

UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST
OFFICE OF THE FACULTY SENATE

Presiding Officer Robert Wilson called the General Faculty Meeting to order on January 29, 2009 at 4:00 p.m. in the Campus Center Auditorium.

Robert Wilson, Presiding Officer – I am Robert Wilson, Presiding Officer of the Faculty Senate and by the Constitution, the Presiding Officer of the General Faculty meetings. I am a professor at the Isenberg School of Management. Our Constitution allows for a General Faculty meeting to be called in three different ways, two of which are being followed today. One is a request by the Chancellor to call such a meeting, and the Chancellor has requested such a meeting. The other is by a petition by more than 10 percent of the faculty, and that has also occurred. Since both of the requests are related to the ongoing budget situation and reorganization issues, we decided to have one meeting to deal with those issues. The purpose of today's meeting and following meetings is to provide updates and information about the budget situation, to provide answers as to what is going on with reorganization and to answer other questions and provide other updates.

You have all received an agenda that has been set by the Faculty Senate Rules Committee. That setting of the agenda is also provided for in the Faculty Senate Constitution. Today's meeting has no motions contained in it except the last item of business, and that is to recess the meeting. Today's meeting is to provide information and to answer questions. There are going to be two parts to the meeting. The first part will be an address by the Chancellor to all of us regarding the budget situation and the reorganization. After he comments about the budget situation, the Chancellor will open the floor up to questions from the audience. At the same time, that part of the question period is going to be limited because we want to allow the Chancellor to talk with us about reorganization as well. The second part of the meeting, which is tentatively scheduled to be up to an hour but could be longer if people want to continue to ask questions and make comments, is to give faculty and others the opportunity to make comments and to ask questions directly to the Chancellor about the budget situation and about reorganization.

This meeting will be continued at the end of today's session until Monday, February 9th at 4:00 p.m. at which point there will be another meeting. The Rules Committee is going to start to work tomorrow on an agenda for that second meeting. It is possible that there will be another meeting after February 9th as well. Our Constitution requires that we have a quorum requirement for all items on the agenda, and that quorum requirement is that it is those people present. There is certainly a quorum for today's meeting. Items that are not on the agenda require a quorum to be a majority of UMass Amherst Faculty members, which is the about 600, the majority. I am going to run today's meeting in accordance with *Robert's Rules of Order*. During the second part of the meeting, or whenever the Chancellor decides to take questions, I ask that you not speak until you are recognized by either the Chancellor or by myself. Before you speak, come to one of the two microphones, and when you come to the microphone, identify yourself, your position and your school or college. Finally, before I introduce the Chancellor today, I ask all of you at today's meeting and at subsequent meetings to show respect for everyone and their opinions. It is okay to have a difference of opinion, but I hope we can do this in a civil, respectful way.

Robert C. Holub, Chancellor – Thank you all for coming here today. We have important things to discuss, but first I wanted to say a couple of words about myself and who I am. I have been a faculty member for thirty years. I still identify myself as a faculty member. I will soon become a member of this faculty, and I am very proud of that. I have always worked at public institutions of higher education. This is what I have dedicated my life to for many years, and I am trying to promote public higher education here in Massachusetts and trying to do the best I can for this particular institution.

One of the things that I objected to was the headline I saw the other day in the *Springfield Republican*. It said, "Chancellor Faces the Faculty" or something similar to that. I do not consider this meeting to be one of confrontation. I conceive of this as part of an ongoing discussion because we are dealing with very serious problems. I feel that I am one of the faculty and have been entrusted by the University of Massachusetts with trying to find solutions to some very difficult problems, problems that nobody welcomed, and I certainly did not welcome in my first year here.

This is a preface (referring to slides). This was something Barack Obama said at his inaugural address. I think it fits in well with what is facing us. We have very serious challenges today. These challenges are not going to go away in a short period of time, but I feel that if we face them together, united as a campus, then we have a better chance of coming through. Barack Obama and I both have the similarity of having been interested in a job before this economic downturn so that we were surprised when we got the jobs and found

the state of affairs. There are a couple of differences, of course. Barack Obama has a much larger purview in his job, and also he can print money which is something I wish I could do that as well.

I want to talk about the budget first. The most important figure is the one in the lower right-hand corner, the \$46 million. Let me explain briefly how we got to the \$46 million. We started out in this year with a slight budget surplus in base funding of \$832,000. Then, we suffered two mid-year cuts of \$11.366 and \$1.297 million. The base budget cuts that we had in this year amount to \$12.66 million. In order to cover those cuts, we took some money from the base budget that we'd received last spring that's about \$4.66 million. We applied that to the cuts, but you can see that \$4.66 million doesn't cover all of the cuts, so we covered the rest of it with one-time money. That leaves us entering FY10 with a deficit of approximately \$7.2 million. We chose to do it that way in order not to disrupt this academic year and to be able to do better planning for the kind of cuts that we have to make.

In FY10, we have a few things. One is that there is a loss of revenue that we couldn't anticipate at the beginning of FY09. The loss of revenue, most of this \$6 million, which is an approximate figure, comes from interest earnings, the earnings that we get from money that comes in. The interest rates, as you know, are much lower this year. We had about \$9.7 million in interest earnings last year. This year, we'll have somewhere between \$4-5 million. That is most of that \$6 million. There are some other items there as well. There is an increase in debt payment of a small amount. When facilities such as the Studio Arts Building or the ISB come online, there are facilities costs. We have additional base expenses in that amount.

So, without the cuts to our budget, we enter FY10 with a deficit of \$15.8 million. If we would not get any cuts for next year, we would still have a deficit of \$15.8 million in base budget that we'd have to make up. That is not likely to happen. The Governor's budget was promulgated yesterday, and we know that there us \$25 million in budget reductions in that budget. To that \$25 million, we have to add an additional sum because anyone who's paid from state money has their fringe benefits paid by the State. If you're not paid from state money and we have to put that on other money, then we have to pick up the fringe benefits. So, in order to pick up fringe benefits for people who would no longer be on state money because of the reductions in state money, we'd have to spend another \$5 million. That's the way we get to the \$46 million. The second slide just goes over the same things, just gives a little more detail, but no matter how we do it, we get to the \$46 million. This just gives a little bit of information about how much we're losing or gaining in various of the smaller categories to get to that point.

Let me also try to clarify something else because this has also appeared in the newspaper, and that is the difference between our total budget and what I would call our fungible budget. Our total budget is much larger than our fungible budget. The total budget last year was approximately \$850 million, that is the last one you see, FY09. The budget is \$856 million there, but a lot of that money is not money we can use for anything that we would like to use it for. A large part of it comes from auxiliaries. We have a very large residential campus, as you know. Students pay for housing and dining. That money is something that comes in as a revenue, and we have to count it as a revenue in terms of bookkeeping, but it's not something we can use for other things such as hiring faculty. The same thing with grants and contracts that are gotten from industry or from the Federal Government or State Government. Those are restricted funds that have to be applied to what those grants are received for. There is a large part of the budget that is not fungible, that we can't use very readily, that goes to specific types of things that we can't alter.

Therefore, I wanted to explain a little bit about where we are with our fungible budget or what we call the fungible budget of the total campus budget. If we take that \$856 million and we take away the things that are pass-throughs more or less, such as auxiliaries where the revenues pass through us, receive the revenue and then we have expenses in that amount or grants and contracts, things like that, we get to a figure that is about \$500 million that we call the unrestricted, undesignated base. Now, that unrestricted, undesignated base is also a budget that we can't use completely because there are other things that we have in our fixed budget that are fixed costs that we have. There are fixed costs, such as debt payments, which we have to pay. The debt payments come, in part, from all the construction that we've done on campus over the last six or seven years. Then, because most of that construction was funded by us—there was only 8 percent that was funded by the State, that means that we had to take out bond issues, and now we have debt payments that we have to make on the money that we borrowed. Obviously, we have to pay utilities. That may go up or down a little bit. When we get down to what we have as a fungible portion of the campus budget, it's about \$300 million. You can see that a \$46 million deficit, out of a \$300 million budget, is a fairly substantial decrease. That \$46 million is before any revenue enhancements, but nonetheless it is a \$46 million deficit.

Now, what we have done so far and what I have reported to the Board of Trustees already, is how we dealt with the first 9c cuts, these midyear cuts. As I said, about \$4.7 million came from the base budget that we have already. Instead of doing things such as hiring faculty, what we did was we took that money that was given to us by the State and we gave it back for the mid-year cut. The rest was taken in one-time reductions. \$4.8 million was taken from the various units, and about \$2 million from central funds. Those are funds we still have to find in the base budget for the budget reduction in FY10. This was just a delaying tactic so that we could delay for a year and not take base budget off of the first, right when we had that. Not all campuses in the University of Massachusetts system acted that way of course. Some of them made base budget cuts in FY09, but we opted to make base budget cuts in FY10 for a large part of what was given to us as a cut in FY09. Also, on December 17th, I announced that where we should look first is toward administrative savings, so the Provost and I decided we were going to cut \$.5 million out of the Chancellor's and Provost's areas by merging, consolidating functions and doing things like that. We are going to also put a hold on certain capital projects for about \$5 million. That doesn't gain us any base budget, but it does gain us some money that we can use, perhaps, for some bridging from one year to the next. That isn't money that is recurring money. So it isn't base money; it isn't money that comes to us every year. But, we are putting certain capital projects on hold. We also stopped the transfer of about \$1.5 million from our operating budget to the capital budget. That money is used for refurbishing classrooms for deferred maintenance for moves and things of this nature. This isn't money that we can always use for operating. I think at some point we'll have to put that back in the budget. I don't think that we can do this year after year, but at least for this year and for next year, perhaps, we will not be transferring that money so that we can apply it toward our deficit. We also have savings on energy that we don't know exactly what the value of them is. I know that my office thermostat is set at 66 degrees and I've told everyone across the campus to set their thermostats at 67 degrees. Some of that will no doubt result in savings to the campus. We are also curtailing certain things like travel advocacy and various events, so we figure that we will be able to apply that towards the deficit, somewhere between \$2-2.5 million. That's a small amount of money, but in this kind of a budget situation, we have to get savings anywhere we can get savings. Some of that money, as I said, in future years, will probably have to go back toward capital expenses because of the sore need we have for deferred maintenance.

This is a slight digression, but I thought that this was interesting for you to see. You often see the headline that there are rising costs in education. In fact, costs have not risen. If we adjust dollars and look at FY1999, we see that it costs more in FY99 to educate a student than it did in FY2008, so that we're actually spending less money on educating students and part of that has to do with you and the kinds of things that you have experienced over the years. What has actually occurred is that the state's operating subsidy, the state's allocation, has gone down in terms of these adjusted dollars by approximately \$1000. Tuition and fees have gone up only by a slight amount in terms of adjusted dollars, although it may seem like they have gone up a lot, it's only gone up very minimally in terms of adjusted dollars. Federal support has gone down, most of that I think is the Pell grant. That may go up again under the new administration which has talked about raising Pell grants. Here you see that we have been fairly good stewards and fairly frugal in public higher education in spending money on students.

I want to talk a little about the federal stimulus plan because this is something that's very much in the news and there are various things being said about it. Let me briefly explain it. I was down in Washington last Wednesday and Thursday talking to people in Kennedy's office and Kerry's office and I spoke to John Olver a couple of times. There were a number of things passed yesterday in the House bill. The Granting Agencies, for example, are going to get more money so there will be an increase in NSF, NIH and other agency funding which is something that we're trying to take advantage of on the campus. I've asked Paul Kosteci to spearhead that effort in order to get more money for our research on campus. There will be some money coming to us in capital expenditures and that will be coming through the state. That money will go to the state and then be distributed to various agencies in the state. We've already given a list of projects to the Governor and to the Governor's office and we're hoping that we will get money for those capital projects over the next few months. So there are a lot of things actually in this stimulus package, but the part that's been perhaps the most widely spoken about is the part that's called the State's Stabilization section of the bill. The State's Stabilization section devotes \$79 billion over a two-year period to be distributed to the states; 61% of that is going to be devoted to education, K-12 and higher education. That is something that will probably be duplicated in the Senate bill. Whether it will eventually pass or not, because there is some opposition as you've seen, some Republican opposition to this, but we think that there is a good chance that that will be passed. There are some uncertainties about it, of course, and that is the Republican opposition and how that might modify it. There are also uncertainties because private institutions want to see private institutions included in that. I consider that it would be unlikely for that to occur because most of the education in the United States is public higher education and, since this is a Federal bill, I don't think that that will occur, but it's possible that we would have to compete for this money in Massachusetts with private

institutions if that does get altered. But, let's assume that it doesn't and that it goes through the way that it is. Then the question is how much are we going to get of that money. There is a formula that is not based on population evidently. If it were based on population, we would get 2%. We're going to get somewhat less than that. That's what John Oliver told me because the formula has to do with average income in the state and ours is high. Therefore, we get a lower allocation. It also has to do with the number of K-12 students where we have per capita fewer K-12 students. What exactly will come to the state is an unknown. How much of that will then be devoted to K-12 and how much to post-secondary education is something that we don't know right now. At a certain point, there will be an allocation to higher education or to post-secondary education as it's worded there. The specific wording says that this money that is supposed to stabilize state budgets is dedicated to moving the budgets back toward the FY08 state allocation level. Nobody thinks there's enough money in there to actually do that, but that's the expressed goal of this allocation. Once it gets to higher education, we're pretty confident that we'll get about a quarter of that, about half goes to the University of Massachusetts and about a little less than half in this case goes to the Amherst campus. So that's what we think we'll get after we know what the post-secondary allocation is, but there is a long way to go before we know what that it.

Is this something that solves current and future problems? The answer to that is probably not because, first of all, it's kind of one-time money for two years so it isn't going to solve all the problems because we need recurring money; we need base budget money in order to proceed with the kinds of things that we want to do. You can't hire faculty for two years and then say, "whoops, we don't have enough money. We just have to not pay you this year or eliminate the position." Does it defer problems then to FY12? And that's a possibility; that is, if the state's economy didn't approve or it got worse and there were no further federal allocations, then basically what we'd owe is the same thing we owe right now in terms of deficits. We'd have a \$46 million deficit or more that we'd have to make up so it's a kind of a dangerous situation because we don't know, obviously, what's going to happen in FY12. Does this bridge things for two years? I think that that's a distinct possibility. Will the bridge be a bridge to nowhere? Will it be a bridge that is long enough for us to survive until the state tax revenues recover? These are all questions that are uncertain. One thing I think that it definitely will do is aid in stretching these cuts over more than one cycle, if we're going to cut, which I think we have to do. That is, it can be used to a certain extent to soften what we do from one year to the next year so that we don't have to do everything in one particular year. That is basically what the Federal Stimulus Plan is and what I think for possible interpretations of it. Things are kind of murky with regard to that because we don't have the exact magnitude of the money; we don't know how much it's going to be and we don't know what strings are going to be attached to it. So, one of the things that's in the Bill that these monies should mitigate is tuition and fee increases. Tuition and fee increases are a recurring amount of money. It's a steady amount of money. It's a base budget amount of money because it comes to us every year. This money is one-time money that comes to us for two years, so they're very different types of money. What exactly that means and how that will play out is something that is yet to be determined. (referring to the slides) I just wanted to show you what it means and you can see how far down we are from the FY08. The appropriation is approximately \$214.7 million after the 9c cuts – after the mid-year cuts. We take away from that the \$25 million that is in the Governor's budget, leaving us with \$189.7. The state appropriation in FY08 was \$223.7. That means that the maximum amount of Federal money that we would get would be \$34 million and that would be \$34 million times two or \$68 million in that two-year period. As I said, nobody that I've spoken to thinks we are going to get anywhere near that kind of money, but that would be the maximum amount that we could get.

The other thing that is uncertain about this is what will it do to the fringe benefit reduction? Money that comes from the state, as I said, the state pays fringe benefits on. Is this money going to be the same color as that state money or will it be something we will have to pay fringe benefits on? If it's considered state money, then we have another \$5 million that we can chop off of our deficit. As you can see, even in the situation where we get everything, which is a situation nobody believes in, and all the fringe benefits, we would still have a budget deficit going into next year because of the various factors that I explained before. So that's the presentation on the budget and I just wanted to ask if there are any questions or anything that I could clarify on this specific budget situation. There's not much controversy about it because there's nothing really controversial in these numbers. They are very unfortunate numbers, but I don't know that there is that much controversy. If you have any questions about them, I'd be happy to hear from you.

Professor Gerald Friedman, Economics – I was just wondering if it would be possible to refinance some of our debt, given the lower interest rates on long-term borrowing.

Chancellor Holub – I don't know. I would have to ask Joyce (Hatch) if we could refinance any of that. You're talking about the debt service we're paying on construction that we've done?

Joyce Hatch, Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance – That’s actually a good question and we have raised our debt. All of our debt is borrowed through the Building Authority and, at this point, a certain amount absolutely cannot be refinanced, but of the amount that possibly could be, the penalties would be so severe that it’s not worth it at this point. It would be more costly to do that. We have asked that question.

Professor David Kotz, Economics – I have a question about whether this Federal money should be considered one-time. After two years, the economy will either recover or it won’t. If it recovers, then it will have bridged the gap. If it hasn’t recovered, then one could think that the same political pressures would be on the Federal Government to continue to provide some funding. So, I wondered if perhaps there is a basis for considering this to not just be temporary in that sense.

Chancellor Holub – I agree and, as soon as we know how much it is, we’re going to have to make some strategic decisions about what it is. But whether the Federal Government is going to be in a position two years hence to do the same thing that it’s doing now, and how that will work out for Massachusetts is, of course, an open question. If other states have recovered in a better way than we have, then there will be less pressure to do this. There are still a lot of uncertainties attached to it and I would say we can’t treat it purely as a recurring base budget. It shouldn’t be looked at as purely one time, but we have to sort of see it as a hybrid and be very careful about what we’re doing with it and what kind of commitments we’re making with that kind of money that we’re uncertain about two years from now.

Samantha Hill, President of GEO and Graduate Student, Political Science – The numbers are not controversial. There is obviously an economic crisis that we have to deal with and I think I’ve heard this presentation three times now and it also doesn’t change. The first place you look to solve the economic crisis is to the faculty and students. My question is – how is UMass supposed to remain a flagship university when class sizes keep getting bigger while we have less faculty? The first thing you are going to do is lay off faculty members and to raise student fees. \$19.3 million of our general budget goes towards President Wilson’s office. That almost \$20 million a year and that money is unaccounted for. We would like to know where that money goes. What other sources of revenue are you exploring? The Chancellor’s position has received a 30% raise over the past five years. What other areas are you exploring? Why is it always the faculty, the staff and the students that get sacrificed first and help to pony-up the money for this budget crisis?

Chancellor Holub – Actually the first place we looked, as I thought I tried to make clear, was in administration. So the only place that we’ve made any cuts so far is in central campus administration and one of the things about the reorganization is that, in looking for other places where we could realize administrative savings, reorganization was one of them. I think that the first places we are looking are really not the faculty. On the other hand, if you take that \$300 million fungible budget, more than two-thirds of that \$300 million fungible budget is in Academic Affairs. It’s very difficult to know what to do. There’s a certain minimal level of operating on any campus. You can’t cut out maintenance completely; you can’t cut out people who are working in the Registrar’s Office or other kinds of offices around the campus. You can’t have no help in any of the departments, so there is a certain minimal level that you need. You can’t cut out everything. Unfortunately, when we look to the budget, we have to look to the Academic Affairs budget and that is a place that we are looking. I didn’t think the meeting was about the budget but rather about the reorganization, but I did want to explain the budget to you and where we’re at so that you’d have a context for what we are trying to do with the reorganization.

Reorganization

One of the things that I said immediately in October when we were faced with these cuts is that my priority on this campus is to preserve as many tenure and tenure-track positions as I could. That’s the most important thing for me. We’ve invested in people on campus. We need to pay special attention to tenure and tenure-track faculty. This reorganization is designed to do that. We want to also foster research opportunities. I think that that can be done with reorganization as well. I think that there is an opportunity to enhance curricular activities and I’ve heard from a number of people some positive things about curricular things that can be done in the context of reorganization, including things like new programs or new courses, new ways perhaps to look at our General Education requirement. It’s also a means, I think, to promote interdisciplinary activities on campus among faculty and students. We will streamline our operations, I think, for better efficiency in the colleges and provide, in the context of these opportunities, clearer directions for our development and fundraising activities. These are some of the things I thought about with regard to reorganization when it occurred to me to do this. Actually, I can’t claim credit for it. Reorganization or merging of units or whatever you want to call it was first suggested to me by a long-time member of the

faculty who said that to me almost immediately with regard to the budget cuts and, when I first heard it, I didn't think it had anything to it, but, when I thought about it further, then I thought it was probably a good idea to examine it. Now, the rationale for this is that I would rather cut from administration than cut from instructional capacity, cut from tenure-track faculty, lecturers, teaching assistants. So, whatever I can save in an area other than faculty lines, I consider to be worthwhile. I think that it also is seeking to streamline the activity of some of the colleges and, at the same time, having a minimal impact on individuals and on departments and programs. It was very important to me to preserve programs, to preserve departments and to have a minimal impact on the research and teaching activity of individuals. An inconsiderable factor is that there's an expectation that's placed on the campus to do something that would eliminate certain activities that we have and, if you've read the newspapers, then you've seen that almost all organizations that are faced with this budget crisis, which is just about every industry and university across the country, are eliminating things. You saw what Brandeis is eliminating. You saw what Penn is eliminating. Elimination is something that we have to do in order to preserve other things on the campus. It's something that is almost expected of us because this is the way that one handles these kinds of crises. I'm thinking in particular of our donors, the Board of Trustees and the politicians who control our other sources of revenue. That is, they understand that in a crisis like this, something has to be done that a dramatic move and these kinds of things enable me to satisfy those constituencies while, at the same time, sparing the things that are the core mission of the campus; that is, the programs, departments and individual faculty members' activities. So, I think that that's my calculation and I actually think it's the correct calculation for those of you who know these kinds of constituencies. It positions us also, I hope, as I've said, for new collaborations in research and teaching.

Now, one of the aims I was thinking of in the reorganization is to consolidate the life sciences. You know that we were originally an agricultural college as most land-grant universities were and, to some extent, we are no longer focused on the same kind of land-grant mission that we had in the 19th century. Most of the people who are in the old Ag School, Natural Resources and the Environment now, are doing the kinds of science that wouldn't be identified necessarily with what their predecessors did in the 19th century, nor are they servicing things in exactly the same way. To integrate the life sciences, therefore, seems like it would bring a 19th-century structure into the 21st century and it seemed like a good idea on this occasion.

I also want to have minimal impact on accreditation. We certainly don't want to harm the students in any of these colleges or any programs or schools. We want it to have a negative impact on the units as I've said before and to perhaps have some positive results from synergy. I want to achieve a savings of \$1 million to perhaps \$2 million and it's important to me that at the same time to avoid duplication of functions at the college level and at the central administration level while also avoiding additional layers of administration. So these are the aims that I've thought of when I've been considering reorganization.

Let me talk a little bit about the procedures that we have. As I said, I was told about this as a possible avenue in October and I started to think about it then. Then, in November, when we had more information on what was coming down the road for us in terms of cuts, it started out as a Faculty Task Force, now it's a Budget Planning Task Force since we've added three student members and four staff members and, in the original charge to that Task Force, I talked about and I asked them to look at consolidations, mergers to eliminate administrative costs in the colleges. So that was part of the original Task Force charge. It's something that was promulgated in a letter to them and put on the Budget web site in November.

In December, there were wide-ranging discussions with deans, both in small groups and as a group of the total deans. I asked the deans to solicit information and to solicit input from the faculty. I've gotten a lot of input from the faculty. I've fielded dozens of emails from people who've commented on reorganization and I know Charlena (Seymour) has gotten many as well. We've gotten input from our web site during that time. The web site was set up back in October and we, of course, have a General Faculty meeting that I called for back in December when I talked to Ernie (May) and asked him to arrange for a general meeting where we could get more input. I've been meeting the last couple of weeks with leadership groups from all of the colleges as well as groups of distinguished faculty members. Those were meetings that were arranged by Charlena so we're meeting widely with a lot of people from across the entire campus and, of course, we've had intense discussions with the senior staff on all of these issues as well.

Now, I just want to reflect just a little bit on rumors that have been circulating and that have come back to me about the reorganization. The first one is particularly troubling to me. I've heard this unfortunately from someone who is a politician that the reorganization was forced on the campus by the President or by the Board of Trustees and I just want to tell you that that's absolutely false. I know that the campus has had strained relationships at times with the Office of the President and perhaps with the President himself, but Jack Wilson has never told me how to do anything. Unfortunately, he has told me that I do have a budget

deficit and that I have to listen to. But he's never told me how to handle this and, at any time that I've spoken to him about the things that we're considering here on campus, he's always said, "Bob, whatever you do, I'm going to support you in this." It's the same way with Rob Manning, Chair of the Board of Trustees and Jim Karam. They've also said exactly the same thing. They haven't given me any suggestions, any hints. They haven't tried to influence this process at all. So, any credit or blame for this comes from the campus and doesn't belong in any sense to the President or the Board of Trustees. I just want to add that I wouldn't have taken this job as Chancellor if I thought I was going to be micromanaged. That was something that I insisted on. I said that I must have the autonomy to run this campus and that was what I expected. I have to say that I haven't been disappointed. If I go to Washington, D.C., I don't have to ask permission.

That the decisions are hasty is also something that has been said, but unfortunately, we're not given a lot of time to deal with these issues. We do have a \$46 million budget deficit that has to be taken care of in FY10. The process has not been top-down. I've been soliciting information from faculty for a long period of time and I've been consulting with faculty for a long period of time. Now, the notion that there's no substantial savings is something that's come up in a variety of discussions, but my feeling about that is the following. Charlena gets requests just about daily to get permission to hire a faculty member in one department or another. Those requests usually are for \$80,000 or \$100,000. The argument certainly can be made with those individual requests – well \$80,000, what does that mean? You have a budget deficit of \$46 million. But the fact is, unless you draw a line, unless you start saving those \$80,000 at each time that you can, you're not going to be able to make up a deficit of that size. So the savings that we will get by no means covers the entire budget deficit, but certainly they'll save 10 faculty positions, 20 lecturer positions, or 50 stipends for TA's. To me, the tradeoff is easy. If I have the choice to be made between reorganization and saving on administrative costs or 10 faculty positions, I'll always want to hire those faculty members rather than have the organization stay put and to lose that money.

The timeline for reorganization – I'm not firm on this yet. I plan to gather information as I've been gathering it. I believe I have my last meetings with the distinguished faculty members tomorrow. I think I have three more meetings. Then I will make a proposal which will be generally known. The Faculty Senate, as I've learned, has to review that proposal and make a recommendation. We'll move toward implementation, I hope, in the subsequent months and then this would go into effect at the beginning of the next fiscal year. So, the success of the reorganization depends largely on the attitude that you have and your participation in this. I've told the story a number of times about the reorganizations that I've been in. When I was at Berkeley, we eliminated the College of Letters and Science, or at least the Dean and the Provost of the College of Letters and Science. We eliminated those positions and I was opposed to that and argued against it, but it happened anyway. Actually, it didn't affect me at all from one day to the next. I was able to do the same kinds of things. So, I know what it is to argue something and not get what you argued for. The second instance was in the humanities, more specifically where the Provost wanted to cluster departments in the humanities, so that they would have shared administrative staffs. Now I also took a position that I wasn't exactly opposed completely, but I was opposed to the way that this was being done. I was opposed to the combination that German was put in because German was put together with Spanish, which I thought was the least intellectually connected with German of the departments that were under consideration. So, that was done anyway and what I decided to do at that point was to try to make the best of it. I was chair of the German department at the time and then entrusted with the task of taking care of the administrative staffs. I tried to do the best that I could to make a good administrative staff to keep this issue away from the faculty so that the faculty could continue to be productive and didn't have to be bothered with the various administrative details that I was taking care of. I think that we did a pretty good job in the German/Spanish/Portuguese administrative unit which is what it became called and it became a very functional unit and we did well.

Now there was another unit that didn't want to do this clustering, this reorganization, and fought against it for five years or so. The faculty wound up fighting with each other, the faculty and staff fought with each other and it became kind of a dysfunctional unit. Eventually, the Dean who was Ralph Hexter at that time, now the President of Hampshire College, asked me to come in and put that unit into receivership and to take over the administrative unit which I did for a semester and tried to set it on a slightly different course. As I said, your active participation is going to be very important. Lead time is also important and I think that if we go into this with a positive spirit, we will be ultimately much more successful. That's all that I have to say about reorganization. I'm happy to answer any questions or to hear anything you have to say about what we're considering.

Senator Marta Calas, Management – I think I have several things I want to comment on and I’m just wondering where to start. Let me start by saying that when I met you, when you came to campus to interview, I came to the general session and there were varieties of people there, faculty, staff and students. Several people asked questions around how much did you know about us and what were your plans for the campus. If I remember correctly, the thing that you said that has stuck with me the most, because you were very different in that regard from any of the other candidates, was that you didn’t know much about us but that you wanted to learn and it would probably take you a year to learn about us. Now, it just happened that you came, there was a budget crisis and now there is going to be a reorganization. If you knew a lot about us or a little bit more about us, you would know that we have been in this place a million times before and that, in fact, we are in exactly the same place and we are hearing the same things. The thing that is really interesting to me is that, in fact, one faculty member, not all of us or most of us or some less distinguished than us, together, didn’t come to you and say, “you know what, we need to reorganize.” But you confessed right now that it was one faculty member who told you that and you thought about it and then eventually you came to the conclusion that it makes sense. Well, I come from the School of Management and sometimes I have difficulty even relating myself to that because I don’t believe we have all the answers and sometimes I even feel embarrassed when we pretend that we do. But the fact of the matter is that it doesn’t seem to me to be a very wise decision to just go from one faculty member’s idea without knowing much about us who have been here a long time and just because we have another budget crisis. Perhaps we can do something different and, instead of worrying about what other people are going to say about us, we decide to start thinking what would it be in a different world when we are the first one to stand up and decide that we don’t have to cut; that we are going to preserve jobs or create new jobs because when we go the slippery slope of creating less jobs or fighting against jobs, what we are doing is really not helping the economy of the U.S. Perhaps, we can do it differently and be the exemplar for many other organizations in the U.S. to follow.

Chancellor Holub – I hardly know where to begin. We are working at the same time on a strategic plan and trying to put the finances of the campus on a different basis so that we’ll be able to alleviate some of the fluctuations that do occur with state funding. Right now, I don’t see any alternative except to make cuts. That’s something that’s being done all over the country, in the business world and in higher education. Again, when I look at the situation, I see some very compelling reasons for reorganization. One of the most compelling is that if it saves me money, then I can devote that to faculty positions, but I also see that it positions us better to be able to obtain revenue from the places where we need to obtain revenue in the future.

Professor Randall Phillis, Biology and President of the Massachusetts Society of Professor – I have a couple of questions just to clarify some points of confusion that I think have been persistent about this issue and then a question about the timing. The first is a question about the cost savings. When I did the math, perhaps too quickly in my head, to get to a million dollars in savings effectively meant that you remove the staff from two or three colleges that are in the college offices in order to achieve the level of savings that you hope to achieve, the \$1-\$2 million range of savings. Chances are that those staffs will have to be moved instead or just eliminated in order to perform the services that will be needed by perhaps the larger colleges of the consolidation. In addition, there will be new needs that account for adjustments to student advising, to lines of accounting. Perhaps there will be physical moves of offices or personnel from one place to another. There are likely to be a whole variety of things, not to mention curricular reforms and other kinds of things that could easily follow from the kinds of reorganizations that you describe. We are now facing a situation where there are effectively no faculty searches underway, that all retirements that we expect this year, which are at least 50 in number and perhaps could approach 100, there will be no searches, staff losses from retirement or other kinds of losses are unlikely also to be replaced by searches and so there will be certainly fewer of us on campus to do the same work. We will have at least as many students if not more and we will have certainly more research effort to do. We’re looking for “shovel-ready research” to help take advantage of the new funding at the National Science Foundation, National Institutes of Health, and, at the same time, there is certain to be extra work that is required to achieve the reorganizations that occur. So I first question whether there really is any monetary gain that the offsetting expenses could easily match the potential savings and that it will certainly impose a workload. Why do we do it now given those constraints? And the question about why are we doing this now also centers around the motivation. So if the motivation were purely to save money, I’m questioning that and, the second part is, is the motivation really internal or what about the external sources? I hear you say that in order to secure the funding from external sources, we need to do this. I hear you say that the Board of Trustees had nothing to do with it and then say that the Board of Trustees is expecting this. I hear you talk about donors and so I’m trying to figure out why now, because it seems that in this time of crisis when the University is asked to do so much that to do this extra thing seems perhaps ill advised.

Chancellor Holub – There is no doubt going to be one-time costs associated with this. I think that's for sure. Whether there will be savings or not, I think is fairly certain. There will be savings. At the very minimum, you have to look at three deans' salaries that will be saved. So I think that some of the back room functions will also be able to be merged and I think that if we talk about \$1 million, we're well within reason. I think that we can run our colleges more on a leaner basis and we have to. I agree with everything that you said, Randy. This is a difficult time and, as I've said to you and I've said to other faculty, we're going to have to do more now with fewer resources. That isn't something that I wanted, but that's something that's the reality of the situation and, when I see that I can save faculty positions, that's what I'm going to try to do. There's maybe a slight irony in all of this. As a faculty member, if I'd been asked ten years ago, where do you want to save money if you have budget reductions? The first thing that I would say is administrative costs and that's what I'm saying – administrative costs are the place to save rather than in faculty lines. I hope that the rest of you agree that that is the place to save and that's what I've been advocating. With regard to internal and external reasons, there are internal and external reasons. That's very true. Nobody in any external position has told me to do this, but in order to secure the kind of funding, in order to be taken seriously in the management function of this University, as I've said to you and to others, if we lose 50 faculty positions which is not out of the realm of possibility, and I say we're going to lose 50 faculty lines, we're not going to have any layoffs, we're just not going to replace people, that's not impressive at all. If I say that we're eliminating three colleges and, at the same time, in eliminating three colleges can preserve the essential functions of the units and programs, then I think we're much better off because I think the other alternatives are to do things like eliminate programs. Eliminating graduate programs, quite frankly, saves me money much more readily and much more easily, but it's something I certainly don't want to do. I'm looking at what I consider to be a very real situation and very real calculations on my part. Now, they may not be 100% accurate, but I think I know some of the kinds of people I'm dealing with because it isn't just people here, it's people across the country who are thinking this way.

Senator Shaw Ling Hsu, Polymer Science and Engineering – I understand the difficulty that the current economic difficulties that I think everyone in the country faces and I also understand the motivation for cost cutting. On the other side is really the revenue generation side of things. I think it's very important to understand your concept on reorganization because reorganization to me (I've been here 31 years) is really not for the next year or the next two years. It's really for the next ten and twenty-five years. One of the things I would like to ask you is, in this reorganization, how do you actually see it to raise the University of Massachusetts' profile because that translates into funding, development or competitive grants, that translates into hiring excellent faculty members and attracting students to the University of Massachusetts campus? How does reorganization lead to a higher and better profile for the University of Massachusetts Amherst?

Chancellor Holub – That's a very good question. One of the things that I've said that we're doing with the strategic plan is trying to look at revenue generation and put the campus on a better footing for generating revenue than it has been in the past. I think that specifically with regard to research, we can be in a much better position with regard to revenue generation if we have certain kinds of collaborations that are fostered in these colleges, but I think more than that, the central administration has to do better and I've said this very often. The central administration is not at the level of the faculty. We have to do better and we have to do better in support of the faculty. There are two areas that I've pointed out and one is in the area of research. The other is in the area of development or fundraising where I think we can do much more. I think that the reorganization allows us to go forward with those initiatives so that we can have the support of the faculty from the central administration that the faculty deserves.

Professor Robert Paynter, Anthropology – You began to address the issue of the life sciences reorganization but there has been quite a bit of discussion in my college about a reorganization that would affect the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences and other colleges and I would like to hear more about that. If the reorganization in life sciences is projected to save \$1-\$2 million, there still seems to be a considerable deficit that needs to be made up. I'm curious what your plans are for making up the rest of that deficit.

Chancellor Holub – First, I would like to correct something briefly and that is the reorganization as a whole will save somewhere between \$1 and \$2 million, not the reorganization of the life sciences. So what are the other things that we're looking at. As I said, we're looking at the elimination of faculty lines, the elimination of lecturer lines, the elimination of teaching assistant lines, the elimination of certain staff functions in various places on the campus. We're looking at cuts in the athletic budget. So, we're looking at all of those areas. Is that what you were referring to?

Professor Paynter – No. I was referring to the reorganization of Social and Behavioral Sciences and Fine Arts and Humanities and another potential college reorganization.

Chancellor Holub – I didn't discuss any of the particular college reorganizations because there are various models for what would happen with the life sciences so that it's not necessarily a College of Life Sciences. It could be something other than that. I don't know if you want me to discuss specifics of reorganization. Well, sometime soon, I will, as soon as I get input from the groups that I'm dealing with tomorrow. The actual reorganization, the actual structures in any kind of a new college are going to be determined, as I've always said, by the faculty themselves. They're not going to be determined by me. I'm not going to micromanage the college. I would hesitate to say exactly how a college that took many of the units from Humanities and Fine Arts and from Social and Behavioral Science how that would be structured and how that would work. I think that that's the task of the faculty, to figure out how to make that work.

Professor Louise Antony, Philosophy – I presume that when you think about how to deal with the shortfall you considered a range of alternatives. Hearing that three deans' salaries would be saved, that's a substantial savings, I agree. On the other hand, there are other things to do to realize savings that don't involve wholesale reorganizations. For example, faculty members could be enjoined to serve in an interim capacity for a few years to get us past this short-term crisis. I wondered, for example, whether you had thought about alternatives to reorganization that might still realize a substantial savings. The other aspect of this is I presume that you made a budget for the reorganization, that you have a breakdown of the costs that will be incurred, both in time and in energy. I'm imagining a campus where the student body is divided between people who have started under one organization and students who have not. There could be overwhelming difficulties in advising, huge additional demands on faculty and advisors at a time when we are probably going to be cutting back or, as you said, doing a great deal more with a great deal less. So, I'd like to see the budget, please, and I'd like to know what kinds of alternatives you've considered that lead you to the decision that this was the best way to realize these costs.

Chancellor Holub – The budgets I haven't made out yet but I certainly will when a decision is reached on what the nature of the reorganization is going to look like. We have various models and it's pretty easy to see what kinds of savings can be realized from administration of two colleges and what kinds of things can be saved. As I said, one is a dean's salary and the other has to do with back room costs. You can look at that pretty easily and get at least an estimate of what the savings would be from eliminating three colleges and forming new colleges. The costs of doing that, we have also looked at. As I said, those are one-time costs and part of what we're doing in postponing the capital projects for \$5 million is trying to look at ways in which we can bridge things in order to have one-time money so that we can do something like that. Now, with regard to alternatives, one of the things about your suggestion is that it's hard for me to think, first of all, that if you take three people out of their faculty positions, you're losing three faculty lines. The other thing is that I think that you do have to pay them an administrative stipend which is going to be something which will be real money. The other thing is you probably have to substitute for their teaching. So I don't see that as an alternative. I see that as something that costs us money rather than something that saves us money. When we get down to the actual proposal, then we'll have those kinds of numbers.

Senator Steven Brewer, Biology – From what you've said, it sounds to me like you are saying that it's much easier to make a case to the external constituencies that cutting three schools is big and dramatic, but it seems to me like you're not making a case based on the merits. You're saying that the functions will mostly be preserved, the work's going to continue to go on, but it's simply, in a sense, a public relations coup that you can say that we've made this big change when, in fact, there's not going to be a big change in terms of the people here and in terms of the functions. We're still going to have to educate the same number of students. We're still going to have the faculty that are going to need support from staff and so on. It seems to me that that runs the risk of looking bad if people can perceive in the media that there's this reorganization, there's this chair shuffling, that it's like rearranging the deck chairs on the Titanic – that we're not actually taking substantive action, we're just doing something that looks good.

Chancellor Holub – What I tried to say when I was discussing this is that I think that there will be real things that will come out of it and I think that there will be real benefits for education at the same time without disadvantaging faculty and programs. I hope that this would be the case in any kind of reorganization that programs would be considered very carefully, that the kinds of proximity that departments will have that weren't proximate in other colleges, that they'll be able to see different ways of doing things and that we would have an improvement in programs and improvement in curriculum and also an improvement in research collaborations. I think that there will be something exciting happening. If people are going to look

for something exciting, I think that having so called “new neighbors” is going to be something that will benefit the faculty ultimately.

Professor Amilcar Shabazz, Chair, Afro-American Studies – From your visit in Washington, is there any sense when you were there that there is any thinking along the lines that this Federal stimulus, should these monies come, is being offered in the sense that they would help the state to keep from raising the fees on students or is there no coupling of those issues?

Chancellor Holub – As I said, in the state’s stabilization section, it’s mentioned specifically that these (and I can’t quote it exactly, but I remember the term) “mitigate the increases in state fees and tuition” was a phrase that was in there and so these monies are designed to mitigate the increases in fees and tuition.

Professor Shabazz – So somewhere trying to think about the students and what they are going to be paying is a concern somewhere in this process?

Chancellor Holub – It is and it’s a concern of mine as well. I just approached the concern a little bit differently than on the basis of pure tuition and fees since a large part of what students actually pay has to do with the financial aid and the way that’s structured.

Professor Shabazz – The other thing is that I think there’s a real sense of anxiousness to sort of get into the nitty gritty of the various reorganization ideas – if we’re going from nine colleges to six, particularly what’s on your mind, and you said it’s going to be on the faculty, so how is that being planned for, how is that being organized? I understand that the original charge to the Budget Planning Task Force is to look at that as an area for making savings, but if we are agreed, given your rationale, given the vision, this is about streamlining UMass Amherst, making it more administratively efficient and saving some costs while minimizing the impact on instruction, I’ve got the vision now. If that is sufficient for the community to say “OK, we’re moving with you on this now,” how do we now begin to structure in a different way than just the Budget Task Force? They’ve come up with the ideas or made recommendations but now in thinking about the implementation phase, how do you envision we’re going to be involved in looking at these various proposals and we’re on a tight timeframe it seems with what you’ve laid out?

Chancellor Holub – I think that that’s one of the reasons that I would like to come to a proposal fairly soon because I think that, as you’ve pointed out and as I’ve emphasized as well, a lot of this depends on the implementation, that is, how successful it is depends on the implementation and there are a lot of details to be worked out. I think they can be worked out over a period of four months, but it is something that I think needs four months. I don’t think it can be done from one day to the next. I can’t announce something on June 30th and expect it to happen on July 1st. I do think it’s important for the people to understand what’s going to happen and I do plan to put a proposal out there fairly soon so that we can get moving. We have to do that, but at the consultative stage, because there are still a number of questions left. This is something I want to go through and, as I said, I’m meeting with the entire faculty today and meeting with a distinguished group of faculty tomorrow from three different colleges with whom I haven’t met yet and I want to give that a chance to play out before I would make a final decision. I want to get the maximum input possible on this. I’ve gotten a lot of input, but I want to make sure everyone is heard before I move forward and even when I make that proposal, it’s going to be a proposal that I hope the community will comment on. I think that that’s completely accepted that the proposal is something could also have modifications in it.

(From the audience, an inaudible question was asked.)

I can talk about some of things that I’ve been thinking about. There’re not unknown so this isn’t any secret. One of the things I’ve been thinking about with regard to HFA and SBS is that large parts of them, not every part perhaps, and this is where there are a lot of things to be said, could be administered under one dean as a different college. I don’t think that this is taking a college and putting it into another college. I considered forming a new college. With regard to NSM and NRE, for example, there are a number of different models that have been talked about. Those were things that I talked to the deans about in December and asked them to get feedback from the faculty on, I believe, three different models that we talked about. Those are the ones that we came up with. I think the two most prominent ones that people have commented on now are putting the Physical Sciences and Engineering together in a college and the Life Sciences in another college and the other one is leaving Engineering as a stand-alone professional school and putting together the sciences into one college which would include not every unit in NRE but a substantial number. So those are the two that I think most people have commented on and to show you what happened, this morning, when I got up to read my email, there was one person who wrote to me saying that they favored the first of these and another person who wrote to me saying that they favored the second one of these. That’s perfectly legitimate. Both of

these people came from a perspective that made complete sense. It isn't that one of them is right or wrong, I don't think. They just have different perspectives and they had good reasons and good arguments. You can't do both, however, so there's going to have to be choices made and I hope it's the right choice, but in a certain sense, I don't think there's a wrong choice, but those are the two models that have been the most prominent models. A lot of people have talked to me about a model of a college of arts and sciences which is a college that I was in at Berkeley and in Knoxville as a faculty member. That's my home college. That's another model that has been prominently discussed. With regard to Nursing, preserving the School of Nursing in a fashion, giving it the autonomy that it needs for its accreditation, but integrating it into Public Health and Health Sciences is also something that's being considered. Those are the basic things that we're thinking about and obviously where any individual unit would be within that, there are some units that, I don't like to say they fall on the edge, but they could be in one college or another. I think for other units it's clear where they would be in one structure or another, but then some could be in one or the other and those are decisions that will have to be reached in some kind of a comment phase.

(From the audience, an inaudible question was asked.)

I'm going to make a proposal and the Faculty Senate will make a formal recommendation as I understand it, but I'm not going to wait for a formal recommendation of the Faculty Senate which will take probably the rest of the term. I would like comment on it from the faculty right from the beginning.

Senator M. Christine King, Nursing – I think we all know the fiscal problems that not only the country is facing but also the state of Massachusetts and certainly our budget and, as Marta (Calas) said, we have lived through this many times. I've been here thirty years as well. I personally feel that this reorganization is something that's been decided and that we need to go along with it and, if we don't go along with it, then we'll feel like we're not good players and that we're not going to be helping the University and, in fact, it might even be detrimental to our program if we fight it as you gave examples from UC Berkeley. I question also what our external view is about reorganization. In my discipline in Nursing, externally in my profession, it would be looked upon negatively to lose independent school status at a major university like UMass Amherst, so external constituents would look in my discipline anyway negatively at this kind of merger for us with the School of Health Sciences. So what other kinds of things can we do to save this \$1 million or \$2 million besides necessarily going on these mergers right now and how can we engage the faculty, whether it's Nursing with Education, Nursing with Public Health, Nursing with Biology, to say "How can we share some resources, how can we collaborate, not only in administrative resources but also in curriculum, in research, without having to necessarily feel that right now, because of the fiscal crisis that the country is in, that we have to reorganize the whole UMass Amherst campus and call these mergers to happen right now?"

Chancellor Holub – I wasn't thinking of eliminating the School of Nursing, as I said. I think that means on what you mean by "independent." I think that the School of Nursing has to have autonomy as I heard at the meeting with the leadership in the School of Nursing and I paid very careful attention to what people were saying there. They have to have autonomy over their curriculum which is something that I would insist on and autonomy over the appointment process and that's something that can also be insisted on. So, it isn't quite as exactly as you portrayed it. The question of how can we save a million dollars otherwise – one of the ways and the way that I would probably have to go to is ten faculty lines or something like that. I'd rather not do that. I'd, again, rather save on administrative costs than to sacrifice faculty positions and that's what I'm trying to do. I recognize that reorganization is something that is inconvenient for some, that it brings more work in the short term. I hope it will bring some collaborations that people haven't thought of before in the short term and in the long term. I hope it will be beneficial to the units, but certainly it will be beneficial in preserving the essential core functions of the campus which I consider its program, departments and schools and that's what I'm trying to do.

Professor Kotz – The reorganization that you're discussing, if it's going to have savings, involve mergers and I'm glad that you're thinking of administrative savings, but there is a history of mergers in many parts of the economy and sometimes they achieve economies and often times they don't. If we thought we had too many colleges here at UMass, inefficiently so, that would be a good reason to merge some, but I hope you would take account of the following kinds of considerations when you merge say two units, for example, Social and Behavioral Sciences, which I'm part of, and Humanities and Fine Arts, that has been discussed. Well, assuming that we're going to have the same number of departments, we're going to have more departments in the new college than there were in the previous two and that can, first of all, lead to a decrease in the quality of services provided by the college. We'll now have faculty who are up for promotion or tenure being evaluated at the college level by people whose disciplines are more distant from that faculty member. We'll save money by having fewer deans, but that means that those faculty members would have to interact with deans. There will be more department chairs and search committee chairs trying to get the attention of the

same dean. Our deans are already very much overworked. If there are going to be fewer of them, they're going to be more overworked. There will be pressure to expand the services available in each of these new colleges so perhaps more assistant deans will be needed so that they can handle the increased work load and it may end up being just as expensive. I urge that you look seriously at the possible problems that result from merging and ending up with a smaller number of larger units, each encompassing a larger number of departments. Faculty benefit from knowing their dean, from having a relationship with their dean, from being able to get a meeting with the dean in less than a month. These kinds of problems could be serious.

Chancellor Holub – Let me just say a few things because you covered a lot of ground there. With regard to faculty committees that are going to exist, I think those faculty committees have to be the responsibility of the faculty. I'm not making any judgment on what they would be and how they would be constituted, so that's something that the faculty in these colleges are going to have to decide on. You may presume that they're going to be one thing or another, but I would urge you to engage yourself and make sure that these committees are something that meets with your satisfaction. I can also say that I was also on a faculty committee at Berkeley and we were all very far away from the faculties in the different colleges, that is, the so-called Budget Committee at Berkeley which is really the Academic Personnel Committee consisted of nine individuals that did the major recommendations for all merit increases, promotions, hiring, all of that and we took cases from all across the campus. Someone being far away from your discipline doesn't mean that they can't learn fairly quickly how to evaluate different kinds of faculty and what they're doing. Since I was in that position, I know. I came from the Humanities, was in the German department, but I was evaluating individuals in Chemical Engineering, in Computer Science and you soon learn what is important about evaluating these people that is what the benchmarks are for their various discipline. There is going to be less service for the students as well. That's what happens when you have a large chunk of money taken out of your budget and that's going to happen whether you have this kind of consolidation or not. In fact, one of the things that I think the consolidation will prevent is the erosion of service that we'd have to have if we had to take cuts out of the college administrative budgets which is what we'd probably have to do. Rather, I think we can protect the service of the faculty better by this kind of consolidation. These are my thoughts at least on a couple of the things you said. I know you covered a lot of ground and I didn't respond to everything.

Professor Elisabeth Selkirk, Chair, Linguistics – I have a reaction to you saying that you think that you've engaged in a truly consultative process in discussing with faculty about the possible reorganizations. I, having met with the heads and chairs from NSM, SBS and HFA, think it's not the feeling that there has been the kind of consultative process that really could give rise to evaluation of the different proposals that have been aired about reorganization. Personally, I'm not opposed to reorganization in principle at all, but I really would like to see different models given a review on the part of faculty in sort of a sustained process. You've said that the Budget Planning Task Force had been somehow given the charge to consider different models of reorganization and so forth, but, in fact, I think that's not the appropriate body to do that and what I would actually suggest is that the Faculty Senate appoint some ad hoc committee to consider reorganization, starting now to enter into discussion with you rather than having you present a proposal, after the meetings that you have tomorrow, that then you are going to look for comment on, rather I think to have a committee that could then bring wisdom of however many years of experience at UMass to consider these different types of possibilities. One of the things I would like to see considered seriously is a College of Arts and Sciences. That seems to resonate in a positive way with people who don't particularly like some of the other things that have been floated like the SBS/HFA merger or the breaking up of NSM and so on. There are various models for how you might do this and we've done this in the past at UMass and this may actually serve potentially positive purposes in creating a college like this. That's a discussion that could be had, I think, alongside the various other particular models that you've proposed about putting this and this together, and this and this together or pulling this apart and so on. The notion that there could be a Faculty Senate appointed committee of faculty, hopefully some who have had experience from the old days when there was a College of Arts and Sciences here, could come immediately into play and help in working out some of this reorganization.

Chancellor Holub – Let me just say that the one thing doesn't exclude the other. This campus like many campuses has gone through many structures, so I don't think that the two things are mutually exclusive. I'm saying reorganization and thinking about other kinds of organization and having a committee that would explore something as specific as arts and sciences, those aren't mutually exclusive propositions.

Professor Selkirk – Look, reorganization is on the table, right? There's some proposal that you're planning on making in a relatively short span of time. The thought is that there needs to be more concerted input from a deliberative faculty body before coming up with something. It's perfectly reasonable that you should be able to present to some representative body of the faculty and put forward your ideas about this and this and

this or your reasons why you don't think this and this and this work and then the committee, with its collective wisdom, might come back and say "well look, here's this other kind of model or this is another way of approaching this and this seems to work on these other campuses and this is something you might consider doing." To have some representative input from faculty at this point would be really wise.

Chancellor Holub – I've heard you on that a number of times and, as I said, I don't think it's mutually exclusive to realize some savings for the coming years and to look further with regard to a reorganization that might include a college of arts and sciences. I don't think that those are two mutually exclusive propositions.

Professor Selkirk – I agree with that, but the College of Arts and Sciences is potentially a substitute for some of the other models. I'm not just talking about a College of Arts and Sciences, an evaluation on the part of this deliberative faculty group. It doesn't make sense to be given, in fact, what the constituencies have to say what's going on, whether from the faculty perspective, it makes sense to divide up NSM in the way that's been proposed, or it makes sense to be putting together Humanities and Fine Arts and SBS without also NSM together. These kinds of things really need, I think, some more sustained input from a representative body of the faculty.

Chancellor Holub – With regard to some of these things like NSM and NRE, as I've said, it depends on who's sitting in the room then. I had two very respectable senior researchers who wrote to me this morning and they came up with two different things that they were talking about. In speaking to people across the campus as I've been doing, I found a lot of different people with a lot of different views. I'm not against deliberation. I am thinking that deliberation on some of the specific things that you've suggested and some of the other chairs and distinguished faculty who met with me have suggested are things that have to be deliberated in a slightly longer period of time. I'm not unwilling to have that occur and I think that that's something positive, but I don't see that saving money for next year and saving faculty lines and having a committee deliberate on further directions of the campus are mutually exclusive propositions.

Professor Donald Tomaskovic-Devey, Chair, Sociology – I don't think you heard what Lisa was trying to say just now which is that a faculty committee could be created now to talk about reorganization and to come up with a plan. I applaud what you said earlier in the week that it's the task of the faculty to implement reorganization and it's certainly been the case in the last couple of weeks that I felt that there's has been much more back and forth and that we've been heard on certain dimensions, but it doesn't feel like the information is getting aggregated towards a plan. It actually seems much more like there's a lot of one-on-one interactions between you and this individual or that individual, the two famous faculty from earlier today.

Chancellor Holub – I also hear from groups, as you know.

Professor Tomaskovic-Devey – One of the first examples is when the NSM, SBS and HFA chairs got together, there wasn't a feeling in the room that it was our job to fight reorganization. The feeling in the room was it was our job to figure out what was the best reorganization for UMass and to think about it as a long-term issue obviously motivated by short-term problems. You have a set of aims for reorganization, the slide earlier, I saw that earlier in the week. When we got together as a group, we said "well, no, you need some overriding goals. What's your vision for the University in the long term to raise the profile of the University?" And the other thing the chairs were worried about was internal efficiencies. If you are going to have a reorganization, you have a goal and then you evaluate the reorganization. At the moment, your aims and kinds of ideas about reorganization seem ad hoc relative to those kinds of higher order goals and there might be lots of reasons for that. The one I worry about the most is how quickly this has overtaken us. There's a need for a faculty committee, particularly including a bunch of chairs on it, not just people who have to deal with the administrative problems of linking between departments and colleges and central administration, that would think through what different configurations had plusses and minuses to them. I think there would be some wisdom there. It might not be total, but I think that the information would have a lot to do with what works, what gets done and what doesn't get done. My fear is not that SBS will go away. My fear is that we will have a college reorganization at the same time as we have a central administration reorganization and you've been fairly clear that both of those are going to happen and that there won't be enough consultation with the people who know how to get things done and things will grind to a halt. I really think it's important to use the expertise of the faculty about how things work and as Lisa proposed, which I also endorse and I think is pretty widely endorsed among chairs, at least in the three colleges that I've talked to, there should be some faculty task force on this reorganization, not just to implement, just in the short run.

Chancellor Holub – Once again, I don't think that doing some sort of reorganization and having a task force are mutually exclusive options. I'll just have to repeat that again. That seems clear to me. The part of any proposal on reorganization that I might come up with should say that we should have a faculty task force that's going to look further into options for reorganizations.

Professor Tomaskovic-Devey – I think that's good and the point I was trying to make that you should sleep on it, think about it, decide whether or not to announce it tomorrow and create a committee and have them have the same March deadline.

Professor Sara Lennox, Director of German and Scandinavian Studies and Director, STPEC Program – I've known Bob for many years so I'm going to be a teeny bit confrontational. I think what people are saying is you don't understand how this campus works yet and this campus does not work from the top down. It works from the bottom up. What we want now is a committee that works with you right now to make these decisions, really, right now. Your predecessor said, when talking about mergers, if the faculty doesn't go along with it, it's not going to work. The faculty is very unhappy right now. So I think everything would work much better if we were all talking together about what a reorganization would look like. The other thing is that we need to see numbers now. The reorganization, which is taking an enormous amount of time, is 2-4% of the entire deficit. What's going to happen to the other \$44 million? Where is that money going to come from? We need to know that. We need to know what the plans are and how we're going to meet that debt and we're wasting a lot of time talking about not very much money. Third of all, I've thought and thought about these figures and I don't think we can get even \$1 million let alone \$2 million out of it. We're not going to regain the deans' salaries because those deans are going back to the faculty. We're only going to regain the administrative stipend. If we're trying to cut \$1 million from the deans' offices, we are not cutting high-paid administrators. We are cutting staff that make \$40,000 a year. We're going to be cutting lots and lots of staff. That is going to devastate the economy of western Massachusetts. We are unionized here and I feel myself in solidarity with my union brothers and sisters in the other unions and I also don't want to live in a depressed part of western Massachusetts because the University is the biggest employer and now many, many people will be out of work. Speaking just for myself, I'd rather lose ten faculty positions of people who aren't here than to lose the secretaries and staff assistants and custodians that I work with every day.

Chancellor Holub – Sara, I wish the choices were that easy. Unfortunately, they're not. With the size of the budget deficit that we have, it just isn't possible. You were talking about the math and we, of course, have done some of the math. We're not just sitting back and not thinking about these things. In order to cut something like \$20 million out of the budget, that's not \$46 million, that's assuming we get \$26 million from somewhere else. In order to cut \$20 million out of the budget, which was more than was ever cut in any previous year because, under the previous chancellor, there was never a cut of \$20 million because I've gone back and looked at it, it's impossible to do without eliminating a substantial number of faculty lines, a substantial number of lecturer positions and a substantial number of graduate student positions, as well as many staff positions. The problem is that we don't have any leeway in that fungible budget. It's not that we have parts of that fungible budget that are sitting around not being used. We don't have \$20 million of it sitting around not being used. I appreciate what you're saying about not wanting to live in a depressed area, not wanting to lay people off. I assure you I didn't take this position thinking that I would be in this role right now. It's certainly not something I want to do, but if you look at that budget and you see what alternatives we have, you'll see that there are precious few alternatives that we do have. It isn't that there is \$20 million that we just haven't been using. That \$20 million is going into people's salaries. Most of that money in the \$300 million, between 60-70% of it, goes into salaries. That's salary money. If you're looking to cut out a significant portion of \$300 million, you have to affect salaries, current salaries, not future salaries. I don't like doing that, but it isn't that we have money lying around that's not been used. With regard to the savings, again, I think that we save \$1 million and I know we'll save \$1 million because what I'm going to do is cut back the budget so that these budgets are \$1 million less than the budgets were before and that's something that the administration of those colleges will just have to make due with. That's the only way that you can do it. Will we get less service, as someone commented? Maybe that will be the result, but there is going to be less service. Again, I can't sugar-coat this for you. There's going to be more work that's going to be done by fewer people. That's what happens when you're in an economic crisis that hasn't been seen by anyone in this room because nobody in this room, I think, is 80 years old. You have to go back to the Great Depression to see an economic crisis like this. Do you think Brandeis wants to sell its entire art collection or Penn wants to lay off 18 research scientists in its Anthropology Museum? These are two things I've read just in the last couple of days. Nobody wants to do those kinds of things, but these are things that are being forced on institutions because we are in a severe economic crisis, the severity of which, at least for the University, I

tried to describe in the first part of the presentation today. This isn't something that's a pleasure for me to do, but, again, when I'm looking at my alternatives, I think that this is the best alternative among a bunch of alternatives that I don't like.

Professor Phyllis – In the interest of the hour, I'd like to be concise and ask a yes or no question. Reflecting on your slide with your aims and rationale for the reorganization and, if there were a plan that could save \$1-2 million and could streamline teaching and streamline support services and facilitate research collaborations and your whatever goals I've forgotten that would also save \$1-2 million but did not require college reorganization, would you still insist on college reorganization?

Chancellor Holub – I don't know. It would depend on what that plan called for. I would have to weigh that against all of the factors that went into the rationale which were not just the \$1-2 million. If anyone sees that there were \$1-2 million to be saved somewhere, I would hope that you would either contact me or the Budget Planning Task Force because we're struggling in order to get the savings that we need without doing things that we really don't want to do but we see ourselves forced to do. So, if anyone has those kinds of suggestions, please get them to us.

MOVED: To recess this meeting of the General Faculty until Monday, February 9, 2009 at 4:00 p.m. in the Student Union Ballroom.

This motion was seconded and adopted.

The General Faculty Meeting stood recessed at 6:05 p.m. on January 29, 2009.

The proceedings of this meeting are available on audiotape in the Faculty Senate Office.

Respectfully submitted,

Ernest D. May
Secretary of the General Faculty