

UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AT AMHERST
OFFICE OF THE FACULTY SENATE

Presiding Officer Jerome Mileur called the 629th regular meeting of the Faculty Senate to order on April 8, 2004 at 3:30 p.m. in Herter Hall, Room 227.

A. PRESENTATION BY JAMES CAHILL, DIRECTOR, FACILITIES PLANNING DIVISION
(see attached)

QUESTIONS

An unidentified attendee asked if the Learning Commons is part of the plans for renovations of the Library.

Director Cahill replied that he is working with the Library and with Jay Schafer on his plans for the ground floor of the Library. Funding for the second phase of the Library, once the deck is replaced, is intended as deferred maintenance allocation to repair the collateral damage from years of deck leakage. Through the design process, they will work to improve the HVAC equipment and remove mold problems there. Plans for the Learning Center have been made known and need to be incorporated into the design process, but there just might not be enough money in the funded part of the project at this time. The campus must push on with the current project, regardless, even if that means talking a little bit longer to achieve desired changes concerning the Learning Center.

Senator Julie Brigham-Grette wondered if there is a plan to replace the parking that will be lost or compromised on the east side of campus where the new Art Building and ISB will be built – particularly regarding the overflow being displaced to Lot 62 and the traffic that's going to increase along Stockbridge Road.

Director Cahill explained that there is a policy on this campus which mandates that parking be replaced whenever it is lost or compromised from the construction of new buildings. That policy has been followed with other projects in the past, and it will continue to be upheld with current and future campus development plans, including the area of campus that Senator Brigham-Grette expressed concern about.

Senator Richard Bogartz asked if the wear-and-tear on the deck of the Library is a result of normal wear-and-tear or poor construction.

Director Cahill replied that he does not think it is a result of poor construction. Concrete cracks and wears out, and occupied building space under open-air plazas requires an extraordinary waterproofing solution, which was common in the late 60's and early 70's. One might question the wisdom of doing it in a harsh New England climate, but today's wear-and-tear is most likely not a result of poor construction.

Secretary of the Faculty Senate Ernest May asked about sustainability, especially concerning the projected "life" of the new buildings and whether elements of environmentally-friendly, "green" construction would be included in the design of these buildings.

Director Cahill responded that his goal is to build 50-year buildings on campus. This might require more initial funding for better construction in the beginning, but it will be well worth it in the long run. ViceChancellor Joyce Hatch is also committed to the idea of putting aside money at this early stage, and regularly throughout the years, to have a set funding source available for general repairs that will need to be addressed throughout the building's lifespan.

Senator Marta Calas inquired about the furnishings of these buildings, specifically wondering if there is a standardized approach regarding interior elements of campus buildings.

Director Cahill replied that there is always a "Furnitures, Fixings, and Equipment" line in the budget for new buildings. This is not really a part of construction itself, but it is part of occupation costs. Once the construction is done, there is a budget for necessary furnishings, sun shading, computer networking, and other such considerations, with a common standard of quality in mind.

Senator Calas followed-up by saying that she is in the School of Management, which has just opened a new wing in the past few years, and although it looks nice at this time, there is a question as to the extent to which this element has been thought-out in terms of long-term practicality. In fact, there have already been several pieces of furniture broken, and contracting for renovations has already begun. Ironically enough, this new contracting is being given to the same team of people that were involved with the initial development of the new wing.

Director Cahill assured her of his awareness of the matter, explaining that the University makes every effort to buy quality furniture and equipment. However, one of the things that contractors need to be more aware of is the particularly rough wear-and-tear that students will inevitably confer on such furnishings. The problem is continually being addressed and, if necessary, it could be taken up directly with the suppliers themselves, who might be asked to replace the furniture or come up with better designs.

Senator Mokhtar Atallah asked if there are any plans for use of the site of the old power plant once the new plant is built.

Director Cahill explained that the plan is to tear down the old heating plant once the new one is up and running. The old site will then be incorporated into a general campus planning process, but there are no specific plans for it, at this time. Options for the site are slightly constrained due to the layout of utilities – particularly a main steam line – in that area.

B. ANNOUNCEMENTS (10-Minute Limit Per Speaker)

1. Principal Administrative Officers

Deputy Provost John Cunningham announced that registration for this Fall is coming soon. If any advisor would like a hard copy of the Fall schedule, they should contact him. The schedule is also currently available on the registrar's website.

2. The Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Secretary May reminded everyone that the next meeting of the Senate will be on April 22nd in Bezanson Recital Hall in the Fine Arts Center. Scheduled for deliberation at that meeting will be the consolidation of the Department of Plant and Soil Sciences and Entomology into the Department of Plant, Soil, and Insect Sciences; consolidation of the Departments of Journalism and Communication into a single department; and the consolidation of Public Health Departments, as well. For the May 6th Senate meeting, there will be deliberation over consolidation of several language departments into the single Department of Languages, Literatures, and Cultures. The Research Council has been diligently evaluating the question of indirect cost recovery, as well as distribution of the indirect costs; they are in serious dialogue with the Chancellor over these matters. The International Studies Council has been discussing sources of support for IPO, as well as the ongoing question of student fees. The Campus Physical Planning Committee, under the new leadership of Bob Wilson, has a big project in front of it with the extensive campus re-build that Jim Cahill described earlier. To some extent, a university's academic destiny is tied up in its architecture, which makes this project especially significant to UMASS. Thus, the upcoming work of the CPPC and the Program and Budget Council could be very intense in the coming days. More active faculty involvement will help to ensure great success in that respect. At the last meeting, several new members – including Bob Wilson – were elected.

3. The Faculty Delegates to the Board of Trustees

Faculty Delegate Brian O'Connor addressed the Senate as a Faculty Representative to the Presidential Search Committee, offering the following statement on record:

"I'd like to take this opportunity to read into the record what I feel are the true events of the last few weeks of deliberations of the Presidential Search Committee. As you may recall, in my last report of March 11th, I predicted we would have at least two – possibly three – more meetings. In fact, after March 11th, I was informed three days later that our next Search Committee meeting would be March 30th. However, on Saturday, March 20th, all my predictions went out the window and everything changed.

"On Saturday, March 20th, as you know, the previously agreed upon issue of total confidentiality by all members of the Search Committee was seriously breached, as a front page story in *The Boston Globe* reported on the two candidates who were, reportedly, the finalists for the presidency. Interestingly enough, it was Saturday morning, when I sometimes do part of my grocery shopping. I had the *Globe* in my grocery cart, but I hadn't read it yet. In every aisle I went down, people were telling me, 'Read it!' So I spent the weekend dodging questions and finally decided that, since names of the finalists were public information, I would openly seek advice and input from as many people as I could contact.

"I'd like to add, at this point, that the issue of confidentiality throughout the entire ten-month process, in retrospect, is unrealistic, unwieldy, and impossible. Keeping the names and the qualifications of the candidates for the presidency [from the public] is, I think, impossible to do. In the future, I hope that the candidates for future presidency positions will agree that – at least in the final stages – their names will be made public, and they will undergo a public forum. I was thinking on my way over here that, I believe, it was exactly two years to the day that Chancellor Lombardi went through a public forum, along with the two other candidates, for the chancellorship. But of course, that was not to be [in this case], and we agreed that that would never happen. I wonder, in retrospect, if that was the way to go.

"At any rate, on March 22nd, in lieu of a cancelled breakfast with the Chancellor that the Rules Committee usually has, I came to Whitmore anyway. I approached Becky Dean, the staff assistant to the Chancellor, and asked if I could make an appointment with the Chancellor. Of course, she said his door is open; knock and go ahead in. Which I did. I

said to the Chancellor, 'We need to chat.' The Chancellor was very helpful. He gave me a lot of excellent advice, as to what he thought I should do or what possible options the Committee had. Then I went back to my office and emailed all of the deans and a variety of other faculty, seeking their advice on not only the two candidates published in the *Globe* but also on additional candidates who some people had known about and others had not. I also talked with Ernie and a few other Rules Committee members, and I had planned to email numerous other faculty and staff. However, late Friday evening – about six o'clock – as I was leaving, the phone rang. It was Sue Kelly from the Search Committee telling me that the meeting of March 30th had been cancelled and we would meet two days from now, in executive session, on Wednesday, March 24th at two o'clock. The public session would be at three o'clock, and the Special Trustee Meeting at four o'clock. Obviously, this limited my ability to get much additional feedback, but I did hear a lot of feedback from the deans, several faculty, and some staff who knew I was on the Search Committee and had emailed me their comments.

"On Wednesday morning, I traveled to Boston with John Armstrong, who many of you know is a fellow Committee member. He is a resident of Amherst who actually lives across the street from me. He is a former Director of Research and Development at IBM, as well as an incredibly strong, loyal supporter of the University. In fact, I told John that I consider him the sixth faculty member on the Committee.

"At the executive session at two o'clock on that Wednesday, the Committee was reprimanded for the breach of confidentiality, and then the discussion turned to the two candidates who were named publicly – that's Mr. Solomont and Dr. Wilson – along with a few that were not named publicly. We had never actually ranked any of the candidates up until that point. We'd hatched raw votes, we had discussed them, but nobody had actually said who's number one, number two, etcetera. We began that discussion at that time.

"I explained to the entire Committee that since confidentiality had been breached, I went ahead and surveyed the Chancellor, the deans, and many faculty members. As I was listening to Dr. Condoleeza Rice speak before the commission this morning on NPR, I knew how she felt. When I said that I had surveyed the Chancellor, the deans, and several faculty, you could hear a pin drop in the room – 'What did they say?' [was the question on everyone's mind]. So I proceeded to say, basically, what the deans, the Chancellor, and what several faculty and students had said in support of the candidates. In all honesty, the vast majority of the support was for Dr. Wilson. In fairness, people were not aware of Mr. Solomont, nor were they really aware of the other two candidates that were in contention and, subsequently, dropped out of contention. Although, in retrospect, I felt somewhat embarrassed, because my other four faculty colleagues from the other campuses did not do what I did, so they were not able to report on how their administrators and faculty felt, but I still think I did the right thing. And I might add that, of the 24 members who are on the Committee, 20 members were physically present, another three were on speaker phones, and one was in the hospital.

"This executive session lasted more than hour, as everybody expected. It lasted until about 3:45 p.m., then we agreed on the ranking of the candidates and went into public session, where we publicly announced that we were putting two names forward – Mr. Solomont and Dr. Wilson – with the vast majority in the support of Dr. Wilson. Following the public session of about 15 minutes, the Special Trustee Meeting was held in another room.

"I'm not going to go through that particular meeting, but I just want to make some points of clarification, because many of you might have read, in the press, that there was a trustee there who was very upset that he was not able to interview the two candidates that were put forth. He made a motion to that effect, in an earlier meeting, which had lost eight to five. Four of the five trustees that voted for this were not at that meeting. So it was agreed upon, at that August 28th meeting, that the Search Committee would be the sole interviewing group – that it was really unwieldy and unprofessional to expect a candidate to be interviewed by 24 members. We interviewed approximately ten candidates with 24 people sitting at a table, [only] then to turn around and have them interviewed by 19 other people on The Board of Trustees. Now there were ten members of the Search Committee who are trustees, so there really was a majority of trustees on the Search Committee. I think that should be written into the record: that it wasn't that I felt the trustees did not have the opportunity to interview all of the candidates.

"The trustees, as you know as reported in the press, voted 11 to 0, with three abstentions, in favor of Dr. Wilson. So, in summary, I'm very confident and comfortable in stating that the Search Committee picked the best possible candidate who has excellent credentials and potential, as well as a proven track record. Although the last two weeks of the process were certainly tainted by the breaches of confidentiality, I am still of the very strong opinion that this committee of six faculty – including John Armstrong as a faculty member – and 18 CEO's was the most dedicated, committed, and truly loyal supporters of the University that I have ever encountered in my 37 years of work at this University. These people, in many situations, to me, demonstrated a more comprehensive appreciation and awareness of the value of the University – in particular of this campus – than some of the trustees that I have encountered in my 6 to 8 years in serving as Faculty Delegate to the Trustees. Finally, I'd just like to point out for your information, that President Wilson will be formally introduced to the Ggovernor and the Legislature in a luncheon at the State House on Tuesday, April 13th, and I do plan to attend. Finally, I'll be happy to answer any questions during the question period. Thank you."

QUESTIONS

Secretary May offered a comment to follow up Senator O'Connor's announcement, saying that his office was not able to schedule President Wilson to address the Senate this semester because of scheduling conflicts, but there is a meeting of the Intercampus Faculty Council at the Trustees' Meeting on May 5th. The ICFC is a group of Senate leaders from the five campuses which meets after Trustee meetings. The May 5th meeting can be expanded to include additional observers, especially chairs of Senate councils or other interested faculty who wish to interact with President Wilson at that time.

D. NEW COURSES

There is no report associated with the following motion:

| <u>COURSE</u> | <u>TITLE</u> | <u>CREDITS</u> |
|---------------|---|----------------|
| EDUC 616 | “Principles of Second Language Learning and Teaching” | 3 |
| EDUC 620 | “Supporting L2 Literacy Development” | 3 |
| EDUC 718 | “Action Research in Schools” | 3 |
| EDUC 734 | “Understanding Research in Language, Literacy, and Culture” | 3 |

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the courses EDUC 616, 620, 718 and 734, as recommended by the
29-04 Graduate Council.

This motion was seconded and adopted.

E. NEW BUSINESS

Special Report of the General Education Council concerning Recommended General Education Designations, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 04-027A with Motion No. 30-04.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the General Education Designations in the curriculum areas, as presented in
30-04 Sen. Doc. No. 04-027A.

This motion was seconded and adopted as amended.

F. BYLAW CHANGES (First Reading)

Special Report of the Rules Committee concerning Bylaw Changes, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 04-028A with Motion No. 31-04.

Secretary May noted that the first emendation is to insert the modifier “UWW” into the phrase “new courses,” on page seven, Section 5-2-7, of the proposed Bylaw Changes.

Deputy Provost Cunningham wondered if including the Director of the Masters of Architecture Program as a committee member is a premature assumption, considering that there has been no formal approval of the Masters of Architecture Program yet.

Secretary May replied that it is anticipated that the Masters of Architecture Program will be approved before the final reading and approval of these Bylaws Changes. He went on to say that the second emendation is in regards to the Undergraduate Education Council, proposing that there be four at-large faculty members added – for a total of seven – to the membership of the Undergraduate Education Council.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Bylaw Changes, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 04-028A.
31-04

(Inasmuch as this is a change to the Senate Bylaws, this is the first of three readings of this motion. It will be read again at the 630th Senate meeting and voted on at the 631st meeting. The motion may be debated and amended at all three meetings.)

The 629th Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate stood adjourned at 4:50 p.m. on April 8, 2004.
The proceedings of this meeting are available on audiotape in the Faculty Senate Office.

Respectfully submitted,

Ernest D. May
Secretary of the Faculty Senate