

**APPENDIX II: FACULTY SENATE COUNCIL REPORTS**

**Academic Priorities Council  
Report on Campus Reorganization  
April 7, 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, 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 preserve 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:

- An exact list of departments within each division needs to be worked out. Concern was expressed about departments moving to colleges against their will. In these cases, it is proposed that Faculty Senate approval be required in a manner to be determined by the Rules Committee.
- 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.
- 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.

March 2, 2009

**TO:** Chairs and Members of the Academic Matters Council, the Undergraduate Education Council, and the Faculty Senate Rules Committee  
**FROM:** The General Education Council  
**RE:** Plan for reorganization of the University

The General Education Council does not, as a Council, support any specific reorganization proposal, but we strongly urge that any plan address the following three questions as they bear upon the future of our General Education program – a program that constitutes a full third of the current undergraduate experience.

**(1) Resources:**

We have learned from hard experience, when confronted with earlier reorganizations, to look at the practical bottom line and to note that the question of resource support for General Education is generally not addressed as an important consequence of reorganization. And so we ask the following: Will any college that provides the bulk of General Education have to choose between this obligation and that of serving their undergraduate majors, as some of our schools and colleges have already decided to do in this challenging fiscal environment? Will there be some redistribution of resources to insure the integrity and quality of General Education, as the responsibility for providing faculty and TA resources moves from one Deanship to another?

**(2) Interdisciplinarity:**

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

**(3) Curricular Incentives:**

We believe that there are opportunities for all schools and colleges to contribute to the General Education and that reorganization can provide leverage to engage those opportunities. Currently, a few schools and colleges carry the bulk of the General Education curriculum, a situation that is not healthy for General Education on this campus. We urge that a reorganization proposal ask whether there will be clear financial and curricular incentives for those colleges that do not currently contribute to General Education to begin to do so, so that the burden of providing the General Education curriculum not be further split and de-institutionalized.

We urge that these key questions be explicitly addressed by any reorganization proposal that gains traction and is carried forward for campus consideration. We ask that any reorganization proposal be examined on the basis of its positive contribution to the resources, the interdisciplinarity, and curricular incentives for this campus’ General Education program.

**The Impact of the Reorganization Proposal on  
Graduate Education**

**A Report of the Graduate Council  
to  
The Faculty Senate**

**Submitted by  
Linda Shea, Chair of the Graduate Council  
April 20, 2009**

## Important Note

The following Graduate Council (GC) report contains responses to the Chancellor's first proposal for reorganization. The Graduate Council is pleased that the modified (most recent) reorganization proposal takes into account many of the perspectives voiced in this report.

## Our Charge

The Graduate Council received a request from Ernest May, Secretary of the Faculty Senate, on February 8 to prepare and submit a preliminary report no later than March 6. Specifically, the charge was as follows:

*"The Rules Committee is requesting that the Graduate Council, in addition to making whatever comments it deems appropriate, provide a report focused on:  
"Impact of the Reorganization Proposal on Graduate Education (if any): please evaluate."*

## The Process

The request for feedback was made approximately one week before the regular meeting of the Graduate Council in February. A few members solicited comments from Graduate Program Directors (GPDs) and other administrators and faculty in their colleges. Limited feedback was received prior to the meeting; however, the request for feedback was discussed. The GC members concluded that they did not have access to enough details of the plan upon which to comment. This response was reported back to Senate Secretary May. Ernest May then forwarded the link to the Chancellor's statement of the reorganization plan and reiterated the request for a report on its impact on graduate education.

The re-request was sent to GC members. Subsequently, several met with GPDs and some forwarded the request to others in their Colleges and Schools. Comments were sent to Linda Shea, Chair of the GC and David Dudek, Graduate Student Assistant to the Chair. The following section summarizes the feedback received by Sunday, March 1, 2009. All written feedback is contained in the appendix to this report.

## Summary of Feedback

Comments centered on two areas: the impact of the reorganization on graduate education and other related concerns about the reorganization and the process of reorganization. The charge to this committee is about graduate education; hence, this report will focus on that.

Feedback was offered by eleven individuals representing the following departments/schools: Chemistry, Microbiology, Biochemistry, Molecular Biology, the Isenberg School of Management, Anthropology, Language, Literature, and Culture, English, and Continuing Education. Support and opposition seem to cluster by school and departments. From this group, supporters of the reorganization reference their link to the merger between NRE and NSM and also the merger of the Resource Economics department into the Isenberg School of Management. Those opposing the reorganization reference the proposed SBS and HFA merger with some opposition from NRE Departments for the NRE/SM merger.

We did not receive feedback with regard to the proposed merger of Public Health and Nursing.

### **Favorable Effects on Graduate Education:**

#### **Support for merging NRE and NSM and Resource Economics with Isenberg SOM**

Based on this small sample, faculty from the Departments of Chemistry, Microbiology, Biochemistry, Molecular Biology, and School of Management believe the reorganization will likely benefit graduate education. Many faculty members in these areas recognize the potential for cross-disciplinary synergies and collaboration among faculty and graduate students. They also mention the benefit of reporting to one Dean and branding opportunities. The favorable responses seem to come from representatives of NSM and the Isenberg School of Management. Some opposition for the NRE/NSM merger came from members of NRE and are referenced in item 7 of the related concerns section below. In referring to the merger between NRE and NSM, one faculty member described the benefit of reporting to one Dean.

*“At the moment, the interdisciplinary graduate programs (Molecular & Cellular Biology, Neuroscience & Behavior, Plant Biology, Organismic & Evolutionary Biology) are in a difficult situation, reporting to three deans and having no permanent reporting structure. Thus the deans have to get together and decide on requests from the graduate programs and this, of course, is always complex.*

*Under the new proposal, almost all of the faculty within those graduate programs (I and many of my Chem colleagues are full members of MCB) will now lie within one college (with a notable exception, alas, of Chem Eng members). Presumably the interdisciplinary graduate programs will now report to this one dean, with only minor issues arising from other deans. This should make many things much simpler, the least of which being funding of staff positions and entering student support.”*

Another reference to the interdisciplinary benefits of the NRE and NSM merger noted,

*“The interdisciplinary life science graduate programs (Molecular and Cellular Biology, Organismic and Evolutionary Biology, Neuroscience and Behavior, Plant Biology) all would likely benefit from a reorganization that brings all of the life sciences under one deanship. These graduate programs now span many departments and colleges across the UMass Amherst campus, leading to difficulties in communication with the administration and the need to negotiate for resources from multiple deans. Consolidating the reporting and funding structure to one deanship would be a significant step forward.”*

Another faculty from MCB offered the following comments.

*“We agree that the coming reorganization will likely have little impact on our graduate program. Right now, I have no idea what opportunities might arise, but I see no credible reason to be worried about the reorganization and what it might do to our graduate program.”*

A meeting with the PhD coordinators in the Isenberg School showed strong support for the merger of the Department of Resource Economics with SOM. One coordinator described some of the current collaboration as well as “branding“ benefits as follows.

*“Several of the faculty there have spoken in our INFORMS speaker series and have served on my students dissertation committees (and I have served on theirs, too). Plus, I have quite a few co-authored journal articles with a member of that department. The faculty members of that department are really nice and they are smart. It would also help a lot in terms of "branding." Plus, that department has some very cool labs and is very good at getting external research funds.”*

While there was no direct feedback from the Resource Economics side, an Isenberg School Ph.D. Coordinator noted,

*“I am very much for having Resource Economics join ISOM. In fact, shortly after such a possibility was announced I started receiving enthusiastic emails from that department.”*

### **Unfavorable Effects on Graduate Education**

Opposition to the proposed reorganization seems to focus on the merger of HFA and SBS (including LARP) and come from both sides of the equation. Representatives from the Departments of Anthropology, English and Language, Literature, and Culture (LLC) believe that reorganization will negatively affect graduate education. The potential lack of understanding of the lab sciences and competition for administrative support are major drawbacks to the merger.

Representatives from Anthropology describe some of these affects as follows:

*“Reorganization will not, in and of itself, affect our linkages across campus. It will, however, in one fell swoop, place us into a division of the university that is the weakest in its field work, research, and lab activities, and that, in many of its departments, might even be considered antagonistic to the many laboratory and hard science ends of our program. The new deanery, and its associated advice giving and decision making bodies, executive and personnel committees cannot be considered well informed about the position of Anthropology in the 21st century, something that never was a problem in the SBS.”*

Another respondent spoke of sentiments within the LLC Department.

*“The specific effects on our graduate programs have only come up in passing. The obvious major problem for all our programs at this point is, of course, lack of faculty. How can we admit students when in various important fields there's no one for them to work with, no one with the relevant specializations to direct their theses/dissertations?”*

The focus of many opposing the reorganization is on broader, related issues such as these listed below.

#### **Related Concerns**

1. The details of the reorganization plan are not clearly understood. There appears to be general confusion about what the plan is and what the alternatives might be. One representative noted,

*“there has been little attention paid at the administrative level to the impact the economic crisis will have on students and faculty as they struggle to pay bills, juggle jobs and family obligations, provide support for the community, and pay higher fees. What support does the University plan to offer students who will suffer from the economic situation, either organizationally, administratively or academically?”*

2. It is not clear how much money will be saved through the reorganization efforts. Several faculty remarked about the lack of details on resources saved and expressed a need to explore other opportunities to realize savings.

*“the energies thrown into reorganization are better spent improving collaboration and communication among existing deaneries (instead of creating new ones) and among existing departments (rather than shipping them around). Instead of disrupting existing constructive working relationships, departments, deaneries, and administrators should be encouraged to strengthen those relationships. And, instead of burdening creative minds with having to spend their creative time reacting to yet another imposition of structure to deal with a problem that has not been brought on by that structure, that energy is better invested in thinking up the many ways*

*that something that works well can be made to work better. That will save money, time, and energy which is exactly what's needed in these trying times."*

3. The process of reorganization is being questioned for having limited dialogue and lack of transparency. As one respondent remarked,

*"I suspect -- and I believe this feeling is widespread among my colleagues -- that the real goal is for key administrators to be seen as doing something, anything, as if that in itself would then count as a significant achievement in that administrator's public profile. And yet surely it takes more guts to say plainly that the proposed reorganization is not going to resolve the issue of budget deficits, to have meaningful consultation with faculty at the beginning, not the end, of the process, and to aim to aid faculty in every way so that we can fulfill our primary responsibilities even in this crisis."*

Another respondent submitted a similar reaction:

*"There has been little consultation with faculty concerning this reorganization. Although ideas and suggestions for cost saving have been solicited, there has been little feedback provided to the originators of those suggestions or the university community concerning the deliberation of those ideas and their acceptance or rejection."*

A third faculty representative provided the following comments:

*"I think that there is a pretty widely held view that this process has been less transparent, consultative and deliberative than people would be comfortable with, and that the graduate student and faculty unions and governance have not been treated as equal working partners in the process. The implication for graduate education is the view it gives of graduate students and faculty at UMass as being less part of the decision making process as most would like."*

4. Departments are already suffering from the impact of diminutive resources, as noted above.
5. Of greater concern to many graduate faculty is the increased curriculum fee. It has a direct negative impact on graduate education and research. It is the impetus for reductions in Teaching Assistantships and the reported reduction in Research Assistantships (using more post-docs instead) as part of grants and contracts.
6. Lack of morale is already evident in departments suffering from reduction in faculty in recent years. The following passage reflects this sentiment.

*"I'm glad you bring up graduate programs in this picture, since I spent part of January writing letters and making calls to help one of our most gifted graduate students transfer out. She wants to work in Arabic and Russian, and can't find any courses or appoint a committee. Putting a lot of energy into losing a student doesn't do much for morale."*

7. Several members expressed concern over the dismantling of the College of NRE. It is the foundation of the Land Grant Mission upon which the University was built. It ignores a recent proposal for a College of Life Sciences in the Environment supported by all departments in NRE in the past. Faculty members are opposed to the elimination of the word "environment" from the College name. They expressed concern about the cultural adaptation required when moving from one college to another, and the importance of valuing and respecting scholarship in different formats such as theory and application. As one faculty member from Plant, Soil and Insect Sciences noted,

*“NRE departments have components of their mission that are in addition to those commonalities with Life Sciences counterparts in the College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics (NSM).*

*While both of the current colleges are dedicated to excellence in basic research and training in their graduate programs, NRE has an additional component of emphasizing applied research and outreach.*

*In short, the benefits that our graduate programs might enjoy by reducing redundancy and competition for resources, would be outweighed by the loss of the applied research and training mission that would occur when disparately aligned units are brought together in a whole that is less than the sum of its parts.”*

In addition to comments on the support or opposition of specific parts of the reorganization plan and the related issues, some opportunities to generate or preserve resources were offered.

### **Opportunities to Explore and Develop**

The call for feedback on the effect of the reorganization on graduate education yielded some fruitful suggestions for new opportunities. The major ones are listed here.

#### **1. Leverage Better utilization of technology in the classroom**

The campus could benefit from more formal or structured efforts to increase use of technology on the classroom. If more classes used technology to teach in a modified blended fashion and/or fully online, there would be no space issues on campus. The delicate scheduling and structure of blended classes will free up space tremendously.

Space is an issue and building larger lecture halls assumes larger classes, but may not be the best solution for effective education. The University can still grow and have more efficient utilization of space if at least 30% - 50% of the class sessions are conducted on line.

#### **2. Leverage Potential for Online and Professional and Continuing Education Programs**

There is a lot of potential for online degree and Professional and Continuing Education programs. The small interdisciplinary programs could be showcases. We could develop a plan to make this easier to do, more clearly communicate to alumni, donors and potential students, and reap greater rewards for departments and faculty - financially and programmatically.

#### **3. Leverage Advantages of Five College Network**

More use should be made of the Five Colleges; at the moment these engagements are strictly extra-curricular for both grad students and faculty. Together, the faculty and graduate presence at the Five Colleges constitute the quality, size and breadth of any major R1 university. We need to take advantage of that more, reward the connections grad students and faculty engender and maintain among the colleges, and further foster relationship, cross-registration and cross-campus collaboration.

**APPENDIX: Raw Data**

**Graduate Council UMASS Reorganization Impact Report**  
**Initial Feedback Received from Faculty – 3/1/2009**

**Faculty Member #1**

I think that the proposed merger of NRE and NSM to form CNS will ENHANCE graduate education in the sciences, particularly the life sciences, by having the interdisciplinary graduate programs all report to one Dean and by fostering interdisciplinary interactions. Synergistic ties with the separate College of Engineering must continue to be encouraged by both relevant Deans, but I'm not too worried about this.

**Faculty Member #2**

It's hard to comment on the effects absent a specific plan. Assuming the primary proposal to join most of NRE with NSM, this will be beneficial to graduate education in one specific way. At the moment, the interdisciplinary graduate programs (Molecular & Cellular Biology, Neuroscience & Behavior, Plant Biology, Organismic & Evolutionary Biology) are in a difficult situation, reporting to three deans and having no permanent reporting structure. Thus the deans have to get together and decide on requests from the graduate programs and this, of course, is always complex.

Under the new proposal, almost all of the faculty within those graduate programs (I and many of my Chem colleagues are full members of MCB) will now lie within one college (with a notable exception, alas, of Chem Eng members). Presumably the interdisciplinary graduate programs will now report to this one dean, with only minor issues arising from other deans. This should make many things much simpler, the least of which being funding of staff positions and entering student support.

MCB has had a difficult time identifying a director willing to take on the position under the current reporting structure. This change will likely make that search easier.

**Faculty Member #3**

I am very much for having Resource Economics join ISOM. In fact, shortly after such a possibility was announced I started receiving enthusiastic emails from that department. Several of the faculty there have spoken in our INFORMS speaker series and have served on my students dissertation committees (and I have served on theirs, too). Plus, I have quite a few co-authored journal articles with a member of that department. The faculty members of that department are really nice and they are smart. It would also help a lot in terms of "branding." Plus, that department has some very cool labs and is very good at getting external research funds.

**Faculty Member #4**

My own input (relative to the Isenberg School) at this time is that the reorganization might have a positive impact on graduate education in the SOM since Resource Economics has many faculty and few students. In particular, they have 4 or 5 PhD students and have faculty with expertise in econometrics and other quantitative areas that may be of interest to our own students. The reorganization may also create more opportunities for collaboration among departments with Resource Economics. It looks like they would have room for some of our students in their courses given the small numbers, perhaps making more efficient use of faculty resources. Please let me know if there are any alternative perceptions.

**Faculty Member #5**

Here are some thoughts on the impact of the proposal from the viewpoint of a director of one of the four life science interdisciplinary graduate programs:

The interdisciplinary life science graduate programs (Molecular and Cellular Biology, Organismic and Evolutionary Biology, Neuroscience and Behavior, Plant Biology) all would likely benefit from a reorganization that brings all of the life sciences under one deanship. These graduate programs now span many departments and colleges across the UMass Amherst campus, leading to difficulties in communication with the administration and the need to negotiate for resources from multiple deans. Consolidating the reporting and funding structure to one deanship would be a significant step forward.

A potential negative aspect to the clustering of all the sciences under one dean would be the relative loss of visibility of the individual units under the dean. Although the four interdisciplinary life science graduate programs often speak in unanimity, it may be that these key graduate programs receive fewer resources in a unified deanery due to reduced overall visibility, thus undermining life science graduate training at the university.

**Faculty Member #6**

I have discussed this with Bret and we agree that the coming reorganization will likely have little impact on our graduate program. This is in line with Chancellor Holub's almost 2 hour presentation at a recent Heads & Chairs meeting, attended by Craig and myself. Basically, what we should be doing now is watching carefully for any opportunities that might arise. For example, and I am just tossing this up in the air, the MCB program will likely benefit from having most (or all?) of its faculty under a "College of Natural Sciences". This facilitates their interactions and MCB may grow or prosper further. So maybe there will be opportunities for us to strengthen ties with the MCB program. Who knows what might evolve? Right now, I have no idea what opportunities might arise, but I see no credible reason to be worried about the reorganization and what it might do to our graduate program.

**Faculty Member #7**

In LLC, as you may have heard from other faculty, there's a general lack of enthusiasm for the proposed reorganization primarily because it has simply not been justified in any significant way.

Nothing suggests it will result in improvements at ground level, or that it is worth all the trouble and time being spent on it.

The specific effects on our graduate programs have only come up in passing. The obvious major problem for all our programs at this point is, of course, lack of faculty. How can we admit students when in various important fields there's no one for them to work with, no one with the relevant specializations to direct their theses/dissertations? It also seems likely that word of this has already gotten around and is causing a decline in the numbers of applications we receive. In addition, we seem to be going to more meetings than ever; this does not help us meet our primary responsibilities, which are to teaching and research, with the time and energy they rightfully demand.

When Lee Edwards was forcing five departments in HFA to merge into one megadepartment, the pattern seems to have been set that serious justifications or rationales or positive goals need not even be presented. Going through all this once again -- this time with only one material benefit: to save a tiny amount on administrative costs (which might or might not in fact be realized) -- seems both foolish and futile. Something is definitely wrong when significant positive reasons of major reorganization need not even be articulated.

I suspect -- and I believe this feeling is widespread among my colleagues -- that the real goal is for key administrators to be seen as doing something, anything, as if that in itself would then count as a significant achievement in that administrator's public profile. And yet surely it takes more guts to say plainly that the proposed reorganization is not going to resolve the issue of budget deficits, to have meaningful consultation with faculty at the beginning, not the end, of the process, and to aim to aid faculty in every way so that we can fulfill our primary responsibilities even in this crisis.

It's hard to escape the cynicism that this time-consuming reorganization is generating on campus. On that subject, I want to share with the entire council (if you wish to pass it on, with or without this message), an email sent to me this week by a friend at the University of Arizona (UA), which is going through the same sort of financial crisis as UMass and seems to be grasping at the same straws. This news item and story from UA may amuse you: <http://uanews.org/node/24285>

“When I came to UA [in the mid-1970s], all those units were in one college, the College of Liberal Arts, with one dean. Then the administration decided to divide it into four faculties - of Science, Social Sciences, Humanities, and Fine Arts - each with its dean. The College of Liberal Arts became an umbrella structure and its dean became a superdean. Then a new president (Koffler) decided that the superdean was too powerful, felt threatened, and eliminated his position. Then after a while the now-leaderless College of Liberal Arts umbrella was eliminated altogether, while the faculties became colleges. So now we're reversing that process. Because of added responsibilities, the new Executive Dean just got a \$50,000 raise. Titanic deck chair, anyone?”

#### Faculty Member #8

I'm glad you bring up graduate programs in this picture, since I spent part of January writing letters and making calls to help one of our most gifted graduate students transfer out. She wants to work in Arabic and Russian, and can't find any courses or appoint a committee. Putting a lot of energy into losing a student doesn't do much for morale.

Let's face it: CHFA has been in deep deficit for a couple of years now. Indeed the financial disaster came to light just as Joel Martin took over as Dean. Joel has done a wonderful job of dreaming up positive initiatives for the College, but there's only so much you can do without funding. I know this only by rumor, but CSBS is also said to be fairly broke.

My experience of the forced merger of five departments has not been very positive. Comparative Literature has so far received 1/3 of one position out of the nineteen hired in the new department, despite the fact that we are (and were before the merger) the only one of the former departments that was functioning well. We then lost our only assistant professor to an outside offer that the College couldn't or wouldn't match -- or even half-match. This was only our second tenure-track hire since 1986 (we lost that one to a counteroffer as well). Comp Lit has always needed excellent national literature departments for us to serve our students well, especially graduate students. Since the loss of faculty in the College (as in much of the University) came through random attrition rather than plan, the faculties of most Departments in HFA are currently shot full of holes. Linguistics is an exception; English might be as well.

The only reason Comp Lit is able to feed its graduate students is because we get our stipends from Gen Ed -- our program of about eleven faculty teaches 1000 seats of Gen Ed every semester. But the handwriting is on the wall. Two of our faculty are on medical leave, and three others are nearly seventy years of age. I always wanted to leave a strong university when I left, but sooner or later I'll give up. As we learned from the LLC experience, when you mix the sick and healthy together, everybody ends up sick. It is the same with Colleges.

**Faculty Member #9**

I see three issues that certainly impact Grad education:

1. Any reduction in faculty would significantly impact the capability to teach grad classes.
2. Loss of support for grad students would hurt twice: basic day-to-day support and ability to teach UG classes.
3. If more classes used technology to teach in a modified blended fashion and/or fully online, there would be NO space issues on campus. The delicate scheduling and structure of blended classes will free up space tremendously. Space is an issue and building larger lecture halls assumes larger classes - - not always the best solution for effective education. The University can still grow and have more efficient utilization of space if at least 30% - 50% of the class sessions are conducted on line.

**Faculty Member #10**

As you know, Anthropology is the social science that is linked to other departments in the most multiplex relationships of ANY department on campus. Anthropology extends into, and has many constructive research and cooperative teaching arrangements with, the humanities, but at least as strong ones with the Natural Sciences, and even the School of Nursing, and Public Health and Education. Anthropology is a lab science, with lab scientists in each of its four sub-disciplines. The department has benefited from its research and teaching alliances across the campus, in a division that includes at least one other laboratory science (Psychology) that is as multiply linked across campus.

Reorganization will not, in and of itself, affect our linkages across campus. It will, however, in one fell swoop, place us into a division of the university that is the weakest in its field work, research, and lab activities, and that, in many of its departments, might even be considered antagonistic to the many laboratory and hard science ends of our program. The new deanery, and its associated advice giving and decision making bodies, executive and personnel committees cannot be considered well informed about the position of Anthropology in the 21st century, something that never was a problem in the SBS.

In addition, our department generates nice overhead, and requires significant scientific infrastructure and curation (some mandated by law). The competition for administrative support in the much enlarged deanery, grouped with departments that don't have similar needs, will be fierce, with a very steep learning curve for the administrators (again, something that never has been a problem in the SBS, and that would not be a problem if we were to be grouped with Psychology and the harder sciences).

In short, the proposed reorganization promises little of benefit to Anthropology (and the other social sciences for that matter), while it puts plenty at risk. Particularly under conditions of extreme fiscal constraints, it will eat up resources, time, and energy that nobody has, and it will disrupt something that nobody has been complaining about. Thus, from the standpoint of the Anthropology Department, my colleagues and I are united in advising against it. If artifacts of active administration need to be generated, the energies thrown into reorganization are better spent improving collaboration and communication among existing deaneries (instead of creating new ones) and among existing departments (rather than shipping them around). Instead of disrupting existing constructive working relationships, departments, deaneries, and administrators should be encouraged to strengthen those relationships. And, instead of burdening creative minds with having to spend their creative time reacting to yet another imposition of structure to deal with a problem that has not been brought on by that structure, that energy is better invested in thinking up the many ways that something that works well can be made to work better. That will save money, time, and energy which is exactly what's needed in these trying times.

**Faculty Member #11**

**These comments are my individual interpretation of feedback from grad students, faculty and others on the reorganization's impact on grad education. Legal Studies has graduate fellows and plans for continued expansion of graduate programming, so it is from the perspective of small, interdisciplinary departments and the graduate students they serve that I write this feedback.**

**1. It is not clear that the major impact on graduate education will come from reorganization, rather than from the loss of resources that might come from a failure to maximize/use federal and state funding, from the budget or the stimulus package. There's a fairly common sense among grad students, faculty, administrators and staff, as far as I have heard, that the reorganization seems to be a small plan that attracts a lot of attention - most people want to know where the rest of the funding will come from, and expect that decision to make the most impact. Further, there has been little attention paid at the administrative level to the impact the economic crisis will have on students and faculty as they struggle to pay bills, juggle jobs and family obligations, provide support for the community, and pay higher fees. What support does the University plan to offer students who will suffer from the economic situation, either organizationally, administratively or academically?**

**2. Another clear message beyond the plan itself is concern over the manner in which it is being discussed and promulgated: I think that there is a pretty widely held view that this process has been less transparent, consultative and deliberative than people would be comfortable with, and that the graduate student and faculty unions and governance have not been treated as equal working partners in the process. The implication for graduate education is the view it gives of graduate students and faculty at UMass as being less part of the decision making process as most would like.**

**3. The reorganization plan itself is not well understood, nor do the people I have spoken with have confidence that its savings will be either realizable in the immediate future, or significant. In other words, the reorganization means a lot of struggle, loss of goodwill and confusion for very little gain. Because of this, many propose a clear and transparent plan in stages - constructed with the input of professional firms as well as UMass community members - that will occur deliberately and over a number of years, rather than a quick reorganization.**

**4. The process by which grants are applied for and then disbursed is overly bureaucratic, rigid and slow. If the reorganization can address these issues specifically, that would garner it support from both faculty and graduate students. On the other hand, it may in the short term cause further slowness and confusion.**

**5. Interdisciplinary cross-fertilization may be helped by the bringing together of social science and humanities departments under one college, allowing joint committees and research, grant application etc. This would require explicit attention to these functions when Deanships and other cross-departmental links are configured.**

**6. More use should be made of the Five Colleges; at the moment these engagements are strictly extra-curricular for both grad students and faculty. Together, the faculty and graduate presence at the Five Colleges constitute the quality, size and breadth of any major R1 university - we need to be taking more advantage of that, reward the connections grad students and faculty engender and maintain among the colleges, and further foster relationship, cross-registration and cross-campus collaboration.**

7. There is a lot of potential for online degree and continuing ed programs. Here again, the small interdisciplinary programs could be showcases: the plan could make this easier to do, more clearly communicated to alumni, donors and potential students, and more rewarding for departments and faculty - financially and programmatically.

8. The savings from reorganization need to be more clearly detailed: besides the elimination of administrative salaries, what does the plan offer? How will it ensure that the loss of administrative positions does not devolve to grad student TAs and faculty? And how will those savings be passed to students in aid and opportunities?

9. Fundamentally, the reorganization looks like a stopgap, and does not seem to offer the kind of relief we will need. I think any feedback the Grad Council provides needs to make this clear, in addition to answering the question we are asked. If our major mandate is maintaining the health and quality of graduate programming, this will be achieved by re-visioning what graduate education must do in the coming difficult years; providing support in multiple spheres for graduate students as teachers, researchers, employees and scholars; taking advantage of programmatic, intellectual and administrative overlaps to maximize use of our resources. The Plan only addresses the last of these objectives, but without discussion of the first two, we cannot employ resources to our best advantage even once/if we have them.

#### Faculty Member # 12

As a member of the College of Natural Resources and the Environment (NRE), I was initially enthusiastic about the prospect of University reorganization insofar as it might provide an opportunity to eliminate inherent redundancies in graduate (and undergraduate) teaching curricula. Another advantage of reorganization would be the possibility of putting greater structure behind the interdisciplinary graduate training programs (MCB, NSB, OEB, and PB) which bridge several departments and, at least in some cases, compete for resources with existing graduate programs within those departments. A common perspective from NRE is that Life Sciences research and graduate training occurs at several foci at our University, and that bringing these units together in a single College of Life Sciences and the Environment might better facilitate their missions.

However, NRE departments have components of their mission that are in addition to those commonalities with Life Sciences counterparts in the College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics (NSM). While both of the current colleges are dedicated to excellence in basic research and training in their graduate programs, NRE has an additional component of emphasizing applied research and outreach. And that is not to say that NRE faculty are homogeneous in this regard. In fact, the activities of NRE faculty are dispersed along a continuum, with some doing predominately basic research at one extreme, and others doing purely applied and outreach activities on the other. But as a college, NRE has embraced this spectrum and possesses leadership and a Dean that is fully capable of grasping this multifaceted identity.

A primary concern for uniting NRE and NSM is that the unique applied research and outreach activities inherent to NRE will lose relevance in the new college structure, or perhaps be abandoned altogether. These differences between applied and basic research will be even further contrasted when considering the merger of NSM and NRE to include departments that are not traditionally viewed as Life Sciences. My fear is that departments such as Plant, Soil, and Insect Sciences which has a significant obligatory outreach mission might find itself in the same college as departments which do not recognize or appreciate this aspect of their mission. Hence, the "Environment" addendum to the

**Life Sciences College is fundamentally important insofar as it encompasses the uniquely characteristic research and outreach chimeras that define of NRE units. Moreover, retaining the applied research and training identity that has been fundamental to this University since its inception is critically dependent on keeping Life Scientists together as a cohort with their own identity and leadership.**

**In short, the benefits that our graduate programs might enjoy by reducing redundancy and competition for resources, would be outweighed by the loss of the applied research and training mission that would occur when disparately aligned units are brought together in a whole that is less than the sum of its parts.**

INTERNATIONAL STUDIES COUNCIL  
UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST

M E M O

**DATE:** March 5, 2009  
**FROM:** Donal Carbaugh, Chair  
**TO:** Ernie May, Secretary of the Faculty Senate  
**SUBJECT:** Reorganization Proposal

\* \* \* \* \*

This memo is in response to the Chancellor's Reorganization Proposal, and to your desire "to fulfill the Faculty Senate's responsibilities for shared governance as outlined in the Wellman Document." The five articles presented below were distributed among members of the International Studies Council (ISC), reflect the deliberations of Council members, and were unanimously endorsed via member vote (with one ex officio member abstaining). Our aim is, like the Chancellor's and the Provost's, to ensure that we move "into the upper echelon of public research universities in the country" (per the Chancellor's February 4 memorandum).

**Article One: Academic Priorities and an International Campus**

Close attention to international aspects of all of the university's activities is required in this era of accelerating globalization, and the attendant proliferation of multicultural societies. The Council urges that any restructuring plan place a central priority on programs which include as an essential element, international studies, links, and alliances. To implement this principle we would ask that each priority that is established be treated in a cross-national and/or cross-cultural perspective. For example, if an academic priority is established within General Education, then General Education should also be treated in a cross-national and cross-cultural perspective. This can be accomplished any number of ways: through faculty initiatives, international student exchanges, course development, and/or curriculum design. To keep apace with our changing world, as well as with our peer institutions, we must provide each academic priority or program, from research to teaching and outreach, with an international dimension as integral to it.

**Article Two: Undergraduate Education and International Education**

Our university's accomplishments and objectives are profoundly enhanced when its programs include students from around the globe. Alternately, our university is equally enhanced when our own undergraduate students engage in study abroad. Both student populations bring diverse viewpoints and experiences to campus, thus adding immeasurably to our university's educational environment. Any reorganization must be done with an attentive eye to maintaining and increasing the global diversity on campus and in developing international study experiences as integral parts of undergraduate education.

**Article Three: Graduate Education and International Research**

The research mission of our university is one of its pre-eminent and distinctive qualities. It is most active and evident, among other places, in graduate education, and through faculty projects which involve graduate students. Any reorganization of the university must be undertaken with careful attention to graduate education and to the various ways in which the research and graduate missions of the campus are advanced through international efforts and intercultural alliances. We strongly encourage further investment in such exchanges and alliances.

**Article Four: Budgets for International Initiatives including the International Programs Office**

**Restructuring the university will presumably re-orient the funding processes through different administrative channels and units. Any such changes, however, must not threaten budgets which advance the university's international efforts; nor should they negatively affect the budget of the International Programs Office specifically. The staffing of this office, especially of the Office of International Students and Scholars, is already at the bare-bones level, and cannot be diminished further without harming the central mission, objectives, and goals of our research university, including its aspiration to reach the "upper echelon."**

**Article Five: Outreach and International Activities**

**Through the International Studies Council, the International Programs Office, and more recently, the International Operations Committee, our university has vetted, approved, and supported various international initiatives. Any restructuring of the university must be reviewed regarding the effects of that restructuring on these various international activities, to ensure that such activities are not adversely affected, and in the hope that such activities be further enhanced.**

**We are also mindful of the many thousands of alumni and friends that this campus possesses around the world, many of whom have had eminently successful careers thanks to the training that they received on the Amherst campus and who remember their experiences here with great fondness. The university would be wise to reach out to this constituency as potential donors as well as for help in recruiting bright students to study at the University of Massachusetts Amherst.**

**Program and Budget Council  
Report on the Reorganization Task Force Report**

**At its meeting on April 22, 2009, the Council unanimously reaffirmed its unanimous earlier vote to report: “The Program and Budget Council believes that the Reorganization Plan could achieve savings of perhaps \$1-1.5M, but forestalls commenting on the Plan’s impact on the campus’ ability to be positioned ‘for success now and in the future by allocating a greater percentage of resources to departments, where the core functions of teaching and research actually occur.’”**

**Likely Impact of the Reorganization Proposal  
on Research at UMass/Amherst  
Now and in the Future.**

**A Preliminary Report of the Research Council  
To  
The Faculty Senate**

**Submitted on Behalf of the Research Council by  
David R. Evans, Chair  
March 7, 2009**

On February 6<sup>th</sup>, several hours after its February meeting, the Research Council received a request from the Rules Committee that the Research Council, in addition to making whatever comments it deems appropriate, provide a preliminary report by March 6, 2009 on the following question:

*Does the Reorganization Proposal position the campus appropriately for success in research, now and as we emerge from the recession?*

Since the Chancellor's reorganization plan was first published, the Reorganization Task Force has been considering a variety of alternative plans. Since responding to what has been and still is a moving target is difficult, the Research Council has taken a somewhat different approach to this task. Rather than reacting to specific proposals involving which departments are put in which unit and how units might be combined, the Research Council has focused on articulating the conditions that would minimize the negative impact of various configurations and maximize the potential for maintaining and enhancing the sponsored research activities on the Amherst campus.

#### **Charge to Research Council Members**

Research Council members were sent the following suggestions to help structure thinking about the ways in which various configurations would affect the research community.

The probability of a constructive outcome from reorganization will be determined by a number of factors, some of which are listed below as differences that need to be managed. In addition, there will be conditions of leadership, management, and resources necessary to produce positive outcomes. Any new Schools or Colleges formed from new configurations or combinations of departments will have to address differences among the constituent departments. How well they do this will be a prime determinant of the impact on research capacity and potential of new configurations.

- 1. Differences in sponsored funding characteristics:** - What are trends in funding priorities for a given area of research? Contrast typical awards for individuals or small groups of 2-3 faculty in HFA, for example, with areas where funding is for larger groups of faculty collaborating across disciplinary lines. In addition, what areas of research are growing, and what organizational structure will best position the campus to respond?
- 2. Differences in priority of teaching, service, and research:** What do different emphases in these areas mean for decisions about personnel and resource allocation? If there are substantial differences within a newly configured School or College, what impacts will that have on new faculty lines, for example? What might be the impact of differences in profiles expected of junior and senior faculty members within a newly configured School or College?
- 3. Differences in valuation of kinds of research:** What impact will result from differences about what constitutes scholarship? This includes judgments about quality, scholarliness, applied vs. pure research, service activities as research, etc.
- 4. Differences in high/low consensus nature of research endeavor in different departments:** Disciplines and departments differ widely in the range of research questions and methods that are considered legitimate. Some fields have many approaches; others have fairly narrowly defined research methods. What impact will wide differences in research consensus have in a new School or College?

**5. Differences resource dependence: Departments and existing Schools and Colleges differ widely in both current and potential amounts of sponsored research. How would reorganization affect them? Widely disparate levels of outside funding between sub-units create substantial challenges in managing the allocation of resources. Wealthier units fear dilution of resources to support others. Poorer units feel they are being discriminated against.**

**6. Differences in social capital: Within established units, individuals and programs have known levels of credibility, influence, and access to decision makers. In new units, there might be substantial inherited discrepancies in social capital that would undermine some and privilege others. Each of these sets of differences can have positive or negative influence on the research endeavor. The key questions include: What conditions are necessary to have the positive outweigh the negative? How likely are those conditions to be present? Will long-term benefits be sufficient to outweigh the short-term costs? And, will the net effect be positive incentives at all levels to increase sponsored research efforts? Many RC members responded with ideas and comments and the RC received comments from other faculty members and administrators. The impact of the reorganization was discussed at the March 6th meeting of the Council where a preliminary draft of the RC report was circulated and reviewed. This report presents some of the major issues raised and summarizes the key points arising from these discussions.**

#### **Issues Raised by the Research Council**

##### *Creating Larger Units*

**Many comments focused on the bureaucratic complexities that could result from reorganization. Sponsored research involves a process of identifying funding opportunities, putting together staff and resources needed to address the criteria of the funders, writing proposals that include both carefully crafted technical responses and matching budgets, getting approvals needed for the Internal Processing Form and the Memorandum of Understanding, submitting the proposals to OGCA and responding to their concerns which often require some modification to the budget, and finally getting the proposals sent to the funding agency by a deadline which is precise and rigid. Late proposals are disqualified.**

**This process requires a series of approval signatures, beginning with the Principal Investigators (PIs), then Department Chairs, then Deans, and sometimes approvals from the Vice Chancellor for Research if the proposal requires cost sharing or negotiations about indirect costs. Larger units formed in any reorganization scheme have the potential to add layers to this approval and signature process, with each layer potentially involving explanations, negotiations, and resolution of conflicts. Experienced PIs know how difficult this process can be, particularly when there are significant differences of priorities. All of this has to take place under short time deadlines while the PI needs to be focusing on the technical and budget components of the proposal.**

**The potential for positive outcomes from combining units to create larger units has several aspects.**

*Social Science Faculty Member - The costs, in terms of faculty and staff time needed to work across current boundaries, are significant expenses that are difficult to measure or to see in operating expenses. They include negotiations with administrators in different colleges who use slightly different rules and procedures. They include multiple signatures on far too many forms and documents to process paperwork. They include a byzantine system that is not clear to most faculty or administrators producing rework.*

*They include lost time that could be used for other, more productive activities. And, for the future, they include many missed opportunities and projects that are never carried out because the coordination and transaction costs are simply too high.*

*Social Science Faculty Member - ...[putting] many research departments under one administrative system which would facilitate and lower the coordination costs of working across what are now college-level boundaries for IPFs, other forms that require multiple signatures and negotiation with deans, cross-listed courses, deployment of faculty for courses and research projects, etc. These costs are currently hidden in the time and effort required to walk paper forms from one unit to another, to negotiate and explain boundary-spanning research and projects to multiple decision makers.*

*Social Science Faculty Member - ... the positive would outweigh the negative if support for research increases in the new Colleges -- more people to help with proposal submissions, College-level seed money, College-level support for Centers that encourage research. [However,] This is unlikely due to the cuts Deans will be making.*

**However, in the short-term there is the risk that these costs will increase.**

*Science Faculty Member - The short-term costs are considerable. It will take quite a bit of faculty time to make the reorganizations work, and that is a cost that is not included in the calculation [of savings.] Eventually, the faculty will adapt (figure out what's important and generate work-arounds for the rest), but for a year or two, the cost to research will be the loss of grant proposals, publications etc. that did not get written while the faculty figure out the rules.*

**Staffing to support research varies widely in amount and quality across departments. How can reorganization be structured so it doesn't weaken departments with strong capability, while working to increase the capability of departments with weaker support?**

*School of Nursing Faculty Member - One potentially major consequence of reorganization on the research mission is the anticipated changes in staff to reduce redundancy. Not all research staff are created equal. Departments like Computer Science which has a very experienced and qualified staff to help faculty turn out proposals may end up with a staff less able to help in the process. Meanwhile other departments might benefit from changes in staff because their research endeavor is presently less developed.*

**Thinking more systemically about the long-term viability of units and establishing new ways of working together will be important.**

*Kinesiology Faculty Member - Any change in organizational structure should be able to withstand changes in leadership. Universities, including UMass-Amherst, experience frequent turnover of people in upper administration. A well-designed structure will be sufficiently solid AND flexible to provide continuity and research excellence in the face of administrative upheaval (change).*

*The capacity for electronic communication has removed many barriers to collaborations across academic units, particularly for research. This trend should be encouraged by the establishment of "research channels" between colleges and schools that go further in facilitating cross-unit work. By doing so, the placement of individual departments in one college or another will not dictate or limit the type or scope of research that is done.*

*What Factors Drive Collaboration across Departments and Schools?*

Several members commented on what might be called the fallacy of the juxtapositional synergy argument, if interpreted to mean that, just because departments are housed together either physically or organizationally, they will work effectively. Especially in this age of instant, worldwide, electronic communications, the older technology of placing people in close physical proximity is no longer a pre-requisite and may have little impact on building new collaborative efforts across disciplines. Typical comments were:

*Science Faculty Member - I think that the "collaborations will be facilitated" argument is overplayed. In my experience, successful collaborations happen because the individuals involved want them to.*

*Arts Faculty Member - As for interdisciplinary collaboration, about which I know quite a bit, I'm not so sure that grouping people by college promotes it. I study medieval English literature, and my research has prompted me to consult with art historians, historians, classicists, foreign language scholars, and religious studies experts. I've even sought help from economists. But my research is the driving force behind these on- and off-campus connections; it doesn't come from which particular departments are in my college or in my building. Putting me in the same college as, say, the Journalism department will never prompt a collaboration*

However, organizational proximity influences power relationships, access to decision-makers, claims on shared resources, and access to approvals needed to support research. Changes in organizational structure will likely work to the short-term disadvantage of most units, but in the long-run, new hierarchies of power and access will emerge which privilege some units over others. The impact on research will depend on how the most productive units fare in the shuffling of the hierarchies which, in turn, will be influenced by the dominant values and priorities of the leadership of the new units.

*Differences in Types of Research Appropriate to Sub-units*

Many comments focused on the differences in the research cultures of departments embedded in larger disciplinary cultures. While one of the goals of larger units is to facilitate crossdisciplinary work, the challenge of combining disparate research philosophies and methods in a single unit will require exceptional quality leadership to avoid developing an ongoing, entrenched conflict within the new unit.

*Dean of the Graduate School – [paraphrased from comment in RC meeting]. What is the 21<sup>st</sup> century future for 20<sup>th</sup> century service departments? What is going to happen to the Land Grant mission of the university if departments that focus primarily on providing service are put in units that prioritize academic research? Specifically, how will the departments in NRE like forestry, etc. fare in a NSM/NRE merger? Will one model of research dominate to the detriment of another?*

*NRE Faculty Member - A primary concern for uniting NRE and NSM is that the unique applied research and outreach activities inherent to NRE will lose relevance in the new college structure, or perhaps be abandoned altogether. These differences between applied and basic research will be even further contrasted when considering the merger of NSM and NRE to include departments that are not traditionally viewed as Life Sciences. My fear is that departments such as Plant, Soil, and Insect Sciences which has*

*a significant obligatory outreach mission might find itself in the same college as departments which do not recognize or appreciate this aspect of their mission. ... Moreover, retaining the applied research and training identity that has been fundamental to this University since its inception is critically dependent on keeping Life Scientists together as a cohort with their own identity and leadership.*

*Science Faculty Member - I am in Chemistry, which is part of NSM and proposed to be included in the new CNS College. On the positive side, it is clear that the Chancellor has heeded the advice that physical and life sciences be kept together. In the same spirit, I can see benefit from having microbiology and veterinary and Animal Sciences join Biochemistry, Chemistry and Biology etc. in the new CNS. It is more difficult to see connections between these departments and the Stockbridge School of Agriculture and allied depts. (e.g., food science, Plant, soil and Insect Sciences, Natural resources conservation). This is not a value judgment. The SSA and allied departments have a huge service component that is completely foreign to NSM.*

*NSM Faculty Member - I feel that UMass has benefited greatly from its non-traditional organization into colleges that share a research culture and methodology. Computer Science has blossomed under the support it received with such an organization and fared much better than many computer science departments housed in Colleges of Arts and Sciences or Colleges of Engineering, since the former is too large to be supportive and the latter has a different emphasis and culture. ... we are housed in a college that understands our research methodology and has, for the most part, been able to be flexible in responding to our needs.*

*Graduate Student Representative – [The most desirable plan it seems to me is]... to combine more synergistic units (NSM and NRE), and keep less synergistic units (SBS and HFA) separate and distinct. My sense is that unit identities could be kept more intact and competition between units of incompatible values and priorities could be minimized under the Chancellor's modified model.*

#### *Impact on Centers and Institutes*

The many Centers and Institutes on campus are important components of the research capability of the university. Many of them have strong track records of obtaining sponsored research and are highly visible externally. Reorganization will likely involve moving some of them to new organizational homes, with unknown consequences for their future capability. If their new home recognizes and values the kind of research they do, then the move will either help maintain or possibly even increase their potential. If the move results in a taxing of their resources to support other components of the unit, then it could reduce their effectiveness.

*Kinesiology Faculty Member - Care must be taken to ensure that current, highly-functioning units in emerging research areas are not jeopardized by structural changes. For example, the Center for Research on Families has significantly enhanced the scope of the research mission of the campus. It is a multidisciplinary unit that includes researchers from nine departments on campus. The center is housed currently in SBS, and attracts funding from NIH, NSF and multiple foundations and private organizations. In considering reorganization of the current academic structure, thought must be given to questions such as: How would a new structure affect where a research center is housed, and the allocation of its resources? How will its "location" affect its mission, its potential to garner additional resources, and the overall research enterprise on campus?*

*One solution would be to house these interdisciplinary centers “above” the level of a single college or school, and give them the direct support of the research administration on campus.*

*Social Science Faculty Member - If SBS is kept separate, as your plan A and plan B promise, then I am not so worried about a home for the Center for Research on the Family (CRF). I guess it still depends on what happens to Psychology. There may be other Centers that are supported by a current College that may be threatened by mergers. For example, the Institute for Global Health (IGH) may suffer or grow if Nursing is pooled with Public Health.*

*Social Science Faculty Member - Some arts and sciences colleges use a set of functional associate deans (budget, HR, undergrad education, etc) and then locate intellectual coherence in several centers, institutes, programs and cross-cutting faculty committees and groups. Others use a set of associate deans of divisions preserving a divisional structure within the college. But in these divisional structures as well, a strong set of cross-cutting, horizontal groups, offices, roles, etc are necessary to foster communication, shared purpose, etc.*

### **Strategies to Enhance the Research Mission of the University**

Returning to the issues set out at the beginning of this report, the Research Council feels that, regardless of the details of the new configuration, in order to maintain or increase the capability for research, the new units need to establish mechanisms and procedures to realize the potential research benefits of the reorganization. What is striking at the moment is the relative scarcity of such mechanisms in many of the existing departments, schools and colleges.

In what follows a series of suggested actions are put forward.

□ Scanning the Environment – Colleges, Schools and Departments would benefit from creating structures whose task is to scan the environment of sponsoring agencies and create a map of both current and emerging priorities in their field. Ideally, we would already have such information and would use it to inform the process of reorganization, but we have little systematic information beyond the perceptions of individuals who are active in various fields of research. One faculty member suggested that:

*School of Public Health and Health Science Faculty Member - change in organizational structure should be taken with an eye toward emerging opportunities. Several of these opportunities have been identified by the current Obama administration, including but not limited to health, sustainable energy, and education. Without a doubt, these will be around for some time to come. A successful research one university will capitalize on its unique sets of expertise, and frame them in the context of these opportunities.*

Other RC Members suggested that such scanning should be part of a strategic planning exercise that units should undertake to identify future directions and then decide which directions the unit wants to invest in to be competitive for new research directions. This would be particularly appropriate for new configurations as part of the process of dealing with differences and coming to share some aspects of a common mission.

□ **Research Development Leadership** – At various levels of the university-Colleges, Schools, Departments, and Programs, research funding would be enhanced by the formation of an ongoing committee, perhaps with designated administrative leadership like an associate dean or deputy department chair, that was responsible for identifying funding opportunities, encouraging appropriate faculty to consider applying, coordinating efforts that might compete or overlap, and helping to get needed support for proposal writing and budgeting.

*School of Education Faculty Member – In our Center, we have a Program Development Committee made up of faculty, staff and students. This committee looks for current and upcoming funding opportunities and facilitates a process of deciding which ones we should bid on. This committee also looks at emerging areas of interest in the sponsor community. Periodically, we review our areas of strength and ask what new areas we want to develop. A recent example of this was the decision to invest in developing our expertise and reputation in the field of education in fragile states. We have since undertaken a series of activities that make us more visible and capable in this field with the expectation that it will result in future research and implementation opportunities.*

*NSM Faculty Member – [Paraphrased from comments in RC Meeting] In our department clusters of faculty members engaged in similar kinds of research have banded together to fund staff positions that help faculty with grant writing and budgets for proposals, and grant administration after awards. The indirect overhead returned to PIs is critical in making such strategies possible. Similar strategies can be employed at department or School levels with leadership that understands the kind of support that is essential for a growing research endeavor.*

□ **Marketing** – UMass should seek to create sub-units or groups with *unique identifiers* as titles that reflect areas of research strength that are responsive to opportunities identified in the scanning of the environment.

*Kinesiology Faculty Member - These units would build on synergies that position the campus in a unique and highly-competitive way. For example, there currently exists on campus a wealth of research expertise and activity related to health and the environment, yet this expertise is diluted in various pockets, with no particular structure or identity for this emerging area of opportunity. The proposed restructuring will not improve this situation. Rather, a solution that modifies the current reorganizational proposal would be to establish a College of Health and the Environment that includes units for the health sciences, environmental sciences, nursing and public health. Each unit would have its own research culture and goals, but the overall identity of UMass-Amherst as a leader in research on health and the environment would be clear.*

*Memo from 14 Faculty Members - There is a strong political, social, and economic justification for the formation of a Life Sciences and the Environment unit on this campus. Within Massachusetts, the Massachusetts Life Sciences Center (MLSC) was created by the Massachusetts legislature in 2006. ... It is making financial investments in public and private institutions and is building collaborative ventures among sectors of the Massachusetts life sciences community. A new Massachusetts Life Sciences Initiative announced in 2008 includes a \$1 billion investment package to enhance and strengthen the state's internationally recognized leadership in the life sciences. Indeed, funding for a new Life Science Building on the UMass-Amherst campus is dependent on continued investment in the Life Sciences by the Commonwealth. ... Nationally, investments under the recent stimulus package in funding through NIH, NSF, USDA, and DOE make it very*

*clear that we will see continued attention paid to life science and environmental issues. Research in life and environmental sciences is seeing expanded funding opportunities...*

□ **Measures of Research Activity** – UMass needs to present itself externally in ways which are recognized by research sponsors, including measures of research productivity. This is true at the university level as well as for Colleges, Schools, Departments, and Centers. Depending on their field, units of the University should create measures which are used externally as well as serving as internal yardsticks to monitor the progress of individual units in meeting their own research goals.

*Director, Office of Research Affairs - the discussion of research must rest on some critical indicators of 'excellence'. John Lombardi made it really simple with his research expenditure and butts in the seat model. Perhaps the NRC evaluation of doctoral programs is a little broader but it still focuses on scholarly products and competitive grants and awards as key indicators. The Chemistry department's use of the SSRI is another hard figure. We must use definitions that make sense in the national competition that we are in for funding.*

□ **Pre- and Post-Award Staffing** – Many RC members commented on the lack of support for proposal writing and budgeting, while others pointed out problems with research administration, especially in a time when regulations and enforcement of government rules is being applied more stringently. Successful units are much more likely to have made the investment in staff members who help PIs manage the whole sponsored research process. Modest investments in staff can pay off many times over by making increased research funding possible. There are many ways to finance such staff and the investment doesn't pay off immediately. Failing to invest, particularly in a new configuration may limit the growth of research funding.

#### **Summary Comments on Reorganization from Research Council**

There are two general conclusions from the Research Council review of the proposed reorganization.

□ **Skillful and successful management of differences in newly merged units is essential to minimize potentially negative impacts on research in the new configuration.**

□ **Creating new mechanisms, procedures and ultimately a culture of support for research within new configurations is equally essential if the benefits from new configurations are to be fully realized.**

#### *Management of Differences between Components of New Configurations*

The challenge will be to successfully manage the differences in the key dimensions discussed at the beginning. To the extent that each new configuration successfully manages the differences between its constituent departments the potential negative impact on research will be minimized. Failure to manage differences successfully has the potential to significantly undermine the research effort at least in the short-term and possibly beyond. Some of those most likely to be problematic for research are.....

□ **Units with a strong record of success in generating sponsored research funds need to have their procedures and resources protected so as to maintain and grow that strength.**

- The existing 70-10-10-10 formula for distribution of indirect costs can function as a reasonable and acceptable tax mechanism by which more successful units subsidize the development of the research potential in less successful units. The formula also provides a transparent, easily administered, and decentralized provision of development resources. By decentralizing to three lower levels, the formula allows each level to make the most effective use of resources in its context.
- Merging units need to create a transitional personnel process that provides protection for current faculty members using criteria and priorities under which they were hired. Such a transitional structure can also serve as a mechanism for gradually developing a modified set of criteria in regard to research that recognizes and values the various kinds of research taking place in the new configuration.
- Merging units with distinctly different research cultures will require exceptional leadership capabilities that are not as essential in more homogenous units. Leaders will have to create a climate of respect and valuation of diverse approaches to research, particularly where pure research units are merged with units having a strong applied research and service mandate.

*Creating Mechanisms and Procedures that Enhance the Research Capacity*

In some ways much of the research effort on campus resembles the gentleman scientist model that characterized much research in the 19<sup>th</sup> Century. We have professional researchers who often operate individually and in units as amateur managers of the research enterprise. While this model has worked in the past, it is no longer adequate for the challenges faced by UMass now. If sponsored research is to become a sustainable and growing revenue stream for the university, then the management of the research enterprise needs to be professionalized. Discussion in the Research Council produced a number of steps that would significantly strengthen the management of the research business on campus.

- Creating staff positions and procedures at Department, School/College level that are charged with bringing a systematic and professional approach to the business of seeking sponsored research and managing resulting awards.
- Creating accountable structures that are charged with scanning the external environment, marketing the capabilities of the university, and working with faculty members to help them match research proposals and sponsor priorities effectively.
- Creating a pool of resources at various levels that can be strategically invested in promising new ventures. Recognizing that having the resources to support marketing, sales, and staffing are all essential parts of any business endeavor.
- Training PIs and administrators to understand procedures for accounting and management of research awards, and thereby making it clear that marketing, sales, and management skills are a necessary part of the role of being a research faculty member or an administrator in this new environment.