

UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AT AMHERST
OFFICE OF THE FACULTY SENATE

Ernest May, Secretary of the Faculty Senate called the 635th regular meeting of the Faculty Senate to order on December 2, 2004 at 3:30 p.m. in Herter Hall, Room 227.

A. ADDRESS BY JAMES CAHILL, DIRECTOR OF FACILITIES AND CAMPUS PLANNING
(see attached)

QUESTIONS

Senator Arthur Kinney, referring to one of Director Cahill's slides which listed the Bartlett envelope and Goodell envelope as renovation projects, asked what an envelope was.

Director Cahill responded that it is either something you put a letter in or it's the enclosure around a building. The envelope is what architects call the exterior skin of a building: the roof of a building, the exterior part of a building that keeps the weather out.

Senator Juan Zamora asked if we had enough money to do these projects.

Director Cahill responded yes, we do. The question is do we have enough money to do them in the way that we want to do them. But yes, these are funded projects.

Senator Zamora then asked who had funded the projects.

Director Cahill referred to his fourth slide and responded that it is a combination of state appropriations from the legislature, money that we borrowed through the Building Authority, and money that is annually allocated from the campus operating budget to support capital projects. The vast majority of it is borrowed money.

Senator Rutherford Platt was curious to know, with all the expertise on this campus regarding green approaches to architecture and landscape architecture/design, and the emphasis on green building design on campuses around the country, how much of that is being incorporated into the plans for these various improvements?

Director Cahill replied that we are trying to incorporate green building concepts into every project that we are doing, particularly the major ones. It is in our best interest to do so. We have one LEAD certified architect on our own staff, who is involved in every one of these projects, who is forcing everybody to pay attention to these issues and that is why we have her associated with the projects. Every architectural firm that we have hired to do the major construction has LEAD certified professionals on their staff and they are participating on the projects. That was a requirement when we went into it. We are trying very hard to incorporate as many green building concepts in these projects as we can.

Senator David Ostendorf noted that Eastman is difficult to cross for students coming from Sylvan. Is there any thought and design into getting the new students who will be in the new housing safely across Eastman to the main campus: general pedestrian safety, tunnels, etc.?

Director Cahill answered that pedestrian safety is always a top priority in developing any project or even in regards to safety on existing roads. It's a good question, and we are doing everything that we can. There is no way to avoid developing the campus without crossing a street. A lot of our developable property is on one side of a road or another from where students or faculty have to walk. We are going to use all the modern technology that there is to provide warnings that pedestrians are crossing in a location. We are not digging under the street with a tunnel and we are not putting a bridge over the street. From our experience and experience of many other people, those types of approaches do not work that well, unless they are in the direct line that pedestrians flow in the course of least resistance. We have a tunnel underneath the road on Commonwealth Avenue and on Massachusetts Avenue and there are still people above the ground, walking in the road. Rather than try to design and build expensive approaches that are not utilized, we are going to try and make it safe by other means. We do have a Pedestrian Safety Committee that is meeting on a regular basis and paying attention to these issues.

Senator Marta Calas asked where are we going to park?

Director Cahill responded that that was a good question. We are building buildings on parking lots because buildings and parking lots want to be in the same place. We are not going to build a new parking garage. We did consider it. We looked at it. We looked at several options of building parking garages to replace the parking that will be

displaced as a result of the development, particularly with the Art Building and the Integrated Science Building, which are going on top of existing parking lots. Instead, we have concluded that the approach that we will take is to replace the parking one-for-one on-site. That is a challenge; it is not an easy thing to do, because, as we gobble up more real estate to build the buildings, it leaves less space to build parking. We believe that we can get all of the parking that is displaced replaced on the site within the vicinity of where we take it out. That is what our goal is. That may mean that we need to adjust the “siting” of the building slightly. All of that is under design right now and we are doing everything we can to provide convenient, safe parking for everybody who currently parks on campus.

Secretary May pointed out that a couple of years ago the Faculty Senate set up an Ad Hoc Committee on Sustainability. One of the aspects of sustainability was green architecture and Facilities and Campus Planning was very responsive to it. He then asked if Director Cahill had an estimate of how much of a percentage of additional cost is being placed on these buildings by this concern with green building.

Director Cahill replied that you get different answers depending on who you ask. The advocates of green building will tell you that you can do it without any additional cost. We haven't been able to get the cost estimators to agree with that. There will be some premium that you pay in initial costs, but it is offset a great deal by the savings in operating costs and that is easily established. One of the things that we are doing with each of the design teams on each of these major projects is having some intense sessions—and each one of these have, so far, lasted all day—where we go through every single approach that we can take to introduce green concepts to the building that make sense, that we believe are cost effective, and that will gain us the greatest long-term savings and operational efficiency that we can.

B. ANNUAL REPORT

2003-2004 Annual Report of the Athletic Council, University of Massachusetts Amherst, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 05-014.

This report was received.

REMARKS BY JOHN MCCUTCHEON, ATHLETIC DIRECTOR

When Ernie asked me to come and meet you today, he suggested a couple of things that I might speak to, and they are: 1) Progress that the Athletic Department has made toward the Chancellor's challenge from a year or so ago to become more self-sufficient as a department and make progress toward fielding more competitive teams, and 2) If I have been aware of any constraints that we may have here at UMass that are significantly different than other universities that I have been associated with in the country.

Toward our making progress, over the first nine months that I have been here, we have spent a great deal of time looking at our infrastructure within the Athletic Department, trying to be as efficient as we possibly can. We have looked at several areas and we have restructured our business operations and our business office has been set up differently. Our accounting practices and budgeting process are being done differently. We have looked at our sports medicine area, our sports information area, our academic support area, and our game conduct areas as well. These have resulted in some staffing changes; some staffing reductions and we think, in many cases, a more efficient structure within those areas. We have also instituted some new policies within the department. We have a new student athlete code of conduct in place that was run through the Advisory Council and a new drug and alcohol testing policy for student athletes as well. These are new programs within the department and I think they will be very beneficial to the best interests of our student athletes in the future.

We have also spent a great deal of time looking at what our income potential is and where we have growth opportunities from the income side. The good news is that I believe that we do have a great deal of opportunity to increase our revenue sources, both in terms of program generated revenue—these are the traditional things like ticket sales, corporate sponsorships, and those kind of things—and the way that we go about our advancement work. Traditionally, in the Athletic Department, most of the external contributions have come in through directed efforts of a coach or some help from administration toward augmenting a special need within a particular sport. We have restructured our staff and our efforts toward raising annual funds to support scholarships, which is a critical piece for any athletic program, both in terms of finding the resources, and in terms of being competitive. Through both those efforts, both restructuring and maximizing our use of our resources and identifying new resources that eventually will translate into more efficient and more competitive teams on the field by providing additional resources for our student athletes and coaches. Our goal with this whole thing is to be as efficient with the resources we have and aggressive at identifying new resources and securing new resources as we can possibly be.

When you look at an athletic department, in any particular sport, there really are certain building blocks that have to be in place in order for teams to be successful and for student athletes to get a good experience and for us to represent

the University in a positive fashion. These start, really, with the institution itself. Without a solid institutional infrastructure, regardless of what an athletic department does, it is going to be built on a rather shaky foundation, and in those regards, I have found here at UMass, we have a great story to tell. We have a great institution; we are the state flagship institution. It's a great message to bring to prospective student athletes. We have a history here of athletic achievement and one that we can now take and build upon.

The other things you have to have are more tangible. You need scholarship support. You need positive and qualified coaching. You need operational budgets which are adequate to get the job done. You need support systems in place in terms of sports information, sports medicine, and academic support. And you need facilities. If you can fill all of those bills, chances are that you are going to be successful on the field and provide positive opportunities for your student athletes. Where are we at the moment with UMass athletics? Well, quite frankly, in those regards, it varies from sport to sport. With some of our sports, we are in a fairly good position. They are fairly well funded, their facilities are good, and our expectations for them are high and I think we are in position to succeed. In other of our sports, it is not the same situation. We have some sports whose facilities aren't quite adequate, aren't competitive with those that we compete against, whose operational budgets aren't quite where they need to be, but probably the most glaring area where we are lacking at the moment is in terms of scholarship support. We currently have a very significant challenge, particularly in terms of our gender-equity balance support, females to males. This problem was a result of budget cuts and program elimination a few years ago which has led to an imbalance. Our number one priority right now is to close the gap in scholarship support between men's and women's programs. From there, if we are able to address that—and we will, one way or the other—we would look to provide additional support for some of our programs which aren't quite at a level, again, with those we compete against.

All in all, in terms of the second question, what challenges we may have here that other universities have, I really don't think our challenges are all that different. Everywhere there are budget constraints and facility needs. It is not particular to athletics. It is the same situation for every unit on campus, probably, and that has been my experience every place that I have been. We will work as aggressively as we can to address those challenges, to do it in a way that minimizes our impact on campus, and hopefully, puts us in position to be a resource for campus, as well. I'd be happy to entertain any questions that anybody may have, and then I'll turn it over to Nelson Lacey and Carol Barr for the rest of the report.

QUESTIONS

Senator Brian O'Connor noted that in the past seven or eight years there seems to be a disconnect between some of the coaching staff and the rest of the University. He didn't know what the reason for that was or how to correct it, but he remembers that, in the past, there seemed to be more of a cooperation between many of the coaches and the rest of the University. In the last few years, that connection has deteriorated to the point where some faculty would not be able to identify, let alone name, a coach. It may be all right, but he suspects that this issue may be why attendance is so poor at athletic events.

Director McCutcheon responded that he appreciated Senator O'Connor's remarks and noted that there needs to be a positive relationship between the Athletic Department and the faculty. In some regards, in certain situations, sometimes when coaches reach out to faculty members, certain faculty will view that as an intrusion, specifically "why are you messing in the business that is our charge, and are you trying to influence me to do something for you that is not appropriate?" So, there is a delicate balance between being involved and bringing undue influence, but certainly it is one that can be handled. The Athletic Department sends a message to their coaches that they need to be involved with their student athletes in areas other than just on the practice court or on the field. They need to have a priority that is conveyed to the student athletes about why they are here, and that is to get their degrees and to get an education. If they are not here for that reason, they have come to the wrong Athletic Department. They do want to have that as a priority. As such, they need to be involved in their academic progress, show concern about their academic progress, and in some cases, make exceptions for their athletic needs, because of what they need to do academically. He thinks if they bring that message consistently and find ways to involve faculty with their operations, and invite faculty down, they will see some of the challenges and things that student athletes have to deal with that the normal student does not. Anything that they can do like that, to build that kind of tie, is invaluable and they would be open to any suggestions in that area.

REMARKS BY NELSON LACEY, CO-CHAIR OF THE ATHLETIC COUNCIL

Carol Barr and I are really happy to represent the Council and share the report of our activities over the last year. We are blessed with a very active Council. The full text of the subcommittee reports are in the attachments to the final report. You all have those. Hopefully, if you are interested, you had taken a look. I just want to point out that all the subcommittee work is in the report.

Just to give you a brief snapshot of what we do. We meet once a month. We always invite a representative of the Athletic Department—it is usually a coach or an administrator—and I had not planned on talking about the coach aspect, but since Brian brought it up, I just wanted to say that whenever we have invited a coach to come to our Council meetings, they have come. We have had a chance to meet all of our coaches of the twenty-three, intercollegiate varsity sports we have on the campus. It never ceases to amaze us when the coaches come, because we are really impressed with them talking about their philosophy, but we also have to be impressed with their ability to produce results on the field. I don't want to get too much into what is happening on the field. Let's just say that when it comes to things like facilities, as an A-10 representative of the Conference, we are just not in competition in a lot of areas.

I'll just give you one example: track and field. We are an A-10 representative that not only does not have an indoor track—and that is not that uncommon, because not every school has an indoor track—but for many years, we did not even have an outdoor track. So here we are, a school trying to recruit good athletes and we don't have any facility for them in any weather, either good or bad weather. And what makes that just a little more complicated is that Amherst College, unfortunately, also doesn't have an indoor track. We don't have anything in this valley to have competitive meets in the wintertime for our track athletes. As for scholarships, which John had mentioned, sometimes we are below, sometimes significantly below, our competition and what they allow. Just so you know, the Conference allows a number of scholarships. It is up to the school to fund them and, a lot of time, we don't fund them to the same extent of our competition. I wanted to put a plug in for the coaches. In my estimation, I think that they are doing a pretty good job.

We also invite to our meetings some representatives from campus. We have been fortunate to have the Chancellor come once a year and we invite many of the Vice Chancellors and we have had almost all Vice Chancellors represented at our Council. I don't want to get too far into our agenda items, just to mention some of the main highlights from last year. We did have an Athletic Director search. That was unexpected. We didn't think that was going to be the case going into last year, but we did. We are very happy that we were able to convince John McCutcheon to come here. Also last year, we had presented to us a NCAA divisional membership report on football. We are very concerned about off-the-field issues related to our student athletes. We talk a lot on our Council about advising of our student athletes. We made some significant progress there last year by engaging the Academic Deans to get their colleges and schools more involved in making sure that everyone of our student athletes gets advising not only from the Athletic Department, but also from their academic department. We talked about registration. We are concerned about our student athletes not being able, sometimes, to work out their schedules given that they have to practice usually at the same time in a season and that creates some issues. Other issues discussed included graduation rates, facilities, and the recreation center.

I was excited when Jim put up his first [building] slide because I thought it was a Recreation Center. It turned out it was the Physical Plant Building. It looked a little bit like a Recreation Center. We were active in trying to get a Recreation Center on this campus. This isn't just an Athletic Department issue, this is a student issue. I don't know how much you travel around to see other colleges, but I think that one thing that you will be struck by if you do that—and I am not just talking about Division I schools—is that most of these places have great facilities for students to work out and participate in sports and we just don't have that. We have been pushing for a Recreation Center and we were excited because we were on the front burner on this issue not too long ago, but, unfortunately, the budget cuts that hit, I think it was two years ago, took the Recreation Center from the front burner, I thought to the back burner, but as I watched Jim present all the things the campus will be doing in the next ten years, I didn't see anything about a Recreation Center up there. That is unfortunate. We will continue to push the administration to think about that. We just believe that it is an important issue. Those are the things we talk about, you have our report, and Carol and I would be happy to answer any questions you might have.

QUESTIONS

Senator Richard Bogartz asked if the Council fantasizes about how things might be if we didn't have the football team.

Professor Lacey responded that they have never fantasized about that. The Council does not talk about what they would do as an Athletic Department, if UMass didn't have a football team. He then asked if there was something else that Senator Bogartz was asking?

Senator Bogartz replied that he didn't have anything secret or unobvious about it. He was just thinking in terms of the resources that go into football. We are losing money in football. What could you do with that, if you didn't have football as this drain?

Senator David Ostendorf added that football is half the budget and it's all of the scholarships, and gender equity, all of those issues are tied to football. Are there constraints from alumni or Trustees that drive this issue in this program?

Professor Lacey responded if the question to the Council is, is that an agenda item for us to consider, dropping our intercollegiate football program, the answer is no, that has not been an agenda item.

Director McCutcheon responded that it is really a long conversation, but the football program does have a large budget, to be sure. It has a large number of participants as well. If you look at Title IX and gender equity these days, it is judged by your balance of males to females, undergraduate population. In those regards, our participation numbers are right where they need to be and that is with having eighty-five male participants on the football team. So, if we drop football, unless we drop an equal number of female participants, our gender equity numbers would be off. If we are going to keep all of our women's sports and have a broad-based program like we would like to do at this size of an institution, we'd have to replace the football players with other male participants. If you take the football program and add up the costs, ascribe directly attributable income from ticket sales, donations to that particular sport, and divide it by the number of participants, you'll find that the cost per participant of football at this institution isn't all that dramatically different from what the average cost of a participant is. None of our programs make more money than it costs to run the sport.

You might be surprised to know that where we are right now, probably our most expensive sport to offer, per participant, is women's basketball, because of the high ratio of coaches to players, the high ratio of scholarships to players, and the relatively little income that comes in associated with that sport. If you cost out the cost-per-participant, football really isn't the overwhelming challenge that a lot of people think it to be. Does it have a large budget? Yes, but it would be the same, relatively speaking, if you added hockey plus baseball plus two or three other men's sports to have the same number of participants. That is one piece of information. The other thing is that if you drop football, there is no guarantee that those resources would be there to transfer over to another sport. Obviously, you would lose the income associated with gifts, you would lose the income associated with ticket sales, and you would lose some intangibles that come with football: things like opportunities for the marching band, opportunities for homecoming and other events that are associated with that, that just would be lost. So there are some things particular to football that you really can't put a price on either. It's been a traditional sport here. There was a study done two years ago that validated to the University that, for the time being, we should remain at the competitive end of 1AA with our football program and that is where we have it positioned and that is what we are trying to do.

Secretary May added that another answer has to do with the way that we are viewed by the Trustees and the state government. This is the flagship campus, but as we know, not every program of high value gets placed on this campus: the Medical School is placed in Worcester, and it looks like a law school will be placed someplace else in the state. From the point of the view of the Trustees and probably the state government, this is where they have the flagship athletic program, and if we were to give up an important aspect of that, such as the football program, they would probably put it somewhere else. He then pointed out that the campus would probably not enjoy that process.

Senator W. C. Conner noted that when he attends football games, we always have twice as many players as any team that we are playing. We have about eighty-five and they have about forty, forty-five. Maybe it has to do with the possibility that the visiting team does not bring all of its players. It seems like we have a fair number of people that we are suiting up and that we are supporting, but who don't ever go on the field. He wondered if we could save money and be a bit more selective if we had a fewer number of players.

Director McCutcheon responded that it would look different at an away game. The numbers would be reversed.

Senator O'Connor said that he encouraged the Council not to give up on the Recreation Center. He remembers, as a Senate Delegate to the Board, how excited several Trustees were about two or three years ago and it did seem as though this was on a freight train. They were going to build this come hell or high water, and Professor Lacey is right, it died. The student trustees were in very strong support of this. A significant number of problems which develop during the weekends, especially in the fall and the spring, would certainly be alleviated if the students had somewhere else to go to blow off steam. This is a very important issue.

Professor Lacey responded that they would not give up and noted that Vice Chancellor Gargano might have an interest in this as well. He pointed out that they surveyed students about eight years ago, through the Student Affairs Research Office, and there was strong support of our student body to do something in that area. If you look at our competition, we compete for students who look at other state universities in New England or other places, and it is not good. That is an area that we really have to provide some priority to.

C. ANNUAL REPORT

Annual Report of the University Writing Committee 2003-2004, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 05-015.

This report was received.

Secretary May noted that he remembered that the Faculty Senate had recommended a Writing Center last year and he understood that it had been implemented to some degree. He was wondering if the Writing Committee or the Deputy Provost wanted to report on that.

Professor Genevieve Chandler, Chair of the University Writing Committee responded that there is a small office that has the Writing Center in it. They had met with the Chancellor about a year ago and he suggested that they come up with a proposal that would be attractive to a donor who was interested in writing. That was what they were thinking about. They were trying to have a larger vision. They looked at benchmark schools. They tried to come up with what they thought would be the best for their students. That is how they came up with their proposal.

D. NEW BUSINESS

1. Special Report of the University Advancement Council concerning A Campus-Based Campaign Planning Process, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 05-016 with Motion No. 12-05.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Campus-Based Campaign Planning Process, as presented in Sen. Doc. 12-05 No. 05-016.

This motion was seconded and adopted.

DISCUSSION OF MOTION

Professor Joseph Bartolomeo, Chair of the University Advancement Council remarked that the Council had a meeting about a month ago with the Chancellor because of some concerns that were raised about how the Capital Campaign priorities would be shared and communicated and how feedback would be solicited from the faculty. It was a very productive meeting and this report is a result of that. The Chancellor and Vice Chancellor put this together as a result of their conversation and it seems to the Council to be a very workable method of communicating and soliciting response. It is, in many ways, analogous to what the Chancellor did with the budget cuts when he put everything online and invited response. He promises to respond individually to each email. In addition, there would be School and College meetings for the individual units. Plans are already underway for those. In fact this week, he was in contact with the Vice Chancellor who is setting aside time on various people's calendars to be able to make those presentations in the spring.

2. Special Report of the General Education Council concerning A Recommended General Education Designation, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 05-017 with Motion No. 13-05.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the General Education designation "PS" for PHYSICS 190E, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 05-017.

This motion was seconded and adopted.

E. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Chief Information Officer

Deputy Provost John Cunningham provided an update on registration on behalf of John Dubach, Chief Information Officer. It is ongoing. At the moment, the technology is holding up. Registrations are about the same as this point last year for the spring semester. We have 14,369 undergraduates who have successfully begun their registrations, taking up 82,500 seats, which is fourteen credits per undergraduate. There are almost 1,100 sections completely closed. He predicts that the discussion will move from the technology of SPIRE to the capacity of seats on SPIRE as we move forward.

2. Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance

Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance Joyce Hatch commented that she noticed on the front page of *The Collegian* today a motion taken at the Student Government Association to urge that all elevators are inspected in a

timely fashion. She wanted to dispel a rumor and get across to people that, for all elevators that she can verify (housing has a separate contract), all certificates of inspection are up to date. Some certificates in some of the elevators may look as if they are expired, but what they do is keep the certificates on file at the Physical Plant because, over the years, there has been vandalism where the certificates have been removed. If you do see any that are expired, they do have up-to-date certificates of inspection for all the elevators.

3. The Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Secretary May pointed out that the final Faculty Senate meeting of the semester will be on December 16th. It is quite a full agenda. As usual, Councils and Committees get a lot of business done in the course of the semester and it all comes in on the last meeting. We will also be having a short talk by Sharon Fross, our new Vice Chancellor for University Outreach and Director of Continuing Education.

F. QUESTION PERIOD

Senator Bogartz noted that, with respect to the elevator certificates, his guess is that the law requires that they be posted in some obvious way.

Vice Chancellor Hatch responded that one thing that is underway is to put a notice in all the elevators that there are updated certificates and where they are housed so that the originals do not get torn down.

Senator Platt commented that on his way to the Faculty Senate meeting, he noticed that the ramp to the Fine Arts Center on North Pleasant Street looks like it is practically detached from the building. He thought that someone would probably want to take a look at it.

Presiding Officer Robert Wilson responded that he assumed that a member of the administration would take note of Senator Platt's concern.

Senator Calas had a question about the process for cross-listing courses. She has heard that you need a special dispensation for it.

Vice Provost Cunningham responded that it turns out that the process in the Scheduling Office for cross-listing the courses is a cumbersome one and caused that Office to ask what is the basis for needing to cross-list courses. The Provost's Office then sent out, to all people with cross-listed courses, a question about what is the true basis and need to cross-list their course. They received a lot of responses saying that there is a basis and need, and now is not the time to ask, because it was mid-October. They have tabled the question for now, but at some point, he thinks they'll be asking, "What is it to cross-list a course and what would be the basis for that decision?"

Senator Calas responded that this issue is very important, because cross-listing a course is an academic matter, and it should be discussed in the proper academic setting. The decision about this issue should not be decided due to technology issues.

Vice Provost Cunningham responded that technology spurred the question and the policy of cross-listing would be nice to review.

Secretary May responded that he agreed with Senator Calas that technology should not drive the curriculum, but having had to deal with the issue of cross-listing on a number of occasions, the last Faculty Senate report, from the Academic Matters Council, which was adopted, actually discourages cross-listing and provides four or five hoops that have to be jumped through in order to get a course cross-listed. Courses can be cross-listed and have been, but we discourage it for a variety of reasons because it is unclear what department is responsible for the course and it makes it difficult to allocate the students and the faculty teaching time. There are a number of things, and he suggested that the matter be taken back to the Academic Matters Council because the Registrar's restrictive attitude toward cross-listing derives from a Faculty Senate's approved report by the Academic Matters Council. Maybe that needs to be revised, but it does have a basis in Faculty Senate legislation.

Senator Calas noted that it is important that we realize that some of these issues were perhaps considered unnecessary when we were strictly dividing the world according to discipline, but the way it has evolved is that more and more interdisciplinary work is happening. Additionally, it is important not to be academically restricted by bureaucracy and the role of technology in bureaucracy here at the University.

Secretary May asked if he could take her comment as a request that the Academic Matters Council review the current policy.

Senator Calas said yes, absolutely.

Vice Provost Cunningham commented that he agreed that, as we get more and more interdisciplinary, that is a good thing and in the future, perhaps, we would not need to cross-list because there would not be any stigma for an education person to take a psychology course, and we would not have to cross-list it with education and psychology, but just have it listed under psychology.

Presiding Officer Robert Wilson remarked that sometimes that is a matter of an upper division elective. It might be required in one department as opposed to another department.

Vice Provost Cunningham responded that they meet in the same room, at the same time, with the same professor, and have the same number; but it could be either Education 581 or Psychology 580. If there is a legitimate reason, we should do it. If there isn't, maybe we shouldn't.

The 635th Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate stood adjourned at 4:54 p.m. on December 2, 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