

**UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AT AMHERST
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
THE FACULTY SENATE**

MINUTES: Acting Presiding Officer Ernest May called the 585th Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate to order on Thursday, December 7, 2000 at 3:30 p.m. in Herter Hall 227.

A. BYLAW CHANGES: Second Reading

Special Report of the Council on University Service, Public Service and Outreach concerning Bylaw Changes, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 01-017 with Motion No. 13-01. (Previously distributed)

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Bylaw Changes, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 01-017.
13-01

(Inasmuch as this is a change to the Senate Bylaws, this is the second of three readings of this motion. It will be read again and voted on at the 586th meeting. This motion may be debated and amended at all three meetings.)

There were no questions or discussion concerning the proposed Bylaw changes at the second reading.

B. NEW BUSINESS

- 1. Special Report of the Committee on Committees concerning Nominations to Faculty Senate Councils and Committees, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 01-018 with Motion No. 14-01. (To be distributed at the Senate meeting.)**

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Nominations to Faculty Senate Councils and Committees, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 01-018.
14-01

This motion was seconded and adopted without objection.

- 2. Special Report of the General Education Council concerning Recommended Courses, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 01-019 with Motion No. 15-01.**

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the General Education designations in the curriculum areas, as set forth in Sen. Doc. No. 01-019.
15-01

This motion was seconded and adopted without objection.

- 3. Special Report of the Rules Committee concerning Final Application for the M.S. and Ph.D. Degree Programs in Marine Sciences and Technology, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 01-020 with Motion No. 16-01.**

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate defer approval of the Final Application for the M.S. and Ph.D. Degree Programs in Marine Sciences and Technology pending response to the concerns enumerated in #1 through #9 in Sen. Doc. No. 01-020.
16-01

This motion was seconded.

Roland Chilton, Chair of the Rules Committee: This is a compendium of the concerns expressed by six of the Faculty Senate councils. The Rules Committee put them together and decided that, on the basis of the concerns expressed, it would not be wise to recommend that the Faculty Senate approve this program without asking some questions. Therefore, the Rules Committee report really does reflect the concerns of councils and committees. My

guess is that members of the councils and committees will be here to talk to those concerns but I understand there is a substitute motion.

Ernest May, Secretary of the Faculty Senate: Let's first ask if the chairs or representatives of any of the councils which considered this proposal are here. There were six councils that considered this lengthy and complicated proposal. It's lengthy because it's a fairly complex interdisciplinary graduate program. It is complicated because it is an Intercampus Graduate School involving the resources and faculty of four campuses. It is a test of what it means to be a "system program," and it is at one polar extreme, I think, where there is a scattering of resources on each campus and we try to pull it all together and make it a program. The other extreme would be our Polymer Science department here, or Biotechnology at Worcester, where we clearly have a "center of excellence" concept of what it is to be a system. So this proposal presents conceptual challenges as well as practical operational challenges.

I would like to congratulate the Academic Priorities Council on an excellent report having to do with how this program would fit into the prioritization of programs on this campus in the event there are new resources, or in the event that we have to contract and constrain resources. It appears that this program might be outside of the scope of the normal process. Similarly, I want to congratulate the Graduate Council on a fine report. It considered several questions, perhaps the most poignant of which was: "Is this a model to be followed by a succession of other graduate programs that might span the campuses, and, if so, have we thought about how that is going to work out?" The phrase "lead campus model" is used: "What's wrong with the lead campus model?"

Senator Chilton then took a few moments to summarize the reports of the other councils which contributed to the report.

They were saying in effect that other trustee policies that give primary responsibility for academic programs to the governance units on the campus no longer apply. Our concern was whether that phrase effectively removes the Intercampus Graduate School from the purview of Faculty Primary Responsibility. It would be good to know that one of the problems with going ahead and simply passing this and saying we'll check with you later is that we may not get an answer to this question. We might not like the answer we get, but we probably should get an answer first.

The Graduate Council's concern was that the proposal is not clear on how the Intercampus Graduate School articulates with existing governance structures. The Program and Budget Council questioned whether, if things go badly in budget allocations for next year, or the year after, or the year after that, what kind of impact would this have on other programs? The Program and Budget Council is also concerned that there were no realistic cost estimates presented, and that there would in fact be costs to the University and to this campus that are not spelled out. The Research Council wanted to know why the purposes of the proposed program could not be achieved through related existing programs or through the modifications of those programs. Another council wanted to know about the standards and procedures and the residency requirements. The Graduate Council said it's not clear on what basis the lead-campus model was rejected. And it's not clear that there's a budget sufficient to support the program as proposed. The Research Council said that this is a unique situation, the first instance of a statewide administration in research efforts, and it's not clear whether this will be regarded as the first step in developing a more system-wide approach to administration of research. Again, a good question, it deserves a good answer, and I don't know if we'll get an answer if we postpone the question by saying basically we'll approve the program. The Academic Matters Council said it's not clear why the degree shouldn't be conferred by one of the home campuses rather than by an intercampus entity. The report, as the Secretary said, is long and complicated, even our summary of them gets complicated, but even the Research Library Council said that it's not clear that there are sufficient library resources to support the new programs on all four campuses. It's not clear that the risk of financial failure has been appropriately addressed. These are some of the questions that came from the councils and committees, and I am really disappointed that the Council heads were not here to talk to them.

Secretary May: I would have to congratulate the six councils that dealt with all this in a little over two and a half months. They produced very thoughtful and well-articulated responses to a very complicated set of issues while at the same time trying to be sensitive to the faculty on this campus who are interested in pursuing the opportunities which this Intercampus Graduate School presents, and also to the system-wide interests that are at stake here, but also to the campus' legitimate concerns about resources and governance and a few other things.

Professor Robert Rothstein: On behalf of the Research Library Council, we second the comments of the Rules Committee to the effect that the proposal contains no reference, no discussion at all about the impact of the IGS on

existing library resources, on the need for new library services, and how they would be provided equitably across the four campuses. We also point out that the campus is used to thinking about start-up costs when hiring new faculty, especially in Sciences and Engineering or when approving new programs. Very rarely is any attention paid to the library start-up costs for new programs or new faculty, and this is once again another case where those library costs have not been taken into consideration.

Senator Robert Wilson: Do we have any idea as to the positions of the Chancellor or the Provost on this issue? It might be helpful if they would provide their perceptions.

Cleve Willis, Dean of the College of Food and Natural Resources: I spoke with Cora this morning. As you know, her mother died this morning so she is away. I don't know whether she would have supported or not the proposal in front of you. I think she wants to hear your views. I think I do know her view on the issue of cost. She doesn't anticipate any cost to the campus. No budget line, she doesn't anticipate or plan on that. Right down to the use of the Research Trust fund, she's not thinking of that at all. As far as demands on the library, the library has a great number of demands on it, and those demands change as topics become hot or less hot. She does not see any compelling demand on the library in the form of start-up costs. She is not hiring faculty for this. I think the view is that the program might have modest participation from this campus, larger from the others. We are not looking at an infusion of funds from this campus. A diversion of funds from other programs on this campus, and the benefits to the campus may be modest. Some faculty some potential students would take advantage, but the important thing is that the costs would be minimal. The financing cost that we talk about in the first place should be zero. There are opportunity costs that Mokhtar Atallah talks about, perhaps faculty will do what faculty will do, so there will be some time used. That time would be used probably by the same faculty in that way. I can't come here and say that she supports, I think she would say "I want to listen," but she did tell me I could say on her behalf, "We're not looking for campus resources for our end of this bargain."

Secretary May: And you as a dean would agree with that?

Dean Willis: Yes.

Secretary May: That is important, because a number of the concerns of the councils had to do with resource issues. The initial document may have been written in the way that it was because the resources issues are so different on the four different campuses. It was hard to include all the complicated resource issues in a comprehensive way in that document, so the document was presented as a degree program document, not as a resource document. But needless to say, resources follow degree programs, so a lot of people have legitimate concerns.

Senator Mokhtar Atallah: When we approve new programs on campus here, the academic structure is the same. There is going to be no change in the Admissions Office, in the Records Office in the Degree Granting Office. But here you have a few students who are going to be accepted on the campus, and these students are unique with respect to where they report and where their records should be kept, and how they are tracked. Obviously, with faculty there will be a new set of advising rules with respect to where the courses are going to be offered. One simple thing would be announcing the courses available for that program. How are we going to coordinate the announcement of these between the different campuses? You have to put it in a catalog somewhere. Whose style is going to be used? So there are going to be resources, not necessarily faculty, because the faculty is going to be part of the research and it is not going to change much, but the advising of the students is going to be different. A student in the department of Forestry and Wildlife within the Amherst campus program is going to have different advising than another student in the same department who is taking the degree in the Marine Science. So all of these things are going to demand both time and someone in the administration building has to deal with them. And that costs money and it has not been addressed. And that's still not as important as the role of the faculty in the governance and the approval of the program. They are taking everything out of our hands.

Professor William McComb: First of all, we need to put into perspective the number of students that we are talking about. In our department we currently have about 117 graduate students, about 12 of whom are involved in marine science issues. Those students are advised by faculty members, who, if this program were in place, could allow that student to pursue a degree in Marine Sciences and Technology through this program, or the same student could choose to pursue a degree through Wildlife and Fisheries Conservation. It is the student's choice, and the adviser simply has to be aware of the requirements of the two different entities. I don't see tracking being particularly

cumbersome, at least within our department, because we have a graduate program director who may be able to address some of these concerns. He tracks the requirements and progress of about 85 grad students and much of the central administration will be held in the hands of the Associate Dean who is currently Jack Archer. His office would be maintaining the records and putting out the catalogs and coordinating the course work. One thing that we have been doing is meeting as part of the Intercampus Oversight Committee, using compressed video format, distance education format. It is quite clear that some of the meetings and communication would occur not only over email, but also through the distance ed format as well. Communication among the four campuses is going to be key. It's going to be a challenge, but by the same token, Jack has taken the initiative of agreeing to have one person on this campus be the lead person to facilitate coordination among all of the faculty members, who, by the way, applied to this graduate program. Each faculty member in this document was required to submit a letter as to why they would like to be part of this program. They submitted their CV, and the Intercampus Oversight Committee, which consists of people from all of the campuses, voted on each one of those applications, and they turned up in here. So, this does represent a degree of faculty interest. Certainly there are some concerns regarding budget on this campus, but as Cleve pointed out, the Provost's office is committed to having no or minimal costs associated to this campus.

Senator David Damery: At this point I would like to submit a substitute motion from the Amherst Faculty of the IGSMST.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate conditionally approve the final application for the M.S. and Ph.D. degree programs in Marine Sciences and Technology for a period of two years. Continued participation by the Amherst campus beyond December 31, 2002 is conditioned on a positive evaluation of a formal response to the concerns enumerated in numbers 1-9 in Sen. Doc. No. 01-020, and on a comprehensive general report of the Intercampus Graduate School to the Faculty Senate to be submitted not later than September 1, 2002.

This motion was seconded.

Senator Damery: This is put forward to try and satisfy a bunch of faculty. There is a bunch of people that have been identified as being interested in this program, and there has been a lot of good work done. I applaud the six committees of the Faculty Senate for being critical, and asking some good hard questions that need to be answered. A number of us feel that the risks are not excessive and we would like the chance to move forward with this and we thought this was a way to achieve this. Apply the necessary critical questions that need to be answered, but let's not try to be obstructionists.

Senator Chilton: It may not take two years to get answers to some of these questions. I was hoping we could get some today. For example, it's not clear on what basis the lead campus model was rejected. Is this something that needs two years of study, or could we get an answer to this today?

Professor McComb: I can give you a perspective, I can't give you an answer. That topic came up in the discussions among the organizing committee for this intercampus school which began 2 years ago, and that proposal was floated and discussed at length among members of all the campuses, and the consensus was that rather than having a lead campus, because the interests were so varied among the different campuses--in other words, we have strengths on this campus, Dartmouth has different strengths, Boston has different strengths--that a lead campus intellectually didn't make a lot of sense. Administratively it might, perhaps, but intellectually it did not, so consequently this intercampus school with a dean and an associate dean was followed. I do want to make one point regarding the dean and the associate dean, and that is that the salaries of those two individuals are provided by UMass Boston and Dartmouth campuses. Resources are not being taken from this University to support those offices.

Senator Mary Wickwire: I admit that I am removed from the central issues here, but I would like to speak at least at this point against the substitute motion. It strikes me that the Rules Committee has shown prudence and discretion in wishing to defer it, and the people who have spoken for the substitute motion have not convinced me of the need to rush ahead and put it into effect for two years and then study the answers to these questions. So I am speaking against the substitute motion.

Senator Todd Fuller: I think one of the things that makes me want to vote for the substitute motion is that the process is going to go on regardless of the vote here. For the other three campuses, they'll be moving forward and I think all the Senate committees are looking out for the people who are actually going to participate in it. Those

people will feel left behind if they don't have the ability to participate in it. And this is a compromise that addresses and will address the legitimate concerns that have been put forward, and are complicated and not easy to make available for everybody, but also address the desire for people to move forward. We want to be a part of this program, along with the other campuses. We want to be on the same timetable as the other campuses.

Senator Christine King: I have a question about the substitute motion. I notice that nowhere in the motion does it speak to any financial implications as being looked at before 2002. I think that some of the concerns expressed in the reports had a lot to do with the firm decision that there would not be any financial implications for the Amherst campus. There was some concern that that wasn't clear cut, and there was concern that the research trust funds were clearly identified as how that mechanism would take place. I think, in some way, waiting 'till 2002 to get firmer answers on those budget issues is a long time.

Dean Willis: The Amherst campus does not plan on having a budget line for this subject, does not plan to turn over research trust funds. I should also say that the plans for the program over these next two years, the funding comes from a quarter of a million dollars per year from central, and that is there whether or not we are players. After that it is up to the program to generate its own funding.

Senator Wilson: I would like to make a friendly motion to amend the substitute motion on the floor. After the phrase that says "through number nine in Senate Document 01-020" I would like to insert the following: "On the approval by the Faculty Senate," and then finish it off.

This motion was moved and seconded.

Senator Wilson: The reason for this is that the motion which appears to be fairly reasonable includes two conditions as it is, as it was originally proposed, that is upon a positive evaluation of formal response. It doesn't really say who would decide whether the response is a positive evaluation, and then, upon the filing of a comprehensive general report, which could be done that might say the whole program is a lousy program, and we should not go forward with it. So this would provide to us the same opportunity that we have right now, and that is to reject any additional involvement in the program after that December 1, 2002. So, it would give us an opportunity at the end of two years to meet again at the Faculty Senate and decide have the responses been positive, are they adequate, or are they inadequate?

Secretary May: That's the intention, and you have pointed out some unclarity. If we inserted the words "by the Faculty Senate," after the words "a positive evaluation" in the fourth line, would that achieve the same thing?

Senator Chilton: I think the phrase that Senator Wilson wants to insert "on the approval by the Faculty Senate," if that simply replaced the phrase "on a positive evaluation," it would be very clear what we meant by "a positive evaluation," we mean "approval by the Faculty Senate." So, we would delete "on a positive evaluation," and put "on the approval by the Faculty Senate" if that's what they have in mind.

Secretary May: "On approval by the Faculty Senate," so that's taken as a friendly amendment to the amendment to the substitute motion.

Senator Lisa Saunders: I think that some of the questions 1-9 are not that easily resolved. We are asking for explanations. It's not an issue of whether we'll approve them or not, it's a question of whether we'll agree, and I'm not sure that we can resolve them. You said it might take two years, for example, to work out the question of why an alternative such as a lead campus model wasn't considered. The second is that I fear the applications to the program could raise the cost of administering the program over the period, and the faculty will come back to us at the end of a two-year period and will be worried about those students and not want to cut off support for the program now that the students have been admitted. There is also the issue that the Provost does not need to issue any budget lines. To me that is cause for more concern because we know under these conditions of scarcity, it is an issue that no budget line is anticipated, because we know that we will end up with a reallocation of resources within departments and across departments. It is really unfortunate that we have to operate under these conditions, and it's really unfortunate that we have to weigh one faculty's desire to work with graduate students in a specific program against the concerns of the rest of the faculty over scarcity, but it's a fact of life on this campus, and has been since I arrived in 1987. Which leads me to the last question: What share of faculty working with graduate students in Marine Sciences actually agreed on this motion? We got a lot of feedback from faculty who would be working on

this program, who were glad that we were putting on the brakes. So I'm curious: how representative is the substitute motion of the faculty who will be working in the program?

Senator Fuller: I am currently the Graduate Program Director for Wildlife and Fisheries Conservation. I would see no problem at all in taking those students into our program and finishing them up under Wildlife and Fisheries Conservation. The criteria for our program are flexible enough, that there shouldn't be any problem involving those students. That is a major concern, but we are confident that no student will be left hanging regardless of the outcome of this.

Dean Willis: I can't go to that level of representing Provost Marrett, but I recognize what you are saying. No one can forecast the future, but what I struggle with is, as I am viewing the modest scale of this program for this campus, I am struggling with how it really is going to lock anything in. We are talking about a small number of graduate students in that area, the vast majority of which I suppose will prefer to get their degrees in the normal graduate programs on this campus, and several may be attracted to the other, but not very many. I think I see this as a residual claimant.

Professor McComb: I would say that probably around 8 or 12 students would want to be involved, possibly 15. I guess the other thing to think about is that we are already a member of the school. What we are concerned with is whether or not we are going to allow our students the opportunity of getting their degree through this Marine Sciences and Technology program, or whether we continue allowing them a chance to get a degree in Wildlife and Fisheries Conservation or Geosciences or any other program. If the three-campus model moves forward without us, our faculty will still be a part of the school, they can still collaborate with people on other campuses, on research programs which could provide funding for students on this campus. It is just that our students would not have the opportunity to get this degree.

Deputy Provost Cunningham: One of the issues about the budget is a serious one, and it is one that we said we would not be allocating resources to. You have to realize that the school is approved, the budget for the school is in place for two years. We are not allocating resources to that. I imagine if we are not part of it and there are three campuses in the degree program, and we're not allocating some resources, it will be found for it or it will stop. I don't see that we will be pressured into reluctantly surrendering resources for a lower priority graduate program than we would rank with our campus money.

Senator Damery: I can't speak for other departments but we have four teaching professors who are behind the program from the Natural Resources Conservation department, and I think that Mike Ross has weighed in and is fully behind the substitute motion. We provide a unified front for one of the larger programs.

Senator Atallah: The most important issue is not the funds or the resources. It is who is offering the degree. If the degree is going to be offered centrally, this means that campuses don't have any control over those degrees. Currently it is campuses that offer the degrees. Even with intercampus programs, degrees are offered by campuses. If we move to the point where degrees are going to be offered by the President's office with programs centralized, we have no control over them, over guaranteeing the quality and the name of the campus that will be associated with those degree programs. If we do that we lose this, and we are setting a precedent, because this is going to be a trend. And if we don't set the right trend from now, we are going to be losing in the future the ability to say no. One of the things coming up is the intercampus UMASS ONLINE and all associated with it, and that is a degree that is not offered by any of the campuses. That's what's important for the entire faculty. Funds can be generated. Funds can be reallocated, but the role of the faculty in maintaining the name of the institutions is very important.

Professor McComb: Regarding control over the degree, that's an important issue. Three campuses have decided to go ahead and pursue this whether we are a part of this or not. So I think it is a matter for this group to decide whether or not we want to follow that model as well.

Secretary May: Naturally we are concerned about system degrees or joint degrees. A four campus joint degree may just be a euphemism for a system degree. The resolution here gives us the option of pulling back. We have joint degree programs currently operating with other campuses. Joint degrees are not necessarily bad. It depends on how they work out.

Senator O'Connor: I have been aware of this school since August of 1999, so I have followed it from a governance viewpoint, and from an academic viewpoint also. I have gone to both sides. I would like to speak in favor of the substitute motion. A lot has happened in the last week, and I think this is the way a lot of things happen on this campus. This is an exciting situation, and I think we have to do something about it. In the number of emails that have come across my desk, I've only seen one opposed, and they weren't directly opposed to it. We've heard rumors that people are opposed to it, but they did not send emails to me against it. This is not a win-win situation but I think that there are enough safeguards in here and I think that the University is going on a systems approach. I hate to say this, but I think politically it's not a good idea at this point to go against this. I think that the other three campuses will see that this program will survive, and with us aboard it will be stronger. I know we're concerned about the system degree approach, I know we're concerned about the money approach, but I look upon this as, there's a significant group of faculty that have really thought about this, and want this program, and I would hate to see the Senate go against the wishes of those faculty who I think have answered the questions adequately that have been raised here.

Senator Tager: I want to support the substitute motion. Even though I'm a member of the Program and Budget Council, and we wrote a report that raised all kinds of issues, I would say that I keep learning about this program. I have had discussions with the faculty involved, and I am of the opinion that we should always support the faculty, and this is an issue in which these people will be the vulnerable ones. It is their grants that are going in there, and they will be the ones who should make the judgement whether this is a worthwhile program or not. This is a very judicious kind of compromise. They have two years and after that they can pull their grants out. I am not going to be affected by this but I do think it enhances the University. I am not sure that this can even surmount the granting of a university-wide degree; there may be this issue of accreditation that will come up, but I am not sure that is our concern--let them deal with it. I think we should stand behind our faculty when they're willing to do innovative things. That is one point. I think it behooves us at this point to act in a more cooperative fashion with the Board of Trustees at this delicate moment in the life of the Amherst campus, particularly when a new Interim Chancellor is going to be chosen. I think we can show that we can cooperate with them. I don't think this is a major issue to go down fighting about, and if the faculty want to do it let them do it. I think this is a very decent compromise for us to follow. Before this meeting I called Craig Moore, who is the chair of the Program and Budget Council, and he agrees with me, and he supports this motion as well. I have been convinced that the faculty knows what they're doing, and I am going to support them.

Senator Martin: I became aware of this program several months ago as a member of the Academic Priorities Council. The question on the Priorities Council report has to do with the responsibilities of faculty that would be asked from this campus to teach these courses. Structurally, which department would they be responsible to? What personnel committee would deal with the performance of that faculty? They would be split from their current department, and that would raise questions about their union and their responsibility as faculty and their workload.

Professor McComb: The list of courses that are available for graduate students to take under the current proposal are almost all courses that are on the books now and are being taught on the various campuses. There is the proposal that several new courses would be developed. In my department a course that would be offered or developed new as part of this program would be a course that would be cross-listed with our department. It would be taught as part of our department offerings, the course evaluations would come back to me and to the personnel committee in our department, and we would evaluate the performance of that faculty member in that matter. Those course evaluations for those intercampus courses would be shared with the administration of the intercampus school and they could provide comments to the dean at the time of evaluation if they chose to.

Senator Chilton: Several speakers have said that this program has been approved, and I wonder if the Faculty Senate has approved this? Or are we talking about something else when we say that it has been approved?

Secretary May: The Graduate School--the entity itself--has been established by the Board of Trustees without formal approval by the Faculty Senate. But the academic programs are being submitted to the Faculty Senates on all the campuses involved, including this one, for approval. The structural entity of the Intercampus Graduate School in Marine Sciences and Technology exists and this campus is a part of it. But, if we defer, then this campus will be part of the Graduate School for window-dressing purposes, and perhaps for the purpose of administering grants, but it will not be offering degrees through the school, until such time as this campus approves the degrees. If we go

with the substitute motion then we will be involved in the structural ways and also have the option for students on this campus to participate in the degree programs. That's my understanding.

The Senate then voted to amend the substitute motion:

VOTE: To strike the phrase in line four "on a positive evaluation" and substitute the phrase "on approval by the Faculty Senate."

The vote to amend the substitute motion passed.

The Faculty Senate then voted to make the substitute motion the main motion on the floor.

VOTE: That the Faculty Senate conditionally approve the final application for the M.S. and Ph.D. degree Programs in Marine Sciences and Technology for a period of two years. Continued participation by the Amherst Campus beyond December 31, 2002 is conditioned on approval by the Faculty Senate of a formal response to the concerns enumerated #1-#9 in Sen. Doc. No. 01-020 and on a comprehensive general report of the Intercampus Graduate School to the Faculty Senate to be submitted not later than September 1, 2002.

The vote to make the substitute motion the main motion passed.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate conditionally approve the final application for the M.S. and Ph.D. degree Programs in Marine Sciences and Technology for a period of two years. Continued participation by the Amherst Campus beyond December 31, 2002 is conditioned on approval by the Faculty Senate of a formal response to the concerns enumerated #1-#9 in Sen. Doc. No. 01-020 and on a comprehensive general report of the Intercampus Graduate School to the Faculty Senate to be submitted not later than September 1, 2002.

This motion was seconded and adopted.

Secretary May congratulated the Councils of the Faculty Senate who were involved in studying this rather complicated and confusing proposal, and on getting their reports done in 2 1/2 months.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. *Jane Giacobbe-Miller, President of the Massachusetts Society of Professors* announced that the process for the CEO search for UMASS ONLINE has been modified by the President's Office. She noted that originally video conferencing was to be used to allow certain people from the campuses to participate in the interviewing of the candidates, but now the process of asking various individuals to participate in the interview process has become a substitute for that. She stated that she would be writing the President's Office to express concern about that and ask for a broader opportunity for participation by people who are interested.

The 585th Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate stood adjourned at 4:45 p.m. December 7, 2000.

Respectfully submitted by Ernest May, Secretary of the Faculty Senate.

The Proceedings of this meeting are available on audio tape at the Faculty Senate Office dated December 7, 2000.