

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

MINUTES: Presiding Officer Frank Hugus called the 593rd meeting of the Faculty Senate to order on May 17, 2001 at 3:30 p.m. in Herter Hall 227.

A motion was made to suspend the rules in order to move item number four on the agenda to item number one on the agenda.

This motion was seconded and adopted unanimously.

1. Special Report of the Research Council concerning The Amendment of Motion No. 69-90, Recommendation Number 1 in Senate Document No. 90-062, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 01-048 with Motion No. 58-01.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the changes in Sen. Doc. No. 90-062, as presented in Sen. Doc. 58-01
58-01 No. 01-048.

This motion was seconded and adopted unanimously.

A. NEW BUSINESS

2. Special Report of the Academic Priorities Council concerning the Proposed Termination of the Department of Consumer Studies, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 01-046 with Motion Nos. 53-01, 54-01 and 55-01.

Senator Richard Bogartz, member of the Academic Priorities Council read from the Council's report:

The Council found itself with members sharing highly diverse points of view, and it is quite remarkable that we put out a report, but here it is.

The Academic Priorities Council was asked to assess the recommendations of Dean Helgesen and Dean Willis to close the Department of Consumer Studies. There was agreement that closure is due to a lack of resources. There was agreement that closure is not due to issues involved in instructional demand and productivity, research productivity, reputation, intellectual liveliness and uniqueness, or outreach and that the department is viewed positively on these established criteria. There was the issue of centrality. Pushed for an argument based on Senate criteria, Dean Helgesen stated (and Dean Willis later agreed) that the Department is not central to the mission of the University or College of Food and Natural Resources. More on 'centrality' later.

Provost Marrett, while not using these words, made the case that the Department simply happened to be on the railroad tracks when the runaway budget deficit train came roaring through. In the words she *did* use, 'Apparel Marketing was not chosen for reduction or termination; it was swept up in a much larger trend that saw the campus's faculty shrink by more than 250 positions over the course of a decade. In this department, as in many others, vacancies went unfilled because the savings had to be applied to persistent operating budget deficits. For the College of Food and Natural Resources as a whole, the decade of the '90s saw the loss of 32.75 base faculty positions, 4.75 of them in Consumer Studies. These losses damaged the institution in many ways, but for Consumer Studies they were devastating. They forced an assessment of whether the Department could continue to function as an independent entity and led to the Dean's request and my decision to stop bringing in new students. Given that there was no prospect of restoring the faculty to critical mass, the Dean proposed the transfer of one program and the termination of another, and I concur with that recommendation.' She further went on to say that the situation could have been reversed only if resources had been invested in Consumer Studies. She says, 'I have already noted the practical difficulty of holding a department harmless in the face of ongoing, across-the-board faculty losses. In theory, of course, the dean could have chosen to take vacancies from other departments in order to make Consumer Studies whole, but this raises issues that go far beyond the Senate termination and reduction procedures.

The Academic Priorities Council mandate states that the Faculty Senate's charge to the Academic Priorities Council is that the Council will provide advice to the administration on all matters of academic planning and priority and provide periodic advice to the administration relating to growth, stabilization and reduction of academic programs; review, at the request of the administration, long-range plans involving changes in academic priorities; develop criteria and procedures whereby programs can be assigned an academic priority; and review all proposals for new programs.

The Council's review amounted to the following. It was our view that the Council was being asked to advise or recommend priority for a single department, when the concept of priority presumes comparison among more than one entity. The council became involved with the review process too late in the game after recommendations to terminate had already occurred. With respect to the issue of centrality, this is a spatial metaphor in search of a metric. Whether an object is central or not, relative to other objects, depends on the dimensions of the space, and these are not indicated. The Council agreed that it could not tell if the centrality decision was objective or subjective and had no basis on which to

evaluate the decision by the deans concerning centrality. The Council also agreed that there appears to be no provisions for the Council to make recommendations concerning reallocation of resources.

So, as a result, the APC is taking no position nor making any specific recommendation to the Faculty Senate or administration on the closure of the Department of Consumer Studies, other than to observe that this is a sad result. We respectfully suggest that, in addition, that this can be reviewed as a bad decision in that we view Consumer Studies to be a program that, if evaluated within the larger perspective of the College of Food and Natural Resources or the campus as a whole, might not have been identified for termination. Unfortunately, decisions such as this will surely be repeated in the future if money is not allocated in increasing amounts to the academic area of the University. We are, however, making a series of recommendations that we hope will help us avoid in the future the narrow box the council found itself in and which confined its role concerning the closure of the Department of Consumer Studies. We make these recommendations based on the following observations and present them as motions for consideration of the Faculty Senate.

The observations are "it's business as usual." In our deliberations and desire to better understand the proposed termination of Consumer Studies, the Academic Priorities Council found it necessary to consider the more general trend in the erosion of the academic infrastructure of this University due to inadequate budgets, and more specifically how this is increasingly being undertaken within an atmosphere of "business as usual." We are alarmed by the figures showing the decline of full-time, tenure-track faculty on this campus over the last two decades. The APC has examined several graphs showing the number of faculty by rank at the Amherst campus for the years 1978 -1997. From Fall 1989 to Fall 2000, the base faculty or tenure-system faculty at the University has fallen from 1,346 to 1,090, a drop of 19 percent.

The Council is alarmed at the continued, even routine, downsizing of the faculty. Concern has seemed to focus on the proper procedure for downsizing rather than on the impact or even impropriety of any such process. We fear this focus has become "business as usual" on this campus. We add our voices to those of the Provost and others who have sounded the alarm. The recent report "The Amherst Campus Budget: Facing the Fiscal Crisis" by the Program and Budget Council of the Faculty Senate bears partial repeating. They say:

"What one can see by looking back at figures published in the University Fact Book over the years, however, is that faculty positions in general have fallen steadily from 1987 to today. Increasingly, instructional capacity has been supplemented with non-faculty teachers. The Chancellor's *Strategic Intent* presented in March of this year indicates that full-time faculty have decreased by 53 from 1994 to 2000 while non-tenure system faculty increased by 117. While this may have kept the student faculty ratio from getting out of control, it is questionable whether the same quality of teaching is being delivered. More importantly, it does not address the question of whether a critical mass of colleagues still exists in many programs to carry out a mission of meaningful research and outreach. Without the flow of fresh new ideas that often comes from recent graduates joining our ranks, it is difficult to maintain the intellectual growth in a discipline that is vital to a strong research agenda. Our faculty is increasingly senior and tenured and shrinking. This trend makes it difficult to remain among the leaders of the academy.

Over the past seven years, funding of programs under Academic Affairs fell from 62.4 percent to 58.1 percent of the total campus budget."

We on the Academic Priorities Council believe there must be a fundamental change in the strategy governing retention and replacement of faculty. We call on the administration and the Faculty Senate to acknowledge this crisis and provide the leadership necessary to address it. The campus should be mobilized to persuade the Board of Trustees and the Legislature to provide the funds necessary to maintain this campus as an accredited research university, and as an institution that contributes enormously to the Commonwealth. These efforts ought to be supported accordingly. To this end, we call for an end to using operating budget funds to pay for deferred maintenance at the cost of losing faculty and departments. We should not be put in the position of setting the interests of the faculty against the interests of the physical plant in which the faculty must work. We must also do what is necessary to make the Legislature understand that the University must have a separate appropriation for deferred maintenance.

MOVED: 53-01 That the Faculty Senate express its dismay and sincere regret that the campus's spending priorities have resulted in a situation in which the Department of Consumer Studies became vulnerable to termination.

This motion was seconded.

Senator Mokhtar Atallah, chair of the Academic Matters Council: The document for termination of departments requires that the Academic Priorities Council should submit a special report and that report shall include an appropriate motion and such motion shall be in the form of an appropriate recommendation to the campus administration. Expression of dismay and regret is not a recommendation to the administration.

Senator Eliot Moss: In view of the other motions coming up and--maybe some other people feel the same way I do: that this motion is, by far, not strong enough--perhaps we can move through these and get to the stronger motions without spending a lot of time on this.

This motion was adopted by a majority vote.

MOVED: 54-01 That the Faculty Senate call on the Board of Trustees and University Administration to re-examine institutional spending priorities that have placed other expenditures above faculty replacement and renewal.

This motion was seconded and adopted unanimously.

MOVED: 55-01 That the Academic Priorities Council be charged with working constructively with the Campus Administration to develop procedures for 1) the assessment of academic programmatic priorities that recognize the campus's mission as a Land Grant research institution and that considers best estimates of the campus's resource situation over the next 5 – 10 years; and 2) ensuring constructive, timely (early) and meaningful faculty involvement in decisions related to program closure.

This motion was seconded.

Roland Chilton, Chair of the Rules Committee: I just have a question and that is, can we expect that the Academic Priorities Council will come in with suggestions for revision of the charge to the council for the procedures? I'm not clear from this that what you're recommending differs from our current procedures for reviewing programs for dismissal.

Senator Bogartz: Well I'm not sure how it differs either, but I do know that we've already considered some changes that we would like to see, in particular some advance warning of when departments are reaching critical mass, that is, when they are one or two above critical mass, so that we can begin to consider departments relative to one another and consider the issue. This all presumes that things are going to continue the way they're going or get worse.

Ernest May, Secretary of the Faculty Senate: I think this motion provides a mandate for the Faculty Senate, which is, generally across academia, considered to be *the* primary quality-assurance mechanism within the faculty, to take an active role. At the moment, by some anomaly, we have left the Faculty Senate out of, for example, the AQUAD process, which is a Trustee-mandated program review process. But I think that there is a way to get the Faculty Senate involved in that, and also to take a more proactive role. And I think that there is some indication that the procedures for termination or reduction should be rewritten, and that we should also have a process for merging departments, for which we currently do not have a specific process, and I hope we can work over the summer and get something ready for the fall. This motion will provide a mandate to do that.

Professor William Thuemmel: This motion is very central to my work over the last 26 years here as the agricultural teacher educator in the School of Education. I'm going to be retiring in a couple of weeks, and I feel with great sadness that there are no plans to replace me. I feel sorry for the students. This program (and I say it with a small 'p' lest I get in trouble), with reorganization, sort of got squeezed out in the School of Ed. And I've been told by *my* Dean that my work is no longer central to the mission of the School of Education. And I point out that the Trustee's document is why I'm here and we have such a program. Incidentally, this program, as I look at the Consumer Studies list of important points, parallels it quite well. Agricultural education at Mass Agricultural College began as a department in 1907 and has been continuous ever since. And it grew into the School of Education back in the '30s. And this is the only such teacher-preparation program for agriculture teachers in Massachusetts. It's one of the few left in the Northeast, in New England. Our graduates are finding lots of jobs. We have about 30 students in that I'm closing out right now, but I mention this because it's little understood, it's little known, but it seems like the land-grant core of our institution is eroding very quickly. In the last five or six years, I just can't believe that we are still a land-grant university. And, you know, some of our colleagues, and even in the administration, will refer to 'can't we do things like the University of Michigan? or the University of Pennsylvania?' and I go nuts. Those are not land-grant universities, folks. Michigan State University and Penn State are the models that ought to be cited when we look for peers. And so this is more information, but I am concerned when I saw Family and Consumer Studies, when we lost our teacher-preparation component in Family and Consumer Studies. And being in agricultural education, vocational-technical ed, I was very concerned about this. And it becomes a house of cards. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

This motion was adopted unanimously.

3. **Special Report of the Status of Women Council concerning The Proposed Closing of the Department of Consumer Studies, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 01-047 with Motion No. 56-01.**

Nancy Patteson, co-chair of the Status of Women Council read from the Council's report:

The Faculty Senate's Status of Women Council is authorized by the bylaws and constitution of the University of Massachusetts at Amherst's Faculty Senate to make recommendations affecting the status of women on this campus. Therefore, it is the responsibility of this Council to address the actions being taken by the administration to eliminate the Department of Consumer Studies. We are most concerned with the implications of the decision on the lives of the students, most of whom are female, and the message that scholarship valued by women and families is irrelevant to the educational mission of this University.

This University has always been committed to providing quality academic opportunity to the students of this Commonwealth and the international community. Why, then, are we closing a program with a commitment to teaching, research and outreach? Why have we allowed the administration to eliminate a program where there were 360 students in a Department consisting of 2 majors and the student body was 98 percent female with 15 percent students of color? The Department offered 3 gen.ed. courses, and overall 40 percent of the 2,500 students who enrolled in its classes every year were drawn from other majors. Students were educated to succeed in management and executive positions in the retail and finance industries and in non-profit organizations that dealt with families and their issues. Graduates, of which most were female, were provided with the opportunity to reach the corporate corner office. Placement rates and average starting salaries were among the highest in CFNR and it was not unusual for students to receive starting offers of \$40,000. Students were in demand professionally and the Department was recognized nationally. Faculty were, and continue to be, distinguished scholars and researchers. Alumni have always been generous supporters.

Vice Chancellor Robert Helgesen stated that his reasons for closing the Department were, and still are, related to a budget deficit. "A necessary critical mass of faculty were lost in the nineties due to budget cuts leaving Consumer Studies vulnerable. The Status of Women Council has no doubt that hard decisions had to be made to balance the budget. We are concerned, however, that the decision to eliminate this program leaves many students, and they are mostly women, disproportionately affected and wondering why this University did not provide them with educational opportunity. At a meeting hosted by the Status of Women Council and attended by faculty, staff, career personnel and students of Consumer Studies, we heard over and over again from the students of how they are sought after and recruited for high-paying jobs, and of how the program gave them hope for moving up and out in the world. The perception of these students is that they have been short-changed by this University and that there is no place else for them to go to prepare for the "real world."

Consumer Studies is one of the few programs on this campus with a student body that is primarily women. The University of Massachusetts has a legal and moral obligation to provide equal opportunity for both women and men in its educational programs."

MOVED: 56-01 **That the Faculty Senate endorse the Status of Women Council's strong disapproval of the decision to eliminate the Department of Consumer Studies, based on the disproportionate harm which this decision has brought to the opportunities for women students on the Amherst campus.**

This motion was seconded.

Senator Marios Philippides: I'm wondering if I can offer an amendment here, if we could add to the motion, 'and we continue to deplore the shameful closing of the Slavic Studies Department, Russian language, as well as the discontinuation of the Ph.D. program in French.'

Presiding Officer Frank Hugus: Senator Phillipides, that amendment is not, strictly speaking, germane to the motion of the Department of Consumer Studies, so the Chair would have to rule that 'out of order.'

Secretary May: Just a comment or two, because this is an unusual case, a major which has a very large percentage of one gender. But there are one or two other similar majors (one that I can think of that's mostly male). The analogy here, I think, has something to do with athletics, because in athletics, because of Title IX, one is required now to assess the way that women and men map onto the different sports and then assess whether administrative actions taken in relations to the support of those sports is equitable in relation to gender. There is no such formal requirement for academic programs. I think we tend to assume that women and men map on to academic majors rather equally, but in fact they don't.

Robert Rothstein, chair of the Research Library Research Council: I'm tempted to identify myself as the ghost of departments past, since slightly over five years ago, I addressed this body with a valedictory in behalf of the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures, which was about to be eliminated. I rise to express my solidarity with colleagues in Consumer Studies, and with their students, and take the opportunity of this particular motion, which mentions the harm to students, women students in particular, to state that, although my colleagues and I from Slavic have found good homes, either in retirement or in hospitable departments (in my own case, in Comparative Literature), the damage was done was to our students, who now have half the

opportunity of studying languages that we used to teach. And, therefore, I am very much in solidarity both with this motion and the one to be next moved. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Senator Ronald Story: I wasn't actually going to speak to this motion because I have some things to say about a later one, but I just want to say that, honestly, it's a common assumption on the campus today that sexism is a part of this decision. It's just a standard assumption. Nearly everybody I know who talks about this just makes that assumption. And I have to say, it's almost impossible to refute. It demonstrates a pecking order that expresses a long tradition of sexism. This department is associated with mostly women, historically, and I think it's going to confirm people's assumptions about this decision and give us a black eye.

Senator Marta Calas: I want to continue with the theme that Senator Story just mentioned because I think it's more than just the number of women in the department. It's the perception of the feminization of a particular profession--how that, in itself, carries value within the University, and therefore the question of regardless of the composition of the student body (which in fact does oftentimes reflect the notion of whether a particular profession is masculine or feminine), but in general the idea that it is possible to think in terms of a feminized profession as less valuable to the University today than one that carries with itself the symbolism of masculinity.

Senator Bogartz: I'd like to mention that in the Academic Priorities Council, this issue did arise, and there were some people, in fact, on the council who felt rather strongly that this might well have been a component of the decision. The problem that confronted us was we had no evidence.

This motion was adopted by a majority vote.

4. Special Motion of the Rules Committee:

MOVED: 57-01 That the Faculty Senate oppose the closing of the Consumer Studies Department because of the failure of the Administration to make a convincing case based upon existing criteria and established procedures for the termination of programs.

Senator Chilton: The Rules Committee does not take issue with the facts as presented in the report of the Academic Priorities Council and supports the motions; however, we think the Academic Priorities Council doesn't go far enough in maintaining the faculty's traditional jurisdiction over primary responsibility for the curriculum. The other thing I want to call attention to is an item in the Academic Priorities Council report that says that the Dean did invoke the criterion of centrality and said that 'I do not believe that Consumer Studies is central to the mission of the University or the College of Food and Natural Resources, nor is it central to the intellectual life of the University.'

I think it's important not to vilify people whose views we might not agree with. And in that case, I think the Academic Priorities Council went on to say that they couldn't decide whether or not this appraisal was objective or subjective, in which case, we probably have some work to do in revising the charge to the Academic Priorities Council, if centrality is purely subjective. And the Council went on to say that, as far as they were concerned, there was no coherent basis for termination other than resource scarcity. The Rules Committee believes that the Faculty Senate should not agree that "resource scarcity" be allowed to prevail as a sole and decisive criterion for the termination of an established academic program in this case or in the future. And I would underscore especially 'in the future.' A program must be demonstrated to rank poorly on two or more of the specified academic criteria. I want to also underscore in the report the notion (and I should acknowledge that all of this language is pretty much the Secretary's--we give credit where credit is due!)...No, really, the report says, and I think every member of the Rules Committee agrees, that process is as important as product. And the procedures set in this case offer substantial implications for the future. Therefore, in the case of the proposal to terminate the Department of Consumer Studies, the Rules Committee does not judge that the case for termination has been established.

Senator Surinder Mehta: Senator Chilton has stated that the Academic Priorities Council does not go far enough in its motion, and, therefore, the Rules Committee is going to go further because it thinks it's the right thing to do. I think the Rules Committee does not go far enough!

Senator Mehta then made a motion to amend Motion number 57-01 by adding the words "and, therefore urges the administration to rescind its decision to the close the Consumer Studies Department." after the word "programs."

The motion to amend was seconded.

Senator Kandula Sastry: Sir, the intent of the amendment is very clear. The intent of the motion is also very clear. The motion does not go just far enough. That is what Senator Mehta said, and after we strongly oppose, then what do you do? You rescind the decision, and then you reconstitute the department and its programs. That's what I think you do. And I certainly agree with him, and in fact, on the table, Senator Atallah and I have

presented the motions, one of which is pretty much along those lines. I certainly concur with Senator Mehta's motion.

Senator Chilton: I think it's important to keep our eye on what we're trying to do here and that is perhaps to undo the wrong but also to alert the administration and the faculty to situations that may arise in the future. So, as long as we don't lose track of the recommendation, and the intent of the recommendation is to make sure that we find a procedure for avoiding the development of these situations in the future, I see no problem with the amendment.

Senator Mehta: It would seem as if Professor Chilton is opposing my amendment; I don't think he is. He's pointing out that we shouldn't lose sight of the importance of proper procedures, and my amendment only emphasizes that the decision was wrong and the procedures were wrong and everything is assumed. And I want to make it clear that the Faculty Senate would urge the administration to rescind a decision that was not properly made.

The motion to amend Motion number 57-01 was adopted by a majority vote.

Senator Jane Giacobbe-Miller: As many of you know, I actually wear two hats in here. I'm a senator and also president of the Massachusetts Society of Professors, so I'd like to begin by communicating that the MSP Board voted to be opposed to the closure of the Consumer Studies Department. I would add that this same motion was passed a year ago, and the position of the MSP has not changed, and it's for all of the reasons that have been discussed in the various reports. The feeling was that the justification did not exist. But I also would like to add that we are very bothered by the treatment of the faculty in this particular situation as well. And that is the process of notifying the faculty that a department is to be closed and then sending them out, hat in hand, to look for a home, to look for a department. We feel this is a shabby way to treat people who have spent a lot of time, devoting a lot of their careers to this institution.

I also think that this motion doesn't go far enough. I think that we have to ask the question, 'What happens next?' My big fear here is that (I really believe the motion is going to pass strongly) people will walk out feeling like, 'It's done; we saved the Consumer Studies program.' But the reality is, this program has been weakened over a period of time. It's been weakened through a process we've seen before in other departments: not filling faculty lines, choking off admissions, and then calling the program 'not viable.' I look back to the earlier motion where we talk about early involvement of the Senate, and the first thing that comes to my mind is: 'the moment we don't refill a faculty position, that's when we're actually in the process of retrenching that program.' So I hope, as we pass this, that we keep in mind that this is not the end of the story for this department, nor the end of the story for the rest of us.

Glen Gordon, Dean of the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences: I'm not speaking *directly* to the question of this particular department but to the notion of the Rules Committee that somehow or other the administration (and for a change, I'm not one of the persons that is directly involved in this decision) acted inappropriately. If it did, it strikes me that perhaps the procedures need to be amended in some way--at least in two ways. If you don't like the way we talked about centrality, then perhaps you have to be more specific in what criteria you want to use when a case about centrality will be made; and secondly, particularly in these times, if you have a set of procedures and it does not include the availability of funds, I think there's something rather drastically wrong with the procedures.

Now when Roland got up there and said they should look at demand--all these things--all of that is fine, and I think all those should be looked at. But there does come a point, certainly in the life of a dean, when we may not be able to pay the bills. It's as simple as that. And my concern I think in some ways I'm facing as a dean over the next year or two [is] the need to cut \$600,000 from my base. That's it. That's a stark fact. I can do it in a number of ways. I am often urged by others not to do it across the board, because that's not 'biting the bullet.' That's just taking the easy way out. But then if I don't take the easy way out, and [I] target a particular program in order to retain the strength in all of the others, then obviously the members of that particular program look upon me as having done a dastardly deed.

So I think in some ways, rather than trying to say, 'Well, the administration did this, and did that, and it shouldn't do it,' the harder question is, 'What should we do?'

Jane says that every time we don't refill a position, we're retrenching. Well, I'm retrenching like hell, then. And all the other deans are retrenching, too, and we're going to keep retrenching until, presumably, we get to [a] \$15 million shortfall that has to be covered. If anybody has a way for me to do my job without cutting faculty lines (because the only other discretionary funds I have are TAs and part-timers, and if I do that, I can't deliver the curriculum either), I would certainly like to know about it.

But I do think the Rules Committee putting anybody through the kinds of hoops that you have to go through with the Senate document, it seems a little bit difficult to say, 'Well, you didn't follow all the procedures.' Jane said that she made this motion a year ago. That tells you that this thing has been going on for a

hell of a long time, and they've been jumping through a lot of hoops. It's not like anybody did this precipitously, but the news keeps getting worse, not better; so, from my point of view, this is the tip of the iceberg, and, if you're worried about this, then indeed we have to figure out how we're going to avoid things like this in the future. I don't think we can avoid it by simply saying, 'We shouldn't cut any programs.'

Senator Daniel Martin: I rise in favor of the motion. I would like to remind you, I am also a member of the Academic Priorities Council, and I want to read you the last paragraph from the Dean to the Provost:

"I do not believe that Consumer Studies is central to the mission of the University."

This is a land-grant university, which trained agricultural teachers, farmers, through the Morrill Act after the Civil War. And I have been thinking about this program, Consumer Studies, a lot. I have here a copy of The Campus Chronicle of April 27, which shows a picture where there is a coming together of the core of the university, which used to be Greek and Latin, now French and German, and Consumer Studies; here's a picture of Professor Pat Warner with Spanish Professor Nina Scott examining an 18th-century shoe. Let me put a footnote to this. I have been to church lately on a Sunday morning, and there were very few people in attendance. Then we went to the mall; it was crowded. I think the mall is the new cathedral in the New World. The university, if I may say one more sentence, the university started with the monastery schools, then it went to the cathedral school, and then the universities in the Middle Ages. But now, we have a change from the word to the object, and modern philosophers, like Foucault, their books are full of pictures of the past, that they used to hit students, the whips and the prison utensils, and this, the object, is really essential to the modern university. The 18th-century shoe is central and not the manuscript anymore. So I think 'centrality,' which has been taught by my friend, Glen Gordon, should be reexamined in consideration to Consumer Studies Department.

Senator Moss: I appreciate Dean Gordon's remarks. He'll make my job of explicating things a little easier. He says, what should a dean do, or what should a dean have done, in a situation like this? And I think the Academic Priorities Council has made that clear, that they were given criteria that are intended for ranking, and they have done that with a set of one. And I think that the Dean of the College of Food and Natural Resources should have carried out a more extensive review and ranking of programs before deciding which one should be eliminated, and that faculty should have been involved in this process. So what we see here is administrative decision-making, and it is decision-making, whether it be a direct decision to curtail or hurt or damage a program or an implicit one by not giving them additional resources to enable them to maintain viability. A dean is making a decision that's going to strangle or eventually eliminate a program, but is doing it in a not-so-public, (if I wanted to be pejorative, a rather underhanded) way. Maybe that's more politically acceptable. It's killing by degrees. It happens slowly. It's harder to get the faculty motivated to oppose it. But I think it is clear, the kind of process that should have gone on. This is not to say that a process like that could not come to a conclusion that, because of resource limitations, some program or another will be reduced, eliminated, combined, moved, whatever. And none of us want that to happen. We all want the pie to be bigger, but if the pie is shrinking and we have to do something, we want to be involved. We want it to be a broad and open and fair process, not one that happens because of one person's choice, which then is very open to these charges of sexism and elitism because of the nature of the program.

Senator Story: I have two hats, too, actually; I'm taking Jane's place as president of the MSP, and I'm also a senator. I would like to support this amended motion. I have problems with terminating this specific program, and this gives me a chance to talk about that.

I think this decision is a bad one because it devalues undergraduate education on this campus. This program has a good record of educating students. It has a large number of students. They have a good record of post-graduate success. And because I'm a political person who thinks about how are we going to get money from the Statehouse, frankly, that's who I am (and Ellen's spouse, that's true), this is the kind of record that we need. This really does strengthen our position in the state. It appeals to families in the Commonwealth. It appeals to legislators. When Brian O'Connor goes in to talk to legislators, this is exactly the kind of thing he talks about. He talks about his own programs, but they respond to this conversation about good undergraduate teaching. It produces alumni, most of them stay, and they provide various kinds of support. I'll tell you, when we start cutting these kinds of programs, we're being penny-wise and pound- foolish. We're cutting off our nose to spite our face. And in the long run, that's the reason we have to keep doing this. I can't underscore that enough. We can't have a great research university and we can't have great outreach, unless we maintain these kinds of good undergraduate-oriented programs.

I also want to say something about outreach. This program also has a good outreach record. It actually has done good service work in towns and communities, and they're needy towns and communities mostly. I have talked to the Chair of this department about the work that they've done in needy communities, and they've done research in these areas, too. And it seems to me that eliminating a program like that diminishes and narrows the concept of outreach in a way that I don't find conscionable. This program has good ties with business where it places its grads. The only problem honestly with the outreach that this program does, it seems to me, is that it

doesn't bring in really big grant money, and it doesn't have big corporate funding. That's the only problem with the outreach that this program does. I would say that this program serves the have-nots and not the haves. And I think to kill a program like this diminishes our notion of outreach, so I hope this motion passes.

Senator Mehta: Glen Gordon is my dean. I respect him a lot, and I like him a lot. He's a grand fellow. When he says he's got \$600,000 less, and so he's going to have to chop some heads, and they're going to be faculty positions, I sympathize with him. He's got a rough, tough job. And he sees no alternative. But I think somewhere along the line, decisions have been made that led to a reduction of \$600,000 in his budget. Now, you can say, 'Well, the state is not giving us enough money; these are hard times. Our budget is less and less.' But the Academic Affairs part of the total budget has been hit the hardest among all the other budgets. Is it not so that for years the proportion allocated to the Academic Affairs budget tied to faculty positions has been severely reduced. And then the argument is made, 'Well, therefore, faculty positions have to be reduced because we've got less money and then departments or programs have to be closed because we have fewer faculty.' Why is there deficiency of faculty? What happened to those 4.75 positions in Consumer Studies department over the years? Is it that we kept on reducing, or the administration or somebody making the decisions to reduce the Academic Affairs part of the budget, and then reduce faculty positions, then used that argument to close the program? Something, logically, is missing over here. So I think this was a bad decision, and I think that Senator Story has made a wonderful, wonderful, support in giving support to my amendment, and I urge the senators to vote this overwhelmingly, hopefully unanimously. Thank you.

Senator Bogartz: I agree with practically all of the remarks that have been made. I would like to say that I support the amended motion without reservations, but it doesn't go far enough. [laughter] And no motion here and no discussion here is going to go far enough. Discussion that remains on the campus, no matter how insightful, no matter how incisive, no matter how vigorous, no matter how well-documented, remains virtually irrelevant. It's only discussion that makes it off-campus that has any chance of producing meaningful change. So, when we get done passing this motion, as I'm sure we will, that should be the beginning of getting the message off-campus, into the newspapers, if you like, but certainly into the Legislature.

Senator Atallah: I would like to speak for the motion in two senses: support for what happened to the Department, and, secondly, it would really form a grounds to support the Deans' decisions. (That's to protect the Dean from being called that they make their decision arbitrarily.) If we go through the procedure, and we establish a ranking, and then we see who is targeted first and second, based on agreement of all the faculty in that college, or in the University and the Faculty Senate in general, no one is going to be blamed when the budget crunch comes. But as it stands now, any department who has someone retiring, or someone leaving for another job, watch out!

Senator Laura Doyle: I would also like to speak in support of the motion as amended. I want to second what Senator Atallah said about process and taking some of the pressure off the deans. It seems to me crucial that each college and school make a process, as to some degree, I believe Dean Edwards has started to try to do with the Faculty Advisory Board, to help work through, 'This is the piece of the pie, and what are we going to do about it.' That's one point. I also want to say, for the record, that the decision, as I understand it, (listening on the Academic Matters Council) *was* made quite quickly, from the top down; the process that's been going on over the last two years has been the faculty trying to become involved in this decision. And that's what's gone on a long time. The decision was made; students were no longer accepted, which is what put the Academic Priorities Council in such a tough position and seems to have forced them to say they simply regretted the decision instead of feeling that they had anyplace to stand to undo that decision. I would also say that, yes, what else needs to happen? I would second what the earlier senator said about getting the news out. I'm afraid that, from my point of view, we're reaching the point of, well, let's just say, rioting. We have a big problem. It's happening across the country. It's time to stop it. It's called, 'dismantling the university.' I will not stand by and say, 'This is what's happening, let's be realists.' If we'd said that, most of the people in this room wouldn't be here. So it's, in my opinion, not something to say, 'This is the piece of the pie. What are we going to do about it?' We're going to make the pie bigger!

I would also just mention that I think the Board of Trustees and the character of our Board of Trustees is incredibly important here. I think a lot of attention needs to be given to that. We need a Board of Trustees who doesn't just see the University as a business, because it is not a business. It does not get reduced to numbers well. That is the nature of the beast, and we need people who are advocating that position on the Board of Trustees. Thank you.

Joseph Larson, Senator Emeritus: Thank you for allowing a part-time faculty member to speak. I'm pleased to hear the references to off the campus. And we've touched on all but one. And that one is the President's Office. Every time this Faculty has spoken publicly about the impact of decisions made off the campus on the quality of our programs, and every time we have expressed concern because there are cuts, a duly appointed member of the President's Office speaks to the press and says, in words like this, 'We increased their budget 4 percent last year.'

There's no reason for any cuts.' This is pretty close to a quote from the Hampshire Gazette from President Bulger's office. As long as that mentality exists, we will continue to go down this line of cutting and reducing without regard to academic quality. What you do here today is a message not only to the Trustees. It should not be only a message to the administration on this campus. This campus administration cannot be fully responsible for all of what is going on. It has to be shared by the President's Office. That's where the leadership comes from, and the message should be sent to them.

Senator Brian O'Connor: Hopefully I can add a different spin to this. I certainly support this motion, and I certainly support what virtually everybody else has said here. Just two things: Professors Phillipides and Rothstein have already spoken to this, but I actually dug out the press release of March 15, 1996, in which we terminated Slavic Studies. And I was hoping that it would never happen again, but obviously here we are. One thing--and as Faculty Senate delegate to the Board of Trustees I will do my best to convey to the Trustees and the President's Office--but let me just tell you a little story. At the last Trustee meeting, one of them said to me, 'Well, what do you think about this plan of the law school? How do you think the Amherst campus will feel?' and I said, 'I look at the University now as a large family. It's a family that's starving. And we don't have an awful lot of food to eat. Now we have an orphan, knocking at the door. (The orphan being, of course, the law school.) And it's really a tough decision to see whether we can feed the orphan or not. I think if we don't fight this, it will look as though, 'Well, once again, they let another program die, so they obviously really don't care.' I think we have to work, not just as this campus, but along with the other campuses to stop this total, gradual destruction. And this is one of the things that's bothering me, and I don't know what the answer is, but I do think that we have to, maybe, redraw whatever we need to redraw; but I think we also have to send the message to the Trustees and to the President's Office that we will simply not sit down and take this anymore. Thank you.

Sheila Mammen, Head of the Department of Consumer Studies: Our fate rests in your hands--although the Provost can choose a different course of action after today's vote. Your support is critical because it sends the following messages: No. 1, You are upholding the CFNR faculty vote of support for Consumer Studies that was taken at the CFNR faculty meeting April 2000; No. 2, University procedures for elimination cannot be arbitrarily ignored; No. 3, You cannot pick a department to eliminate without comparing it to other departments in the MBU; No. 4, Administration cannot starve a department, then eliminate it willy-nilly, citing a lack of critical mass; No. 5, It is absurd that our University System is willing to entertain the purchase of an ailing law school for \$12.5 million, which serves less than 130 students, while a program that is in high demand on the flagship campus is being shut down for lack of \$250,000; No. 6, a decision of this magnitude should not be made by those departing campus (it is a matter of life and death for us, and it affects the fate of the young women of the Commonwealth, who for the large part remain in Massachusetts upon graduation); No. 7, As a Faculty Senator, you are standing for principle (your own self interest, and that of your academic department, will not be served by the demise of Consumer Studies). Some of you may ask, 'Are all departments sacred? Should nothing ever be eliminated?' To this I say: a program which enjoys such high demand and is able to provide lucrative careers for graduates, male and female but overwhelmingly female, with average starting salaries of \$40,000 should not be under threat of elimination. Is this who you would sacrifice? Is this how you would make this decision? Ultimately, if this happens to us, this could happen to anyone. Thank you.

This motion was adopted as amended by a majority vote.

A motion was made to suspend the rules so that additional motions could be presented concerning the closing of the Department of Consumer Studies.

The motion to suspend the rules was seconded and adopted by a majority vote.

Senator Atallah: The Department of Consumer Studies is still shackled, and they cannot do their job effectively because of what happened to them. And I think, with our sentiment that was expressed now, we should take the next step to what to do to that Department. And the first of those motions addresses the first step.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate advise the administration to start immediately the process of restitution of the Consumer Studies Department faculty, as well as the Apparel Marketing, and Family and Consumer Sciences majors, so that the Department can carry on its mission as part of this Land-Grant University and fulfill its responsibility to the citizens of the Commonwealth.

This motion was seconded.

Senator Sastry: I think the Senate has very graciously and very eloquently spoken in favor of Consumer Studies. It is time to give them a helping hand, to make sure that the restitution process goes on without sitting on the table on a bureaucrat's desk and waiting for something to happen. I think that this motion simply says: why don't

the good officers of the Rules Committee, the Consumer Studies faculty, and the Administration get together to find ways of rebuilding the Department?

Secretary May: I would advise the Senate that, at this point, we are stepping over from one area, where we have primary responsibility, (and that is for the academic mission of the campus), into another area where we have advisory responsibility, and that is advising the administration on expenditures and other budgetary matters.

I would agree with Dean Gordon, that, in many senses, this institution, like many across the country, can no longer afford to be what it has become. And that supporting all the programs which have grown up to be estimable programs within the budgets which we have, as pointed out in the report from Craig Moore a couple of meetings ago, is not easy in most places--and it's impossible in some, maybe in this one. So the options for carrying out this mandate will be difficult for a dean, and I think that we need to have the involvement of Program and Budget and others. Basically, what it'll amount to doing is taking resources from larger, strong departments and bolstering up departments which have gone below critical mass or which are approaching critical mass.

Senator O'Connor: I guess I'm going to ask a question. It's my understanding that there are no members of this major in the class of '04. That is the class that started last September. There obviously won't be any students coming in this September. So that's two years in which there will be no students. It's obviously out of the catalog that was just produced. It was out of last year's catalog also. The other question I have is, I wish there was some way we could put in there to possibly to look at a merger. I haven't heard the term 'merger' used this afternoon at all. And I have a feeling that that's going to be something that more and more departments are going to have to do. I mean, I'm a product of the merging of Zoology and Botany, which turned out to be very, very successful, so it's not something that doesn't work; so I'm wondering if, perhaps, Senator Atallah could talk about the possibility of a merger here, or also what to do about the majors.

Senator Atallah: The motion is intending to *advise* the administration, and it says 'starting a process.' It doesn't specify a certain time that this process has to be completed, but there have to be steps to be taken to address the problem of the Department. If we wait, in another two years there will be no students in that Department, so we effectively did not vote anything! You don't leave them in limbo; you have to do something to support the vote that was taken here.

Senator Mehta: When I have proposed my amendment, I have said that the Academic Priorities Council's motion didn't go far enough, and the Rules Committee motion did not go far enough, and that was why I was offering that amendment to the Rules Committee motion. I think *my* motion didn't go far enough. And now something is being done about it. I had that in mind, but I didn't know how to put it in my amendment, how to take care of that matter, which is now being taken care of by this motion, that is, if we pass it.

The other point I wanted to make was what Senator O'Connor was saying about the problem of the majors for '03 and '04--that they have not been admitted and catalogs have been printed. Well, we can open up the major again, and there are currently students on the campus who may shift into it, who may transfer from outside and come into the program because now it's been opened up again. So I don't really think that's too much of a problem. It's too bad that we don't have the students who would have come otherwise, who may not be able to come now, but we've got plenty of students. So I urge you to pass this motion.

Senator Martin: I will speak in favor of the motion, and I may suggest something, which I discussed with Professor Mammen, the Chair of the Consumer Studies Department: the model of Europe. In Europe, we have professional schools and we announce, '40 people will be admitted next year. 400 people show up to the exam, and it's entrance by examination. They only have four and then some adjunct faculty on their staff. Could we live with a procedure where, not 300 majors as they have now, but 50, a limited number, were admitted to the major through examination?

Senator Sastry: Sir, as was noted already, there were no majors admitted last year and this coming year. So what we are seeing here is not a kind of delta function, which suddenly springs up all at once, but there should be a gradual period of a couple of years, wherein faculty are hired, students are admitted, so that for a period of a couple to three years the program comes back up, phased in nicely, so that it serves the Commonwealth. That's the idea of this motion, not just to start doing something overnight.

Senator Chilton: Very unwisely, I'm going to suggest that the makers of this motion suggest where the money should come from. If we're going to make recommendations that they reinstate this program, we ought to recommend where they can find the money. That seems to me a reasonable kind of recommendation.

Senator Arthur Kinney: I'd just like to reinsert into the conversation Senator Doyle's remark, that we don't have to stay with the money we've got. We try to get some more money and to remind the Senate that someone else, I

think it was Senator Larson who made the comment, that this is a message to the President and to the Trustees about whether we believe in this kind of service to the Commonwealth.

Senator Moss: I would like to speak again to process here. Ultimately, I find myself in favor of this motion, but more for the reason that an appropriate process was not followed, so the program should not be eliminated on the grounds that were used. Then the logical conclusion is: it must be restored. This does not preclude, it's not inconsistent with the college beginning a process by which they would rank programs and departments and determine something for elimination if they have a continuing budget problem. I think what it does imply is that the college, the campus as a whole, the University as a whole--we need to find some one- or two-year money to fix this because *they* didn't follow the process.

Professor Mammen: I'd like you to know that most of our students are transfer students. We typically take in very few incoming freshmen each year. I'm not sure if this is helpful, but I think it might be.

Senator Calas: I just want to address a point that has been made at different points during the discussion, either overtly or covertly, which is a question of the budget. And that, if we continue to speak about the budget first, rather than about programs first, already we are talking ourselves into a box in which we are talking about limited resources, rather than talking academics first, programs first, and then, 'let's go find the money' so that we can present a really strong case about the programs we need to keep, enlarge, maintain, in whichever way or form--but talking about budget first is already undermining ourselves.

Senator Richard Burt: I just wanted to add that I think that we've had these problems for some time now, the declining number of faculty in *good* times. It has nothing to do with the budget. The budget isn't *causing* this to happen. In terms of the long term, whatever process we have, it's going to end up eliminating a department, so I think that process isn't the real issue. It's the administration's policy, and that's what we have to challenge--the policy that we should reduce permanent faculty.

The additional motion was adopted by a vote of 29-6.

A second additional motion was presented by Senator Atallah:

MOVED: That the Consumer Studies faculty and the administration work closely with the Rules Committee of the Senate in arriving at the concrete plan toward the renewal and restoration of the Department in a timely fashion and that such a plan be presented to the Senate at its first meeting in the fall of 2001.

This motion was seconded.

Senator May: I was hoping to take some vacation time this summer!

In the last couple of weeks I've had some time to ponder the peculiar arrangement of executive, legislative and judicial responsibilities on the campus. It's not exactly set up like the Federal Government here. Obviously the Administration has all the executive responsibilities. The Faculty Senate is vested with considerable legislative responsibilities, formulating University policy which is not already set by the Trustees through Trustee documents. There is no judicial branch here, except the Rules Committee sometimes is called upon to judge whether "the rules" have been adhered to or not. While I am not opposed to this motion, I would comment that this puts the Rules Committee in an unusual position of being part of an executive action. I don't recall the Rules Committee having been called upon to be part of an executive action like this before.

Senator Sastry: The idea is simply not to let it go. Rather, to set up a reasonable framework of time, wherein the parties involved, the Department and the Dean and whoever, get together and arrive at a reasonable plan for the future. We're not saying, 'do that by September.' Simply present to us: 'we are discussing; things are looking good.' If you say that in September, we will be happy. That's why we said the Rules Committee can facilitate such a get-together and facilitate, so that in September, we'll hear the progress of our motions.

Senator Chilton: It would be nice to say I'm in favor of this motion, but I'm really not. And I think it's an inappropriate task to impose on the Rules Committee, and I would hope that we would not vote for this particular motion.

Senator Atallah: I would be glad to hear an alternative.

This motion was adopted by a majority vote.

5. **Special Report of the Committee on Committees concerning Nominations to Faculty Senate Councils and Committees, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 01-049 with Motion No. 59-01.**

MOVED: 59-01 That the Faculty Senate approve the nominations to Faculty Senate Councils and Committees, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 01-049.

This motion was seconded and adopted unanimously.

6. **Special Report of the Graduate Council concerning Name Change of the School of Education's Ph.D. Program from "Counseling Psychology" to "School Psychology," as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 01-050 with Motion No. 60-01.**

MOVED: 60-01 That the Faculty Senate approve the name change in the School of Education's Ph.D. program from "Counseling Psychology" to "School Psychology," as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 01-050.

This motion was seconded and adopted unanimously.

B. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Principal Administrative Officers

Chancellor David Scott: I was going to give an update on the budget situation, but in view of the lateness of the hour, I don't think I shall do that today. We can write an article to the Chronicle for next week. (Is the Chronicle published next week?) Yes. We'll write an article for the Chronicle that explains it, but, actually, things are converging reasonably well around the whole approach that we took last November. So there's *better* news, actually, on the residual deficit that we have in the budget--but I'll write something for the Chronicle on that.

I think this is my last meeting of the senate. And I guess I could wish that the discussion had been a different one today on my last meeting. I recall the words of Clark Kerr. I can't think of the translatable phrase that would apply, but I recall, as he was leaving the University of California, he said, 'I leave as I began, fired with enthusiasm!' So I think I leave as I began, on a type of discussion that is not totally different from what it was eight years ago when I arrived here!

So, as I say, I wish it could have been different, but, actually, I would say that it perhaps is the most important discussion that I've actually heard in eight years. And I wish it had occurred earlier, not necessarily around this particular program. This discussion is very necessary. And I find myself in the strange position of agreeing with almost everything that was said, *everything* that was said on all sides, on both sides, on three sides.

And the harsh reality is that these kinds of actions will have to happen, and they will continue to happen as expressed by Glen Gordon and others here. They must happen, and they will happen one-by-one unless one engages on a systemic approach to some of these issues.

And what I hear today in some of the motions is the first intimations of trying to take a systemic look at some of these issues. I don't want to flog a dead horse, but I *have* proposed (but I failed to implement it; I failed to carry it through) from time to time, system approaches that would take more systemic looks, because I believe that one of the issues that we're struggling with in the case of the Consumer Studies Department is that we put the *Dean* in an impossible situation of making decisions and choices in difficult circumstances amongst programs that it makes no intellectual or rational sense to make choices among. It does not make sense to actually make choices around a program like Consumer Studies or Hotel, Restaurant and Travel Administration or Sports Management, for that matter. It doesn't make sense to have to look at these alongside Microbiology, but that is what the Dean has to do. And there are certain programs, like Microbiology, that one can *never* imagine a University of Massachusetts not having. So the Dean is put in a very, very difficult position.

And my plan for a long time has been that there needs to be an *intellectual* reorganization of the University, and I don't know that it would have saved this program. All I know is that it would have been a different dialogue, a different set of choices, a different set of priorities. So I urge you to do what you have taken up today, and I have to say that, as I leave, I failed in that task. I also failed in getting enough resources for this University, and many people have said today that one solution to this dilemma that we face with Consumer Studies is to get more resources from outside. That is a good idea, but it is not an approach over which we have total control.

There's a second approach, which is to make a different set of priority decisions on the macroscopic division of the budget. That is *totally* within our power. We can actually decide to allocate \$300,000 here and take \$300,000 away from deferred maintenance, or whatever. These are choices that *we* can make. And I may have made the wrong choices at the end of the day--with all the input and all the advice, and so on--may have made the wrong choices. I actually don't think so, but you have to take up that issue *now* for the next cycle of planning: What should be the proper macroscopic distribution of the budget? Have we done too much in some areas and not enough in others. And, obviously, there's a feeling here that we *didn't* make necessarily all the right choices.

But the third path, the third way, which I think is the right way, is not to actually cut out programs one-by-one, but it is to take the system approach at reorganizing knowledge in a way that rational mergers, consolidations and judgments can be made amongst a set of programs that would not necessarily lead to eliminating them one-by-one. But without doing that we will. The administrators *have* to eliminate them one-by-one. Something has to give.

So I leave you with that message. I want to thank the Senate, and I want to thank the Rules Committee, the members now and the members in the past, for all that you have done, dealing with difficult issues, like the ones you've dealt with today. I want to thank you all. I want to thank you for making me a better Chancellor.

It's a strange thing, and I'm sure you've all experienced this, but as often happens in life. You moved into a new house, it took you years to get everything unpacked from the basement. And just as you're tacking the last picture up on the wall, there's a knock on the door. D.H. Lawrence had some wonderful lines about it: 'Who's that knocking at my door?/ Who is that knocking at my door?/It is someone come to do me harm./No./No./ It is the three strange angels./ Admit them./ Admit them.' So I move, just as I feel I was tacking the last picture up on the wall, figuratively speaking, and I feel now after eight years I know how to be the Chancellor. And then, the three strange angels (I'm speaking figuratively here, of course) say, "it's time for you to move."

And it is time to move. Eight years is actually quite a long time. And then, as I think about it, you're probably the best Chancellor or you're the best administrator, or you're best at many things when, in fact, you haven't had all the experience because then you are probably more sympathetic, more willing to take some risks, more courageous than after the eight years.

So I thank you for all that you have done and all that you will do in the years ahead. And, believe me, I'll be watching with great interest and listening and cheering from the sidelines.

I'm going to do something else in academe, or connected with academe. I do not plan to be a President or a Chancellor, actually, anywhere else, but I do believe that academe needs quite large systemic change, and I wrote about some of that in Strategic Thinking eight years ago. It needs large systemic change. And one of the things that it needs, actually, is a very careful look now at (what I think Jane Giacobbe and others referred to today) the balance that has to occur between the University as a set of entrepreneurial activities and as a place of meditation and reflection and contemplative practice. I have actually come to the conclusion that it's very hard to change a university from within. (At least I didn't manage to do all that needed to be done.) And I've come to the conclusion that I will now work with [and] for universities from without. Thank you for preparing me for the next part of the journey ahead, and good luck to all of you. Thank you.

2. **The Secretary of the Faculty Senate**

Secretary May thanked the Senators for their dedicated work this year.

3. **The Representative of the Massachusetts Society of Professors**

President Jane Giacobbe-Miller mentioned that she's heard a rumor across campus that there would be record enrollments and fewer faculty for the coming year, and asked for a comment on that rumor.

C. **QUESTION PERIOD**

Vice Chancellor Javier Cevallos replied that the incoming class will probably be the largest in five years, with around 4100 students, approximately three or four hundred more students than were on campus last fall.

Chancellor Scott: I just want to make a comment on this, as well. I think you all know that we're going through some major transitions with admissions policies and attempts to enhance the yield, attempts to do more outreach efforts, and so on. And the good news is that these are working, and the bad news is that these are working. As one makes these changes, and as you change the historic yield patterns, which have always hovered around, I think, 28 to 31 percent, the yields are actually rising, and that's a tribute to what you've done, what faculty, students and staff have done in doing a great deal of work on yield enhancement. But as an institution goes through many changes in the admissions procedures, breaking historical approaches and patterns, one is bound to get some fluctuations. And there's likely to be the kind of fluctuations that are being talked about here, which will put stress on you next year. But as one establishes the new patterns in that new sea of complexity, one will be able to make new choices, new decisions that will stabilize enrollments again and make classes better than they ever have been before. But there will be stress next year. *Après moi, the deluge!*

Senator Michael Egan: My question is addressed to the Chancellor. Sir, about halfway through your tenure, the University adopted a set of principles guiding the conduct of employees. Called Document T96-136, as amended, Principles of Employee Conduct University of Massachusetts, it requires employees to conduct themselves according to high standards of ethical practice, encourage such behaviors in others, accept full

responsibility for their actions, create a work environment that is professional and supportive, and deliver quality service, among other laudable things. Can you confirm that this document is still the policy of the University?

Chancellor Scott: I can say that not only is T96-136 still University policy but that the University is legally required to conduct its business according both to it and to the highest ethical standards.

Senator Egan: Thank you, Sir. Can you then tell me what remedies are available to employees who are able to provide clear and fully documented examples of letters of recommendation being removed from their personnel files, blatant discrimination, the refusal of university officials to cooperate with the Ombudsperson and other behaviors that obviously breach the guidelines contained in T-96-136?

Chancellor Scott: I believe there are review procedures written into the document.

Senator Egan: Yes, I know, but what exactly are these review procedures?

Chancellor Scott: I will look into the matter and send you that information.

Senator Egan: Thank you, Sir, I look forward to receiving it.

Senator Bogartz: The Chancellor seems like such a good man that he doesn't deserve to go away without having the benefit of disagreement. He should be served better than to just allow him to make his remarks and not receive some disagreement. (I mean that in all sincerity, by the way. If he were just a jerk, I'd say, 'Eh, why bother?') But his claim, his statement, his assertion that we are going to have faculty downsizing, it's just a question of whether it happens willy-nilly or whether we adopt systemic approaches so that we can make it happen smoothly, is a message that I've been hearing for some time. And it's the wrong message, and we shouldn't be buying it. And it *definitely* shouldn't be coming from the Chancellor, of all people. The Chancellor should be the person who's saying, 'What must happen is not downsizing, but upsizing.' But if you're not going to be a President or a Chancellor somewhere else, you may have reason to reconsider your position with respect to this.

Chancellor Scott: I have no problems with disagreements, because if you and I agreed on everything, one of us would be redundant. That's true at all levels of administration and of governance. There is this view that every level of governance has to agree a hundred percent with the level below. I think one needs to agree 80 percent of the time, but there should be 20 percent disagreements. But you're talking about *such* a macro issue that it wouldn't be proper not to say something a little bit beyond that.

Believe me, I have been an ardent advocate for additional resources for this campus for eight years. It has been central to everything I've said to the Board of Trustees, and to the President, and in every document I have written, but I have failed to get the level of resources that are needed.

In that circumstance (I say now as I am leaving, but I've also said it as I've been going along), if you cannot guarantee you're going to get these new resources, it is very important to make a plan and a structure for the University to make it as resilient as it can be with whatever level of resources, whatever hand is dealt you out of the deck. And that requires, unfortunately, taking some advance risks and some decision and boundary conditions and planning. Because otherwise you will have a gray attenuation of the institution and you will certainly also strike departments one-by-one to be executed at dawn by firing squad, just because they got out of bed first. It is very important to make a systemic plan that will prepare the university, possibly for not receiving the infusion of resources that we really deserve and that we really need, but, reciprocally to try and position it so that if there is an infusion of some successful raising of resources later, we will also know better where to invest them.

So one has to tread that delicate line. But simply for me to take the position, 'God damn, until the water closes over my head, I'm gonna say, "We need more resources and the institution in the meanwhile will simply be allowed to spiral down in some kind of gray attenuation," I am not going to preside over planning in that way, and I did not. Of course we can disagree on the shots that I called and the decisions that were made and the priorities that I made. That's legitimate disagreement, but what I cannot agree on is not to do that planning proactively and only to wait for more resources. Your own academic councils... Craig Moore has presented a plan, saying 'Do not wait for the state to provide more resources.' Your own council said this two, three weeks ago. And I said then, 'Don't put up the shutters so soon.' Continue to make that case and mount a grass-roots effort. Continue to try to do that to get the special investment. But unless you want the institution to spiral down and be one step behind the building inspector, month after month, year after year, as she shuts down one building after another, instead of one step ahead of her, which is what we've tried to do, the outlook for this institution is not good. But we will *never* give up on the need for additional resources and new resources, and I have fought for that for this campus for a long time. But I have also tried to position the campus in the best way for the level of resources that we had. And I'm willing to admit [that] maybe I made the wrong shots, called the wrong shots. That's up for grabs!

**The 593rd Meeting of the Faculty Senate stood adjourned at 5:37 p.m. May 17, 2001.
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 May 17, 2001.**