

University of Massachusetts Amherst
Faculty Senate, UMA 250 Task Force
December 12, 2005, 3:30 p.m.
Hampshire House Conference Room

Minutes

Present: Maurianne Adams, Rick Adrion, Marilyn Billings, Tony Butterfield, Elizabeth Chilton, Joe Goldstein, John Jenkins, Sheila Mammen, Ernie May, Brian O'Connor, Paul Utgoff

1. Minutes from November 14, 2005 were approved.

2. Discussion of first round UMA 250 allocations

Resources comparison – those most hurt in the past have 1 or more positions allocated.

Comment on the 10 positions allocated for next year rather than now.

Ernie responded that in Music, it has to do with the Dean and Chair searches, waiting for those positions to be filled first, then fill the faculty positions in the following year.

* Ernie will send out to the Task Force: the document on net loss of positions over the past 5 years.

Other comments on allocations:

Groups 1, 2, and 3 all seemed to get something except for Plant and Soil Sciences which only got 1 replacement.

HT is red but nothing from 250 Plan.

For the most part, those at the top got something but as one moves down the list, it seems less clear how positions were allocated.

Question about Nursing and Public Health. PH got 10 positions. Addressing the accreditation problem?

** For Thursday, ask about Public Health.

Is the task of filling instruction rather than research now done? Would instruction need to be considered in years 2 and 3?

** Ask for clarification on Thursday.

Question about the transparency of the process, especially as we go down the list.

The UMA 250 Task Force agrees that the outcome seems moderately aligned with the process, but there are definitely some questions to explore on Thursday.

3. Agenda items for meeting with Chancellor and Provost on Thursday, December 15.

What are the expectations for each of these positions? Please clarify.

What will / has become of the dollars for the 10 positions, approximately \$1.5 million?
Are “emergencies” such as increased utility costs, the issue of faculty professional development funds going to siphon off these resources?

What are the strings attached to each position?

How are start up costs covered and how are they determined?

This number of searches will impact start up funds. Is it still 1/3 provost, 1/3 college and 1/3 department?

10 searches have been deferred.

What will happen with these?

Will they be filled next year? If so, does that mean there will be 62 searches next year?

Will all the promises expire at the end of this year?

Not filling the 10 positions may have to do with the political “strings that are attached” by the Dean searches. HFA has 7 of these positions; SOM has 3 – both have Dean searches underway.

If a unit is allocated 4 positions in 06-07, what happens in the future if those positions have been held back due to Dean searches? What about future positions?

Do we have offices and facilities for these people?

Strategic direction indicated by this round of allocations:

Public Health is one. Decision seems to have been made to retain Public Health as an accredited program

The plan seems to be to get back into a competitive position in as many programs as possible.

4. Next steps for the Task Force

Refining instructional criteria – distinguish among undergrad, master, and doctoral credit hours.

What about advising? Thesis advising is taken into account by 800 level courses.

What about the rest?

How do interdisciplinary programs and certificate programs get counted / allocated? Supposedly credit hours are traced back to departments. However this leaves out centers and institutes.

What about cross-listed courses?

The Life Sciences programs are unique. The undergraduate courses are in departments, graduate courses are in 4 interdisciplinary programs.

** Question for the Provost – there needs to be a future strategic direction.

How do we address the imbalance between the needs of the state economy (in engineering & science) and student desires for majors (in social sciences)?

Year 2 – research

Year 3: the benchmarking year – those doing well against their benchmarks will be rewarded.

Research criteria coming next

For the sciences, its dollars

For social sciences and humanities, need reasonable comparators to substitute for dollars.

Look at Florida – some colleges include instruction as a benchmark

<http://www.ir.ufl.edu/compare/aaubench.htm>

Also look at Florida for examples of indicators to submit to Deans by Feb 01, 2006.

Are these still the same indicators that will be used in 3 years?

AQAD process – look at these

Many AQAD items don't match against Florida data.

The Athletics team analogy was mentioned – the expectation is that we will be at the tournaments, not necessarily win the championship, but be in the game.

For comparator schools, look at AAU schools – these would qualify as leading schools.

Might be reasonable to benchmark. If we look at department by department, we may be better in some areas.

5. Reports from Schools and Colleges

Ernie has not received any phone calls. No one else had heard anything.

Other comments and questions:

When is the first year that data will be collected? Is it collected in April? Who will be doing the collecting? The analysis?

What is meant by outstanding departments – leading programs - in this country? Are we inching toward them? Or do we pick a range of departments that may not be top in the country?

We need to demonstrate that we are working at the highest level of productivity given UMass constraints.

This is an excellent conversation. Faculty are talking about how to get better, to compete.