

Report of the CHFA-CSBS Reorganization Committee
to Deans Joel Martin and Robert Feldman
3/28/10

The faculty and staff of the reorganization committee with their affiliations and subcommittee assignments are:

Audrey Altstadt (History, Structure)
Douglas Anderton (Sociology & Associate Dean, Research)
James Boyce (Economics, Research)
John Bracey (Afro-American Studies, Curricula)
Jackie Brousseau-Pereira (CSBS, Development)
Elizabeth Chilton (Anthropology, Structure, co-chair CSBS)
Joanne Corbeil-Harper (Theatre, Human Resources and Finance)
Lisa Green (Linguistics, Curricula)
Anne Herrington (English, Structure)
John Hird (Political Science, Curricula)
John Kingston (Linguistics, Faculty Personnel Actions; co-chair CHFA)
Donna LeCourt (English & Associate Dean, Faculty Personnel Actions & Research)
Karen Lederer (Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies, Advising)
Ronald Michaud (Art & Associate Dean, Research)
Joya Misra (Sociology and Public Policy, Faculty Personnel Actions)
Dana Ritter (CHFA, Human Resources and Finance)
Erica Scharrer (Communication, Faculty Personnel Actions)
Karen Schoenberger (CSBS, Advising & Structure)
Nikki Stoia (Music & Associate Dean, Advising)
Melissa Walsh (CSBS, Human Resources and Finance)
Wendy Wilde (Sociology, Human Resources and Finance & Curriculum)
Ann Williams (CHFA, Human Resources and Finance)

Table of Contents

Report	Page #
Executive Summary	2
Structure	3
HR & Finance	5
Development and Alumni	7
Research	8
Curriculum	10
Advising	12
Faculty Personnel	13
Faculty and Staff Input and Recommendations from Heads and Chairs	16
General Conclusions	17

Executive Summary

We report here the findings of the committee convened by Dean Joel Martin of the College of Humanities and Fine Arts (CHFA) and Dean Robert Feldman of the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences (CSBS) to respond to Chancellor Robert Holub's proposal to merge these two Colleges. The committee was charged by the deans to determine how merging these two Colleges would affect the work of faculty, staff, and students, to estimate what challenges and costs a merger would entail, and to discover what lessons we might learn from the merger last year of the former Colleges of Natural Sciences and Mathematics (CNSM) and Natural Resource and the Environment (CNRE) into the present College of Natural Sciences (CNS). The committee is composed of faculty and staff from CSBS and CHFA. After a number of planning meetings of the entire committee in the late fall of 2009, we divided ourselves up into subcommittees that examined college structure, college human resources and finance, development and alumni relations, research, curricula, advising, and faculty personnel actions (the first page of this report lists the members of the committee and identifies the subcommittee(s) to which they contributed). Each subcommittee produced a detailed written report on their area of study late in February 2010, which was then distilled into an executive summary by mid March. Those summaries form the bulk of this report. Each of them presents the challenges a merger would raise, possible solutions to those challenges, and, where possible, estimates of the costs in dollars, time, and energies that would be incurred to implement those solutions. The chairs of this committee also met with the heads and chairs of the two Colleges. This report pulls together the executive summaries, situates them in the University's current context, relates them to last spring's survey of the university community's views on the merger proposal, to the report of the task force convened then by the Chancellor to examine that proposal, to CNS's experience, and to the heads' and chairs' reactions and advice, and recommends courses of action.

The Chancellor's proposal for the creation of a College of Humanities, Arts, and Social Science (CHASS) on March 12, 2009 outlines the potential benefits of college reorganization, principally, to save administrative costs and to remove barriers to collaboration. The task of this committee was to weigh these proposed benefits against the likely costs. The main goal of this report is to provide detailed feedback on those costs and ways those costs might be mitigated should the Colleges merge. To anticipate our conclusion before presenting the evidence that supports it, we conclude that the benefits of merging these two Colleges would have to be quite substantial to outweigh the considerable costs we identify below and to compensate for the time and energy they would take away from essential efforts to generate new revenue and create the new programs and activities needed to respond to the current and continuing financial crisis. Some of the costs would increase the base budget of the merged College and would thus reduce the savings anticipated from the merger without producing clear long term benefits. In the following sections we examine the potential challenges, solutions, and costs in each of seven major areas: administrative structure, human resources and finance, development and alumni relations, research, curricula, student advising, and faculty personnel actions.

Executive Summaries of Subcommittee Reports

The next seven sections of this report consist of the executive summaries of the subcommittees' reports.

Structure

Administrative Staff

Challenge 1. While there are many parallels in the staff responsibilities in the two Colleges, we noted first that there are simply more staff members at the Dean's level in CHFA than there are in CSBS. This is due in part to the college-level Business Office in CHFA, which centralizes many aspects of bookkeeping and financial reporting for smaller departments and programs in that College (see also under Departments). These and other functions are performed in the Dean's Office in CHFA because some departments in that college have a very small number of staff. As the campus central administration has progressively decentralized administrative functions, the Dean's Office staffs in both Colleges have taken up responsibility for carrying out these functions rather than passing them on to the departments, whose staffs are too small to handle them. Another key difference is that CSBS apparently has a tradition of stronger support at the Associate Dean level for faculty research, particularly sponsored research.

Solution 1. In any merged college it would be critical to greatly expand the Dean's level support for faculty research. One Associate Dean is overseeing this in CSBS currently and, while it is working well, a single Associate Dean could not handle the diversity of the research demands of a merged college. Presently, there is an Associate Dean for research in CHFA, too, but no Dean's Office staff provide support for sponsored research beyond basic bookkeeping services. More centralized support is particularly needed for the process of building budgets, submitting grants for review by OGCA, and resubmission. Lack of support for these stages of grant preparation at least inhibits and may even prevent faculty from applying for grants. If there were centralized support on this level, connected directly to college-level support for Faculty, we believe that faculty in both Colleges would both apply and be awarded more grants and fellowships. This is in part a University-wide issue, but in a proposed new college this issue would become even more critical given the diversity of our work, the diversity of the types of sponsors, and our need to "counterbalance" the strong sponsored research profile of the new CNS.

Cost 1. If a merger were to happen, we would propose creating an Associate Dean staff of three in the college office to support faculty research in the areas of social science, humanities, and fine arts — all of which have very different typical research profiles and sponsors. Further, if there is any centralization of administrative support for faculty, we recommend that this support focus on supporting grant preparation for sponsored research proposals. Of course, adding these new staff to the Dean's Office would increase the base budget costs in the merged College.

Challenge 2. There is a significant difference between the levels of staffing in CHFA and CSBS departments: with the exception of English, LLC, Music, and Theater, CHFA Departments tend to have 1-2 staff members, while most CSBS departments have 3-4 staff members (with programs having fewer). As noted earlier this is partly because of the centralized Business Office in CHFA. It is perhaps the difference that needs to be examined most carefully with respect to a proposed merger. The clerical and professional staff that support departments are critical to our ability to maintain excellence in our departments and programs, and are therefore not an area where any cutting should be contemplated, contrary to the Chancellor's expectation.

Solution 2. In general, it is better to give departments autonomy with respect to day-to-day bookkeeping and financial management, including administration of grants after they have been

awarded. A modified business office would still play an important role for smaller departments, stand-alone programs, or centers that do not have their own bookkeepers or where centralization of booking would be more efficient.

Cost 2. Therefore, if there is a merger of the Colleges, for the sake of efficiency and consistency, it would be important to provide additional staffing to some of the departments in CHFA, which would produce yet another increase in base budgets.

Enrollment Management

Challenge. Another area where a merger would require significant investment of Dean's staff resources is enrollment management — working with departments to balance and troubleshoot enrollment numbers with classroom space, TA allocations, and part-timer budgets. The already great variation both within and between the Colleges with respect to the scheduling of laboratories, sections, etc., in particular spaces (e.g., music or anthropology) would only be increased if the Colleges were merged. Currently, these matters are handled by the Assistant Dean in CSBS. In CHFA, they are handled primarily by individual departments.

Solution. It is critical for the Dean's staff to support the departments in managing enrollment so as to both maximize the number of students enrolled in classes and maintain the highest degree of teaching excellence.

Costs. Enrollment management must be incorporated into large scale planning with respect to facilities (see section on Facilities). Again, this is not a role that can be accomplished by one person, and we estimate that at least two staff members would be needed to assist the departments in coordinating enrollment management with respect to facilities and budgets. Adding these staff also increases base budgets.

Facilities

Challenge. If merging two of the largest Colleges on campus is to be feasible, we must consider how the College would operate, and in particular what facilities the Dean's office would need to operate effectively. Facilities always play a major role in how well an organization functions, by providing (or not) appropriate space and proximities to interacting coworkers that promote cohesive, productive, and functional administrative units.

The recent comprehensive space review for academic areas shows that this issue is important to the University. In this study, staff in Facilities and Campus Planning along with Burt Hill Architects, looked at facilities for quality, quantity, functionality and proximities.

Solution. According to a report from Facilities Planning (by Pamela Rooney), if all functions at the CSBS and CHFA Dean's level were to combine as is, 11640 nasf would be needed to house them, without any extensive redesign or refitting of the space itself. This equals the area of the Textbook Annex.

Costs. There are currently few sites on campus with this amount of square footage, and those that do exist would require relocating the units now occupying them and expensive renovations to make them usable by the Dean's Office of the merged College. The Textbook Annex is under contract for Auxiliary Services and Book Store, and comparable space elsewhere on campus is occupied by the Procurement and Controller's offices. The basic cost of renovating the Textbook Annex into office space is approximately \$3.4 million. Cost to clean up, abate,

and ventilate office space in a building such as Goodell, creating comparable office space to what the Procurement and Controller's offices currently occupy, is estimated to be minimally \$2.5 - \$3 million, before tackling the larger, building-wide systems upgrades needed for the Dean's Office (\$7.5 million). Although these would primarily be one-time costs, collectively they are substantial and would need to be applied over several fiscal years.

Research Centers

Challenge. There are more research centers and independent programs in CSBS than there are in CHFA. The main concern with respect to a merger is that in many cases these centers were created under the Deanery and not in any individual department. The goal of research centers at UMass is to create a platform that allows faculty to realize greater potential for obtaining sponsored research. Because the Dean is both an academic leader and a critical source of financial support for centers, many faculty are concerned as to whether these centers will remain vital following a merger.

Solution. Because research centers play an essential role in attracting sponsored research funding, we strongly recommend that especial care and effort be expended to sustain the academic and financial commitments that ensure the centers' continued viability, if a merger moves forward.

Recommendations

Our conclusion concerning college structure is that the proposed merger — if it is to maintain the viability of the two Colleges as research and teaching enterprises — will be costly in terms of both staff resources (in both staff time and salaries) and financial investment, particularly with respect to:

- College-level support for research
- Enrollment management
- Administrative support for departments
- Viability of research centers and independent programs
- Facilities

The increase in staff needed in both the Dean's Office and the departments to maintain viability would increase the base budget of the merged College substantially, and the estimated one-time costs for providing the facilities needed by the merged Dean's Office are considerable.

Human Resources and Finance

Leadership and Organizational Structure of the Dean's Office

Challenge. In the areas of human resources and finance, the most pressing questions are: when would the Colleges merge, who would be the Dean of the merged College, and what would be the organizational structure of the merged College – divisional or fully integrated? Discussions with staff in the Dean's Office of the new CNS revealed that not answering these questions ahead of time greatly exacerbated the difficulties of merging the old CNSM and CNRE.

Solution. Having the opportunity to work with a new leader for 6-12 months before a merger actually took place would allow for careful planning in setting up the new administrative structure and fostering cooperation amongst the staff for an optimal transition. To aid in a successful merger, a new Dean would have to make informed decisions on a division of labor within the dean's level staff, with input from the staff and other personnel on campus with whom they interact on a regular basis. If prior planning time was not possible, a temporary divisional structure might afford some of the same benefits.

Costs. Without prior planning there would be a longer adjustment period at a time when there is also an increased workload due to moving, integrating files, and developing a new structure "as we go." The general functioning of the College would be hampered during a period of transition, undermining productivity, faculty services, and the morale of staff.

Attrition at the Dean's level would be minimal due to the demographics of the current staff in both Colleges. When we are able once again to recruit tenure track faculty at the level needed, additional staff would be required to handle increased workloads. Therefore, little or no cost savings in staff at the Dean's level would be realized.

Housing the Dean's Office

Challenge. Availability of space and the relocation of staff, office contents, and personnel files for approximately 600 current faculty and staff along with additional inactive files of 400+ would be time consuming and costly (see also the discussion of the likely space needs of the merged Dean's Office on page 4). The condition of the buildings in which both Colleges are presently located would pose a challenge as a structural engineer would have to determine a location that could hold the tremendous weight of these files.

Solution and costs. Prior planning with representatives from each College working with facilities and space management to plan the most effective space and equipment allocations would be essential. Office renovations to accommodate a reorganized staff would also pose a significant cost in addition to hiring a moving contractor to make the actual moves.

Adopting Common Business Practices

Challenges. The business practices in the two Colleges are very different and merging them would also present a challenge. CHFA has a more centralized model whereas CSBS is more decentralized.

Solution and costs. Consultation between the new Dean and College staff would help to implement best practices from each College, which would minimize disruption of daily operations. Although a merger in any form would interfere (at least in the transition phase) with the functioning of daily operations, input from those most directly affected can only serve to increase morale and overall cooperation.

Currently each Dean's Office has a distinct personnel database management system. The merging of these two systems could cost in the area of \$20-30K or more and would be very time consuming. This could, however, create an opportunity for an entirely new networked based system which, although useful, could cost even more. Until a new system could be developed, the two distinct databases would have to be maintained.

Development and Alumni Relations

Personnel Changes and Merger Stress

Challenge. The greatest challenge facing the area of development, communications and alumni relations is reconfiguring the staff. Currently, there are six full-time and two part-time staff focused on these activities in the two Colleges. Each of these people is already occupied with a full complement of work. The stress of a merger along with the time it will take to determine positions will be very challenging. In both Colleges, this is an area that has traditionally been understaffed and only very recently have steps been taken to increase staff to support these necessary functions.

Solution. Decide early who will lead the merged College so that work can begin as soon as possible to determine how to best use the staff resources available. Staff should be included in any discussion of how the work will be assigned.

Costs: Most of the costs here are opportunity costs, as the time it will take to reorganize the office will be time that would otherwise be spent by staff working on their current activities. Retooling job descriptions and reassigning responsibilities will most likely be a time-consuming and stressful process. Also, the time associated with making changes in office staffing due to the merger may have a negative effect on the number of visits development staff can make and we may therefore see a decrease in incoming gifts. Based on conversations with the other merged College, there is also a possibility that one or more of the unions on campus may be involved in this task. This could lead to actual legal costs.

Merger of Alumni Advisory Boards

Challenge. Each College has an alumni advisory board, but they are at very different stages of development. Both the CSBS and CHFA boards have been active for more than 5 years and board members have been very involved in branding and fundraising efforts for the Colleges. Bringing these two groups together will require thoughtful consideration and possibly delicate management.

Solution. Name a new Dean quickly so that s/he can consult with the chairs and members of both boards regarding the best way to involve the alumni advisory boards.

Costs. As with the first challenge, most of the costs associated with this action are costs of time. Hopefully, this would not lead to a drop in giving by any of the board members involved, but that is a possibility that cannot be dismissed casually.

Rebranding

Challenge. Each College has its own branding materials and communications, including a website, print materials and other promotional pieces.

Solution. Work quickly to establish a leader for the new College to work through the staff changes and decide on a branding strategy for moving forward.

Costs. With a merger, at least two types of costs will be associated with any rebranding strategy. There will be staff costs associated with creating a new brand as well as rolling out the new branding effort. There may be a cost too in engagement with alumni, some of whom will

have unknowingly changed College affiliations three times in two years. Finally, there will be fiscal costs associated with recreating collateral materials and establishing a new website.

Development

Challenge. Development officers and the Dean will have to work to create a fundraising vision for the new College. This also means prioritizing visits with donors. Typically, the Dean is only involved in development visits for prospects above a certain threshold of giving. Combining Colleges will increase the number of prospects. This will put a strain on the Dean's time when s/he will also be working to integrate two separate entities.

Solution. It does not seem to be a way around this. Again, finding out quickly who is to lead this new entity would help in the planning but the work is still there to be done (as with all of the challenges above).

Costs. Actual costs associated with this challenge might be the loss of gift funds because of changing priorities for development and staff being diverted from their work while managing the merger itself. Also, as with all of the issues discussed in this section, the incoming Dean of this College has enormous challenges to face in bringing these two large entities together successfully. This person will have to be involved in all aspects of the merger – it is impossible to do this all well and without high costs in time and morale.

Research

“The prestige of this campus rests, to a great extent, on the research and creative activity conducted here. Whatever form this takes — articles, books, conference presentations, patents, paintings, or performances — the recognition that it receives within each of the disciplines contributes to the reputation of the whole institution” (Chancellor's Framework for Excellence). In a Research 1 University, maintaining the research productivity and reputation of *all* departments should be one of the central priorities shaping any reorganization of units.

Research Productivity and Diversity

Challenge. The most obvious challenge of reorganization would be maintaining the high level and quality of faculty research activity in both Colleges. This can only be accomplished by respecting diverse research models. Both CHFA and CSBS have made significant strides in research productivity through investments in faculty research support in recent years. Currently, both Colleges invest significant resources in faculty research and do so in some similar ways (e.g., support for junior faculty, travel funding for professional presentations/exhibitions, and start-up packages). At the same time, each College emphasizes different kinds of research and funding that reflect different paradigms within faculties. Faculty in either College can and do engage in both kinds of research, but there are significant differences in the prevalence of each paradigm among faculty, and the corresponding research support needs of such faculty, in each College. Much of the research conducted in the humanities and arts requires more support for scholars working independently and for international on-site and archival research as well as performances and exhibitions. Much of the research in the social and behavioral sciences emphasizes analytical and data-oriented peer-reviewed studies. Accommodating such different notions of research, both of which are critical to the reputation of the university, requires both the support structures which have emerged for more individual research efforts (e.g. fellowships, travel and archival work) and those which have been created to support externally

funded and large-scale collaborative research efforts (e.g. NIH and NSF grants support and matching funds, interdisciplinary research centers, and faculty pre- and post-award support).

Solution. One solution to this challenge is to maintain the different infrastructures for research support within each College. Research centers (e.g., Center for Heritage and Society, Social and Demographic Research Institute), have proven very useful in developing staff resources within research units that have in turn notably increased productivity of faculty within those units by tailoring expertise to the activities of related faculty. As the Research Council noted in its report on reorganization last year, research centers “have strong track records of obtaining sponsored research and are highly visible externally.” The more independent, individually-led research activities require different infrastructures and rely more upon seminars (e.g., the Interdisciplinary Seminar in the Humanities and Fine Arts), conferences, and individual faculty support. Similarly, many faculty, particularly in the arts, also work in paradigms that equate activity (e.g. performances and exhibitions) or service to the community with research; this activity and service requires different infrastructures amenable to the performing arts, archival and editorial work, or outreach and applied research. As a result, funding mechanisms in each College are both similar and different. Many infrastructure programs developed in the social and behavioral sciences, not surprisingly, involve faculty heavily in review of seed support and collective research pursuits. While peer review processes also play a role, many programs developed in humanities and the fine arts also require timely response to fellowship opportunities and direct requests to the Dean's office. While any consideration of reorganization should learn from the best practices of all units involved, it should also place a high priority on preserving the merits of the college-specific systems which have been carefully developed and nurtured, with positive results, over the recent past.

Resource Allocation and the Balance of Research and Teaching

Challenge. The other chief challenge posed to research by reorganization is the danger of creating a chronically underfunded research faculty within a “teaching” or “service” college. Since organization at a college level can largely shape the distribution of externally sponsored research activities, both Colleges are concerned about the substantial reliance on indirect cost returns, or RTF, as the primary funding mechanism for supporting research development and infrastructure. This mechanism, without a flow of investment across RTF-rich and poor organizational enclaves, perpetuates inequality and threatens to cumulatively inhibit research activities in those areas where investment is most needed. RTF provides support for necessary startup costs, matching funds and allows existing research activities to help develop previously underdeveloped research areas or new endeavors.

For faculty whose sponsored research may not generate RTF (e.g. fellowships, service-related research activities, performances, exhibitions), alternative sources of matching funding are needed that do not rely solely on RTF income. Faculty in both CHFA and CSBS have historically had less access to external research funding and indirect costs than faculty in CNS. In FY09, for example, CNS generated \$77,385,500 in externally funded expenditures, CSBS \$2,797,700, and CHFA \$788,200. Externally sponsored research expenditures per faculty member in CSBS were only 9 percent, and in CHFA only 1.6 percent, of those of CNS faculty. Given the relatively lower research related costs (e.g. facilities, startup) in the social sciences and humanities and fine arts, the relative returns to the institution for research investment are somewhat less skewed than these totals suggest.

Nonetheless, if recent and future reorganization perpetuates the segregation of indirect cost returns into one college, and faculty research support remains heavily dependent on those

indirect cost returns, the effect of reorganization will not be a “binary star” system, but a further ghettoization of underfunded research faculty in those very Colleges that have the greatest contact with our students and future alumni. Faculty in both Colleges do need to generate more sponsored research, and many of them are increasingly engaged in larger collaborative research across College boundaries and funding agencies. However, despite this trend, funding opportunities for research faculty in many disciplines or sub-fields within both Colleges are likely to remain less available and funded on a smaller scale (e.g., in 2005-06, research expenditures in the humanities came to just 0.45% of the federal total¹).

Solution. Any reorganization plan should either preserve the specialized research support, investment and infrastructures created to serve very different needs, or actively involve faculty across Colleges in any specific discussion of plans to change the research organization they have created to meet these needs. The contributions and needs of *all* faculty must be represented and understood across traditional divides if changes to existing research-related activities are to receive the same care they have received within recently re-configured Colleges. To do anything less is to relegate these Colleges to mere blunt instruments serving reorganization rather than the needs of research faculty.

Failing to redistribute RTF, at the same time as student revenues are effectively redistributed institution-wide, means that teaching activities by faculty in CSBS and CHFA are subsidizing research activity and lower teaching loads in other Colleges while reinvestment in CSBS and CHFA research activities is lagging and lacking. This redistribution becomes apparent when we consider that CHFA and CSBS together are responsible for approximately 40% of the student seats offered at the university (CNS 27.8%). The two Colleges currently house 37% of the total undergraduate student majors. Additionally, over 54% of students in CHFA courses and 44% in CSBS are students from other Colleges, demonstrating the large investment both Colleges make to General Education.

One solution to this challenge is to consider alternative funding mechanisms for research support. If students come to a Research 1 University to benefit from an active research faculty and to engage in faculty research, the reinvestment of student revenues (or an equivalent commitment to redistribute indirect costs) must recognize the ultimate source of institutional revenues and make a commitment to investment in research in those faculties that attract and teach our students. Otherwise, a college risks valuing teaching over research activity and realigning resources that could leave research interests severely underfunded. Without redistribution of RTF, and with no direct fiscal incentives for monetization of student credit hours envisioned, there is no new mechanism to address these inequities in research resources. In assessing the potential costs of a proposed college merger and the potential for further reorganization, not to redistribute RTF or to recognize differences in the student credit hours in resource distributions to the Colleges is perhaps the greatest threat to the national standing of many of the departments and programs within CHFA and CSBS.

Curricula

Faculty in CHFA and CSBS teach 40.9% of the student credit hours for the University. Overall the number of student credit hours that each College dedicates to lower division courses, on the

¹American Academy of Arts and Sciences, “Figure IV:10a: Academic Research and Development Expenditures in the Humanities and Other Selected Fields, Fiscal Year 2005-2006.” *Humanities Resource Center Online*. http://www.humanitiesindicators.org/content/hrcolImageFrame.aspx?i=IV-10a.jpg&o=hrcolVD.aspx_topIV10. Retrieved February 8, 2010.

one hand, and to graduate courses, on the other, is quite similar; however, the Colleges differ in other areas, such as undergraduate requirements and teaching loads. Differences, such as those that relate to College requirements and teaching loads and graduate student teaching, should be taken into consideration from the perspective of the proposed merger of the two Colleges.

College Requirements for Undergraduates

Challenge. Undergraduate majors in CHFA and CSBS have to fulfill different College requirements in addition to the University requirements. For example, they have to take courses outside of their own Colleges that are designed to enhance exposure to global and regional perspectives and to strengthen analytic reasoning skills. Undergraduate majors in CHFA are required to take courses in CSBS and CNS, for example, and they must also meet the CHFA foreign language requirement. Undergraduate majors in CSBS have to fulfill the Global Education Requirement.

Costs and suggestions. A number of questions arise about these requirements in light of reorganization. Would the merger make it possible/necessary to (re-)state the requirements in terms of requirements for a united College or will they stand as they are, such that CHFA departments and CSBS departments will retain separate requirements after they have merged? It will probably be possible to work out a set of terms or requirements for the merged departments eventually, but given the possible student confusion and the extent to which many students who will be affected will have already begun to fulfill their requirements under the current College structure, it may be more practical to leave the requirements as they are for a period after the merger and subsequently work on a “reconciliation” plan. The changes will also greatly affect the advising administration in both Colleges.

Teaching Loads and Graduate Student Teaching

Challenge. CHFA has more faculty and teaches more total student credit hours than CSBS, and more general education courses are taught in CHFA than in CSBS. More CHFA faculty than CSBS faculty teach lower division courses, and slightly more CSBS faculty teach upper division and graduate courses than CHFA faculty. CSBS has more majors than CHFA, and the number of majors per faculty member in CSBS is more than double that in CHFA. In addition, the ratio of student credit hours to faculty in CSBS is higher than in CHFA. More CHFA resources are devoted to servicing general education courses, and more CSBS resources are devoted to teaching majors. The teaching loads for faculty vary across the Colleges, at least as measured by courses. While the teaching load for CSBS faculty is consistently 2-2, some faculty in CHFA departments have 2-3, 3-2, and even 3-3 teaching loads.

Graduate student instructional activity varies across Colleges with respect to lower and upper division courses. For example, 84% of CHFA teaching associates teach lower division courses, and 16% teach upper division courses. In CSBS, 52% of teaching associates teach lower division courses, and 48% teach upper division courses.

Costs and Recommendations. The data regarding teaching loads and graduate student teaching underscore the variation across Colleges, which can be addressed from the angle of equity. Questions regarding departmental teaching loads arise in comparisons of departments within Colleges across campus, so they are certain to arise in a merger if departments from one College are seen as teaching more/less than departments from the other College. Efforts should be made either to “equalize” teaching loads or to explain variation in terms of overall workloads.

The process would have implications for other areas, such as course releases, teaching budgets and graduate student support. As reported by CHFA faculty, it is not uncommon for them to teach overloads in order to offer the classes that “must be taught.” In such cases, it may not be possible for them to take course releases even if they are granted. In still other cases, a course release may turn out to be a 2-2 load — which is a full load for some departments — instead of a 3-2 or even heavier load.

Assessing “equity” in teaching across very different departments is complex and the number of courses taught is just one factor in evaluating “teaching load;” others may include student credit hours taught, hours required outside the classroom (e.g., grading, labs), the nature of the course (e.g., writing-intensive courses versus large lectures), etc. Working to solve the equity issue could have implications for hiring new faculty, graduate student TA allocations, adjunct teaching, etc. Significant resources may be necessary to address the course load equity issue, and it is an issue that is sure to attract significant attention should a merger transpire. Any changes must be carefully considered, as increasing graduate student teaching, for example, would lengthen the time to complete the degree. Also, teaching loads need to be discussed in considering the possible link between designing online and other courses and sources of revenue.

Advising

Two recent major events in College-based advising at the University form the basis of this report. One is the dissolution of the Arts and Sciences Advising Center as of July 1st, 2009, per the mandate of the previous Provost, Charlena Seymour, and the expenditure of an enormous amount of dollars and staff time that were and still are involved with that massive undertaking, and the other is the merging of the former NSM and NRE Colleges, including the acquisition of the psychology major. As a result of these two events we now have separate CHFA, CSBS, and CNS Advising Centers. Each advising center literally serves thousands of students and is in the process of continually enhancing its multi-faceted advising services and pursuing new advising initiatives, the latter of which neither CHFA nor CSBS (or CNSM for that matter) was able to do under the umbrella of the former Arts & Sciences Advising Center. That center, with a great amount of staff collegiality (which continues among the Colleges today), was able to employ only enough staff members to serve students in advising appointments, reviewing and rendering decisions on the many and varied student petitions received, rendering academic discipline decisions and developing appropriate academic plans, coordinating and advising during January and Summer Orientation sessions, clearing students for graduation, handling any number of academic emergencies, and much more. The CHFA and CSBS Advising Centers now have almost enough staff to conduct all their advising work, to examine what they do to continually improve services, and to take leadership roles in supporting recruitment and retention.

After interviewing the two CNS Advising Center Associate Deans, who collaborated in the formation of the Center, it became clear to us that due to the simultaneous timing of the CNRE/CNSM merger and the dissolution of the Arts & Sciences Advising Center, the integration of CNS Advising has worked for that College. Keep in mind that the CNS Advising Center has not yet experienced the entire full-year cycle of advising, including the tremendous demands of Summer Orientation advising.

Challenge. Re-integrating advising would be an entirely different matter for CHFA and CSBS. Each College has engaged in a rigorous two-year process to arrive at the current CHFA and

CSBS Advising Centers, with the physical renovation of the CHFA Advising Center finally happening during this 2010 Spring Break.

Each advising center – CNS (former CNRE/CNSM), CSBS, and CHFA – is now finally operating with a number of staff that is somewhat closer to what is needed. CNS hired an additional full-time professional advisor and may be hiring another; CSBS hired a new Executive Director (a full-time Associate Dean) for its Advising Center, who works with another Associate Academic Dean, and two advising TAs, and CHFA hired a new Undergraduate Success Coordinator (full-time staff position, dedicated to recruitment and retention). CNS will move to renovated space in Morrill; CSBS moved into renovated space in Thompson (particularly well done, with offices appropriate to academic advising – addressing privacy issues, etc.); and CHFA will, after perseverance in woefully sub-standard space, enjoy a renovation of its current Machmer space during this Spring Break. While the space will still not be large enough to accommodate all of the CHFA Advising Center operations, at least its front-line and advising areas will no longer be so inadequate.

Solution. A viable, integrated advising structure that could adequately serve CHFA and CSBS majors would require a new space. This space would need to be identified by Space Management, as there is currently no suitable space belonging to either College. This space would need to be appropriately located on campus, as well as sized and configured for the needs of advising over 6,000 majors.

Costs. The amount of stress and extra work that the staff of both advising centers has already undergone cannot be emphasized enough. A merged center would create a large amount of initial extra work for University staff as well – for example, the Registrar's Office and OIR staff had to literally recode majors' data when CNS was created. Space would have to be identified and configured and/or renovated. As for the Dean's Office for the merged College, the cost of providing this space would be considerable even if it were one-time. Yet another advising organizational structure would need to be implemented. A merged center would require new branding information and literature, a new website, and general communications of yet another advising center change to students and University staff and faculty. There would be a loss of College identity for students, and there would be a significant amount of initial student confusion. For example, many students have only just now learned where their advising centers are, and they would have to learn yet another location after the Colleges merged.

Benefits. A merged center would examine the requirements for those double-majors in CHFA and CSBS. There would be continued Academic Dean collegiality, as well as coordination and cooperation between the centers. There would be an examination and application of the best practices of both College advising centers and major advising.

Recommendation

We strongly believe that the costs outweigh the benefits. CHFA and CSBS majors have now made a real connection with the separate advising centers. An enormous amount of money and human effort has also gone into establishing these new separate advising centers. Given the current campus space constraints, and the Colleges' distinctly different requirements and somewhat different advising philosophies and structures, we believe that if the two Colleges merge, the best solution for advising would be to have the centers remain separate, but coordinating and cooperating when sensible. Ultimately CHFA majors, CSBS majors, and the University would be best served with enhanced advising service and significant dedication to recruitment and retention initiatives.

Faculty Personnel Actions

Personnel actions for tenure-stream and contract faculty in CHFA and CSBS both resemble and differ from one another in important ways. We address the challenges these differences present and offer tentative solutions below.

Ensuring High-Quality Evaluation of Faculty Performance

Challenge. Both Colleges currently do an excellent job of ensuring rigorous, discipline-specific standards to tenures and promotions, with standards applied fairly and thoughtfully. The committees that handle faculty personnel actions also already carry out a tremendous amount of work over the course of the year. If, as is likely, this workload were doubled as a result of merging the two Colleges, it could become so burdensome that reviews of both tenure-track and contract faculty would become less engaged and rigorous. The merged Personnel Committee in CNS dealt with over 20 tenure and 4.2 reviews last fall and is dealing with over 20 promotion and 4.2 reviews this spring. This is one-third more than the number of cases that the Personnel Committee in CHFA and the Executive Committee in CSBS have on their plates in a typical year. Moreover, while the new CNS Personnel Committee has developed some excellent practices, they have yet to have a meeting where all 15 members are present; as a result they operate with a quorum of 9.

Solution. The heavy workload could be addressed by providing faculty on College Personnel Committees with teaching and service reductions in their home departments while they serve on these committees. Compensating for course reductions for 15 or more faculty would add to the affected departments' base budgets. An alternative solution is to maintain a divisional structure, with separate committees for the legacy HFA and SBS Colleges. The workload would remain what it now is, and the same high level of quality would be maintained without additional support.

Coping with More Diverse Standards of Performance

Challenge. The diverse standards for research, teaching, and service in the two Colleges also create substantial challenges. While there is significant heterogeneity within Colleges (e.g., cultural anthropology and economics; dance and linguistics), merging the two Colleges would lead to even greater diversity in expectations and standards, and an even greater distance between the experiences of committee members and personnel cases. This is equally if not more true of lecturers, who play extremely different roles in different departments.

Solution. One solution, following the example of CNS, would be for each department to develop/draft a "culture" document that prescribes standards for evaluating its faculty members for the members of the College personnel committee and outside reviewers. However, this would require substantial time from faculty in each of the merging departments, as well as the potential for conflict over how the College-level committee reads these documents and applies them to personnel cases. A divisional structure would be another solution, though it still may require some additional expenditure of administrator, staff, and faculty time to work out how the two committees would develop similar processes to ensure fair and equitable treatment. If the divisional structure solution were not adopted, evaluating faculty who were hired under the previous College structure would present an additional challenge. CNS handles such legacy cases by offering the affected faculty the choice of being evaluated by those committee members that came from their original College or by the entire committee.

Constituting the Personnel Committee

Challenge. The Personnel Committee of CHFA and the Executive Committee of CSBS are presently constituted in quite different ways. They differ in how their members are selected, whether the candidate's department is represented on the committee, whether that representative participates in the discussion, and in the role of the Associate Dean on the committee. Each department is represented on the CSBS Executive Committee (like CNS), while CHFA elects members from districts that represent a number of departments. The departmental representatives on the CSBS Executive Committee participate in discussion of candidates from their departments, but do not vote, while any member of the CHFA Personnel committee who belongs to the candidate's department is recused from the case entirely. The Associate Dean for personnel attends meetings of the CSBS Executive Committee, where he or she advises the committee on procedure, while the corresponding Associate Dean in CHFA does not attend Personnel Committee meetings.

These differences pose twofold challenges: moving to the CHFA approach may make those in legacy CSBS departments feel disenfranchised; moving to a CSBS approach would lead to an excessively large committee (approximately 18 members), which could make decision-making and high quality discussion and evaluation difficult. It might also over-burden faculty members in small CHFA departments who would have to serve on the Committee every few years.

Solution. Once again, a divisional structure that maintains the different practices of the two Colleges is a possible solution. An alternative would be to work with the university Ombudsperson to develop an approach to handling personnel cases that faculty from both Colleges would find legitimate. This alternative would require significant staff and faculty time to achieve.

Merging Records

Challenge. The physical and electronic personnel files that the two Colleges must now maintain are very numerous, and the software used by the College Personnel Officers is not the same. The physical records also take up considerable space, and the Colleges have already invested heavily in consultants in setting up the software they each use.

Solution. Permanent staff would need to spend a considerable amount of time in merging the two sets of files and software, additional temporary staff would be needed to achieve the merger expeditiously, and further resources would have to be invested in software consultants to ensure that the new software worked properly. There also would be the cost at identifying a space to hold the many physical files of the two Colleges. All tenure and promotion file contents were scanned and available on-line through a password-protected system to the CNS Personnel Committee this year for the first time. While this practice made it easier for the Personnel Committee to review files, it does not ameliorate the need for space to store physical files, and it also requires considerable staff time to scan all the documents. There is likewise little or no prospect for cost-savings from staff mergers, as the existing College Personnel offices are currently understaffed, and a merger would require additional staff time.

A divisional structure is once again an attractive alternative, though it should include efforts to adopt common administrative processes. The efforts required to bring a divisional structure about would take up considerable staff time and should include an effort to bring staff to the number needed to handle the increased workloads. Doing so would add to the merged

College's base budget.

Recommendation

The proposed merger will not lead to more effective approaches to handling faculty personnel actions. If a College merger moves forward, a divisional structure is clearly the best solution to all the challenges discussed above.

The Reorganization Taskforce Report, Faculty and Staff Input, and Recommendations from Heads and Chairs,

Aside from the individual subcommittee reports, which are summarized above, we should acknowledge information gleaned from four other sources: the Reorganization Task Force's Report from last year, faculty input, discussions with our counterparts in CNS, and current input from Heads and Chairs.

The Reorganization Task Force Report

Last year the Reorganization Task Force, chaired by Jane Fountain and appointed by Chancellor Holub, recommended strongly against a merger of the current Colleges of HFA and SBS. Instead, they recommended (in order of priority: (1) a College of Arts and Sciences (CAS, which would include the Colleges of HFA, SBS, and the former Colleges of NSM and NRE); or (2) a merger of the Colleges of NSM and NRE (into the current College of NS) and the maintenance of the current HFA and SBS Colleges. They also noted that #2 could be considered a step towards #1 in the long term. We would like to echo these recommendations and say that they are consistent with our evaluation one year later.

Faculty input

Faculty input comes primarily from the blog survey that was conducted by the Reorganization Task Force last February-March. These comments were not a statistically representative sample. However, of the 21 responses, most of which were from faculty in CHFA and CSBS, the response to a merged College was quite negative. Our sense from talking throughout the intervening year both formally and informally with colleagues from across campus is that most faculty and staff are still quite negative about the prospects for a major shift in academic leadership and administrative process under the current unstable conditions at the University.

Discussions with our CNS counterparts

The most obvious difference between the new CNS and the proposed CHASS is that most of the departments in the former CNSM and CNRE wanted to merge, because doing so would remove impediments to collaboration, particularly in getting sponsored research funding. It is clear that on the whole, faculty and administrators in CHFA and CSBS do not want to merge. In light of this difference, we found it telling in the discussions with faculty and staff in CNS that they dwelt on the difficulties in implementing the merger rather than rejoicing in the benefits that were supposed to accrue from it. Those difficulties have so far largely prevented them from accomplishing what they had hoped to achieve with the merger. This result, which the discussion of challenges and costs above anticipates in detail, indicates that the benefits of merging our two Colleges have to be much more clearly established in advance to overcome a reluctance to merge that is supported by such a weight of evidence.

In the committee's meeting with Dean Goodwin, he suggested that the benefits of merging were primarily in college-level advising. He felt that the research synergies were not buoyed by the merger, that "faculty will find collaborators on campus when they need to." Further, we discovered that the cost savings in the College's base budget came primarily from attrition in staff through retirement. We would not expect similar attrition given the relative age and seniority of most of the Dean's level staff. Given understaffing across the board in the two Colleges, any purposeful reduction in staffing would be devastating to the academic and research units.

Input from CSBS and CHFA Heads and Chairs

Finally, the co-chairs of this committee met with the Heads and Chairs of CSBS and CHFA (separately). The CSBS Chairs were very seriously concerned about how drastically this would affect everyone's time, energy, and focus. They noted that their biggest fear was that this would take energy away from investment in many of the new initiatives on campus that are designed to generate new revenue streams and to improve the excellence of our University. They especially noted the disruptions in staff time, and emphasized that there were already too many destabilizers operating at this time. They expressed concern about reductions in research and teaching productivity, and suggested that if any merger must happen that it be done in a sequence such that it does not begin until after the new programs and initiatives settle down over the next two years, and after the state budget stabilizes.

The concerns of the CHFA heads and chairs complemented those of their CSBS counterparts, as well as echoing a number of the challenges raised by the subcommittee reports. They agree that the distribution of revenues between the Colleges does not currently reflect the very large number of undergraduate students taught by CHFA and CSBS. Redistribution is needed if these Colleges are to achieve the "margin of excellence" in research as well as teaching advocated by the Chancellor. Moreover, any merger must preserve the benefits of the already costly investments that the Colleges have already made individually to promote research, improve advising, and support the development of faculty on the way to tenure. It must likewise preserve the reputation of the highly ranked departments and programs in the two Colleges. Uncertainty about when the merger would occur, how the Dean of the merged College would be chosen, and what would be the administrative structure of the merged Colleges also undermine confidence in the process. Some concern was expressed about whether the small size of a number of CHFA departments would make them vulnerable in the much larger unit created by the merger. The CHFA chairs brought up the issue of power balance in the creation of a larger college as a "counter-balance" to the new CNS. It was noted that the most important criteria for decisions about campus investment and administration should stem from campus priorities. Thus, it was felt that having two Deans on the south end of campus may actually help them to advocate for their units better than if there was one Dean of one larger combined College.

General Conclusions

To conclude, the benefits of the proposed merger would have to be overwhelmingly large to eclipse the significant one-time and base costs that our committee has identified. All aspects of the proposed merger would be costly both in real dollars and in terms of faculty and staff time and effort. These costs would not be met quickly but instead over a period of years. Many of the

costs add to the base budgets rather than being one-time, and some of the one-time costs are quite large. This evidence indicates that we should hesitate to merge even in good times, when we have all the resources we would need to pull the merger off successfully. But these times are not good times. Instead, we are working in a period of ever shrinking resources, and current economic forecasts predict that the recovery, such as it is, will be slow and halting. Given these conditions, all members of the university community have been asked to think of ways to generate additional revenue, and the evidence is that we have engaged vigorously in this task. The vigor of this engagement demonstrates that the faculty and staff in the two Colleges are more than willing to take on additional, often hard work when the benefits are clear. A merger of our Colleges would likely undermine this engagement and thus sabotage this necessary effort to gain better control over our financial future.

If the administration decides to move forward with this proposed merger, then it must acknowledge and provide for the substantial financial and productivity costs, as well as the negative impact on morale and working conditions. Mitigating these impacts would require considerable financial investment, strong and consistent leadership at the Dean's level, and a great deal of time. A vital part of this mitigation is the choice of the academic leader of the new College. A great deal of time and care would have to go into this extremely important decision. All members of this committee acknowledge that Deans are far more than senior administrators: they provide academic leadership and vision to the Colleges they oversee. Having a Dean chosen before such a merger takes place would be the key to maintaining a positive faculty and staff morale, to insuring that the new College has a champion from the outset, and to implementing as smooth a transition as possible. These efforts must also ensure that the benefits the Colleges have gained from their considerable investments in research support, advising, and development and alumni relations are not lost. Further, some kind of divisional structure would also seem necessary regardless of timing.

Finally, while the main focus of this committee was inward-looking, we want to underscore that no major research university in the U.S. has a College like the proposed College of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences: at a minimum it would need to include the Department of Psychology in order to be viable both intellectually and financially. We recommend that if a merger is deemed necessary that other models be considered, such as a College of Arts and Sciences.

Acknowledgement

The committee could not have accomplished even a small portion of the work it did without the exceptional help and support provided by its two research assistants, Amanda Carr from English and Grace Cleary from Anthropology. Every member of both Colleges owes them an enormous debt of gratitude.