

UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AT AMHERST
OFFICE OF THE FACULTY SENATE

Presiding Officer Robert Wilson called the 633rd regular meeting of the Faculty Senate to order on October 21, 2004 at 3:30 p.m. in Herter Hall, Room 227.

A. ADDRESS BY SENATOR STANLEY ROSENBERG (D-HAMPSHIRE AND FRANKLIN DISTRICTS)
(see attached)

QUESTIONS

Senator Maria Tymoczko asked if Senator Rosenberg could explain what kinds of trade-offs he foresees, what things might we get from the sort of plan he is talking about, and what might we not like that it is better for us to accept.

Senator Rosenberg responded that the majority of states in the country use formula funding. Formula funding, in an oversimplified form, is basically building your budgets on the basis of a formula that recognizes the combination of programs, enrollment, age and condition of facilities, admission, all of those things together. That implies that you can actually come up with a figure that would be the ideal funding level for the institution. When you finish developing those budgets, then the political process ensues with regard to how much of that is actually going to be produced. In the ideal world, you would have 100 percent funding of the formulas. Virtually no state, including the states that we use as examples, ever actually achieves 100 percent.

That said, we came pretty close to fully funding the formula during the 90s. The difficulty is that a lot of the players in the system want to use the formulas to build the budget so we know how much we need, but when you get too close to fully funding, they want to blow the formulas up, because they want ever-expanding possibilities. Last time, we used the Carnegie Commission report, and we said university and state college students should pay a third of the cost of their education and the community college [students] should pay twenty-five percent. [This was] based on the Carnegie Commission's study to answer the question who benefits by higher education and what is their proportionate share of responsibility. They came up with two-thirds of the benefit goes to society in the case of the university and state colleges and one-third to the students, and yet the students basically do not want to pay a third of the cost of their education.

Before the fiscal crisis of '88 to '92, we were substantially below the national average. By the end of that fiscal crisis, we were the fourth most expensive public university in America. Then we started driving down the tuition and fees, to the point where we went back down to the middle of the pack in the country, but our tuition and fees were in the range of about twenty-five or twenty-six percent of the cost of education. When the fiscal crisis came again, the kids who happened to be in school at that point, saw their tuition and fees go back up to amongst the highest in the country. These kinds of things cannot be allowed. The students of the mid-90s basically did the political work to drive their tuition fees down to about the national average or slightly below and it was below the one-third, where, if we could have kept it at the one-third and had a policy that allowed us not to fall below one-third, the picture might have looked a little bit different during this fiscal crisis.

It is those types of trade-offs that get made and those are two very concrete examples of things people were fighting behind the scenes, because, as we got closer to fully funding the formulas, people started to try to blow up—behind-the-scenes, administrators tried to blow up—the use of the formulas because we were getting too close to full funding of the system. To give a caveat, one of the problems with formula funding is that there were certain things that were not in the formula, like deferred maintenance, and so, rightly, people pointed out that if we got to full funding of the formula, we would still have a problem, because we would have \$400 million worth of deferred maintenance. That is a separate problem in a separate discussion, it does not necessitate blowing up of the formula, but people were trying to blow up formula funding, because we were getting too close to full funding of the institutions.

Those are the kinds of trade-offs that you have to make in the discussion for some predictability and stability, and so, for example, we would like to keep student charges within a particular range, and, while we are growing state appropriations, we want to allow institutions to create the equivalent of a rainy day fund, into which they can put a piece of that excess tuition. Therefore, when we end of up in the next fiscal crisis—they come every eight to ten years because of the cycles of the economy—you would have that money to fall back on to help sustain the institution. Why should one group of students have their tuitions and fees go down by five or ten percent and then the next group have to pay way up there? Let's have fairly consistent student charges without regard to what is going on in the economy and let's put some of those dollars aside as the state does in its rainy day fund, so you could fall back on that when we have problems. That would be an example of a policy we could pursue.

Senator David Ostendorf commented that we can manage excellence on this campus. He then asked if there were any merit measures included in the state appropriation process, any reward for jobs well done. He pointed out that to the extent that that may be true, if we are all put in some common education pot, we lose our ability to justify our budget increases.

Senator Rosenberg responded that he does not believe in tying funding into “merit” or “progress” while the budget is underfunded. He thinks that if you want to have a discussion of rewards for performance, you start that discussion when you have a budget that is close to fully funded. When the state underfunds you by a twenty-eight percent decrease, why would you, in that situation, put people in the situation of having to fight to get their basic funding when there isn’t enough money to produce the kind of performance results that you want? He thinks that this is a problem and noted that we did do a performance-based pool of money during that ’88-’92 period, when we were close to full funding. We had a pool of money to which campuses could apply for special funding, on the basis of merit and special activities, but we were close to the full funding of the formula. They were called the Carlin Grants. We have an accountability system, which was put into effect when he was Chair of Ways and Means. They produce a report annually that shows where the weaknesses are, where the strengths are and it also shows what the progress is in closing the gaps where we are weak. It is not that he does not believe in accountability; however, he has trouble tying people’s allowance and their pay to a system such as that, when you are underfunding them, and not even giving them the basic money they need in order to function.

Secretary of the Faculty Senate Ernest May noted that Senator Rosenberg talked to access issues and alluded to issues of design, and he asked if there has been an assessment of the overall design of the system. The System grew perhaps without a preexisting design, but, from time to time, it probably is good to look at how well we are meeting the needs of our state and region. Part of the issue of activating our constituency is that there is not a single story. There is a story of UMass Amherst, there is a story of UMass College of Liberal Arts, a story of Holyoke Community College; it is not a coherent story that has been put together for Massachusetts Higher Education. There is not a single spokesman who is a champion, as it were, of this story.

Senator Rosenberg responded that Massachusetts public higher education has gone through cycles. At one point, we had separate silos: there was a board for community colleges, a board for state colleges, then we had three, four, five University campuses. It takes a long time to create a cohesive, unified system. It takes a long time to develop a single voice. People have, in recent years, been looking to the President of the University of Massachusetts to play that role for the whole public higher education system. He thinks that that is the job of the Chair and the Chancellor of the Board of Higher Education to create the vision, to create that momentum, but unfortunately, they have been unsuccessful.

In some states, there have been external forces which have created that organization and that capacity, so that when the system gets itself together and has a single message, they are able to push that message forward and get those million people he’s talking about organized with the same message. He is hoping that we can make a start on that in this round. We have been having a conversation with some business leaders and some other people about trying to create something along the lines of a public higher education council, which would be a 501-C3 non-profit group that would work to carry the message of public higher education throughout the Commonwealth. But there is a lot of work to be done there. As you know, this in an extraordinarily political state and each member is most concerned with the campus in their district, if they have one. That is the message that they carry, that is what they are looking out for in the budget, and some of us have been working to try to create this sense of a single system with roughly twenty-nine institutions, each with a separate mission, but all working together toward the same common goal of providing a quality, accessible higher education for the people who end up being the majority of the people in our workforce with college educations.

Chancellor John Lombardi asked Senator Rosenberg about the law school.

Senator Rosenberg responded that he had very lengthy conversions with President Jack Wilson and the Board of Higher Education yesterday and he asked both of them how we could be rushing to a decision, and a major decision, without a public process and without a due diligence component that will leave people comfortable with the idea of creating yet another law school in the Commonwealth—the first public one, but yet another law school in the Commonwealth. He also questioned the process of deciding to have the law school in Dartmouth, when there has been no discussion about where such a facility should be placed. He is only just learning the details of this proposal, but they claim it is not going to cost a penny to the state, and so it should not impact any other campus. He asked how this could be possible. The answer is because they are going to run it through continuing education. He asked if that meant that students are going to pay the full cost of their education, which is what happens in continuing education, and they said yes. His next question was why are we creating a law school that looks like a private law school under the aegis of the University? What is the justification for doing that if they are going to pay market rate? That law school already exists. They are paying tuition, theoretically, at the full cost of operating the law school, so what is the point of bringing this into the University? He has received no answer.

What he thinks is really critical here and missing from the picture is that when we created the medical school, there was a roughly two-year, public process and debate about whether Massachusetts needed a public medical school, where that medical school should be, and what it should look like. To the credit of the University, when the decision was made, and it was located in Worcester, we ended up in twenty-five years, building what is now the third best public medical school in the country. Many of us thought that it should be in Amherst, or at least in Springfield, but affiliated with Amherst. It ended up in Worcester. There were mergers to create the Dartmouth campus; before it was Dartmouth, it was Southeastern

Massachusetts University, and there were merged institutions in Lowell to create Lowell Tech, which became the University of Lowell, which became the University of Massachusetts Lowell. All of those and the Worcester piece each required legislation. Why are people down in southeastern Massachusetts saying we have to get this done before the Legislature comes back into session and we have the authority to do this without any legislative involvement? He asked how is that right and why are we doing that. If this is a good proposal, it should be able to be seen in the light of day. It should be able to be part of a major public discussion.

Then he asked the question, if we are going to do a law school—it is not like creating another English department or nursing program—this is a major, major decision; if we decide that we need a law school, then the question is where should it be located. And aren't most public university law schools affiliated with or located on the flagship campus? He took another step in his conversations and pointed out that we have had a succession of governors and a succession of presidents who said “we are going to honor and we are going to improve the flagship campus;” and yet every time we make a major decision that is going to require years and years of special focus to build that new component, it takes a lot of money, and it takes so much of the marginal dollar. If we have an extra \$50 million to spend on the University, why would all of that \$50 million be spent on building up a law school somewhere, when this campus has some programs that should be nationally ranked, that need another million or two million dollars, and we cannot get it? How are we going to keep the promise of building a flagship-level, world-class campus if, every time we have a piece of extra money we can spend on public higher education, in the university system, we end up not putting it into building the excellence of the flagship campus? The same thing happened with the medical school; again, the medical school is a phenomenal success, and we should take great pride as a university community and as a Commonwealth, but it took a huge amount of investment. That investment was then not available to this campus.

He is asking them the question, if we have \$50 million, if that is what it is going to cost, which is what some people are saying it is going to cost to make the law school a big success, then where is the \$50 million for the Amherst campus for programs there that will put us where you want us to be, which is to be a world-class, world-renowned flagship campus? How can we keep making these choices every time we feel that there is a new opportunity and there is a new piece of money, it ends up going somewhere else? It is one thing if you locate in Amherst or not; it is another thing if you do it and siphon off resources which should otherwise be used to build the quality of the basic infrastructure that we already have. John Olver once said to him, “the problem, Stan, is that we cannot chase every ambulance.” He thinks that this is one of those cases. There is an opportunity there, but we are coming off of a fiscal crisis. Our budget has been cut twenty-eight percent. In the last fiscal crisis, we never rebounded to the previous level (adjusted for inflation), so we have a serious structural problem in financing the flagship campus. Yet we are now considering taking on a responsibility, which they say will not cost us a penny, but which the experts tell us will cost \$40 million-\$50 million, to turn that into a university-level, quality law school. How are we going to that, when we are so far behind the eight ball? Those are the kinds of questions he has raised for them to think about and answer.

Secretary May thanked Senator Rosenberg and added that he heard this morning at that Board of Trustees meeting that a number of students will be given quite a break, along the lines of the contract which is in effect at the Medical School, for service in the Commonwealth after they graduate. If they go into low-income, legal assistance, they sign that contract like they do at the Medical School and they will receive a considerable break. So it is not that they are all full-payers, by any means. Probably most of them will not be full-payers.

Senator Rosenberg responded that he thinks that this is a really critical point, because they are basically selling this law school as something that is not going to cost us a penny. Well let's have a third party, an external review, so we understand that they have come up with a business plan and a strategy that is actually workable. That is a different discussion if you can get to that point. He is not convinced that they can do this without costing the Commonwealth a penny. He believes that they are going to be back at us within two or three or four years. He specifically asked if there will be no per-student subsidy on the level of at least what we provide now for each University of Massachusetts' student, and the response was, no, there will be no state subsidy. It will be 100% funded by the students. If that is the case, then it makes no sense to put that law school in the University. It is a private law school, and why are we talking about putting that in the University? The only reason he can think of is because, at some point, they know it is not going to work, and we will already be obligated and we are going to have to come up with the money.

Secretary May responded that that was a point well made and the other thing that he heard in the hallways at the meeting is that at the moment, if one of the three critical players, the Governor, the Senate President, or the House Speaker, told them that they had to wait, they would wait, but they have not heard that.

Senator Rosenberg responded that Salvatore DiMasi, the new Speaker of the House, yesterday said that he did not think it was a good idea for Dartmouth to merge with the law school, so maybe that will start that particular ball rolling. He really pushed President Wilson yesterday, and really pushed him hard on the due diligence. He said that he will take that extremely seriously.

Secretary May said that he thought that if the President's Office feels that the brouhaha over this is hurting the University's ability to get a good appropriation that might slow it down.

Senator Rosenberg thanked the Faculty Senate for the opportunity to speak.

B. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. The Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Secretary May noted that he made his announcements in the discussion with Senator Rosenberg. Needless to say, the law school proposal is an interesting political initiative by the Chair of the Board, James Karam. He thinks that the Delegates to the Board will have a more complete report.

2. The Faculty Delegates of the Board of Trustees

Senator Arthur Kinney noted that due to the Red Sox being in the World Series, Brian O'Connor became Arthur Kinney on Tuesday and Ernie May on Thursday. He can report on the Committee on Academic and Student Affairs that met with the Board of Trustees on Tuesday morning. Robert Malloy, of our School of Education, was given the President's Service Award. James Kurose from Computer Science was named Distinguished University Professor by the Board.

Most of the meeting did in fact go to the discussion of the law school. Both Chancellor MacCormack and Board of Trustees Chair Karam claimed due diligence and passed around a manual that talked about all of their investigation about the possibility of purchasing a law school that exists in Dartmouth. A number of points were raised about that. Secretary May is right, there are 25 full scholarships given for students who promise to go into public service and one of their points was that public service would be what this law school, and no other law school, would feature in the continental U.S. That is, 25 students per class, so 75 total in the law school. Apparently there is a building that they can buy, and a functioning law school that is there. It has a faculty that flunked two accreditations for the American Bar Association. It has a 15,000 volume library, though it was said at one point that 50,000 volumes is the minimum for a good law library. It is his sense—and the Chancellor and Deputy Provost Cunningham who were there may want to comment on this—that it really had not gone very far yet, despite the fullness that the Dartmouth campus was reporting, Trustee Boyle took great exception to this rushing to judgment. Although there was some initial mention that it would come before the full Board in November, it does not seem at all prepared for that yet.

There were two other things that came in as system-wide reports. In terms of faculty review—that is the post-tenure review that we go through every seven years—there were 165 up for review this year, 23% waived for retiring or because they were on sabbatical or leave or in an administrative post, so that left 96 cases, of which 95 were accepted and one is being rewritten. In terms of the AQAD reviews, they were thought to be very successful. Thirty were completed this year across the system. And it is an opportunity for the Provost and the departments to evaluate themselves and get some advice from outside.

3. President of the Graduate Student Senate

President Uri Strauss stated that he was pretty pleased with the level at which they have been able to fill the councils of this Senate with graduate student representatives. He knows that there are lots of positions open, but they do not necessarily have lots of active graduate students. On top of this Senate, they have their own internal committees to fill, but they managed to find all the representatives that they needed for the Graduate Council, and for most of the active subcommittees they have been able to place people on a few other councils as well. They could do much better, but he is reasonably pleased with that. The activities of the Graduate Student Senate have been focused in large part on issues of diversity and access. They discovered that the administration has recently enacted a couple more cases of discrimination against international students that they are not very pleased with. One concerns the ability of international students to waive supplemental health fees based on outside comprehensive coverage, the issue being that international students do not have the same entitlement that domestic students do for those waivers. They plan to bring that up with the administration. The other one is that it has been reported to him that the new application fee is going to be at a differential level for international students than for domestic students.

He then mentioned the new commission created to address diversity issues on campus. He has some concerns about the constitution of it, the representativeness of individuals who are on it. They are skeptical about a couple of other things about it—the way in which the charge of the commission has been framed in terms of services and how the services perhaps, the ones that exist, are not necessarily working, and that this commission is charged with primarily changing those services. They believe that there is a lot that this administration can do outside of the scope of changing services to improve the situation for students of color on campus and other students, queer students, for

example. They are also a bit skeptical about the process by which this commission was selected and announced, so, although he is a member of the commission, he found out about it twenty-four hours before the press conference, and apparently the way that this commission was constituted was done without a whole lot of consultation. He does not know if there was any consultation with any of the students who fall into different ethnic designations and other students, other than the traditional white, male, straight students.

C. QUESTION PERIOD

Senator Brian O'Connor first thanked Senator Kinney and Secretary May for filling in for him, and clarified that it was not the Red Sox, but his crazy lecture schedule, which affected his attendance at the Board meeting. He then noted that some of his constituents had asked him about the University policy on dogs in University buildings. These are dogs that are brought to the University, to offices, and possibly classrooms—he knows the classroom regulation—but offices (where the dogs are kept), he does not know the policy for that. Is there anybody who can answer what the policy is?

Chancellor Lombardi responded that he took an instant survey of the administrative team, and it is very clear that nobody has a clue what the rule is, but going on his vast experience in this world, he can tell you that, in almost all universities, the dogs that are allowed inside offices and classrooms and public classrooms are seeing eye dogs. Other dogs are normally supposed to be outside. Now, whether we have an official rule, we will check and report back to this body, but his guess is, that is where we are.

Senator Roland Chilton asked the Chancellor, in regards to the law school issue, is anyone on this campus working on or planning to propose a law school at this University. If not, is it a good idea to oppose some other campus from proposing a law school?

Chancellor Lombardi stated that the answer to the first part of Senator Chilton's question is no, we do not have a group trying to plan a law school. If you look over the range of things this University needs to do, probably that is not at the top of our list. If we were going to invest the kind of money that Senator Rosenberg is talking about, the primary purpose of that kind of investment would be to enhance and build the programs we have and continue to make them first rate, to deal with the issue of space for students, recreation facilities for students, a library, a whole host of things which are really high priority for this institution. We are not in the mode of proposing that the Commonwealth invest in a law school at this institution. We generally try to avoid being a dog in the manger, so, if another institution has an institutional agenda and a goal and a purpose and it chooses to go about pursuing that, our job, as long as it does not directly affect us or damage us, is to simply stay out of that conversation, because we do not think that we have major standing for that conversation. This discussion that is going on at Dartmouth, about the merger of the private law school with the campus, is a very complicated conversation because the proposal in its formal presentation does in fact not require any money from the state. If that is in fact the case, and if that is in fact true and if those people who know about these things review it and agree and the Trustees approve it, then we will simply applaud Dartmouth for their initiative, even though we would not ourselves choose that as our first alternative for a new investment.

Senator Marta Calas stated that she has a question that is related to something Senator Rosenberg said, which is related to the issue of the law school, specifically not funding the students by making the whole program be paid for through continuing education. Her question is more general, which is, as she has observed it, doing programs through continuing education seems to be a trend that is increasing in many programs as another fundraiser. She is extremely concerned about that, because in a way, it is also making teaching more attractive for many faculty members and that, in many ways, is impacting the research mandate of this campus. She wonders if in the long term—and we often do not look at the long term sufficiently—will this seemingly innocent activity, which is economically helpful, end up negatively impacting the research objective of the campus?

Chancellor Lombardi responded that it was a very good question. He thinks that all universities which do continuing education and distance education as well as a major residential campus program have to maintain a very keen eye and watch the evolution of those things so that they stay within their appropriate boundaries, so that what is continuing education remains continuing education and not a substitute for the main event of on-campus instruction for resident students. The same thing is true for distance education. Now what will likely happen over the next ten to fifteen years, particularly with the advances we see in technology, we are likely to see that the ability to maintain these distinctions become more difficult than they have been in the past. Because we will see modalities of instruction that are hard to distinguish between on-campus and distance learning, because the on-campus courses will have a high technology component and students will do things in virtual space, even though they are in residence and the faculty are in residence. It will not be quite clear cut to say this is distance over here and this is continuing education over there and this is residence over here. He thinks what will happen is that groups like this Faculty Senate will find it

necessary, from time to time, to look at the pattern of instruction and the modalities and so forth, and figure out whether we are doing things in the right way.

Now as Senator Calas indicated, there is a complexity to this beyond the substantive matter of whether it is the right way to teach the right people at the right time. That has to do with the peculiarities that the bureaucracy creates in changing incentive structures related to the way in which we do the teaching. If you do the teaching in distance education, maybe there is money being paid one way and, if you do it in continuing education, it is paid for and collected in a different way and, if you do it on campus, it is paid for and collected in a third way. Eventually, as these alternatives expand in various ways and in other places and other institutions, we, too, will have to confront what they mean for us, in terms of how we charge for it, how we manage it, what impact it has on faculty work patterns, and how we deal with it. We can see some of it taking place in the Management School, where there is a very substantial continuing education component in their program, and they are working on ways to balance out their work loads and assignments and who is teaching what for whom. Other departments and colleges are getting into this also through distance education. He does not have an answer, except to tell you, you are right, we have to watch it. We have to be certain that we know what we are doing and track the trends, so when they reach some level that worries us, we can have some group of faculty pay attention to this and provide us with some guidance. It is true that the financial arrangements that were built into law and rule and regulation before we had all of the computerization and networking and high-speed pipes, etc., those bureaucratic regulations probably do not map very well with our current capacities that we have to do our teaching, so then we get these mismatches that you are referring to.

Secretary May noted that the Faculty Senate has established an Ad Hoc Committee on Online Learning, which is now co-chaired by Sara McComb and Marilyn Billings, which had its second meeting a few days ago and is getting organized so that we are actually looking at these issues. He encouraged Professor Calas to communicate her particular concerns with either of the co-chairs. They have subcommittees that are going to look at each of the areas.

Senator W. C. Conner posed a question to John Dubach, stating that, two meetings ago, he asked what the costs were for the information system, specifically SPIRE. At that time, John Dubach said that he had really no idea (which leads into the ad hoc committee that may be formed to oversee that), but has he figured out how much it cost since Senator Conner last asked?

Special Assistant to the Chancellor John Dubach responded that the quick answer was that he did not realize that that was a standing open question. He did give a number for the cost of the implementation. If Senator Conner would like to pose the question of what specifically does what part cost, he would be happy to try and dig out the numbers for him. He can tell us that the operating cost is—between the staff and the maintenance, etc.—in the neighborhood of \$1.5 million to \$1.7 million a year. That is off the top of his head, he might be a little bit off. He is happy to give him other numbers, but he just does not know exactly what numbers Senator Conner wants.

Secretary May pointed out that at this morning's Trustee meeting, the Committee on Administration and Finance approved a loan of \$3 million for the three undergraduate campuses to do their upgrade to the latest version of the student information system.

Special Assistant Dubach noted that that was not actually true, as the other campuses have not implemented the PeopleSoft student information system. That loan is to get them to where we have been for a couple of years now. Speaking to Senator Conner he reiterated his offer to get him numbers, but again he needs to know specifically what information the Senator is looking for.

Senator Conner responded that since there is an ad hoc committee, he supposed that part of their charge would be to look at the details, because it is obvious that the cost has been exorbitant and maybe six months from now, if it turns out that they cannot sustain it, we may have to find a new horse, an expensive horse, to ride down the street.

Special Assistant Dubach responded that he would be happy to provide as many numbers as we can talk about, and we can talk about this with this committee as we go forward. He would like the opportunity to point out, however, that in terms of student systems, our campus' implementation has been among the least expensive in the country.

D. ANNUAL REPORTS

1. Annual Report of the Graduate Council for Academic Year 2003-04, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 05-002.

This report was received.

Tony Butterfield, Chair of the Graduate Council, enumerated the highlights of the report. They approved a new M.A. Program in Architecture. Suggesting—and as Secretary May just reported the Faculty Senate did create—an online

learning committee. They also approved the four departmental consolidations that Provost Seymour recommended last January. They did not approve the \$65 IPO fee for international students, feeling that the presence of international students on campus benefits the entire academic enterprise and they should not be singled out. In addition, we have our more routine course approvals, the work of the Ethics and Mentoring programs, the Travel Grants, we exercise oversight, but did not get directly involved in the program because the funding for the program changed.

2. Annual Report of the Research Council of the Faculty Senate, Academic Year 2003-2004, University of Massachusetts Amherst, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 05-003.

This report was received.

Secretary May noted that the Research Council is to be commended this year in responding to a challenge from the Chancellor to conduct a rather comprehensive series of studies of opinions of the research community in various areas. The details of this are quite interesting. They ended up in three summary memos, which are attached to the report. The Research Council has the responsibility to advise the administration, and this constitutes advice to the administration from the Research Council. It is not yet a formal endorsement by the Faculty Senate of any of the suggestions in those memos; however, if Senators or the Research Council would like to submit those ideas either separately or together for deliberation by the full Senate, they are at liberty to do so, in which case, items which have budgetary implications would be sent to the Program and Budget Council, and if they have graduate implications, to the Graduate Council, etc. It could be that these memos could become the basis for consideration of further initiatives by the Senate. At the moment, their status is that the Chancellor asked for advice in certain areas, he has received it, and he has made an informal beginning of a response to the Research Council; but if there are Senators or other elements of the Senate who wanted to undertake a full deliberation of any of those particular initiatives that are suggested in those memos, which are pretty comprehensive, then they should alert him or a member of the Rules Committee, and they will seek to undertake that kind of deliberation.

Senator Ostendorf, Chair of the Research Council, simply wanted to put the thing in context. The Council does find Whitmore very supportive of research. He wants the Faculty Senate to understand that. The Council may disagree with some of the tactics of the Research Administration, but they certainly are in agreement with the overall strategy of Whitmore.

Senator Howard Stidman commented that it should not pass unnoticed that the Faculty Research Grant Program was unfunded for the 2003-2004 academic year. He would like to know whether that program remains unfunded for this current academic year, and if so, what can be done to restore that funding? It seems to him it is extremely important that faculty members, especially younger, pre-tenure and post-tenure faculty members, be able to avail themselves of what are sometimes modest, but nevertheless badly needed funds for research.

Provost Charlena Seymour stated that, to her knowledge, the Faculty Research Grants still remain unfunded, however, at the present time, the Vice Provost for Research is circulating a proposal amongst a number of faculty, also to the deans, and one that she believes will come to the Research Council for consideration. There are a lot of questions about not only whether this Faculty Research Grant proposal should be continued to be funded, but also what would be the priorities, how much would we allocate to such a fund, and when would it begin. Those types of questions are now being discussed and she is waiting for a recommendation from the Vice Provost for Research.

Senator Ostendorf responded that the Council does have a recommendation for the Faculty Research Grant Program in this report, and it does recommend a specific amount. So the Council certainly agrees and concurs with this. Last year was the first time in thirty years it was not funded. We certainly acknowledge and appreciate its significance. We understand that it is an investment primarily in our untenured and tenured-track faculty and it is a wise investment, so we fully look to a resumption of its occurrence and recommend that it be restored.

3. Annual Report of the Research Library Council, Academic Year 2003-2004, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 05-004.

This report was received.

4. Annual Report of the University Advancement Council, Academic Year 2003-2004, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 05-005.

This report was received.

Joseph Bartolomeo, Chair of the University Advancement Council, noted that, unlike many of the other councils, they do not do a lot of ongoing business that requires an extensive summary. However, with the Capital Campaign, the Council is playing an increasingly active role in oversight and cooperation with the Vice Chancellor and exploring ways in which faculty concerns are addressed—faculty concerns about the Campaign and faculty involvement in the Campaign.

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Special Report of the Rules Committee concerning The Establishment of an Ad Hoc Committee on the Student Information System (ACSIS), as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 05-006 with Motion No. 04-05.

MOVED: 04-05 That the Faculty Senate establish an Ad Hoc Committee on the Student Information System (ACSIS), as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 05-006.

This motion was seconded and adopted.

2. Special Report of the Academic Matters Council concerning Increasing the Number of Credits for a Course, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 05-007 with Motion No. 05-05.

MOVED: 05-05 That the Faculty Senate approve the Special Report of the Academic Matters Council concerning Increasing the Number of Credits for a Course, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 05-007.

This motion was seconded and adopted.

DISCUSSION OF MOTION

John Jenkins, Chair of the Academic Matters Council, drew the Senators' attention to this motion, because this is a particularly important issue for campus. The Council is trying to maintain the fast-track status of simple requests for changes of credits and, at the same time, taking into account the fact that many such changes would have important impacts outside the department initially involved. In particular, they may have major effects in the General Education program. We, on one hand, feel it is very important to maintain truth in advertising for students, so that they know what the content and what the requirements of a course are likely to be. At the same time, we recognize that if many faculty wanted to increase the number of credits in each course, we could dramatically tilt the balance of the courses within the distribution of courses within General Education and majors and minors and electives. He would encourage each of you to watch this as it evolves. Be aware that every course that increases is one more course toward the possibility of a tilt in the balance. Watch sideways, talk to your colleagues and stay with us on this one.

The 633rd Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate stood adjourned at 4:50 p.m. on October 21, 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