

Academic Priorities Council
Preliminary Report on Campus Reorganization
March 5, 2009

The Academic Priorities Council (APC) considered the Chancellor's proposal for reorganization of the Amherst campus relative to its academic vision and how it positions the campus for success now and as we emerge from the recession. In doing so, the APC sought input from the campus community and held a series of meeting with Deans, Department Chairs/Heads, and faculty members and welcomed feedback via email as well. A summary of the discussions from those meetings is appended.

As the flagship campus of the University of Massachusetts system, UMass, Amherst seeks to be a nationally recognized, top tier, public research university. In addition, it is recognized that both undergraduate and graduate education and the "student experience" are critical components of our success. Students are the foundation of our financial support and demographic trends suggest that competition for students will intensify over the next ten years. Thus, it is critical that the organizational structure we create be supportive of faculty research and teaching across disciplines, supportive of providing students with a high quality educational experience, and allow us to take advantage of strategic opportunities both within and across disciplines which have the potential to foster external funding and investment and build our national and international reputation.

It is also necessary to create an organizational structure that will allow departments and colleges to build on their core strengths, maintain their identity, and continue processes they have developed to support their faculty and students effectively. An organizational structure should encourage efficient use of resources, break down barriers that inhibit multidisciplinary research and study, allow units to take advantage of synergies, and foster a sense of community and shared purpose.

Upon consideration of the feedback received, the goals and mission of the University, and our academic priorities, the following recommendations and rationale are offered.

Proposed Organizational Structure

The Academic Priorities Council supports a modified version of the Chancellor's reorganization proposal, one that builds on the life science initiative by combining departments in NSM and NRE, but allows SBS and HFA to remain separate. Two structures were viewed as acceptable after discussion at our last meeting on March 10th, although one was considered preferable to the other.

The preferred structure would be a College of Arts & Sciences with three divisions managed by Divisional Associate Deans and four colleges outside of the Arts & Science College. The three divisions in an A & S model would be (1) a combined NSM and NRE college, (2) SBS, and (3) HFA. The schools and colleges outside of Arts & Sciences would include (1) the College of Engineering, (2) the Isenberg School of Management with Resource Economics, (3) the School of Education, and (4) a College of Public Health and Health Sciences that includes a

School of Nursing. Some concern was expressed that this structure would require an additional level of administration and three Associate Deans. However, this structure was viewed as potentially superior in encouraging cross-disciplinary use of resources and collaboration to meet the needs of the general education curriculum.

A second acceptable structure would be a seven college model that includes: (1) a combined NSM and NRE college, comparable to that proposed by the Chancellor, (2) SBS, (3) HFA, (4) the Isenberg School of Management with Resource Economics, (5) a College of Public Health and Health Sciences that includes a School of Nursing, (6) the College of Engineering, and (7) the School of Education.

In both structures, while NRE would join with NSM, not all departments would necessarily need to make the move. In addition, it is recommended that a subcommittee consider the best placement of departments such as Landscape Architecture and Linguistics.

Support for the proposed modification includes:

- The sciences would be together, thus, facilitating the life sciences initiative supported by the individual units and the State of Massachusetts with the potential for significant funding opportunities.
- Combining the sciences within a single college or division would promote more effective management of large scale science projects involving the life sciences, clean energy, and the environment, as examples.
- Combining the sciences should facilitate the streamlining of processes including grant administration, curriculum development and support, financial management, and advising.
- Both structures could facilitate better management of the science curriculum.
- Both structures could contribute to ameliorating the “two cultures” issue.
- In the A & S structure, interdisciplinary research and teaching efforts among divisions could be promoted. This structure would facilitate cooperation and collaboration across divisions, both curricular and funding. Servicing of the general education curriculum across divisions is recommended and would be facilitated.
- The A & S structure would potentially allow for a more integrative, potentially interdisciplinary experience for many students.
- Both structures preserves successful initiatives established in well functioning colleges and allow highly productive units to continue to be productive without disruption.
- Both structures allow established business processes to remain in place without interruption, such as Spire, existing personnel committees, tenure and promotion processes, and the community college transfer model.
- Disciplines can maintain their identities, a concern expressed by some.

Issues that need to be addressed in the Proposed Reorganizational Structure include:

- A huge science division could make personnel committees and tenure and promotion processes difficult. Processes would need to be worked out so that these functions are manageable.

- An exact list of departments within each division needs to be worked out. Concern was expressed about departments moving to colleges against their will and it was suggested that the Faculty Senate and Rules Committee be involved in discussions about these cases.
- Consideration should be given to the Chancellor and VCR being more outward focused rather than inward focused. They should be entrepreneurial in order to generate additional funding opportunities and facilitate the research and outreach efforts of faculty. They should also promote entrepreneurial efforts among individual units so departments and colleges will be less reliant on state funding and be able to deal more effectively with budget reductions.

APPENDIX

Academic Priority Council Minutes February 10, 2009

1. Invited guests included Jane Fountain and members of the Chancellor's Reorganization Task Force and Steve Goodwin, Dean of NRE, the Academic Dean, and Department Heads/Chairs in NRE.
2. Jane Fountain provided observations on the campus reorganization which included guiding principles, key points to keep in mind when considering various models, the benefits of an Arts & Sciences model, examples of several models, and its impact on the campus culture.
 - An important guiding principle is to structure for strategic advantage in research, fundraising, and recruitment, while cutting administrative expenses. Structure does matter because it forms the basis of our communities on campus, incentive structures and channels of communication. We should work under the principle of "do no harm" and avoid a structure that will disadvantage other units.
 - We should learn from existing models and benchmark across relevant schools. Change should be managed from the bottom up, top down, and middle out and points of difference should be reconciled. Schools and colleges include intellectual communities and management systems.
 - Models at Penn State, the University of Minnesota, and UT Austin were examined since all emphasize research excellence. Jane indicated that it may be best to go from 3 to 1 rather than 2 to 1 due to the growth of computational social sciences and to avoid harming the social sciences.
 - Benefits of the Arts & Science model are that it is the dominant model within 75-85% of universities and it doesn't preclude a life sciences college, environmental studies, or other specialized schools. Jane questions whether UMass is large enough to justify a structure that includes an Arts & Sciences college and an additional science college.
 - Faculty seek intellectual coherence within and across divisions. An A & S management structure should have coherence at the Dean's level and Provost's level in order to increase research funding and support of projects. This structure could streamline administrative processes, leverage economies of scale, and allow pooling of resources. An A & S Dean needs to work closely and impartially with the sciences, arts, and humanities.
 - The units that are included in A & S differ at various colleges across the country.
 - UCONN, UNC, and UVA have few executive and divisional deans. The University of Florida, UCONN, and the University of Pittsburgh have functional associate Deans. Florida also has a medical school and agriculture. All have A & S Advisory Councils with faculty from each division.
 - Restructuring involves a cultural transformation and will result in a more competitive environment. It involves competition for resources based on performance, research and outcomes.

3. Steve Goodwin, Dean of NRE, maintains that any plan will work. Research is not constrained by culture. Academic vision is set by the people that are hired. Is no reorganization better? Steve likes what they have created in NRE.
 - Reorganizing will stimulate changes. Originally, NRE floated a plan that included Life Sciences and the Environment – geosciences, life sciences, and public health.
 - Life Sciences will need the most attention in terms of curriculum. The department names are old and don't represent the way the world is now. A bottom up vision is best. The life sciences will come together. They allow more flexibility for students and looking at things from a multi-disciplinary approach. The life sciences is one unit that would be useful. It would be helpful to have something with the name "life sciences" in it. The same could be said for the "environment".
 - In a College of Natural Sciences, we need to rethink the functions of departments. Life sciences is a great group. Bringing the life sciences together will help facilitate the transition to new and better facilities.
 - A focus on the environment could include a Center for Sustainability, research on resource conservation, new hires with NRC, and teaching with NRC and Resource Economics.

4. Department heads indicated that reorganization is an annoyance with the current budget cuts. This is the biggest issue and staff are stressed. Can cuts be achieved without reorganization?
 - A concern was expressed for Landscape, Architecture and Planning by the Department Chair. They were taken away from NRE and placed into Humanities and the Social Sciences. They may not be able to offer a B.S. and their undergraduate degrees are all science. This will be an impediment to their curriculum and initiatives. Their branding is with NRE and not the Arts and Humanities. Departments within Arts and the Humanities have a different focus. Landscape, Architecture and Planning is comfortable in a College of Arts & Sciences or a College of Natural Sciences. They are closer to Plant & Soil, Insect Science, and Natural Resources Conservation than the Fine Arts.
 - The Natural Resources Conservation Department does not object to going into a College of Natural Science. There would need to be a separation of budgets and functions and this analysis has not been done yet. Environmental sustainability is important and being buried. Concern was expressed about accessibility to the Dean with a large college as well as maintenance of student services and student advising. The Academic Deans are in charge of advising and academic discipline. There are 5,000 undergraduates and the Chancellor has indicated that fewer services would be available for students. Another concern for the Natural Resources Conservation Dept. is their branding in the College of Natural Sciences.
 - Leadership in a new college is critical in breaking down the boundaries. Leadership is more important than structure. An applied biology department could be marginalized in a large college without effective leadership. A structure is needed for Agriculture and Resource.

- Concern was expressed by Dept. Heads that if NRE goes into NSM, that they would lose their identity. NSM brings in a lot of research funding. Assignment of TAs would have to be figured out at the graduate level.
- There is an opportunity to restructure the science curriculum. A committee could consider interdisciplinary majors.

Academic Priorities Council
Minutes
February 17, 2009

Present: Randall Knoper, Monroe Rabin, Dara Wier, Margaret Allard, Ernie May, Eliot Moss, Richard Bogartz, Scott Stangroom, Tony Butterfield, Carol Barr, Jean DeMartinis, Jim Rinderle, Carolyn Cave, Kathy Debevec (Chair)

1. Tony Butterfield, Dean of the Isenberg School of Management, and Carol Barr, Associate Dean of Undergraduate Programs, were invited to discuss the Chancellor's Restructuring Proposal.
 - The Isenberg School of Management was viewed as the least affected by the restructuring proposal. It was felt that Resource Economics could be easily integrated into the School. Synergies already exist between the Isenberg School and Resource Economics. Isenberg services Resource Economics students in their junior year writing requirement and Resource Economics teaches the required statistics course for Isenberg students. Resource Economics students currently take the Isenberg Core Curriculum. At the graduate level, faculty in Resource Economics serve on doctoral committees for Isenberg students. Synergies between the faculties are possible.
 - Eight years ago, the four original departments in the Isenberg School (Accounting, Management, Marketing, and Finance and Operations Management) merged with HTM and Sport Management. Initially, there were logistical concerns but the Dean was committed to the process and it proceeded smoothly.
 - In terms of personnel issues, Isenberg has two separate personnel committees, one that handles personnel actions within the four original departments and a second that handles applied management departments (HTM and Sport Management). Resource economics could be a third member on the applied management committee.
 - It was not clear how this merger would save money. Approximately 221 students would be coming into the Isenberg School and it is felt that administrative support in Resource Economics (including their current advising personnel) needs to transfer into the school along with their budget. Otherwise, students would suffer given the current level of resources in the Isenberg School alone. The Associate Dean's office in Isenberg handles all advising for Isenberg students in their first two years, a role that other units across campus do not assume. Academic Deans have a great deal of responsibility including academic discipline, advising, withdrawals, and new student orientation in June, July, and August. One potential concern expressed is that Resource Economics is an open major, as is HTM, and students may view Resource Economics as a path into the Isenberg School. The Isenberg BBA is closed as is Sport Management.
 - From a campus perspective, it is unclear how savings would be realized in the short-term. We may need more Associate Deans and there are costs and organizational issues involved with Spire and People Soft. These changes will take time.
 - It was felt that our reputation as a University is not based on structure so much as units of excellence.
 - The academic vision appears to involve increased research funding, cost savings, and the feeling that good things will happen when bringing various units together. The

state is emphasizing the life sciences and grant funding appears to be heading in this direction.

2. Jean DeMartinis offered an initial perspective on Nursing's view of the Chancellor's Restructuring proposal.
 - Nursing currently has an interim Dean (Jean Swinney). Three faculty positions have been opened and closed. Currently there are 10 tenure track faculty and 47 clinical faculty.
 - Nursing is viewed more favorably on the outside as a standalone unit (a college) than as part of life sciences or as a department. When Nursing is separate and self-sufficient, it is viewed more favorably in accreditation, has a stronger reputation, and attracts more research funding.
 - Nursing needs to be part of the name of a college in order for it to maintain its identity. A School of Nursing and Health Professionals would be viewed favorably but being connected with Public Health would be less desirable.
 - If merged, it would be important to have an Associate Dean for Research. The Dean would need to support service and practice, not just research. This is important from the perspective of "do no harm". It is unclear how the combination of community engagement and scholarship would be viewed by other disciplines.
 - Further written input from Nursing will be sought.

Academic Priorities Council
Minutes
February 24, 2009

Present: Joel Martin, Mike Malone, Janet Rifkin, John Hird, Audrey Altstadt, Melinda Novak, Leda Cook, Michael Morgan, Don Tomaskovic-Devey, Joya Misra, Anne Herrington, Randall Knoper, Laura Doyle, Andrew Barto, Michael Sugerman, Bryan Harvey, Karen Schoenberger, Joe Bartolomeo, Arlene Avakien, Ernie May, Lisa Henderson, Tracie Reed, Sally Powers, Richard Bogartz, Margaret Allard, Carolyn Cave, Scott Stangroom, Matteo Pangallo, Lisa Selkirk, Jim Rinderle, Joe Goldstein, Eliot Moss, Jane Fountain, Kathy Debevec (Chair)

1. Invited guests included Mike Malone, Dean of Engineering, Janet Rifkin, Dean of SBS, and Joel Martin, Dean of HFA and their colleagues.
2. According to Dean Malone, the two units most frequently included in Colleges of Engineering are Computer Science and Polymer Science. The engineering faculty welcomes those departments in the reorganization. There are two reasons to put colleges together: 1) they share common intellectual values, and 2) the units have common problems to solve. When asked if the reorganization is justified, Dean Malone indicated that the proposed fee increase is a hardship on students in a very tough economic time. The reorganization is expected to save \$1.5 million. In terms of synergies, engineering is already engaged with other units and the reorganization will bring only marginal returns on this front.
3. Dean Rifkin is concerned that the reorganization is not driven by an academic vision. Talk of a vision started with the life sciences and the desire for collaboration to take advantage of resources. Units like SBS have been an afterthought and not really considered in the reorganization. The combined SBS and Arts college could work and some interesting things could happen, however, the lack of resources are an issue and their research agendas are different. What hasn't been talked about is what it means to run two colleges that have huge majors. In the two colleges, there would be close to 8,000 majors. Meeting the needs of those students will require more adjuncts and part-timers, and improved advising, all of which will suck up additional resources. There also needs to be a climate for research opportunities. Both colleges are research oriented but they are not thought of in those terms. Thought needs to be given on how to support research initiatives in the new structure. It is unwise to move forward until the units know what kind of support they will get under a new structure. SBS and HFA need resources to invest in faculty.

One organizational unit that works is at the level of the college. Disrupting that unit can be dysfunctional. Areas such as human resources and scheduling are difficult and may require another task force to assess. The lack of resources in SBS and HFA and the implications of that deficit need to be understood. An examination of these types of issues should come first. A search for a new Vice Chancellor for Research is critical. We can look at opportunities, but we need to know what they will cost. Research funding for faculty is critical.

4. Dean Martin suggested the need for an intellectual rationale for the reorganization. It should reflect the institution's values. HFA was on a good path – increasing faculty, getting increased support, resources in cluster hiring, new programs that have been put in place, etc. Concern was expressed by faculty that this will be dismantled. Dean Martin questions what the nutrient mix is in the reorganization which will allow support for research and creative activity. This should be on the table. He has had to fund raise for computers for the digital lab in their new state of the art building. It would be helpful to be able to hold on to some of the curriculum fee. In the reorganization, attention needs to be given to transitional costs.
5. Faculty in SBS indicated that Dean Rifkin has been instrumental in taking SBS on a path of increased and transparent funding for research. Concern was expressed that the reorg will destroy this accomplishment. An SBS-HFA merger will result in this unit being the poor unit on campus. These are historically impoverished colleges. They will become a source of general education support and the work horse on campus. While the implicit message is that the college structure doesn't make a difference, this isn't the case over the last 7 years in SBS. Structure makes a huge difference in research, students, and faculty lines. Flexibility in research support is needed at the college and department level. Loss of resources is a concern. It has helped more recently when resources were distributed based on FTEs. Policy decisions are made on how resources are distributed. Investment has occurred in the sciences and this has been important for them. Dean Martin indicated that we need to look at how we support research across campus. HFA shouldn't have to beg the research council for money for those getting Guggenheims.
6. Areas of Concern expressed by Faculty Attending:
 - Many faculty expressed concern that the academic vision for the reorganization has not been clearly communicated or they see no academic vision in the proposed plan. It was agreed that it is difficult to create a vision in the absence of discussions about money and funding. The vision should identify priorities and the priorities should be balanced. Research needs to be valued in all colleges. Discussions need to take place on the 70-10-10-10 split. Since 10% goes to the college, it does matter what college you are in. In SBS and HFA, funds don't include overhead costs by the nature of their research and how it is funded. Vision and funding go hand in hand. Funding is at risk under the merger.
 - The APC needs to identify values. These should include support for faculty, support for students, and investment in strategic opportunities. The reorganization should not be driven by public relations, but should be based on a business model and a vision.
 - For an A & S model to be considered, there needs to be a favorable climate for research that is fair to all. It needs to have flexibility in funding and funding needs to be transparent and accessible to all faculty. A grave concern of HFA and SBS is the level of support that they will receive from the administration. This is an unknown

and likely to be less than their current level of support. Resource issues need to be addressed head on.

- John Kingston of Linguistics, indicated that what keeps him up at night is concerns over personnel committees, enormous teaching loads, loss of good faculty because their teaching burden will only increase under the Chancellor's proposed plan and alternatives elsewhere will be a draw.
- Ericka Shar oversees the undergraduate program in Communications which has 800 majors. She identified her two biggest fears in relation to the reorganization: 1) faculty's capacity to do research and 2) the student experience. The size of the new organization will be an obstacle and challenge in terms of students having a favorable experience. The new advising initiative in SBS has made a difference in the student experience and this is at risk.
- Audrey Alstadt addressed three areas of concern: 1) Change should be based on academic priorities. We need to foster and enrich research productivity and share responsibility for the classroom experience. The size of a unit needs to be manageable and Deans need to understand what faculty do. 2) Processes need transparency. Procedures need to be clear when engaging in a search and in tenure and promotion decisions. The administration needs to recognize the expertise of the faculty and not interfere with the recruiting process. 3) There needs to be mutual respect between the administration and faculty. The faculty seek a vision from the Chancellor. Faculty are not trying to be obstructionist. Outside constituencies need to be educated about what a university looks like, rather than the university having to change to satisfy outside constituencies. The vision should include all units and encompass a range of perspectives. It should be preceded by a statement of our goals.
- More time is needed to organize SBS and the humanities. The timing of the reorganization is in question. It is one thing to move in this direction but another to consider whether it makes sense at this time. Moving quickly is unwise and there may be some wisdom in delaying reorganization.

7. Alternative Models:

- Jane Fountain has been examining how and why universities organize as they do. Ninety percent have a College of Arts and Sciences. This allows them to house all of the scholarly pursuits together. They share an intellectual purpose, research enterprises and teaching. The A & S structure streamlines processes. It is a way to consolidate but needs to serve a strategic purpose. Change can bubble up from the bottom. We spend too much time discussing how to divide up the crumbs. Instead, we need to grow the pie. The Chancellor and Vice Chancellors need to be out there looking for money rather than relying on our appropriation.
- Joe Goldstein suggested we consider organizing applied colleges in some grouping. It makes sense to put the Arts & Sciences together. It fosters interaction and will save

money at the staff level. Associate Deans are needed for each college. In response to the funding discussion, the RTF model serves as a basis of support for the sciences. Departments pay for new faculty expenses, such as labs, from these funds. In engineering, these funds don't come from the central administration.

- Alternative models can bubble up through the APC and the Reorganization Task Force. The two groups should be bold.

Academic Priorities Council
Minutes
March 3, 2009

Present: Jim Kurose, Shaw Hsu, Danny Schnell, Mike Williams, David Gross, Monroe Rabin, Matteo Pangallo, Ernie May, Carolyn Cave, Margaret Allard, Andrew Barto, Scott Stangroom, Joe Goldstein, Bryan Harvey, Randall Knoper, Jim Rinderle, Richard Bogartz, Kathy Debevec, Jane Fountain

1. Dean Jim Kurose and his colleagues were invited to share their perspective on the Chancellor's Proposed Reorganization Plan.
2. Dean Kurose described his college, NSM, as very interdisciplinary in both research and graduate program offerings. He sees a great deal of collaboration among departments within and outside of the natural sciences. Currently in NSM, there is collaboration between the physical sciences and life sciences. There are no boundaries in the physical sciences. Faculty in physics, polymer science, computer science, and chemistry do life sciences work. Funded grants are a priority in NSM.
3. Bringing Life Sciences together in a college is viewed positively. This should lead to more interaction, although having separate schools hasn't been an obstacle for research collaborations. Currently, there is joint funding with Engineering. Randall Knoper indicated that for undergraduate education and general education, it is important to have the ability to use teaching resources more effectively. The integration of the life sciences could facilitate this.
4. David Gross suggested that bringing the sciences together will *facilitate processes involved with multidisciplinary grants in the life sciences*. Currently, PIs must go to multiple Deans to get things done and if all were within the Life Sciences, it would be easier. Dan Schnell supported this view. In addition, integrating the sciences would break down administrative barriers to sharing teaching resources across colleges. In both NRE and NSM, departments have expressed a willingness to share the load. Agreement on curriculum requirements, such as the language requirement, could be worked out and encourage multidisciplinary study for students.
5. Currently on campus there are 88 *centers*. These centers tend not to function across disciplines. An *institute* involving the Life Sciences would give interdisciplinary graduate programs in the Life Sciences an identity that can be strengthened and used to draw grant funding and recruit students. A single unified institute for Energy or the Environment could also be interdisciplinary and involve faculty across departments. While a faculty member's identity is first with their department, institutes could foster collaboration among faculty in different disciplines and colleges. These institutes would convey an image on the outside of faculty research and expertise at UMass. They could create funding opportunities and politicians and would know where to go and who to talk to concerning different areas and opportunities. Jane Fountain suggested that we should also be proactive in promoting our institution's expertise and be out there selling all the

time. We should be seeking out policy priorities that could generate funding opportunities. It would be useful to have a point person for this.

6. The question was raised why Computer Science would want to go into a Science college. In many universities, computer science is in the same college as engineering and polymer science. Computer science is with engineering in 13 out of 17 programs, according to Jim Kurose. Many in engineering are favorable to that grouping. Others viewed it as a model of the 80s and 90s. Andy Barto indicated that the roots of computer science are in engineering but that they reach out to other colleges as well. Some of the strongest connections are with ECE and computer science may be taking a step back if placed with engineering. Informatics and computing is hot and in some universities, there is a College of Informatics (Cornell, Indiana, Berkley). This may be similar to our IT major.
7. The scale of a large Science college would be a challenge under any organization. Deans now work 70+ hours a week. When faculty size within a college increases from 240 to 375, the organization becomes more difficult to manage. On the positive side, cross-fertilization can often happen at meetings. Nine to ten individuals meeting together may be OK but 15-18 is too many. The load of personnel committees may be unmanageable in the larger college as well. This is an issue that would need attention and thought. Research on best practices for such personnel committees would be advisable. Is there time to do the working out?
8. What structure positions the university best for success? We need to consider which structure facilitates grant funding. Undergraduate teaching may be best when the life and physical sciences are together. On the other hand, it is more challenging to evaluate faculty teaching across borders at the undergraduate level. TA resources may be another issue. All of these things and more need to be considered.