

UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AT AMHERST  
OFFICE OF THE FACULTY SENATE

Presiding Officer Robert Wilson called the 638<sup>th</sup> regular meeting of the Faculty Senate to order on February 24, 2005 at 3:30 p.m. in Herter Hall, Room 227.

A. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. The Faculty Delegates to the Board of Trustees

Faculty Delegate to the Board of Trustees Brian O'Connor reported that the Board of Trustees met last week at UMass Lowell. The Trustees held their annual retreat where they discussed the student experience. They also discussed performance measurements, marketing, and the law school on the Dartmouth campus. Chair Karam announced that the Board of Higher Education has formed a committee to study the proposal and thus far the public comment has been very supportive.

On the evening of May 12<sup>th</sup>, President Wilson will be inaugurated in an event at Symphony. Originally, it was going to be a formal inauguration, privately funded, but those private funds are now going to be turned over to a scholarship fund. At that evening session, Senator Kennedy will be awarded with a President's medal for his contributions to higher education not only in the Commonwealth, but throughout the country.

In terms of business of the Board of Trustees, some of you read in the press that Professor Dan Clawson of the Sociology department and Professor Max Page of the Art department gave a short presentation on the decline in the number of tenure-track faculty on the Amherst campus. In actual business, the Ph.D. program in Nursing was approved on the Amherst campus. Senator O'Connor explained that we have had a Ph.D. program, but it was in conjunction with the Worcester campus. That connection has terminated and we now have separate programs. In addition, the appointment of Professor Arthur S. Keene from the Anthropology department as the first incumbent of the Terrance Murray Commonwealth College professorship was approved.

The Trustees approved a changed mission statement of the University.

"The University's mission is to provide an affordable and accessible education of high quality and to conduct programs of research and public service that advance knowledge and improve the lives of the people of the Commonwealth, the nation, and the world."

From what he understands, the only differences are that they added "affordable and accessible," and "the nation and the world."

There were several other meetings. They have a new schedule of meetings in which all of the subcommittees meet on the same day as the Committee of the Whole. He then noted that they have recently reinstated the custom of inviting faculty representatives to the Board of Trustees' dinner, which is usually the night between the Committee of the Whole and the full Board meeting. He had a very enjoyable dinner with several of the trustees, including Chancellor Lombardi. He felt it was a valuable opportunity to sit with the trustees and give them the faculty perspective, and hopefully a student perspective, of what is really going on.

QUESTIONS

Senator Robert Sinclair asked who wrote the mission statement?

Senator O'Connor responded that he did not know who wrote it, though he assumed that the President's Office had done so.

Senator Sinclair asked an inaudible question.

Senator O'Connor explained that he had found the previous mission statement and established that the only changes were the addition of the words "affordable and accessible," and "the nation and the world." The previous version that he found was written during the first year of President Bolger's presidency, but he did not know who wrote that version either.

Senator Richard Bogartz noted there was a report in the paper in response to Professor Clawson's and Professor Page's suggestion that we needed two hundred more faculty. President Wilson responded that he was in favor of that, but that we needed to move very carefully. He then asked if Senator O'Connor had any information on the meaning of that statement.

Senator O'Connor reviewed his notes from the meeting and noted that President Wilson had said that we were on our way back from terrible financial times of the past three to four years. He (Wilson) is hoping for new money and new money will be used to strengthen programs, to increase financial aid, to grow the faculty and to upgrade instructional technology. There was no doubt that President Wilson was sensitive to Professor Clawson's statements as were all of the trustees. Several of them personally asked Senator O'Connor if things were really that bad, to which he had responded, of course it is that bad. He used his department as an example. Thirty-seven years ago, they had 40 Zoology faculty and 150 students, now they have 1,000 majors and 35 faculty.

Senator Rutherford Platt asked for some clarification regarding the statement regarding the law school, particularly that the response has been generally favorable. He specifically wanted to know where that public comment was coming from and who is characterizing it as favorable?

Senator O'Connor responded that every president of the state community colleges and every president of the state colleges supported it. Additionally, the congressional delegation has supported it. That's all he could say.

Senator Platt responded that that was unbelievable. He had the opportunity to talk with two law school deans, one from the University of San Diego and one from Lewis and Clark and those are both excellent, long-standing law schools. They are both anguishing about recruitment, about library costs, about retaining faculty. If they have those kinds of problems, what is this going to involve with an unaccredited law school?

Senator O'Connor responded that it is in the hands of the Board of Higher Education now and it will be interesting to see what their final decision is.

Senator Sinclair Senator Sinclair returned to concerns regarding the mission statement. He asked if the Faculty Senate was going to review and approve the new mission statement.

Senator O'Connor responded that he did not know and asked if the administration cared to respond.

Presiding Officer Wilson theorized that the Faculty Senate does not get to vote on it if it has already been passed.

Chancellor John Lombardi responded that it is really very easy. The Trustees own the University and, if you do not recognize that the Trustees own the University, you missed the point. The Trustees own the University; they are responsible for the University. They take advice from all of us, they listen to us when they please, and then they declare what is the policy of the University. They have approved this mission statement as the policy of the University. Therefore, that is what it is. If this Senate chooses to say that there is something wrong with that statement, they are free to say so. However, his advice is that of all the crises and difficulties and big issues that are before us, probably the content of this particular statement is not worth an enormous amount of time and effort, but to each his own.

Senator Sinclair responded that if we think about the mission of the University instead of a few words in this statement and change the issue to importance of faculty and students and staff and administration being in concert with the substance of the mission, with all due respect to Chancellor, Senator Sinclair would suggest that the mission of the University is important.

## B. NEW BUSINESS

1. Special Report of the Academic Priorities, Graduate and Program and Budget Councils concerning a Professional Doctorate in Audiology (Au.D.), as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 05-027 with Motion No. 26-05.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Professional Doctorate in Audiology (Au.D.), as presented in Sen. Doc. 26-05 No. 05-027.

This motion was seconded and adopted.

2. Special Report of the Rules Committee concerning The Undergraduate General Education Requirement, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 85-024B with Motion No. 27-05.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate adopt the proposed changes in the Tier I (R1) Basic Math Skills Requirement, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 85-024B.

## DISCUSSION OF MOTION

Senator Richard Bogartz, Chair of the Rules Committee, explained that because the Math department is no longer giving the test directly, but instead students take a placement version online which is not proctored, it is not possible to administer it as a requirement test. Instead the proposal is to have courses meet the requirements.

This motion was seconded and adopted.

C. NEW COURSE (10 Minutes)

There is no report associated with the following motion:

<u>COURSE</u>	<u>TITLE</u>	<u>CREDITS</u>
ENGIN 351	“Writing in Engineering”	3

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the course ENGIN 351, as recommended by the Academic Matters Council. 25-05

This motion was seconded and adopted.

D. PRESENTATION BY:  
JOSEPH BARTOLOMEO, CHAIR, UNIVERSITY ADVANCEMENT COUNCIL  
WITH AN INTRODUCTION BY CHANCELLOR JOHN V. LOMBARDI  
“FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN THE CAPITAL CAMPAIGN”  
(see attached)

QUESTIONS

Presiding Officer Robert Wilson asked why there was such a difference from one school or college to another as far as the goals?

Professor Bartolomeo responded that the goals were determined based on the capacity that the campaign consultant and the development staff felt each school could reach. Certainly, it would be wonderful if a number of schools exceeded their capacity, but at this point, based on the best information that is available now, these were goals that were considered appropriate given the resources, given the past history of giving, given the numbers of prospects for each one of the colleges. That is why there is a difference between them. It is not surprising that the colleges that have tended to be most successful at private fundraising already have the highest capacity at this point.

Senator W. C. Conner noted that the building campaign projected for the next ten years was presented to the Faculty Senate a few months ago and he asked how does the capital improvements issue here relate to that, is it part of that package or something separate?

Chancellor Lombardi responded that the capital list that is in the campaign includes buildings that are already on our capital plan, because if we are able to fund some of those buildings with private dollars, it releases borrowed dollars for the next items on our critical capital list. As you know, right now our capital plan only buys us about 40% of the essential capital repair and renovation projects that are needed for this campus that have already been certified. We have been able to find money for about 40%, so every dollar that we can raise for capital releases a dollar that can go to the next item on the priority list. In addition, on the capital list, there are projects that are not on the funded capital list that we are working with in our projection. If a college has a need, but it did not make it to that list, it is there. For example, in the case of athletics, we are not sponsoring athletic construction; we are not sponsoring capital expenditures for athletics out of our borrowed funds or out of our general fund, but athletics has a lot of capital needs. If they can raise them, they can do what they need to do. Those would be under the athletics section. They would have a whole bunch of capital projects that are appropriate for putting in stands, lights, and turf and that is all for the gift side. If someone wants to endow them or build them, congratulations, and if they do not, well we will struggle for awhile more.

Senator Conner asked a clarifying question about the types of donations included in the campaign.

Chancellor Lombardi responded that the campaign includes every dollar raised—private, corporate, or foundation that is not a grant and not sponsored research. That includes annual giving and donations from alumni.

Senator Conner then asked if we did not have a campaign, how much money would we receive from individual donors?

Chancellor Lombardi responded that our normal amount is something in the order of \$25 million a year. That is what we would get if we did not campaign and did not push the envelope. Normally, we get \$20 million to \$25 million in our annual fund and for gifts that come in through the normal operations.

Senator Conner then asked how long the campaign is expected to be?

Chancellor Lombardi responded that it is a seven-year campaign.

Senator Conner noted that normally in seven years we would get \$175 million, so the capital campaign is doubling that amount.

Chancellor Lombardi responded that some of the campaign money will not be capital, some of it will be endowment, some of it will be current use funds, some of it will be scholarship funds. Even today, out of our \$20-\$25 million that comes in now, some of it is endowment, some of it is for capital, some of it is for current use. What we are trying to do is raise the level. The working total comes from the assumption that a campaign, if it is done well, ought to at least double your yield. We have a consultant that is out there doing a more detailed and comprehensive analysis of the capacity of our friends and neighbors. The consultant will come back and tell us whether \$350 million is reasonable, is too high, too low, and we will recalibrate the number that will be our target and that is what will be announced when we announce the campaign. \$350 million is a working number.

Senator Conner remarked that he recalled that there is a state program for professorship that matches funds raised. Are we going to count that in the numbers?

Chancellor Lombardi responded, absolutely; count every dollar from every source.

Professor Bartolomeo added that that is not atypical for these kinds of campaigns. Everybody counts everything.

Chancellor Lombardi pointed out that one of the characteristics of these campaigns that is very important is that you keep clean, good, straight books, because donors like to know where the money is that is coming in, they want to know what it is for, they like to know how it is done. Part of what has gone on in the background is the creation of an infrastructure that allows us to be very responsible with the donors, so that for any donor who makes a gift, there is a complete logging of it, there is a transaction, we know where it is, we know how much it is, we know how much it is earning, we know what it has been spent for, and we provide regular reports to our donors on what their funds are doing. It is very important. Stewardship is the official word for it.

Professor Bartolomeo made an additional point that he did not make when he was talking about the Advancement Council and that is to inform the Senate that, as Chair of the Advancement Council, he is a voting member of the UMass Amherst Foundation Board. He attends those meetings and is a member of the Finance and Audit subcommittee. If you have any questions about the Board and its workings, feel free to contact him. There is a link for the Faculty Senate Advancement Council on the campaign web site.

Presiding Officer Robert Wilson encouraged the faculty to look at the web site, because it really is pretty impressive. If you want to see the plans and goals for your college or school, they are right there.

## E. QUESTION PERIOD

Senator Conner noted the 24% reduction in the number of faculty over the past ten years and then pointed out that he had asked this question of a previous chancellor. The question is, the faculty are down by 24%, could the Chancellor give us an idea of what the administration had done in that period of time, both in the number of administrators (and the amount of money that is spent for administrators) and the amount of maintenance? So, if in that period of time, has everybody moved down in parallel and the percentage being spent on faculty is constant, or is the percent used for faculty salaries decreasing?

Chancellor Lombardi responded that the first answer to his question is that, over the last ten years, the cost structure of all of American higher education has spent less on faculty and more on administration everywhere, because of A) computing costs—which some Senators may have commented on once or twice before about PeopleSoft. Every dollar spent on PeopleSoft could have been spent on a faculty member and was not. So, therefore, there was a shift in expenditures on that score. B) The cost of capital investment, renovation, and repair at this institution has begun to eat away at the ability of the institution to pay for faculty. Indeed, we are approximately 250 faculty short of what we

should have at this institution to be nationally competitive. The amount of money that it would take to deal with that is something in the order of \$30 million. That \$30 million today sits in the general funds budget and is going to be used to try and keep the place open. If the state would do what it ought to do, the state would invest \$30 million either in the capital repair and renovation budget and then release money that could be used to hire those 250 missing faculty or provide us with a budget increase of \$30 million to purchase the additional 250 faculty that we require to be a nationally competitive institution.

Now, insofar as the reduction in the administrative staff, he cannot talk about anything other than what has happened since he has been here. In the budget crisis that we just went through, the administrative staff took about twice to three times as big a hit as the faculty side, in order to maintain the academic programs that we maintained. In this cycle at least, faculty have been our first priority.

*Senator Conner* responded that he was glad to hear it. He would appreciate if they could be given, for the past twenty years, those figures—maybe every five years—how many faculty, how many administrators, how much money was spent in each of the areas; then he thinks that they would be able to defend that.

*Chancellor Lombardi* responded that that was all on the web site for the period of which he is in charge.

*Senator Conner* stated that was perfect. He is still interested in going back to see what the history has been, not just the past three years.

*Senator Howard Peelle* had a question for the Provost. As the campus enters prime recruiting season, would the Provost be able to give us her view and her guidance about what appropriate communication there should be between search committees, in particular, their chairs, and the faculty of the schools/colleges, especially in searches for a new dean?

*Provost Charlena Seymour* responded that they certainly hope that the lines of communication are open. There are processes for setting up the search committee; the search committee is pulled together with nominations from the Faculty Senate, nominations from the school personnel committee, and also nominations from the Provost's Office. Once that pool is put together as the appointing authority, she selects individuals from each of those pools and submits it to the chair. She consults with the chair in terms of the balance for the committee and then the committee gets together and meets with the chair and the Provost and she gives the committee the charge. Once the charge is given, the information that is discussed in each of the search committees is confidential. Thereafter, the committee is asked to actually review folders, to bring candidates to campus. There is a schedule that is put together by each of the search committees. All of these schedules are not uniform because it is the privilege of the search committee to determine the type of people, the number of people, the number of audiences that each of the candidates is to speak before. Once that is determined, then each of the candidates meets with the Provost and then a decision is made about who is going to be the dean.

---

The 638<sup>th</sup> Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate stood adjourned at 4:27 p.m. on February 24, 2005.  
The proceedings of this meeting are available on audiotape in the Faculty Senate Office.

Respectfully submitted,

Ernest D. May  
Secretary of the Faculty Senate