS and to reduce an imbalance in the current funding structure that may be exacerbated by the merger between NRE and NSM and by the movement of the Psychology Department out of the SBS.

Limitations of the CHASS Model

The Reorganization Task Force members strongly support the Chancellor’s proposal to strengthen research collaborations and to build for excellence in research and teaching while striving for efficiencies and effectiveness on campus. With these goals in mind, the RTF strongly recommends against CHASS as a means to move the campus forward strategically toward excellence in research, teaching and outreach. The CHASS option separates disciplines and related applied fields at exactly the time in our history when integration is the driving force for innovation in research and teaching. Further, the creation of a “science college” and a “liberal arts college” holds strong potential to exacerbate cultural, resource and operational divides that are already problematic on campus. Still further, the separation of the disciplines into two colleges implies a divide to undergraduates that is actually being bridged in myriad ways at universities and, more importantly, in the world.

CHASS lacks the many advantages to be found in the arts and science model. Social sciences are increasingly oriented toward externally funded research, primarily through the National Science Foundation. In the social sciences collaborative research, typically including PhD students, is the dominant research model. In the humanities, single researcher models are still dominant.

Two campuses among the 34 public universities of the AAU use the CHASS model: the University of Texas Austin and the University of Minnesota. In each case the psychology department is within the CHASS. Theory and research in psychology is fundamental to the other social sciences, which draw from theories of individual and social behavior. Second, these two examples of CHASS are very large campuses. The UT Austin campus is twice the size of the UMass Amherst campus, and there are 16,000 undergraduates at the University of Minnesota College of Liberal Arts. More generally, twenty five percent of public universities in the AAU are organized using a decentralized model, typically meaning that there are separate colleges of science, social science, and humanities and fine arts. Often, fine arts is organized as a separate school. In all cases of decentralized AAU public university campuses, the psychology department is found with the social sciences.

Finally, both HFA and SBS have begun to build infrastructures and trajectories that support different strategic directions for growth. Consequently, consolidating HFA and SBS into a college separate from the sciences is viewed as inconsistent with – and doing harm to -- the current and future education and research functions of these faculties.

Transition Processes: Guiding Principles

The Task Force on Reorganization recognizes that our recommended reorganization into fewer academic units (whether it be the College of Arts and Sciences or a Seven College Model) provides only a first significant step towards making this type of reorganization into a reality that fulfills the multiple objectives and potential benefits that may arise from a carefully planned implementation of this reorganization. We encourage the Chancellor to appoint a committee composed of representatives from the units most directly affected by the reorganization to address these issues. This committee could include members of the current RTF to provide continuity during the process. We also make the following recommendations in order to maximize the considerable positive potential of reorganization while minimizing the substantial risks associated with such moves. These further recommendations regarding the transition and implementation of campus reorganization include:

- Further analysis should be conducted and the associated data and findings should be shared broadly with Deans, Department Chairs and affected faculty members.
- The deans and faculty members affected by reorganization to a College of Arts and Sciences or a Seven College Model should be provided the opportunity to work out the details of administration, governance, etc. within a reasonable period of time. This approach is critical to the success and productivity of any reorganization that is designed to enhance efficiency and facilitate value-added integration. It is important that there be a real opportunity for faculty, with knowledge of existing collaborations and a personal stake in evaluation of the potential of new collaborations, to have a primary role in identifying and generating cooperative and collaborative arrangements over the course of the transition.
- Planning for reorganization should also include all deans, even those that are interim, acting and outgoing.
- Recognizing that the proposed reorganization is happening in conjunction with budget cuts, there should be a progressive transition model that provides for some immediate budget cuts prior to reorganization and a clear process should then be established to provide for multiple rounds of budget cuts at different points during reorganization. This progressive model will enable the campus to better target budget cuts over time that are aligned and best support the administrative efficiencies and future strategic priorities that emerge from the reorganization.
- It is vitally important that careful attention be paid to the phases of implementation. The progressive transition model should provide a means for ensuring that the appropriate spectrum of relevant academic functions be clearly identified with a defined sequence of transitional activities, including a specific timeline, which is to be developed and implemented prior to the launch of the actual reorganization.

- The progressive transition should also include a careful analysis of all functions and services related to the academic enterprise; this includes attention to the following preliminary list (this is not necessarily an exhaustive inventory):
 - Academic Personnel – in particular, careful attention is needed regarding existing rules that apply to junior faculty and related personnel and faculty affairs committees and organization;
 - Shared governance structures and principles;
 - Curricular and program development;
 - Undergraduate course scheduling and advising;
 - Graduate student programming and supervision;
 - Grant-making and management activities;
 - Outreach and engagement activities;
 - The function and role of existing Centers and Institutes;
 - Advancement and development;
 - Budget management and planning.

- All decisions associated with reorganization should be intentionally aligned with the emerging Campus Strategic Plan.

- Other areas within the academic core of the institution should be examined for aligned reorganization to enhance and support the effects of the reorganization of colleges and schools; this may include the structures and functions associated with the Provost’s Office, the Graduate School, and Research and Engagement units.

Additional Opportunities to Increase Excellence

As the campus advances in its strategic planning process and reorganization plans, we anticipate that several existing programs, organizations and processes will be reviewed with a view toward greater efficiency while preserving and enhancing our strategic ability to grow and increase the excellence of research and teaching. Here we note a small subset of items, particularly those related to the research mission of the campus.

Any reorganization must focus on long-term benefits by raising the profile and reputation of the University of Massachusetts Amherst. From all the available statistics, our out-of-state student enrollment is low compared to that of our peer institutions as well as other public New England universities. In addition, although there have been successes, the growth of campus funding (federal, state and private) is low as compared to that of our peers in New England and elsewhere.

We believe these shortcomings can be attributed, at least in part, to the low profile of the overall research environment and the stature that we have in the professional communities. The situation can be significantly improved by having a strong central

research office. The reestablishment of the Vice Chancellor for Research and Engagement is an excellent strategy and can be included as part of the reorganization effort. This consolidation has significant merit because any reorganization should have a positive effect on the ability of all researchers to execute the activities that are vital for their research, while continuing to allow those currently in progress to grow and prosper. The central mission of this consolidated office is to raise the profile and prepare the campus to seek and develop various initiatives that resonate with our society and funding agencies. Currently the need to streamline the proposal submission process, the difficulties in resolving intellectual property issues, and the need for a centralized coherent response to research initiatives all depend on the effectiveness of a centralized research office. A strong Graduate School within a strong Vice Chancellor for Research Office might effectively advocate for researchers' agendas and needs. This possibility for reorganization merits further consideration although outside the scope of our charge.

In addition, it should be noted that maintenance of research infrastructure is an extremely important and expensive endeavor that is in need of consideration by any reorganization. The support of this infrastructure is required to reduce barriers for research by all faculty and students. Should facilities, including machine shops, electronics shops, and research facilities like electron microscopy, NMR, and Mass Spectrometry be consolidated campus-wide? This becomes an even more important issue as the cost for instrumentation, maintenance and staffing have increased significantly. Any reorganization must take this into consideration.

Conclusions

It should be underscored that given the very short time frame permitted by economic events, ours is not a comprehensive assessment of options for restructuring. There are several possibilities that we were able to discuss only briefly. Others – notably the relationship of the School of Nursing to the School of Public Health and the best place for various departments -- lay outside the scope of this committee, at least during its initial iteration. This report is preliminary. It would be an error to over-state that extent of our analysis.

Thus, our final recommendation is to stress the need for continued analysis and deliberation that is centered on faculty expertise regarding promising research and education directions and the most effective means for their implementation. A careful plan should be developed to disseminate this report and subsequent recommendations and decisions to the campus community as quickly and responsibly as possible. Given the amount of work that remains in designing and implementing an effective and efficient transition throughout the reorganization process, we reiterate our encouragement that the Chancellor to appoint a committee composed of representatives from the units most directly affected by the reorganization to address these issues. This could include members of the current RTF to provide continuity during the process

Table One: American Association of Universities: Selected Characteristics of Public Members

	Org ¹	Assoc dean roles ²	Fed Res rank ³	Ugrad Enr	Grad Enr	Total Enr
Public (34 schools -- 75% have a College of Arts & Sciences)						
Indiana University	CAS	functional	87 [^]	19,182	7,370	27,466
Iowa State University	CAS	functional	92	22,739	4,015	26,754
Michigan State University	decent		58	36,337	8,489	44,826
The Ohio State University	CAS	div dean	22	39,209	10,097	49,306
The Pennsylvania State University	decent		18	37,988	6,130	44,118
Purdue University	decent		62	31,761	7,427	39,188
Rutgers, State University of New Jersey	CAS	divisional	72	28,019	8,010	36,029
Stony Brook - State University of New York	CAS	functional	70	15,730	5,887	21,617
Texas A&M University	tech		42	38,430	9,106	47,536
University at Buffalo, State University of New York	CAS	functional	61	18,760	7,146	25,906
The University of Arizona	CAS ^{new}		23	29,340	6,962	36,302
University of California, Davis	CAS	div dean	36	23,499	4,094	27,593
University of California, Berkeley	CAS	div deans	24	24,636	9,267	33,903
University of California, Irvine	decent		55	22,122	4,432	26,554
University of California, Los Angeles	CAS	div dean	6	25,928	10,971	36,899
University of California, San Diego	decent		8	22,518	4,213	26,731
University of California, Santa Barbara	CAS	div dean	84	18,892	2,976	21,868
University of Colorado at Boulder	CAS	div assoc	37	25,080	4,629	29,709
University of Florida	CAS	functional	38	35,189	12,201	47,390
University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign	CAS	div assoc	25	30,895	10,421	41,316
The University of Iowa	CAS	functional	41	20,079	6,405	26,484
The University of Kansas	CAS	div assoc	117	20,555	5,471	26,026
University of Maryland at College Park	decent		49	25,857	10,040	35,897
University of Michigan	CAS	div assoc	4	25,994	12,391	38,385
University of Minnesota, Twin Cities	CHASS	functional	20	28,505	14,918	43,423
University of Missouri-Columbia	CAS	functional	94	22,649	6,028	28,677
University of Nebraska-Lincoln	CAS	functional	110	16,944	4,500	21,444
The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill	CAS	div assoc	19	17,895	8,275	26,170
University of Oregon	CAS	hybrid	145	17,356	3,315	20,671
University of Pittsburgh	CAS	functional	12	17,427	8,288	25,715
The University of Texas at Austin	CHASS		30	37,389	10,864	48,253
University of Virginia	CAS	div assoc	47	15,208	7,608	22,816
University of Washington	CAS	div dean	2	29,397	10,278	39,675
The University of Wisconsin-Madison	CAS	div assoc	5	30,750	8,710	39,460
University of Massachusetts Amherst			115	18,717	5,150	23,867
[University of Mass-Amherst and Worcester]			[49]			

¹ CAS= College of Arts and Sciences; decent = decentralized; CHASS = College of Liberal Arts

² functional = dean's office organized with functional associate deans (budget, HR, undergrad, etc.); div dean = divisional form using deans; div assoc = divisional form using associate deans; hybrid = associate dean are both functional and divisional

³ 2005 Federal Research Expenditures; ^ includes Purdue/Ind

**Appendix One: Message of February 3, 2009 from Chancellor Holub
Establishing the Reorganization Task Force**

(http://www.umass.edu/chancellor/budget_tfr_020309.html)

Task Force Formed to Review Reorganization Proposal

February 3, 2009

To: The Campus Community

Today, I'm writing to the campus to share information on the ongoing budget crisis, and to outline a process for our campus to move forward.

1) In response to requests at the general meeting of the Faculty Senate last Thursday, I am announcing the formation of a Task Force on Reorganization (TFR) that will deal with issues of reorganization and make recommendations to me and the Provost with regard to reorganization. With this announcement I am explicitly recognizing the faculty desire to have additional deliberative input into the process.

The TFR will be composed of a number of department chairs and faculty members from the current colleges of HFA, NRE, NSM, and SBS. It will deliberate on the proposed actions I am outlining below and provide me with input by March 6. During the past month I have heard that there is considerable sentiment for reinstituting a College of Arts and Sciences that would unite many of the departments in these four colleges. I have serious reservations about the establishment of such a college, but I do think that the idea is worth exploring. I would therefore also charge the task force with exploring the idea of a College of Arts and Sciences, or any other alternate organizational structure that it finds appropriate for the campus. I am asking Jane Fountain to lead this task force and to report its findings to the central administration.

Assuming it works in a timely fashion, I will wait for a report from the TFR before finalizing any structure. I recognize that the TFR may wish to deliberate for a longer period of time about the reintroduction of a College of Arts and Sciences, and I have no date by which it must deliver a recommendation on this matter. I do not see the organization I am proposing as antithetical to the formation of a College of Arts and Sciences. Indeed, I believe in many ways it moves us halfway there.

2) As many of you know, the campus has been contemplating reorganization since we received news of the devastating budget

situation in the fall of 2008. The Provost and I have consulted widely with faculty from all affected colleges and received dozens of emails from across the campus. We met several times with deans and held meetings with groups of distinguished faculty members from colleges that may be impacted by change.

I believe that the structures I am proposing make the most sense for the campus at this particular time. They will provide efficiencies in administration, considerable monetary savings, minimal disruption of faculty, programs, and departments, as well as the potential for exciting new collaborations in research and teaching. They will also demonstrate that we are taking the financial crisis seriously and that we are managing the campus effectively. I know that not everyone will agree, but I hope that faculty will put aside their personal preferences and work within the proposed structure toward the goal we all want: moving UMass Amherst into the upper echelon of public research universities in the country.

I propose the elimination of four colleges and their reconstitution as two colleges. The colleges to be eliminated would be the College of Humanities and Fine Arts; the College of Natural Resources and the Environment; the College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics; and the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences. The official names of the newly formed colleges will be left to the faculty in them. I will refer to them for convenience in this memorandum as the College of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences (CHASS) and the College of Natural Sciences (CNS).

My proposal places the following departments and programs in CHASS: Afro-American Studies; Art; Classics; English; History; Judaic and Near Eastern Studies; Languages, Literatures, and Cultures; Linguistics; Music and Dance; Philosophy; Slavic and East European Studies; Theater; Women's Studies; Anthropology; Communication; Communication Disorders; Economics; Labor Relations and Research Center; Legal Studies; Political Science; Public Policy and Administration; Social Thought and Political Economy; Sociology; Landscape Architecture and Regional Planning.

My proposal places the following departments in CNS: Environmental Sciences; Food Science; Microbiology; Natural Resources Conservation; Plant, Soil and Insect Sciences; Stockbridge School of Agriculture; Veterinary and Animal Sciences; Psychology; Astronomy; Biochemistry and Molecular Biology; Biology; Chemistry; Computer Science; Geosciences; Mathematics and Statistics; Physics; and Polymer Science and Engineering.

I propose that Resource Economics be included in the School of Management.

In addition I propose that the School of Nursing retain its autonomy and have an associate dean or an executive director from among the current School of Nursing, but that it be administered through the College of Public Health and Health Sciences.

Besides the report of the TFR, I will be soliciting input from the faculty in general about this proposal. The Faculty Senate will also receive this proposal and make a formal recommendation; I have been told that if the Senate receives it now, it can make this recommendation before the end of the term.

The governance of the two new colleges will be left entirely to the administration and faculty of the colleges. While neither the Provost nor I wish to micromanage the new colleges, we suggest as a first step that committees consisting of faculty, staff, and administrators from NRE and NSM for CNS; and committees consisting of faculty, staff, and administrators from HFA and SBS for CHASS should be formed to assist in the transition.

3) At the most recent faculty meeting a number of individuals requested that I provide more concrete information about actual savings. I therefore worked with my office and the Provost's Office to obtain a fuller view of what savings could be realized by the merger.

In looking at various models, we can see the potential for saving \$1.3 million to \$1.5 million per year. These estimates are conservative. In addition, at least one current dean has told me that he believes additional savings will accrue over time owing to increased efficiencies. These savings are substantial, especially when we consider the need to invest funds in essential areas of the academic enterprise. Once we move forward with implementation, I will share our thoughts on staffing and cost savings with the new deans and their leadership team.

I cannot be more specific about savings at this time for two reasons. First, I do not want to micromanage the deans who will be appointed to CHASS and CNS or their respective leadership teams. As I have stated above, these colleges must be free to determine their own course of action. Second, I do not want to cause undue panic among individuals working in the current colleges about their jobs. As you may know, I have promised the unions on campus that I will not announce any layoffs until the campus has more information on fees and federal money, both of which will be essential in determining how we move forward this year and next year.

There will be some members of the faculty who will be disappointed by the reorganization I am proposing and even by reorganization in general. I hope, however, that the majority

will understand both the necessity for reorganization and the advantages that accrue from the proposed structure.

I wish to thank everyone who has participated in this process to this point for their input. It has helped me considerably in arriving at this proposal.

Chancellor Robert C. Holub

**Appendix 00: Message of February 6, 2009 from Chancellor Holub
Naming Reorganization Task Force Members**

(http://www.umass.edu/chancellor/budget_taskforcemembers_020609.html)

Task Force on Reorganization Members Named

February 6, 2009

To: The Campus Community

Earlier this week, I reported that I would be forming a Task Force on Reorganization to provide advice about the proposal I have made on college reorganization and to explore as well the possibility of a College of Arts and Sciences, or any other alternate organizational structure that it finds appropriate for the campus. Today, I am pleased to announce that the following individuals have agreed to serve on this Task Force, which includes several heads and chairs from affected departments as well as faculty members suggested by the Faculty Senate:

- * Jane Fountain, Professor, Department of Political Science, Task Force Chair
- * Danny Schnell, Professor and Head, Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology
- * Shaw Ling Hsu, Professor and Head, Department of Polymer Science and Engineering
- * Andrew Barto, Professor and Chair, Department of Computer Science
- * Joseph Bartolomeo, Professor and Chair, Department of English
- * Julie Hayes, Professor and Chair, Department of Languages, Literatures and Cultures
- * Jeff Cox, Professor and Chair, Department of Music and Dance
- * John Hird, Professor and Chair, Department of Political Science
- * Douglas Anderton, Professor, Department of Sociology, and Acting Chair, Department of Communication
- * Melinda Novak, Professor and Chair, Department of Psychology
- * Paul Fiset, Professor and Head, Department of Natural Resources Conservation
- * Samuel Black, Professor and Head, Department of Veterinary and Animal Sciences
- * Eric Decker, Professor and Head, Department of Food Science
- * Joseph Berger, Associate Professor and Chair, Department of Educational Policy, Research and Administration
- * Jane Miller, Associate Professor, Department of Management

* Robert Faulkner, Professor of Sociology

I have also forwarded the reorganization proposal to the Faculty Senate for its review. And I hope to continue to receive input from the faculty in general.

Again, I thank everyone who has participated in the process to this point for their input and for the understanding so many have shown of the budgetary necessity for reorganization. I continue to believe that we must do everything we can to ensure the efficiency of our administrative structures so that we can provide the maximum possible protection for the core academic functions of the campus.

Chancellor Robert C. Holub
Research Administration and Graduate Education