

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

MINUTES: Presiding Officer Jerome Mileur called the 616th meeting of the Faculty Senate to order March 27, 2003 at 3:30 p.m. in Herter Hall 227.

A. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Principal Administrative Officers

Chancellor John Lombardi: I would like to tell you I know exactly where we are and where we're going and where we're going to end up, but since I cannot find anybody in the state who knows this information, it's not possible for me to pass it on to you.

What I can tell you is the context in which we're operating. The first thing that we know is that the Legislature is on a fast track to try and resolve the budget issues. This is, of course, critical for us because we operate on long-term processes--any kinds of adjustments we need to make, the more time we have to make them, the more effectively and the more expeditiously we can make them with the least damage to the institution. So, we are eager to know what it is that the legislature is going to do in resolving the fiscal crisis that's before us.

They tell us that both the House and the Senate will be working on their budgets pretty much in tandem. The normal delays that occur between the time that the House finishes and the time that the Senate finishes (and then they go to conference, and then they send it to the governor, and the governor sends it back down and we all find out about it in October) this system will be greatly enhanced this year. They hope to be finished with the House version some time in early April. They expect the Senate version to emerge very quickly after that. They then expect the Conference Committee to roll quickly and move to the Governor, so we're hopeful that some time at the end of April, at least, we'll have a pretty good indication of where they're headed. We may not know the exact numbers, we may not know the exact dimensions of the solution, but we will know pretty well what the Legislature thinks it's going to do.

The second issue is that we have great hopes that, of course, they will find mysterious pots of money out there and pour it into the gaping hole that is the state budget, but in all reality, we have to anticipate that we will share in the kind of pain that is being talked about and likely to be distributed across the Commonwealth. We've heard numbers of various kinds related to the cities and the towns. We've heard numbers of various kinds related to other services and other higher education institutions. So we're looking at some serious kind of conversation about a budget reduction we expect sometime in April.

Exactly how much that will be we can't estimate at this point. The President's Office is working very hard to try and get a fix on this and at the same time to make a very strong case for what the University and its campuses require to be able to continue the kind of high-quality performance that has characterized our service to the Commonwealth. How successful that effort will be depends a great deal on how difficult the problem is that the Legislature faces.

Nonetheless, in anticipation that we're going to have to deal with some of this, I thought I ought to give you at least a sort of general notion of how we would proceed in the event there was some significant budget reduction required of us by a solution proposed by the Legislature and approved by the Governor.

The way we would proceed, of course, is to start at the outside of the enterprise because our primary priority is to sustain the teaching and research enterprise of the University. So we would begin looking at things where we have subsidies and support out in the countryside; out in programs and activities which, while highly valuable, may not actually be supportive of the core mission of teaching and research. We'd work through that process until we have arrived at the number that allows us to continue these core programs that define the University.

The second thing that's important for everybody to keep very strongly in mind all the time as we have these conversations is that of all the people who care about the University of Massachusetts, there's one group that over the last two or three years has consistently stepped up and done more to sustain this enterprise and its quality program, and that's the students. So, while we're busy talking about problems and other kinds of things, and while we're busy trying to struggle with the problems generated by the tax base in the Commonwealth, we don't want to forget for a minute that the one group, that when challenged to help us solve our problems, challenged to help provide the resources that allow us to produce first-rate instruction and research at this University, the one group that consistently stood up and said, "Yes, we will do more," that group has been the students. So I have a pretty tight focus on making sure that whatever we do in this process, that we maintain a clear and precise view on how we're going to sustain and fulfill our own commitment back to those who care so much about us. This is something that I think we all want to remember as we work with our students, as we recognize that our students have really done their part in this conversation.

Now our job is to persuade our legislators they need to do their part to help match the kind of support and commitment that our students have already shown. In this conversation, we expect to maintain—unless there's some unimaginable catastrophe in the financial realm—the quality of the academic programs. We expect to maintain the core activity that we have imagined that we're going to do in the area of maintenance and construction in order to keep this campus from falling apart around us. We expect to maintain the commitments that we have made to stay with our research programs in terms of matching and the like. We expect to maintain, as I said before, our commitment to our students in terms of maintaining the instructional programs and our classes and the like.

Exactly what we do depends a great deal on what the message is from the Legislature, so that if the message from the Legislature is awful but within the realm of management, we will manage it. In the event the message from the Legislature is in some measure well beyond that, then we'll have to go back and rethink how we would approach these issues.

Our system is involved in a process of attempting to identify other forms of savings, and you will hear about this, I'm sure, through the popular press from time to time. They're looking at various ways to consolidate systems. They're looking for various ways to achieve in economies through joint purchasing and various other programs. How much this might yield is difficult to say at the present time. But we know they're working on it.

In this conversation, there are some things we don't want to forget. While on one side we don't want to forget how much our students have done for us, neither do we want to forget the fact that our faculty and staff still have not had their salary increases funded. Nor can we forget that these salary increases become more and more critical for the University as time goes by, that is as one year leads into another year, leads into another year, and we have been unable to fund salary increases, we find ourselves falling behind the national marketplace. We will become increasingly under pressure. Each year that we wait to address this issue is a year that produces a bigger problem for us, so we will not quit this conversation even though we're going to have a terrible time this year making that case. Nonetheless, we have to continue to keep it there on the agenda, high on the priority list so that as the prospects of the Commonwealth improve, and as the opportunity to fund critical needs of the University emerge, nobody forgets that this is one of those highest priority critical needs of the institution. When we're able to get funding for these kinds of things, this needs to be very much at the top of everybody's agenda.

I don't anticipate the Legislature will respond altogether favorably to this argument at this time, since they're busy taking money away, not adding money in, but at the same time, I don't think that because things are tough that we should give up the conversation nor allow the critical need to disappear from view. So we will be on this case. We will be articulating this need even in a time when it's probably not reasonable to expect them to resolve it. Nonetheless, it won't disappear from our agenda because it's

critical to our success to be able to make progress on that in the next several years, and if we don't, we're gonna have ourselves one heck of a problem. We already have one, it's going to get worse, so I wanted to put that out there on the table.

In addition to all of this, we all have had the conversation about the reorganization and restructuring of higher education which has squirreled around in all kinds of interesting ways. For a newcomer to this commonwealth, it's been quite a bit of theater, that's for sure. Some parts of it are still obscure to me because I think possibly I don't understand the language in which these words are being spoken. Nonetheless, I have had some experience in this form of warfare in other places, and I have studied it in other places. So for purposes of context, let me offer the following perspective.

The first is that almost every state constructs a system to contain in one way or another its higher education institutions. These systems have two functions. The first function is they're supposed to get money for the institutions that belong to the system. The second purpose is they're supposed to protect the system from the political vagaries of the environment in which we live. This is the transaction: we join a system, in general, so that the system is more effective in lobbying for resources and support than we would be individually as individual institutions because the system can mobilize legislative support from many districts where an individual institution can usually only mobilize support that is effective from its immediate jurisdiction. This is especially true for flagship universities in rural communities. They have a difficulty in that while their legislative friends are strong and enthusiastic, they are few, and in the Legislature number is important, as much as enthusiasm. For this reason we find a place like Champagne-Urbana working with Chicago Circle in a system. We find places like Bloomington, Indiana, working with Indiana University in Indianapolis in a system in order to have a voice that speaks for the whole state on behalf of the different institutions and their particular missions. It's for this reason that we have these systems, and those who believe that you can spin off the systems into its aggregate part(s) and everybody will be happy, have not had the experience of doing that. Because what then happens in the first instance is a free-for-all in the legislature, where everybody lines up their legislative delegations and goes shooting.

If you happen to have the Speaker of the House or the President of the Senate in your district, this is a helpful thing. On the other hand, if you don't, and you're not living in a major urban area, you are walking the halls alone. And this is not the best place to be, I can assure you. You can get away with a certain amount of that but not a whole lot.

So, when you look at all of these proposals that float around, you want to keep that in mind, that people will promise you wonderful things but it's not clear they can deliver them to you.

Now the second question is, can a system such as we have in Massachusetts be reorganized and restructured and improved and enhanced? The answer is, surely it can. Every higher education system in America can be improved, including ours. On the other hand, there is only one system that's functioned in Massachusetts that's actually functioned, and that's called the University of Massachusetts system. It's the only one that has an infrastructure, it's the only one that has done the kind of consolidation and joint programs of which people speak. It is the only one that has delivered a distance-education program that's actually profitable, which is a miracle in American higher education. It's the only one that has been able to produce a consolidated effort to try and introduce PeopleSoft, whereas other institutions, doing it on their own, are going broke and having difficulties of all kinds. And so there are lots of good things about that system, and so, if I were in charge, which fortunately for everybody I'm not, but if I were in charge, I would put the UMass system in charge of the whole shebang and tell it to fix it. But of course that's not apparently the goal of the current enterprise, so we'll let everybody else sort it out as they see fit, since the Legislature's actually the people in charge of this conversation.

Anyway, that's what I know, which isn't a whole hell of a lot, but it gives you a context where we all are working. And I'd be happy to answer any questions, even though I don't know the answer. Being a college professor, I know how to do this.

Senator Jenny Spencer asked a question about the testimony of Steve Lenhardt, Vice President for Management and Fiscal Affairs and Treasurer, in a recent state hearing and about a list of specific proposed cost-saving measures by the President's Office, including layoffs.

Chancellor Lombardi: Yes, that memo that was sent to the legislature by the system office is an effort to try and make clear to the legislators that at some levels of reduction they're talking about, the consequences are very severe. One of the difficulties in these conversations is on one side to make clear that these reductions are nontrivial that people are talking about, that they have real impacts on real people and real services and that the adjustment that people talk about with neutral terms, like adjustment, are actually serious in their consequences for real people, whether they're students or staff or constituencies of the institution or whatever they are. And so consequently, part of the reason for Lenhardt's memo was to say, "Look, if we're gonna have this conversation, let's not imagine that there's a great deal of fat in this system, which if you just squeeze it, it will go away and leave us all lean, healthy and handsome." That's not what will happen. What will happen is if you squeeze in this order of magnitude, we will be limping, we will be partially broken, we will not be who we were before.

Now what a lot of people don't recognize is that this system and this institution in particular have already taken a sequence of significant reductions and shrinkages and activities that actually extend back far longer than the immediate two years of crisis. That is, we took a big hit for the retirement process, the money of which was sucked up in budget reduction instead of being used to reinvigorate our enterprise. We took another hit mid-year last year.

But in addition, over the past decade or so, the University has been trying to keep body and soul together by robbing Peter to pay Paul, and so we have not done the kind of maintenance everybody wanted to do; we haven't done the kind of construction and renovation we've wanted to do. We've not been able to do the things we wanted to do. For a while, there are things you want to do. After a while, they become things you have to do; otherwise, the buildings fall down, they become unsafe, the elevators don't work, the roof leaks, and so on. We are now faced with a whole series of those kinds of things that we must do—all of which takes the fat out of the system, if there were any fat.

There is no fat. Consequently, reductions of scales that have been talked about in various places will change the campuses of the University of Massachusetts system in fundamental ways. How they will change them depends a lot on how much it is.

The things he's [Steve Lenhardt's] talking about are amalgamations of what might happen on five different campuses. So the same things won't happen on each campus. Some campuses may need to close programs that are not viable, some campuses may need to do administrative restructuring, some campuses may be able to postpone construction when we can't do so, and so on. But in the aggregate, these are the kinds of things they're trying to make clear to the legislators will happen if the order of magnitude they've been talking about is visited upon us.

And that's why these numbers are out there. What we're trying to do is say, "Whatever happens at this University, we are going to maintain the core of teaching and research at the highest level. What we do, we're gonna do perfectly well; we're gonna do it top order, we're gonna do at nationally competitive levels, in part because we owe it to our faculty and in part because we owe it to the students who are paying the bill. And so we are focused on that particular agenda, and so whatever the news that's delivered to us, when we then come back to you with the adjustments we have to make and we go through the process of consultation that is mandated and is appropriate through this council and its various subcommittees, we will be speaking to that priority, those academic imperatives, to coin a phrase, that are at the center of what we do.

Now I would like to tell you I know exactly what they're talking about in those numbers, but I don't think they know for sure themselves, except to try and say to the

legislature, "This is not a free good to take this kind of money out of these institutions." And that's the purpose of that conversation.

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

Secretary Ernest May announced a series of speakers for upcoming Senate meetings, stating that Catherine Boudreau, President of the MTA will speak April 10th, Stephen Tocco, Chairman of the Massachusetts Board of Higher Education will speak April 24th, and Chancellor Lombardi will address the Senate on May 8th.

3. **The President of the Student Government Association**

Brian Long, Secretary of University Policy for SGA announced that, during recent SGA elections, David Carr was re-elected President, Hannah Fatemi was elected Student Trustee, and a referendum question regarding the Faculty Senate's recommended smoking policy passed, demonstrating that students feel smoking should be banned in public areas on campus. Senator Kiera Manikoff has been in touch with several members of the Academic Matters Council in support of the change to the campus' academic grading system, and Secretary Long offered an open invitation to a representative of the Faculty Senate members to attend SGA meetings Wednesdays at 7:00 p.m. in the Campus Center.

B. QUESTION PERIOD

Secretary May stated that the proposal to change the grading system from the current A, AB, B, BC to the standardized A, A+, A-, B+, B-, has been approved by the Academic Matters Council and is still under review by the Graduate Council. He then stated that the President's Office has begun to make impact statements and put out press releases similar to those by faculty last year that were seen as having a negative effect on University enrollment. He asked the Chancellor to comment on that situation.

Chancellor Lombardi: Well I have two comments. One, life's not fair. But the other comment I want to make is that while there is significant bad news floating around in the land, which everybody knows about, which is happening not just in our commonwealth but in every state in the nation, this kind of conversation that we're having here today is a conversation that is taking place across the nation. There's probably only two or three states in the entire country that are not looking forward to budget reductions on the order of magnitude that we're talking about here. So we don't live in a particularly different world, although we would all like to live in a different world. This is a world that is fairly widely shared.

Now secondly, one of the distinctions that you can make in these things is to be very clear about what you're going to do and what you're going to keep first-rate.

Part of the difficulty that occurs when we talk about these kinds of crises is that we sometimes give the impression that everything is going to fall apart. Everything's not going to fall apart. We have a plan and we have a system, and we have the capacity in this institution to guarantee that the stuff that we're continuing on with here in the center of our academic mission is going to be first rate. It's going to continue. The students are going to be supported, the classes will be there, the seats will be there, they will be taught well, the faculty will be supported in their teaching and their research enterprise. So, we are clear that what we have to do to adjust will nonetheless leave us with a core enterprise that is very strong and very viable and very effective.

The way to get there is painful, depending on the order of magnitude of the problem that's delivered to us. Nonetheless, when we proceed to deal with whatever problem is given to us, this priority will remain at the center of the conversation. And we have seen no scenario that will leave us in such a case that we can't sustain this kind of teaching and research mission of our university at a level that is nationally competitive. So we are committed to making that happen.

Now, that's not going to be easy, depending on how much money they send us a bill for; nonetheless, just because it's not easy, doesn't mean that we're not gonna do it. We're gonna do it with the collaboration and support of everybody here. We're gonna do it in the best and most effective way possible, but we are going to do it that way because to do anything else is to give up the game, and we're not giving up the game.

- C. **Special Report of the Nominating Committee for Secretary of the Faculty Senate, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 03-018.**

The Senate adopted a motion to suspend voting by written ballot and re-elected Ernest May to position of Secretary by acclamation.

D. **BYLAW CHANGE**

Special Report of the Undergraduate Education Council concerning A Bylaw Change, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 03-015 with Motion No. 14-03.

MOTION: That the Faculty Senate approve the Bylaw Change, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 03-015. 14-03

This motion was adopted by the Faculty Senate.

E. **NEW COURSES**

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the courses ENGL 513 and EXCSCI 571, as recommended 18-03 by the Academic Matters and Graduate Councils.

This motion was adopted.

F. **NEW BUSINESS**

1. **Special Report of the Academic Matters Council and the Program and Budget Council concerning A Proposal to Create Two Concentrations in the B.S. in Astronomy Program and to Modify the Requirements of the B.A. in Astronomy and the Minor in Astronomy, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 03-022 with Motion Nos. 19-03, 20-03 and 21-03.**

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the division of the B.S. in Astronomy into concentrations in 19-03 Astrophysics and Space Science, as recommended by the Academic Matters Council in Sen. Doc. No. 03-022.

This motion was adopted.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the revision to the requirements of the B.A. in Astronomy, 20-03 as recommended by the Academic Matters Council in Sen. Doc. No. 03-022.

This motion was adopted.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the revision to the requirements of the Minor in 21-03 Astronomy, as recommended by the Academic Matters Council in Sen. Doc. No. 03-022.

This motion was adopted.

2. **Special Report of the Academic Matters Council, Graduate Council and Program and Budget Council concerning the Name Change from the Department of Hotel, Restaurant and Travel Administration to the Department of Hospitality and Tourism Management as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 03-023 with Motion Nos. 22-03 and 23-03.**

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the change of name of the Department of Hotel, Restaurant 22-03 and Travel Administration to the Department of Hospitality and Tourism Management, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 03-023.

This motion was adopted.

MOVED: 23-03 That the Faculty Senate approve the change of names of the Undergraduate Major and Graduate Programs within the Department of Hotel, Restaurant and Travel Administration to Hospitality and Tourism Management, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 03-023.

This motion was adopted.

3. Special Report of the Academic Matters Council, Graduate Council and Program and Budget Council concerning the Name Change from the Department of Sport Studies to the Department of Sport Management, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 03-024 with Motion Nos. 24-03 and 25-03.

MOVED: 24-03 That the Faculty Senate approve the change of name of the Department of Sport Studies to the Department of Sport Management, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 03-024.

This motion was adopted.

MOVED: 25-03 That the Faculty Senate approve the change of names of the M.S. and Ph.D. programs within the Department of Sport Studies from Sport Studies to Sport Management, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 03-024.

This motion was adopted.

The 616th meeting of the Faculty Senate stood adjourned at 4:17 p.m. March 27, 2003.

Respectfully submitted by Ernest May, Secretary of the Faculty Senate

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