

UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AT AMHERST  
OFFICE OF THE FACULTY SENATE

Presiding Officer Robert Wilson called the 632<sup>nd</sup> regular meeting of the Faculty Senate to order on September 23, 2004 at 4:30 p.m. in Herter Hall, Room 227.

A. 2003-2004 ANNUAL REPORT OF THE UNIVERSITY COMPUTER AND ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS COMMITTEE, AS PRESENTED IN SEN. DOC. NO. 05-001  
STEVEN BREWER, CHAIR

Professor Steve Brewer presented the Annual Report, and drew attention to two items, which were seen as particularly relevant given the problems with SPIRE this year; therefore, those items were moved to the beginning of the agenda of the Faculty Senate meeting. The first item is oversight of the implementation of SIS Liaison Levels One through Three. In a special report of the Faculty Senate University Computer and Electronic Communications Committee (FSUCECC) in the spring, they proposed a structure with three levels of different liaisons to evaluate problems with PeopleSoft and SPIRE and prioritize items that needed to be addressed with a Level One that would have the administrative ability to get those items solved either through programming or structural changes of the system. That Committee is reported about in the first agenda item. The second item is a review of the implementation of PeopleSoft 8.0. Professor Brewer then asked if anyone had any questions.

QUESTIONS

Senator W.C. Conner asked how much PeopleSoft has cost us so far. He stated that numbers have been batted around and wanted to know what happens when somebody buys PeopleSoft, who will maintain it? He has heard that some company may buy it and PeopleSoft may be totally disbanded and not supported by the current makers.

Professor Brewer responded that he did not have the answer to Senator Conner's question, and was not sure who the best person would be to answer it, though he suggested that John Dubach would be the person to have the most relevant figures.

Special Assistant to the Chancellor John Dubach responded that he did not want to be elusive, but he needed to put a little definition on the question, because when one says PeopleSoft, you have to recognize that the campus has implemented a student system using PeopleSoft, and the University system has implemented HR and finance systems using PeopleSoft, so there are several numbers here and there are a number of ways he could answer the question. If he confines himself to the student system (which is the only one for which he knows the detailed answers), then he has to clarify even further what is meant by how much the system has cost. The reason is because there are operational costs and there are project costs. So what it cost to implement it and what does it cost to operate it are two different questions. The project cost—from the day we decided we wanted to go out and get a new system, which as he recalled was about 1996—in terms of what it took to implement the system, for the Amherst student system, that was in the neighborhood of \$8 million to \$10 million. This includes staff time. Once you are in production, staff time includes the routine things, which they would be doing under any system. So, how do you separate that out? The \$8 million to \$10 million is a round number. If we were trying to get precise numbers, we should spend a little time defining what the question is. As to the maintenance, we do pay an annual maintenance contract to PeopleSoft; again this is now rolled into the whole system, so he does not have exact numbers. What we get for that are the upgrades to the system, the fixes to the system, the regulation changes—for instance, at least twice a year, Financial Aid goes through a whole number of regulation changes, which have to be put into the system—we get all that; and we get customer support in the sense that we have a help desk that we can go to that has the ability to take our cases, put them in their trouble-ticket system and try to answer our questions and problems in that regard. Should Oracle acquire PeopleSoft, the question is who knows? He pointed out that Oracle does not really have a student system—they do have one, but its market share is small—so what they do with the student system may be different than what they intend to do with the HR and finance systems. But again, that is pure speculation.

Senator Marta Calas asked where we are in relationship to PeopleSoft, in terms of being their guinea pigs or a real business customer. Are we a different kind of customer for PeopleSoft than their business customers? It seems like we are a laboratory for them.

Special Assistant Dubach responded that no, we are not a guinea pig or a laboratory for PeopleSoft, in fact with regards to the conversion to 8.0, we were probably about the fiftieth university to convert to it. He added that student systems are so complicated; they are so dependant upon a university's own business rules, etc., that each one of these systems is fairly unique unto itself. The amount of table definition, etc., that goes into defining a university's rules and how a university works in one of these systems is sufficiently complex that this is not simply taking a program

and putting it on a computer and expecting it to run the same way in every place. There is enough uniqueness to each installation that that is part of what we are seeing.

Secretary of the Faculty Senate Ernest May directed a question to Chancellor Lombardi. He noted that when this all started, the Trustees discussed percentages of operating budgets that should go into IT and so forth. There were some bankers on the Board who explained that in the banking world, they spend 11% to 13% of their operating budgets on IT infrastructure, whereas he believes that ours is in the order of 1%, 2%, or 3%. What do you foresee as the percentage of the budget which would need to be directed in this direction in order to get our enterprise software to be functioning like a bank does?

Chancellor John Lombardi responded that we do not want our administrative and functional systems to operate like a bank, because if they did, we would have to dismiss the faculty and have academic ATM machines. So consequently, the financial structure of a bank and the proportions spent on back-office infrastructure is not a good model to apply to universities. The first answer to Secretary May's question is that those who say that we ought to emulate banks are not paying attention to the activities that we do, the purposes that we have, and who does those activities. Secondly, we run a pretty lean shop in the computer support operation and all the things that are associated with it. On one side, you could say we need to build in a lot more cushion so that these difficulties from time to time would not arise, on the other hand, were we to build in that cushion, and the difficulties did not arise, we would be at this meeting and the faculty would be saying, "Why do we have this fat computer budget when we have these desperate needs for library books, faculty and staff appointments, and other kinds of services?" So we try to have a balance between running reasonably lean and reasonably tough, but at the same time, recognizing that every now and then we will have a moment of crisis in which we have to scramble around and try to bring ourselves back to center. This may not be the best strategy in the world, but when we are not fully funding all of the academic programs of this campus at the level we should, and our faculty are scrambling around to make things work, we did not think that the goal was to make all of our computer operations absolutely staffed to the eyeteeth.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate urgently recommend that an online problem-ticketing-database be immediately  
01-05 established that will allow SIS stakeholders to report problems and follow the progress of solving submitted problems through the "trouble-ticket" process.

This motion was seconded.

#### DISCUSSION OF MOTION

Special Assistant Dubach said that there is basically such a system in place with the OIT Help Desk. You can get on the web through the OIT Help Desk page, enter a trouble ticket, and in principle, follow it through the system until your problem was solved. From his discussions with the University Computer and Electronic Communications Committee last year, he thinks that they may be looking for a little more than this. He has no objections to what is here in the motion, but we may need to explore a bit more what they are after, because in his mind right now this does exist.

Secretary May responded that as he recalled, in the discussion of that ticket process, the issue was that it does always close the loop, depending on the nature of the problem. If it is a technical problem, it may close the loop, but if a problem interfaces with the Registrar's Office, for example, it gets back to the point where the person with the problem will get a call from the Registrar saying that this is a departmental problem, so it has looped back. There were several faculty concerned who felt that the current system was not sufficiently comprehensive—involving the Registrar's Office and other offices. The faculty member just wants the system to work and s/he doesn't care whether it ends with OIT or the Registrar's Office or some other office. He then asked what the problems were to implement a more expanded trouble-ticketing system.

Special Assistant Dubach responded that he did not think that there were any actual problems with extending it, though there will be license issues if we want it to go to the Registrar, etc. What we have done in the past is forwarded those trouble tickets to the Registrar and, in principle, the Registrar has gotten back to us, and then we have tried to post the thing within OIT. He did recognize the need to have items which go out to other offices, to make sure that the responses come back to OIT. The way this works in OIT is that there are a tier one, a tier two, and a tier three. Tier one and tier two are normally within OIT, if that cannot get answered, sometimes the question will go to the functional offices and the trick is to make sure that we get the response back through the system, as opposed to the functional office directly contacting the person who posed the question. Certainly there are things that we can work on more. He would say that those things are more process issues than they are technology issues. One of the things that he thinks that the Committee was looking for was a way to try and find out if someone else has already filed this problem. That way you don't have 100 people filing a problem and not realizing that 99 other people have

filed the same problem, because right now, the way the system works is that you can only see your own trouble ticket. So maybe we can go in a direction to get additional reporting out of the system.

Senator Maria Tymoczko proposed an amendment to the motion in light of the discussion. Insert “all” before “SIS stakeholders” and in the last line, add “an expanded and more effective” where it currently says “the” before “trouble-ticket’ process,” so it will now read, “through an expanded and more effective ‘trouble-ticket’ process.”

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate urgently recommend that an online problem-ticketing-database be immediately  
01-05 established that will allow all SIS stakeholders to report problems and follow the progress of solving submitted problems through an expanded and more effective “trouble-ticket” process.

This motion was seconded and adopted as amended.

#### DISCUSSION OF AMENDED MOTION

Professor Joe Kunkel, Secretary of the FSUCECC stated that the intention was to have this trouble-ticket system be a focus around which the Liaison Groups One, Two, and Three would be able to coalesce and be able to see the problems that were going forward, and to do each of their roles more effectively. Therefore he supports the amended motion.

The second motion from the FSUCECC Annual Report was read.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate authorize the Rules Committee to establish an Ad Hoc Committee to explore the  
02-05 success of alternative SIS systems implemented at sister institutions, in order to provide a comparative basis for evaluating UMA’s current PeopleSoft SIS module.

This motion was seconded and adopted.

#### DISCUSSION OF MOTION

Senator Mokhtar Atallah asked how much it would cost to do the study. Secondly, if the study determines that there is another system that is better than this, how much is it going to cost to replace the current system with a new system? If all that cost is put into making what we have better with less money, then that is where the money should go. To clarify, the question is, is there an estimated cost of the study? And secondly, if the study proves that there is another system that is better, how much is it going to cost the University to replace the current system?

Professor Brewer responded that he did not have an estimated cost for the Rules Committee to authorize a committee to explore alternative SIS systems and asked if someone from that Committee would like to give such an estimate.

Secretary May responded that ad hoc committees don’t cost anything, except they are started out with a few sandwiches for lunch. Other than that, the study doesn’t have any cost. The implications of this study are potentially staggering though, because the enterprise software is expensive. But taking a look at what others are doing and whether we are getting, comparatively speaking, the best bang for the buck, he doesn’t think that that has any downside, and would like to hear if others believe it does. It may be that changing has a lot of costs, but standing still might have even more costs.

Senator Richard Bogartz wanted to hear from the administration as to whether there was a snowball’s chance in hell of anything being done with this information, because if not, what is the purpose of doing the study?

Chancellor Lombardi responded that the answer to Senator Bogartz’s question depends on what the study says. It depends on how good the study is, on what information is in the study, and on whether it is something somebody wants to do. A study which would be useful would explore what services and functions various student systems provide to their faculty and their students, and he thinks that you would find that the range of services that are provided to faculty and students of institutions of our size vary dramatically from institution to institution depending on how much money they spend on their system, how long they have been at it, what their purposes are, how well organized their curriculum is, and how tightly structured their curricular system is. So, there is nothing wrong with doing this study to get a sense of how we support instruction on this campus through our computerized systems, but to answer the question of what would we do with the study, he did not know. However, if it were to save \$10 million and work better, he would implement it tomorrow. On the other hand, if it would cost us \$40 million, and do about the same, his enthusiasm would be significantly less.

Professor Kunkel noted that when President Wilson visited UMass Amherst, he (Prof. Kunkel) raised the question about the “SIS system as mandated,” and President Wilson corrected him, explaining that the SIS system was not mandated, that it had been chosen, so in a sense, they only had themselves to blame. However, President Wilson also said that there were probably better products on the market today. Although we may not have made a mistake at the time—it was one of the best alternatives in 1996—there are already competitors who are possibly producing a better product now. And it is that possibility that we want to ascertain.

Senator Calas pointed out that several universities are exploring the issue of open source. In fact, they are banding together, creating some kind of consortium, precisely to go outside of the market system. She thinks that open source should also be part of the exploration that is done. This issue is often discussed in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*. Everybody is in the same boat more or less, and schools which use PeopleSoft are not faring any better than anyone else.

Professor Brewer responded that when this motion was considered, open source solutions were certainly part of the discussion and it would be one of the things that the ad hoc committee would look at.

## B. ANNOUNCEMENTS

### 1. Principal Administrative Officers

Chancellor Lombardi did not have big announcements, but wanted to update the Senate on various issues they may have heard about. First, the Legislative cycle has concluded, at least until after the elections, and in that cycle the University had mostly good news, with some significant exceptions. The significant exception is, of course, that the retroactive pay raise, which was approved by the Legislature, was vetoed by the Governor and is not likely to come up again until the 2005 session. However, the good news is that our Legislators appear to be almost universally in favor of re-passing that and making it go forward. So while we are reasonably irritated at the delay, nonetheless, the support for this measure appears to remain firm and strong in the Legislature, so eventually we should be on track for that.

The good news is that the Legislature approved a matching program for private gifts and grants. They authorized \$50 million and they appropriated \$9 million. That authorization runs for about five years, and each year they will appropriate (we hope) a significant chunk of money to put on the table to be matched by the fundraising programs at UMass. So, we will be in the mode of finding people who would like to have their money matched in order to endow some academic program or to deal with some physical plant or other construction issue. One of the advantages of this program compared to a previous edition is that it is not just endowment, but also includes construction. The match is fifty cents on the dollar, so if someone makes a gift of say \$25,000, there will be \$12,500 added to it. In the aggregate—if you don’t include the salary increases which, of course, are very important to us—the operating budget of the University is basically flat, that is, it is basically exactly the same as it was last year. That is good news for those of us who have recently been considering catastrophic reductions, because those reductions will not be required. We will be able to continue on the budget plan we laid out last year, so we are pretty much on track to do what we expect to do.

At the same time, it does force us to continue to pay attention to revenue generation. Nobody likes to talk about it or think about it, but nonetheless, if we do not generate it, we cannot spend it; because the State has given us what they are going to give us, and basically what they have done is, they are paying most of our salary budget—not all of it, but most of it. So the State’s contribution to UMass Amherst is to pay our salaries, but they don’t contribute to pay the operating costs: the heat, the lights, etc. So, as we attempt to improve the quality of our program and replace the things that need to be replaced and buy new things that we need, that requires us to generate revenue. Our students are doing a terrific job helping us with that. As you know, their fees went up last year, and they are making a major contribution to the revenue stream that supports the quality of this campus. Our faculty are doing terrifically, because the grant and contract revenue continues to go up. We have been very successful in hiring new faculty. We have about 70 new faculty hired to come on board this year or the subsequent year. We will be recruiting at least 40 new faculty this year to be hired in the subsequent year.

The Chancellor next discussed the upcoming construction projects. The big projects are: the Integrative Sciences Building first, followed by the renovation to the nursing building, and then the construction of a visual arts building. The new steam plant will be built behind the Mullins Center. You will also see a lot of digging going on as we replace steam pipes all over campus.

Student acceptance rate is running just about on track; the students have about the same profile. We expect to continue our recruitment for out-of-state students as well as maintaining or slightly increasing our in-state student population. We hope that the residence hall that we are going to build to accommodate the new students, as well as

other projects to add classroom space and so forth, will continue as planned. So we are pretty much on track. It is not going to be easy, but he believes we will be able to do it.

Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance Joyce Hatch provided an update on two major projects that are underway. We started them last year and they are under the direction of the Physical Plant. The first is a Custodial Project. It was contracted last year with a consultant to come in and help us design a cleanliness standard; design procedures for cleaning; and design an accountability and training program, which we will take in-house and train our trainers and our custodial teams. We will have accountability, which was a big piece of what we were looking for. Right now they are piloting in the north end of campus. It was underway for about three or four months and at the end of four months, there was a check in. It's an outside, third party doing the evaluation. Most of the places were up to standard and a few weren't. When an area is not up to par, the staff goes through re-training. They will be rolling out 25% of the campus at a time and by the end of the spring semester, the whole campus should be covered. They welcome feedback.

The other effort underway is an energy performance contract. It's a \$40 million contract with Johnson Control. It's been quite a few years in the making. It's a ten-year contract, but the work will be done in a year and a half. All the upgrades to steam lines, lighting, and toilets will be done in 18 months. The ten-year part of the contract is that it has been financed over ten years. Johnson Control has guaranteed us savings, so we are able to pay the cost of the borrowing out of our current energy budget. So it pays for itself. We expect to save between 27% and 30% on steam, water, and electrical consumption per year. The upgrades may have an impact on you. You will be alerted to when people will be in your building, and they will be asking whether day or evening is the best time to do work in a building. They will be changing lighting ballasts, toilets, and water valves. There may be some disruption, but you'll be notified. They'll be having information groups when they get to certain buildings. There's a lot of information on their web site and there is a pamphlet that is going out. The savings is quantifiable, and if we don't see the result of the savings, then Johnson Control will owe us, because they have guaranteed the savings. It's a win-win situation.

Vice Provost for Research Paul Kostecki announced that the Office of Grant and Contract Administration, the Office of Commercial Ventures and Intellectual Property, and the Office for Industry Liaison and Economic Development have moved to the building formerly known as the Career Center. It is now the Research Administration Building. They are moving towards an electronic submission procedure for sponsored research activity. The UMass Press has also moved; it is now in the East Experiment Station. They are going to have an open house on October 14<sup>th</sup>. He also believes that the OGCA is planning to have an open house in late October or early November.

Presiding Officer Wilson, on behalf of the Faculty Senate, formally recognized and welcomed Sharon Fross, the new Vice Provost for University Outreach and Director of Continuing Education.

Vice Provost for University Outreach and Director of Continuing Education Sharon Fross stated that she is very glad to be part of UMass Amherst and looks forward to getting to know and working with the members of the Faculty Senate. She comes to us from Penn State. Outreach and continuing education has become more important to many research and flagship universities, especially in the past decade. There are many opportunities here at UMass Amherst that have not been realized and she looks forward to building the kind of outreach and continuing education program that has really become a significant presence on research and flagship universities. Secretary May and Presiding Officer Wilson have asked her to come back later in the semester to talk more about some of her goals and objectives and how we can expand the programming here.

## 2. The Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Secretary May introduced the new graduate assistant in the Faculty Senate Office, Tamatha Gaumnitz. She is the Communications Coordinator, and will be maintaining the Faculty Senate's web site—a new web site is under construction, which will have a page for each council and committee and other information. She will also be communicating Faculty Senate stories to the In the Loop publication. In the Loop effectively replaces the Campus Chronicle; it is online via the UMass web site.

Committee preference request forms are out, councils and committees are quite full, but there is always circulation as terms expire each semester.

At the October 7<sup>th</sup> meeting, which is the next meeting, the Rules Committee has decided to meet as a Committee of the Whole. We will meet in the Massachusetts Room of the Mullins Center, with special guest, Jack Wilson, moderated by Presiding Officer Bob Wilson. Elected and ex officio senators will have a seat at the table, but there will also be plenty of chairs set up for others and for the public. It will be a public meeting. We are discussing the topic, "Faculty Renewal and the Structure of the Faculty in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century," and its general and system-wide aspects with President Wilson. We hope that all senators will attend. It will start at 4:00, due to President Wilson's schedule. We will have

a reception after the meeting. This will be President Wilson's first interaction with the Faculty Senate since being appointed to the permanent presidency. At later dates this year, we hope to discuss the same issue, but in its campus-specific aspects, with Chancellor Lombardi, Provost Seymour, and the deans.

### 3. The Faculty Delegates to the Board of Trustees

Faculty Delegate to the Board of Trustees W. Brian O'Connor reported that the trustees met, as usual, over the summer. Much of what he has to announce has been covered in the press, so he will focus on the highlights. First though, he wanted to introduce the new Student Trustee from this campus, Matt Murphy. The highlights include: The Governor has approved \$36 million for the capital budget. There was the sale of the property on Nantucket. UMass Amherst owned some property on Nantucket, which has been sold for \$20 million. It will still be a conservation effort, and he believes that the money went to the endowment. There are about 45 endowed chairs, of those, about half are at the medical school and most of the rest of the endowed chairs are here at this campus. To add to what Vice Chancellor Hatch said, he reviewed a list of the progress of the renovated buildings and other projects, including the Isenberg School of Management, the engineering buildings, Bezanson Recital Hall, Fine Arts Center, and steam line. These projects have involved over \$130 million over the past three years. The next five to ten years are very ambitious, over \$800 million is for planned capital projects, and as was mentioned, one of them is the new Integrated Sciences Building. This will lead to 10% of the operating budget going to debt payback, which is a little bit greater than the typical 4% that it has been for the past several years. President Wilson announced that \$1 million in grants had been given to all five campuses, to basically serve as seed money to help advance promising research.

He saw one of the best discussions in his eight to ten years of attending trustee meetings, at the meeting of the Committee on Student and Academic Affairs. It was a discussion of the tenure process. He was not sure how it ended up on that Committee's agenda, but it proved to be incredibly informative to the Trustees. He thinks that Trustee John DiBiaggio orchestrated it. Trustee DiBiaggio is the only academic on the Board; he is the former president of Tufts, Michigan State, and Connecticut. The panel included a young woman who had just received tenure in the philosophy department at either UMass Dartmouth or Lowell, the head of the English department at UMass Boston, and our own Dean Osterweil in Natural Sciences and Math. Dean Osterweil did an excellent job of explaining the rigors of the tenure process.

Grace Fey has stepped down as Chair of the Board; she will remain as a member of the Board as she has about a year and a half left of her term. James Karam is the new Chair; Karl White is the Vice Chair. One of the things that was mentioned at the Trustee meeting that he is not totally in favor of—but he does not have a vote in the matter—is that they are requesting a change to legislation to allow votes to be taken by teleconference. He would hate to see meetings change to just one person there, and everyone else being on the phone, unfortunately, he thinks that is what is going to happen. In important news to this campus, the proposal for a Masters' in Architecture was approved. A new committee was approved, a Compensation Committee, which will consider and recommend to the Board on all matters pertaining to the compensation of the President of the University, which is consistent to executive compensation policy. There was also the approval of the establishment of the tuition retention fund for out-of-state students on this campus; a preliminary report will be issued to the Board on January 15, 2005. Finally, the attendance has been much improved: at the full Board meeting there was only one trustee absent, and at the other committee meetings there was probably 95% to 97% attendance.

### 4. The President of the Graduate Student Senate

President of the Graduate Student Senate Uri Strauss wanted to update the Senate on the GSS's activities and about events affecting graduate students. One of their main concerns over last semester was the International Student Fee, and they are very pleased that the administration has decided to drop that fee after the Labor Relations Board ruled against it. He wanted to thank all of the faculty who spoke up in support of the students on this particular issue. A couple of things that are going to be of concern, and that they plan to be active on this semester, include housing. Housing has always been an issue for graduate students, there are various issues, for example, the North Village and other residences have had issues with raising rents and with the living conditions. Graduate students have sort of been squeezed out of Crampton, which, over the summer, turned into an undergraduate-only dorm. Thankfully, the expected crunch in Prince turned out not to be as bad as expected, so that has seemed to have worked out. But graduate students living on campus have lost access to a computer lab, and that is an issue of concern. They also found out over the summer that the new residence that is being built is not quite the affordable housing that they were hoping for, which would help alleviate the housing crunch on campus. It seems that these will be residences with individual rooms, but they will cost about \$500 a month in rent, which cannot be considered affordable. The GSS has not formulated a concrete plan or suggested alternatives, but it is something about which they are concerned. Finally, they are looking forward to working under a new contract, as he is sure that all of the unions on campus are as well.

## 5. The President of the Student Government Association

President of the Student Government Association Eduardo Bustamante wanted to focus on just one major issue, and that was the cost of textbooks. This was an issue on which he campaigned, and he believes it was why he was elected. During the first week of school, they surveyed about 600 students in front of the Textbook Annex and spoke to them about the amount of money they are spending on books. Some students, for example nursing students, are spending up to \$1,000 a semester. Others are spending between \$600 and \$800 a semester. He has received overwhelming positive response from all the faculty he has contacted about this, and he hopes the Faculty Senate will be part of that support. He wants the faculty to know that SGA's agenda includes them. What the SGA is proposing is a textbook rental system. It is used in roughly a dozen other public schools that they know of, and many private schools. Essentially students spend between \$120 and \$150 to rent their books for the semester. If at the end of the semester, they wish to buy them, they can. It is a way to combat the exploitation by the publishers. To make it work from the faculty standpoint, they would need the faculty to go along with two things: 1) that they commit to using the rental system wherever possible and 2) that they agree to use the same book for the minimum of two years, with rare exceptions. As far as what faculty as individuals can do, the student body asks that they become active participants in helping them with this goal. The contract for Follet is up in July of this year, which gives them a limited time frame. Their vision and their hope, ambitious as it is, are to go with the faculty to the administration by mid-October with a proposal for a different system. That would give the administration and the students six months to discuss the matter before a final decision is made. If they don't do it now, it will be another five years of financial hardship for the students.

Secretary May shared with the Faculty Senate that, when Mr. Bustamante contacted him a few days ago, he sent the information to Richard Rogers, who is the Chair of the Undergraduate Education Council and John Jenkins, the chair of the Academic Matters Council. It is not something which the Faculty Senate can vote on today, because it is a complicated issue, but they will try to expedite it as fast as they can and the AMC and UEC will take this up right away.

## C. QUESTION PERIOD

Senator Calas had a comment and a question for the Vice Provost for Research. The OGCA is the most fantastic, incredible office in the whole University—at least for the time being. The question is, whose idea was it to move OGCA when the deadline for NSF was precisely the Monday after the week they were supposed to move? In fact, they did not move that week, but the following week—the week of the deadline. She recognized that OGCA did everything possible to help faculty while they were moving, but it is pretty crazy to be moving during such a crucial time.

Vice Provost for Research Kostecki responded that the move was part of a fifteen-step move that is happening around campus, which started before he got to his position a year ago. They worked with Facilities and Space Management and worked with OGCA to find the best window of opportunity for the move. They had a window from about mid-July to mid-August and the ideal time would have been the last week in July and first week in August. If they had been able to do that, then Senator Calas would not have run into the problem that she did. As it was, the move was about two weeks later than they wanted it to be. They did the best that they could, and it was better than a worse-case scenario of moving in September. They hope to do it better in the future, and hopefully they will not have to move again for some time.

Senator O'Connor brought up the issue of the status of Opscan. He has never received as many emails and phone calls as he has about the fact that Optical Scanning Services may no longer be available at UMass. This is a service used by many faculty, and he himself has used it for over thirty years. He cannot understand the rationale for this action. If we do away with the ability to grade exams in this way, we had better be able to hire a lot more people to hand-grade exams.

Chancellor Lombardi responded that the communication on this matter was not as good as it could have been. He too has received many emails on the subject. First the decision to move Opscan out of the campus was made by the System Office. The System owns and runs the Opscan enterprise and they are moving to Shrewsbury. They are taking the money, and the program, and the people. The hole that will be left is one that we have to go about filling. They have sent out a survey to try and understand how much need there is, exactly where the need is, what kind of Opscan is still required, and whether people are expecting their use of Opscan to increase or decrease over the years, so that we can replace the service. There are various strategies for doing so: One is to create our own office and our own Opscan facility. On the other hand, if it turns out that the need is episodic and concentrated then maybe the thing to do is to contract with a service that's available for us when we need it, but that we don't have to pay for 24 hours a day. Which of those options we need, we don't know, which is why they really need to have people respond to

the survey. He assured the Senate that they are on this case, they will provide the services our faculty need, and they just need to know for sure what those services are.

Senator Julie Brigham-Grette asked what do you do if you have an exam in two weeks? They have 300-500 students. Is there a service right now? Are they cut off? What do they do?

Chancellor Lombardi responded that they would not be left hanging. Opscan is not moving until the end of the year.

Senator Atallah had a question for Vice Chancellor Hatch. The space audit system went through, and there have been some changes, specifically his department, Nutrition. They are losing a lab in Skinner and they do not know where they are going to teach the course that uses that lab next semester. He hopes that there is something in the plan to take care of such issues.

Vice Chancellor Hatch responded that the space audit was completed, though there is some outstanding data for which they are waiting. The study that was done actually does not have anything to do with any action that is being taken right now. So there is no connection at this point between that study and any moves that have happened. She isn't sure what caused the closing of the lab. She can check with the Provost's Office and get back to him.

Senator Atallah responded that there is a food lab on the top floor of Skinner, which is used jointly by Hospitality and Tourism Management and Nutrition. That lab is going to be closed next semester and they don't know where they are going to teach their course.

Vice Chancellor Hatch responded that that is the result of the moves out of Skinner, which are needed so that they can begin renovations. Skinner is going to be totally renovated for the Nursing program. That's the reason for the move, the next question is—which she does not have an answer for at this time—is what happens next semester, so that is what they should find out.

Senator Robert Sinclair commented that on his way over to the meeting today, he noticed how lovely the campus looks, and he knows what it takes to make it as nice as it is. Therefore, he thinks that the Senate should show appreciation for the people who bring our campus to the level of quality that matches what we hope to accomplish institutionally on a state-wide and national basis.

Senator Calas shared that, regarding the issue of the textbooks, she has been using the Library, which means that she decided that, for her undergraduate classes, not to use any more textbooks, because it is a total exploitation of the students. What she did was create a web page that is linked—every reading—to the Library, so that she is maximizing the use of the Library and of all the electronic facilities that we have available now. So, insofar as the students have the electronic facilities to be able to connect to the web page, therefore being able to do the readings, they do not need textbooks anymore. In fact, one of the outcomes of her action is that the textbook companies are constantly inviting her to order their textbooks for her students with the new gimmicks that they have, but in the end, we are capable of doing much more by doing our own web pages. Additionally, there is the advantage to update constantly, whereas a textbook is outdated as soon as it is published. In many ways, the textbook people get pretty nervous when she tells them that she does not need a textbook anymore, she can do it herself. So she thinks that is something that they will want to explore as well.

**D. ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, ON BEHALF OF THE FACULTY SENATE, OVER THE SUMMER 2004**

**1. NEW COURSES**

<u>COURSE</u>	<u>TITLE</u>	<u>CREDITS</u>
EDUC 258	“Educating for Social Justice and Diversity Through Peer Theater”	3
ENVIRSCI 465	“Principles of Environmental Site Assessment”	3

2. Special Report of the Rules Committee concerning the Establishment of an Ad Hoc Committee on the Coordinating Functions and Responsibilities of the International Programs Office, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 04-043A with Motion No. 48-04.

3. Special Report of the Rules Committee concerning the Establishment of an Ad Hoc Committee on Online Learning, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 04-044A with Motion No. 50-04.

4. **Special Report of the General Education Council concerning A Recommended General Education Designation, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 04-045 with Motion No. 51-04.**
5. **Special Report of the Academic Matters Council concerning Changes in the Repeated Courses Policy to Concur with Changes in the Grading Systems, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 04-046 with Motion No. 52-04.**

**MOVED: 03-05** That the Faculty Senate affirm the actions taken by the Rules Committee over the Summer 2004 as listed on the agenda.

The motion was seconded and adopted.

**E. ELECTIONS**

**1. One At-Large Member of the Rules Committee**

Senators Maurianne Adams and Marilyn Billings were nominated for this position. Senator Billings was elected by written ballot.

**2. Rules Committee Chair**

Senator Richard Bogartz was re-elected by acclamation.

**F. OLD BUSINESS**

**Special Report of the Committee on Committees concerning Nominations to Faculty Senate Councils and Committees, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 04-040B with Motion No. 45-04.**

**MOVED: 45-04** That the Faculty Senate approve the nominations to Faculty Senate Councils and Committees, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 04-040B.

The motion was seconded and adopted.

**G. NEW BUSINESS**

**Oral Progress Report by a member of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Coordinating Functions and Responsibilities of the International Programs Office.**

*Presiding Officer Wilson*, a member of this Ad Hoc Committee, read an email sent to him by Ralph Faulkingham, Chair of the Ad Hoc Committee, with a short interim report:

“The IPO Ad Hoc Committee met on three occasions in the late spring to clarify our mission from the Faculty Senate, to hear the Provost’s thoughts on this mission, and to weigh the capacity of IPO to meet its current and projected campus mandates in an environment of severe resource constraints. The committee has organized itself internally to work to complete its mission, and we expect to be back to the Senate with a full report by semester’s end.”

*Secretary May* mentioned that the Senate had recently established a couple of Ad Hoc Committees. One of the committees got started over the summer, the IPO Ad Hoc Committee. The other one, on online learning, is just getting going. Hopefully these Committees will not exist for an overly long time. We will address these topics, then we will either end the committees and refer the continuing business of those topic areas back to the Councils and Committees, or, in the case of the Online Learning, it may be the case that it becomes a permanent Council of the Senate. Also, another ad hoc committee was just established today on the subject of the SIS module.

-----  
The 632<sup>nd</sup> Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate stood adjourned at 5:55 p.m. on September 23, 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