



University of
Massachusetts
Amherst

Campus Engagement Programs in Search of a Framework Centralization v. Decentralization to Broaden the Impacts of Research

Barbara Pearson, Ph.D., Office of Research Development. <http://www.umass.edu/research/broader-impacts>

Centralization

- ❖ More able to identify and align with strategic priorities
- ❖ More able to match priorities with appropriate resources
- ❖ Can better track activities to assess and communicate impact
- ❖ Easier for external partners to make contact with the university
- ❖ Demonstrates institutional commitment to engagement
- ❖ More capable of effecting systemic change (e.g. changing the culture of RE in Promotion & Tenure)
- ❖ Engagement and outreach are at the table when high-level decisions are discussed and made.

We can assign a dollar amount to a central office. Can anyone estimate the value lost by centralizing? By not centralizing?

Barbara Pearson, Ph.D., Broader Impacts Specialist, Office of Research Development. bpearson@research.umass.edu

Decentralization: Nimble. Spontaneous. Generates a multitude of programs. Deputizes everyone to create connection and tap diverse funding sources. Every activity is someone's top priority. Can maintain (local) infrastructure to nurture relationships and manage logistics. Major burden is for better intra-institutional communication.

Campus-wide Resources



College-level Resources



Departmental Outreach



Individual Initiatives



Community Journalism, N. McBride
Community Based Research, Giang Pham
Language Diversity in Brazil, Luiz Amaral

Outreach Toolkit: online guidelines, tips, activities and other resources to help scientists engage in public outreach with the K-12 community