

UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AT AMHERST
OFFICE OF THE FACULTY SENATE

Presiding Officer Robert Wilson called the 639th regular meeting of the Faculty Senate to order on March 24, 2005 at 3:30 p.m. in Herter Hall, Room 227.

- A. ADDRESS BY CHANCELLOR JOHN V. LOMBARDI
“RESPONSE TO THE REPORT OF THE DIVERSITY COMMISSION”
(see attached)

QUESTIONS

Senator Marta Calas said that she appreciates that the Chancellor had taken such quick steps after the Commission report and that his plan, in many ways, represents a lot of the concerns that we have as faculty. She is devastated by the process of trying to recruit doctoral students and faculty of color and being told by candidates that they would not consider us seriously precisely because of the racism on this campus. She is talking about this year, not in the past. For her department, this is very serious because diversity is pretty scarce in her faculty. Therefore, it is a real serious issue. However, precisely because of the seriousness of the issue, she is concerned by two different issues in this case. The first is that the Chancellor says that this is a proposal, but it is called an Action Plan so, in the minds of everybody, this is his plan. Since the Commission’s report was presented to the campus, the campus needs to deliberate the issues in the context of the Commission’s report, not just in the context of the Chancellor’s plan. Therefore, we need a much wider understanding of all the possibilities of the plans, including the one recommended by the Commission.

Her second point is that the time allotted for responding to the Chancellor’s plan was too short. In fact, the first of the three weeks allotted for comment fell during spring break when many people were off campus, so that the date that many campus community members first had access to the plan was March 21st. She then asked if the Chancellor would consider extending the period of recommendations—so that there could be a more widespread discussion—until a month from March 21st which would be April 22nd.

Presiding Officer Robert Wilson asked the Chancellor if he wanted to respond.

Chancellor Lombardi said that he wanted to hear everyone’s comments before responding.

Professor Dan Clawson, the president of the faculty union, noted that Pete Rossi, a distinguished faculty member in his department, pointed out that no good deed goes unpunished. In this case, it is clear to anyone who has been on campus and has been dealing with it that, for the past year, the people who have been doing the good deed of bringing to the attention of the campus our problems with diversity are the students. They are the people who have raised the issue and put it on the agenda and made all of us think about it and deal with it. Above all, what really put it on the agenda was, last fall, they had a loud, vibrant demonstration that went through the halls of Whitmore and, as a consequence of that, several things happened. One of them was that the good deed of calling this problem to the attention of the campus was punished by imposing a picketing code that is highly problematic and that has been modified some, but remains a problem.

The second thing that happened was, as a result of that demonstration, we got the creation of a Diversity Commission. Now that Diversity Commission had a whole variety of recommendations. The short version of their recommendations and Chancellor Lombardi’s plan is that the parts of the Commission’s recommendations that had to do with academic affairs have largely been accepted and the parts of the Commission’s recommendations that had to do with student affairs have largely been rejected. It seems that the students have been punished for calling to the attention of the campus its problems with diversity—in the Chancellor’s plan, but not in the Commission’s report—by basically stripping the Student Government Association and student agencies of their power and independence. That seems highly problematic and totally inappropriate and not to have anything to do with diversity. It seems like an agenda that was being promoted outside of what the Commission recommended. Professor Clawson does not see any reason for it and he would like to know why students should be stripped of their power and ability to raise issues and to call the attention of the campus to the problems that we all have and for which we are thankful that they have done so. Stripping students of that authority makes this more like a corporation and less like a University and suppresses free speech and the diversity of opinions.

Professor Sara Lennox had an addendum to Professor Clawson’s statement. She has read the Diversity Commission’s report which is very eloquent and thoughtful and helpful to us for thinking about the problems that we have had on this campus for many decades. That report has not been presented to us. It is a very complex report; it needs a lot of thoughtfulness. We need to consider, as a faculty, as a university community, how we respond to this. She does not think it is appropriate, in the context of what Senator Calas said, that we respond only to the Chancellor’s response to that report. We need to respond to both reports and also other reports, perhaps some of the proposals that were submitted to the Chancellor, and consider as a community what the right response is. Professor Lennox also found the Commission’s report quite wrenching. The

Commission itself was very moved by the alienation, the coldness, the estrangement that many students of color and students with other not entirely mainstream identifications have. It seemed to her that those emotional difficulties were not addressed in the Chancellor's response and, for those of us who are trying to create a community to educate young people, this is a huge oversight. Her last point is that there are faculty committees on diversity that have been meeting for months and are just in the process of compiling their final reports and apparently all that work was for nothing because it is not considered in the Chancellor's plan. She absolutely agrees that we really must have more time and more discussion of this issue before we proceed to any action whatsoever.

Senator Richard Bogartz noted that, when he looks at the title on the draft action plan, it says *draft* action plan, so it is not the action plan, it is a draft of it. The Chancellor has asked for responses and we are giving him responses. This isn't the plan yet, obviously. He has looked at the plan and he does not see any evidence in this document of any attempt to punish anybody. It may not go according to what some people's wishes are, but this does not look like an attempt to punish anyone.

Professor Mark Brenner had two questions. One is that from his reading of the Diversity Commission's report, one of its central findings/recommendations is to create a senior principal officer within the administration whose responsibility it will be to monitor and engage the issues of diversity on campus. That is not a feature of the draft action plan. He is curious why, when that was one of the central recommendations of the Commission, that it was not included in the Chancellor's action plan. The second question is he would like some elaboration from the Chancellor about the timetable that he has put forward for this, because Professor Brenner's read of the draft action plan, at least in the arena of student activities, is that this is perhaps one of the most comprehensive reorganizations of our campus in three decades. It seems to be a generational shift. In principle, he thinks that we have to make those kinds of major reorganizations with some care and take some time to reflect on them. As his colleagues before him have indicated, this timetable seems to be fairly quick. He would like to hear some more thought about why we need to make such dramatic changes at all and why we need to do them so quickly.

Professor Arlene Avakian noted that she read the Commission's report with great hope and then she read the Chancellor's action plan with some concern. The shift in student affairs is very, very significant. She is very concerned that those proposals really do not address diversity in a serious way. There is a lot of talk of the creation of new this and new that, and a list of things that students could do to feel more connected to the campus, like pulling an all-nighter, which to her it did not have a coherence that would be focused on diversity and this is supposed to be a response to the Commission on Diversity. That concerns her a lot.

Undergraduate Student Marisha Leiblum asked for a point of clarification. She asked the Chancellor if they were going to be talking to the wall or if there was going to be some kind of response to these questions at some point.

Chancellor Lombardi responded that the purpose of the exercise is to gather opinions, comments, and suggestions for improvements to the draft. He is listening very carefully so that he can take advantage of people's perception of what is right and wrong about the draft and then incorporate it when they revise it.

Ms. Leiblum responded that that did not answer her question. She asked if the Chancellor was going to give any feedback.

Chancellor Lombardi responded no.

Ms. Leiblum then asked if that meant that for the whole meeting he was not going to speak back.

Chancellor Lombardi again responded no.

Ms. Leiblum then pointed out that this was just like when he did not want to speak to the SGA Senate last night and just like when he did not want to come to the public hearing today. She understands what Senator Bogartz is saying that this is a draft action plan, but at the same time, she does not feel that feedback is being heard because, if there are not public venues in which the Chancellor is willing to respond to the comments of the community, we are not going to know what his response is. We are not going to know what he has been thinking about this plan until he releases the final draft and then gives three days before it is implemented.

Undergraduate Student Jeff Napolitano, a member of the SGA, noted that the Commission detailed several times in its report the mistrust of the student body of the administration. As far as he can tell, the report did not say anything about taking away power from the student government; it did not say anything about removing control from student power. In fact, it did say that one of the things that needed to be taken into consideration was that the integrity of the student government and its agencies be respected. They were very explicit about that. Yet the Chancellor's proposal "relieves" the student government—in the words of the proposal—of its agencies, of the burden of its agencies. He does not know where the idea to relieve the student government of its agencies came from, but he can say that we did not ask for our agencies to be relieved by the administration and, in fact, the point, as he understands it historically, of these agencies is because the student body does not trust the administration to deal with these issues. He thinks that that is only reinforced by the draft plan. He thinks that if we

are going to talk about the Commission's report, we should talk about the mistrust by students; we should probably dismiss the idea of taking away power from students and student government.

Undergraduate Student Barak Sered, a member of the SGA, remarked that, in addition to stripping the student body of its agencies with a capital "A," the Chancellor's draft proposal also strips the student body of its agency with a small "a"; its ability to decide for itself what it wants to do. He lists a number of things the new Center for Student Development is going to organize, including programming such as Black History Month, Martin Luther King Day and AIDS Awareness Day. These are programming that are supposed to come from the community. You do not have some guy with a suit say, "all right, tomorrow you are going to celebrate Black History Month." Black History Month is going to be celebrated if, and only if, the community of black people on campus wants to celebrate it. The same goes for AIDS Awareness Day and for any Jewish festival that we are celebrating. He thinks that the Chancellor's proposal really is meant to stifle student initiative and strip us of any agency.

Graduate Student Megan McDonough expressed her strong concern regarding a particular line in Chancellor Lombardi's proposal which says that the Office of Commuter Services will be aligned with Housing. She is very concerned because they are the only agency on campus which provides programming for families. She is concerned that if that office is no longer part of Student Affairs, they will then be strictly limited to providing housing referrals and assignments, and it will be stripped of their role as an advocacy agency for families on campus. She thinks that the report neglected to look at the very diverse family population which is on campus. Many international students have children. Many people of color have children. We are of all different ages, races, genders and she believes that it is important to provide programming and support for this diverse population.

President of the Graduate Student Senate, Uri Strauss, a member of the Commission on Campus Diversity, spoke for himself, but thought he could speak for a few other people on the Commission who have been having some internal discussion. They are all, at the very least, concerned and, at the very most, outraged by what they see as a very significant departure from both the spirit and the letter of the Commission's recommendations. He would also like to remind the Chancellor that, in his remarks to the Commission, he did say that he would implement the recommendations that the Commission made, not just that he would consider them. Mr. Strauss recognized that the Chancellor had said that he was not going to take the opportunity to reply, but maybe, if he would like to apologize for his dishonesty, that would definitely be appreciated.

Professor Anne Herrington, a member of the Commission, stated that she was concerned specifically that the student affairs section of the Chancellor's plan really does seem to diverge in spirit and design from the Commission report. It focuses so exclusively on inclusion; it makes anything about diversity and difference seem only a cause for balkanization and she does not think that is the case. What she will say in her written response to the Chancellor's proposal is to request to delay implementation of this broader Center for Student Development, which seems beyond the scope of the specific action plan, and ask that they focus on the recommendations related to diversity, knowing that that has to be part of inclusion. In particular, two of the recommendations from the Commission which she thinks are very important to recognize are the integrity of the Student Government Association and to affirm the role of the ALANA support programs in the very specific ways that the Commission recommended. That included delimiting the focus in some ways but restoring the advocacy and mentoring function of those services and recognizing the useful link to outreach and advocacy to other programs.

Associate Director of the Native American Student Support Services Program and Instructor Joyce Vincent noted that when she was reading the Commission's recommendations, she saw some things that pleased her and she saw some things on which we would need to have more discussion. Then she read the Chancellor's proposal and when she looked at the academic component of it, she saw some things that she found quite pleasing—especially for someone like herself who is not tenure-track faculty, but is an instructor trying to contribute, to help fill the gap in diversity in academic affairs—but then when she got to the student affairs portion and she reread it several times, she developed a quandary. To her, she felt as if she were reading two different reports written by two different individuals. One side seemed to have been a little more detailed and articulate; the student affairs portion seemed to be somewhat vague and not so much moving towards diversity. It seemed to be taking all the advocacy components on campus that encompass student advocacy and staff advocacy, and broadening student activities into a Center for Student Development and putting all of these groups underneath without their advocacy component. That feels more like a move towards assimilation rather than inclusion of diversity.

She did not see concrete dollar amounts really designated towards the student affairs side of this. It did not seem like new money or new initiative commitment. It seemed like it was generating some of the empty positions of the former director of the ALANA support program and one of the director positions that was in campus activities and revitalizing those positions, putting new bodies in them with a new mission and a new job description. She is also concerned about what the job descriptions will be for the staff under this new umbrella, because it seems extremely vague. Here we are about to welcome a new incoming class. We have new student programs; we have a phone-a-thon; we are going to be welcoming these students and we do not know if we are going to exist as a support advocacy agency for them, so what do we tell these new students to make them feel really welcome to come to this University? She also agreed that we should extend the response period to April 22nd because she thinks that we need to have more dialogue specifically around the student affairs portion of the proposal.

Undergraduate Student Leia Hlustick had a question regarding the restructuring of the support services and the like. What she has heard from students time and time again is that the support services are working for them; all they need are the funds to fill the positions and to have better advising. In this reorganization, she does not see that happening. What she has seen is the allocation of funds for the Center for Student Development. These funds could go to hire the currently needed staff and others, as opposed to forming this new umbrella that is going to put everyone under one roof and just dilute all of our issues.

Graduate Student Gladys Franco, the graduate assistant for the Office of ALANA Affairs, stated that the Chancellor either made a human mistake in not recognizing the real problems at UMass or he purposely just avoided addressing them. The problem here has always existed. The reason that we protested this Commission when it was first organized was because we knew that what was going to happen is what is happening right now. What has been happening at UMass for decades is that the administration does not want to deal with the racial tension, does not want to deal with the real issues that are affecting the students and the UMass community. The Chancellor brought this Commission together with outside experts; he did not ask the people who are here; he did not ask the students or faculty or staff who are dealing with these issues on a day-to-day basis. He brought this Commission here and they spent four months looking at the issues and made great recommendations. When the time comes to implement them, what the administration has historically done and what it seems like the Chancellor is currently doing, is stash them away, put them in a file, never look at them again, and continue to try to implement whatever the administration's political agenda is.

The Chancellor said in his proposal that things will not continue to be like they were before and he is here today to hear from us how he can make this proposal better. Well, how he can make the proposal better, how he can help the University, how he can help the students, the administration, the faculty, and the staff of this University, is by actually listening to us, to the people who are here. He does not need to bring people from other universities, from outside the University to understand the issues that are affecting us today. The way to fix the problems of this University is to take the students' voice into consideration, because after all, that is the reason that you all are here. You are supposed to be working here for us.

The first thing that the Chancellor should do is take the UMass community action plan that was developed by the UMass community and endorsed by various groups on campus. The President of the SGA, Eduardo Bustamante, and the President of GSS, Uri Strauss—who were the only students on the Diversity Commission—put this together and they make great recommendations. The recommendations that they make in this plan would actually start fixing the problems that are affecting the students on this campus. This is where the Chancellor needs to start.

Undergraduate Student Katie Ciccolini wanted to comment on what another person had said. She agreed with the feeling of talking to a wall. Being somewhat uneducated on the matter, she had come to the meeting to learn. She does not understand how she is supposed to learn if she is only hearing one side. She believes that this exercise is just to satisfy the students in a way where they are made to think that the Chancellor is actually taking in the students' and faculty's suggestions and concerns, but in reality, this is just a political stunt. She wondered how she is supposed to know what to think if there is no response from the leader of her school. She does not see the point of this exercise if they do not get an opportunity to hear the Chancellor, even if it extends the meeting and puts people on the spot. This is an essential issue.

President of the Student Government Association, Eduardo Bustamante, a member of the Diversity Commission, stated that he appreciated the proposals that Chancellor Lombardi submitted regarding academic affairs. That being said, he feels that this exercise is going to be redundant if there is no feedback. The idea of a discussion is that we present our ideas and the Chancellor presents his objections if he disagrees, and then we can try to meet that objection. As it is, we are really limited. For this to go anywhere, it cannot be just us saying the same things over and over again and getting no response. He really believes that we should stop this question and answer session until we at least get a good justification for why the Chancellor is not answering questions.

Senator Bogartz noted that he did not need to defend Chancellor Lombardi as he has met no one more capable of defending himself than the Chancellor, but he has been sitting here thinking what alternative perspective one might have on why Chancellor Lombardi is sitting there not responding. One way to take it is that he does not deign to respond to this because he is really not interested. Another way of thinking about it is, what if you were in his position? Would you want to spend some time giving some serious thought to the points being raised or would you just want to respond to everything that was coming at you off the top of your head? If Senator Bogartz was in the Chancellor's position, he would want to think about it for a while, he would want to take it seriously; he would want to respect people's remarks enough to think about it before he gives his immediate responses.

Professor Clawson agreed that if the Chancellor wanted time to think, that made sense, however, people do want to know if there is going to be a time for public discussion and response where we can have an exchange of ideas, which is normally thought to be central to what a university is about.

Chancellor Lombardi observed that some folks wondered why he did not respond to every question, some folks wondered why he did not engage in an elaborate conversation with every single opinion that was presented in the course of this conversation, and so he wanted to explain. First of all, we have had a very large amount of conversation on this subject and we need to continue that conversation. Second, he has heard a lot here today that is important to him. He wanted to hear it all. He wanted to hear both the content and the emotion associated with it. These issues are not the least bit easy. These issues have been with us for a very long time. Many people, much smarter than him, have been working on this much longer than he has on this campus and we still have, as many people have testified today, very serious problems on this campus that we have not found a way to resolve.

He takes it very seriously that what we have proposed is not satisfying a large number of our constituency. He recognizes that what they have proposed does not match word-for-word or point-for-point what the Commission proposed. He recognizes that they probably need to go back and revise that in light of all of the suggestions that have been made, in light of the counterproposals that have been provided to them. These are very complex issues and he is not prepared at this time to do tit for tat and discover whether this particular item ought to be changed for that particular item, because they are connected and interlinked. He does agree that probably they have not allowed enough time for this conversation. They will extend the comment period, as suggested, for another couple of weeks so that they can capture all of these suggestions. They will revise the proposal and put a new proposal up on the web site so that everyone will have a chance to look at that complicated proposal, think about how it works, understand how it functions, and respond to that as well.

They are eager to try and continue this conversation. On the other hand, he has observed parts of this conversation in various venues over the last two and a half years. He has recognized that many of those conversations are not very productive. They are conversations that generate tremendous emotion on various sides. They degenerate quickly into accusations of a personal nature which do not get us very far. So, consequently, he is trying to keep this conversation on a programmatic, functional, effective level because it is only by doing that that we are going to make some progress here. We have been struggling with this as an institution and a community for what is truly a remarkably long time. This community has invented some really outstanding, original and innovative programs to address these issues, but they have not resolved them. He is not persuaded that simply by throwing money at what we now have, we will end up with a better set of circumstances. Therefore, he has asked for all of this information. He has asked for all of this input. He has heard all of these comments. He will now try, with the staff and the other people they have, to respond in some sort of coherent, structured, and effective way. The participants have asked a number of questions which are not easy for him to answer. They are complicated and they are difficult and he is not sure that he will even be happy with his own answer. Nonetheless, he has to think about it before he answers, so he thinks that they want to give him a little time, because he is going to give them a little time.

Colette Nadeau, Administrative Coordinator for Student Activities wanted to know who helped the Chancellor write the draft action plan, and who does he expect to have help him draft the revision of that plan?

Chancellor Lombardi explained that the people who helped him write the draft of the proposal that they put up on the web is a very long list of people. Some of them contributed to the Commission report, some of them provided Commission testimony for that report, all of which provided a basis and a context within which they drafted the action plan. He does not know that he can identify individual authors. Lots of people are the authors and while he takes full responsibility for all of its defects, whatever is good about it, please assign to those you know and love.

Jeff Napolitano, stated that he feels that accountability on the part of the administration is a problem. For example, when there were staff positions empty in offices like the Everywoman's Center and the Stonewall Center, there was no plan, there was no sense of accountability about why these things were not getting done. They asked Vice Chancellor Gargano to come to the SGA to explain his rationale which he refused to do. They asked Chancellor Lombardi to come to the SGA to explain and he also refused. Gladys spoke earlier about the administration being here to serve the needs of the student body—and serve may not be the exact word, but at the very least they are not here to destroy the student body, the student governance. He has never been to a forum where the Chancellor has publicly responded to students. When we talked about having a discussion and that there needs to be a back and forth, there has to be some place, if not here, where we actually get answers, justifications. As a member of the SGA, he cannot miss a meeting without being accountable to somebody. He does not understand how dismantling our campus and reorganizing it in the biggest change in three decades could just be done without any sense of administrative accountability or justification.

Professor Alice Nash wanted to say publicly that, as a faculty member, she felt while reading the report—and has felt for some time—that we really underestimate the importance of ALANA support services for our students. As a teacher, she cannot teach all of the people that she needs to teach out of her own knowledge and experience. There are some things that students are not going to say to her, it is not appropriate. They might develop that level of closeness, but she cannot count the number of times she has called one of the women in ALANA support services—and she understands that most of the administration are men, but it is really the women that she works with and counts on. These are the ones who, respecting the confidentiality of the student, can help her figure out what is going on. Sometimes that means that she, as a teacher, has to change what she does. Very often they are treated like stepchildren. They are not tenured faculty, they are staff. It is not just the money,

although money counts, but there is a feeling—and she thinks that probably a lot of the faculty are guilty of it as well—of really not taking them seriously enough. She wondered if there is any structural way in which we can say publicly from the top down that this really is important work. She tries to tell her students that they need to combine passion and argument and evidence, all of them have to come together. That is part of why you come to a university; it is part of why we live here, to keep learning how to do that. That needs to be done in an atmosphere of respect. She just wanted to say publicly, thank you, to the people in ALANA support services and to the students who keep bringing these issues up, because we cannot do anything without them.

Undergraduate Student Miranda Davidson wanted to know if there is going to be a second draft made now to which students can respond? She expressed her concern regarding a lack of information about the current draft plan and the scheduling of various events, like the forum earlier today, which conflict with student schedules. She wanted to know if they were going to be given a chance to effectively respond to something like the draft plan and if their responses are actually going to be heard and another forum given to the students to respond. Is there going to be a second draft and is it possible to make a meeting for a response from the students that is respectful to student schedules?

Undergraduate Student Matthew Murphy, a member of the Board of Trustees for the University, wanted to highlight the fact that traditionally universities and colleges have been run jointly by faculty and students. Because faculty and students are the people who are here every day engaging in education and they know what is best for the university. Administration was created as a way to take the day-to-day workload off of students and faculty. Now we are facing a problem where the administration does not seem to be functioning in this intended capacity. We have the autonomy of the SGA being threatened, we have graduate students about to bargain to impasse with the University, we are seeing a serious decline in the number of tenure-track faculty. He is here to call upon both this body and the students—graduate and undergraduate—to act in solidarity to try and reassert the inherent, invested authority that we have in the functioning of this University as recognized in the AAUP's Statement on University Governance and which is given legal credibility by Trustee policy, the Wellman Document, to really bring this University back to its initial land-grant roots, its commitment to public service, high-quality education, to truly serve the citizens of this Commonwealth.

B. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. The Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Secretary of the Faculty Senate Ernest May pointed out in relation to the Diversity Commission's report and the campus response that it really is a complicated document. It finds itself dealing with issues that are embedded in long history and many levels of functioning of the University. Some of them are unique to the Chancellor's authority, such as the structure of the central administration, but many of them are really relational issues, issues which really go down into departments and things that personnel committees do, things that department chairs do, things that deans do, things that people in student services and staff do. Then there is the whole issue of the financial aspects of all this, so this is an extraordinarily complicated process.

He is happy to hear that the Chancellor is going to extend the comment period, but even that does not end it by any matter of means. It may end the Chancellor's piece of it, which Secretary May estimates is no more than one-third. The rest of it, the remaining two-thirds, will take place on the campus as a whole, and the Faculty Senate councils and committees play an important part in that process. The Rules Committee has asked different councils and committees to consider certain parts of the Commission report and certain parts of the Chancellor's response in order to provide greater output during the comment period. Even after that happens, after the Chancellor puts out a final implementation plan, in some areas that just begins the conversation across the campus, because these things have to do with 5,000 employees, 25,000 students. There is not just a dictate from the central administration, that is not how universities work. In a very narrow area influence, the central administration may work that way, but what happens in some unit in student affairs or in some particular academic department is much more diffuse. It depends on what the community decides is important and what the community decides to do.

The councils and committees are already active in providing a response to the Chancellor and the central administration on all this. They will become even more active after the plan is implemented in terms of deliberating and setting future directions in relation to this report.

2. The Faculty Delegates to the Board of Trustees

Faculty Delegate to the Board of Trustees Brian O'Connor had nothing official to report, but several faculty have asked him if he knows anything more about the proposed law school at the Dartmouth campus. If you read the *Boston Globe* or the Springfield paper or the Northampton paper, there are several articles about some of the so-called problems with the law school. He knows nothing more than everybody else does who has read those reports. There has not been an official Trustees' meeting since the one this past fall at which the Trustees voted to approve the

law school. As he understands it, on March 31st, the Board of Higher Education will make a decision. Whether the decision that they make is binding or not, he is not exactly sure, but basically that is where things stand at the moment. There was an article in today's *Boston Globe* which raises the issue of how many students will attend the law school. That obviously translates into the bottom line. If you cannot get 500 students, then obviously there will be a problem.

3. The Representative of the Massachusetts Society of Professors

President of the Massachusetts Society of Professors Dan Clawson reported on two items. First, we should soon be getting the retroactive pay for the six month period for July 1 – December 31, 2003. That works out to about a third of the total money that we are owed. We will keep fighting for the rest of the retroactive pay that we are owed. The Legislature had given us a firm public promise that this part would be paid last July, they have given us a much shakier promise about when, over the course of the next year -and-a-half to two years, they will pay the rest of the retro, but we will keep working on them and we will see. In this process, at two different occasions, they almost left off the retroactive pay for our retired members and, in each case, we got them to reinsert that. According to the law, we should be paid that retroactive pay on April 8, but he understands that we are not going to get it until April 22.

The second issue he wanted to discuss was tenure-track faculty decline. Everyone agrees that there are too few tenure-track faculty on campus. Chancellor Lombardi has spoken out about it publicly and said that we need 200 to 300 more faculty on campus. President Wilson has said something similar. We have been out hammering on it in any and every way we can. In December, we had a hearing and took testimony. There was a report issued. We took the report to the Board of Trustees, we took it to a hearing in the Legislature, we got a front-page story in the *Boston Globe*, a lead editorial in the *Boston Globe*, a column in the *Globe*, an editorial in the *Springfield Republican*, lead stories on a whole lot of television and radio stations, and there is some sense that people are now actually talking about it and it's at least conceivable to imagine something being done about it. They are taking copies of that report (it's available on their web site) to every member of the Legislature and they are talking to some of them about ways to implement this and to get it put into effect. This is probably as tough a struggle or more so than winning the contracts originally was. We did do that eventually and we hope to accomplish this eventually.

4. The President of the Graduate Student Senate

President of the Graduate Student Senate Uri Strauss noted that first they cannot wait to have a permanent dean in the Graduate School; they are very glad that is happening. He then reported on a couple of votes which they took in the GSS. One concerns the picketing code. They do not believe that it is University policy and they voted to recognize that. They do not think it was implemented according to Trustee policy and they therefore do not consider it University policy. The second one concerns the draft action plan. Again, they recognize that it was framed as a draft, but they thought that it diverged so dramatically from the Commission's recommendations, they felt comfortable rejecting it in the Senate, which they did.

5. The President of the Student Government Association

President of the Student Government Association Eduardo Bustamante said that he would like to announce that in response to the response to the Diversity Commission's report, they drafted a UMass Community Action Plan. The Faculty Senate should have received a comparison sheet of recommendations that their plan presents which were omitted and rejected from the Chancellor's plan. They are available on the web at <http://sga.stuaf.umass.edu/> and they are also at www.takebackumass.com. The idea essentially is that they are supporting all of the Commission's recommendations and maybe going a little above and beyond that. They encourage the faculty to seriously consider it. It is something that will have support from almost all of the organizations within student affairs which were proposed to be reorganized. They latch onto the Chancellor's proposal wherever they agree. They support almost all of the academic portions. If anyone has any questions his email address is eduardoebustamante@hotmail.com. He would be more than happy to send out any documentation he has on his official response as well. He appreciates the people being at today's meeting and he hopes that they realize what it means when students come out, especially during election week. He also appreciates the extension on the comment period.

QUESTIONS

Senator Calas stated that, prior to today's meeting, she had reviewed the Faculty Senate Bylaws. One of the things that struck her, something that we do not talk about often, is what is the purpose of the Senate. The Bylaws include three very clear-cut purposes. This actually refers back to one of the earlier comments regarding what is the responsibility of the faculty and students on campus in reference to campus governance. The Senate Bylaws are very clear that the first of those purposes is "to ensure the representation of all faculty members of the campus community in the governance of the Amherst campus and the University as a whole." Then it goes on to talk about how we

should be involved and participate in the development of policies and procedures within the various colleges and so on. It is Senator Calas' understanding that today's meeting was very much focused on responding to issues raised by the Chancellor's plan, but we have not heard, as a community, about the other plans. We have heard about these plans in a sideways manner. They have been presented as alternatives but unspoken, so they are still voiceless. It seems to her that the Faculty Senate should provide the space for the other plans to be presented and discussed in their own right. Rather than taking the Chancellor's plan as a point of reference, we consider it as one among all the plans. Since now we have until April 22nd, she thinks that there is a possibility for that to happen.

Senator Rutherford Platt expressed his concern regarding the law school proposal. He noted the recent report sponsored by Northeastern and Suffolk Law School (which have their own biases), which is very negative towards the proposed law school gaining accreditation. He suggested that the Faculty Senate pass a motion encouraging the Board of Higher Education, which meets next Friday, to disapprove the law school.

Presiding Officer Wilson noted that this matter would be better discussed during New Business.

Senator Mokhtar Atallah asked where things stood with the campus' OPSCAN service that we were told was going to be taken away, but the faculty were promised that they would still have that service somehow. What is the progress so far and are we guaranteed that we will have that service next semester?

Chancellor Lombardi responded that the commitment to maintaining that service remains and he noted that the OPSCAN service had not yet left the campus as was originally anticipated.

Senator W.C. Conner commented that Chancellor Lombardi did a very good job in trying to put together a solution to a very difficult problem. Since the Chancellor had not heard that today from anybody, Senator Conner thought he would change the mood slightly, particularly because the Chancellor is trying to find an overall solution that fit into a more streamlined administration, which Senator Conner has been arguing for for a long time, so he greatly appreciates that. He realizes that there are difficulties and he realizes that anytime someone changes something around here, somebody is going to be mad as hell.

D. NEW COURSES

There is no report associated with the following motion:

<u>COURSE</u>	<u>TITLE</u>	<u>CREDITS</u>
ANTHRO 304	“Andean/Amazonian Spirituality and Biodiversity”	4
NURSING 325	“Community Health Nursing IIC: Maternal-Newborn Nursing”	2

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the courses ANTHRO 304 and NURSING 325, as recommended by the
28-05 Academic Matters Council.

This motion was seconded.

DISCUSSION OF THE MOTION

Senator Joseph Donohue noting that he hated to strain the patience of this body, had a question about punctuation. Regarding the course title, “Andean/Amazonian Spirituality and Biodiversity,” what puzzles him is he does not know whether the slash means “and” or “or” or “with” or what it means. Additionally, if it means “or,” why can't it say “or?” Or, as is more likely, if it means “and,” why could it not say “and?” Why does it have to be a slash? He has noted a proliferation of people saying “slash” and he is concerned about a slippery punctuation slope.

Senator Atallah noted that the Academic Matters Council does not question what each faculty calls a course. It is really the property of the faculty and has been approved by a committee within the department before it is sent to the Academic Matters Council, therefore, they do not change the name of courses.

After some discussion back and forth it was moved to table ANTHRO 304 – “Andean/Amazonian Spirituality and Biodiversity” to ask the proposer of the course to consider changing the slash in the name of the course to the word “and.”

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the course NURSING 325, as recommended by the Academic Matters
28-05 Council.

This motion was seconded and adopted.

Senator Robert Sinclair brought to the attention of the Senate that we had spent about five times the amount of time on this slash than we did on the mission statement of the University.

Senator Platt then asked if the Rules of Order could be suspended so that he could discuss his proposed motion before he had to leave for another commitment.

Secretary May pointed out that this was a very complicated topic and he did not think it was a good idea for the Faculty Senate to take a position on this complicated an issue without deliberation, without some reasoning from its councils and committees. He was going to vote against it.

Senator Platt clarified that his desire to suspend the Rules of Order was specifically so that the matter could be discussed.

It was moved to suspend the rules of order.

This motion was seconded, but not adopted.

D. NEW COURSES (continued)

There is no report associated with the following motion:

<u>COURSE</u>	<u>TITLE</u>	<u>CREDITS</u>
BMATWT 530	“Mechanics of Building Materials for Construction”	3
BMATWT 540	“Design of Wood Structures”	3
EXERSCI 540	“Changing Personal Health Behaviors”	3

MOVED: 29-05 That the Faculty Senate approve the courses BMATWT 530 and 540 and EXERSCI 540, as recommended by the Academic Matters and Graduate Councils.

This motion was seconded and adopted.

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Special Report of the Academic Priorities Council and the Graduate Council concerning A Dual Master’s Degree Option: MBA/MS in Hospitality and Tourism Management, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 05-028 with Motion No. 30-05.

MOVED: 30-05 That the Faculty Senate approve the Dual Master’s Degree Option: MBA/MS in Hospitality and Tourism Management, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 05-028.

This motion was seconded and adopted.

DISCUSSION OF THE MOTION

Senator Arthur Kinney pointed out that the document does show that we are meeting the new specifications that the Senate approved last year, that the Provost has approved, and the President’s Office has approved for a dual degree option. It is to reduce the total credit load by about twenty percent in order to make it a manageable dual degree.

2. Special Report of the Academic Priorities Council and the Graduate Council concerning A Dual Master’s Degree Option: MBA/MS in Sport Management, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 05-029 with Motion No. 31-05.

MOVED: 31-05 That the Faculty Senate approve the Dual Master’s Degree Option: MBA/MS in Sport Management, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 05-029.

This motion was seconded and adopted.

3. Special Report of the General Education Council concerning A Recommended General Education Designation, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 05-030 with Motion No. 32-05.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the General Education designation “SIU” for WOMENSST 290A, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 05-030.

This motion was seconded and adopted.

DISCUSSION OF THE MOTION

Senator O’Connor asked if this course, as an experimental course, was not to be offered as a permanent course, what would happen to its designation as “SIU?” Specifically, he was concerned about the students who needed the General Education credit.

Senator John McCarthy explained that even if the course was not offered in the future, the students who received the SIU General Education credit would not lose that credit. General Education credit is awarded based on how the course is designated at the time that the student took the course.

Senator Maria Tymoczko noted that it was built into the original General Education documents that experimental courses can have General Education designations. It is not very common for course proposers to take the initiative to do so, but it has been a long-standing option.

Senator Conner asked the name of the course.

Senator McCarthy responded that it is “The Biology of ‘Difference.’”

4. Senator Platt again raised his interest in passing a motion recommending that the Board of Higher Education disapprove the new law school.

DISCUSSION

Discussion focused on concerns of the impact of the Faculty Senate on the Amherst campus passing a motion regarding the initiatives of another campus. Politically, this action seemed unwise. We would not want Faculty Senates on other campuses to pass motions regarding initiatives from our campus; it was probably not in our best interest to pass a motion regarding the actions of the Dartmouth campus. Even if individual members of the Faculty Senate have reservations of the impact of Dartmouth acquiring an unaccredited law school on the University system as a whole, it would still be inappropriate for the Faculty Senate to take a formal action on the matter. It was noted that the process has gone through extraordinary due diligence; it would be in our best interest to not get involved in the matter at this late point. Members of this campus who have concerns about the new law school should, by all means, contact the Board of Higher Education, but the Faculty Senate as a whole should recognize the due diligence which has been followed and not act officially. In response to all the points which had been made, the motion was withdrawn.

5. Senator Calas presented a new motion.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate invite presentations of other than the Chancellor’s plan on “Improving Campus Diversity Draft Action Plan March 12, 2005” to be discussed and deliberated by the Faculty Senate before the deadline for comments on the Chancellor’s plan.

Presiding Officer Wilson asked, for clarification, if Senator Calas wanted to present this as a motion, or if she wanted to forward her request to the Rules Committee for consideration to put it on the agenda.

Senator Calas asked what he would recommend to make it happen.

Presiding Officer Wilson responded that he could not guarantee any specific action and that he was simply asking a question. Normally, when one wants to place something on a future agenda, it goes to the Rules Committee and the Rules Committee makes a decision.

Senator Calas pointed out that according to Robert’s Rules of Order, the agenda for a meeting is not approved until the meeting members approve the agenda. Even if it comes to the Rules Committee and they say, “no,” she could still introduce it at the beginning of the next Senate Meeting, but it would be a moot point, because then they would not have had the chance to invite others to present their plans.

The motion was seconded.

DISCUSSION OF THE MOTION

Senator Bogartz thinks it is a good idea, but he would like to see the proposal(s) before the Faculty Senate meeting and have a chance to think about it rather than have it handed to him as he walks in and have to respond.

Secretary May asked if Senator Calas was thinking of a particular proposal or any alternative proposal that anyone in the campus community might see fit to devise, because he thinks that that could get a bit difficult to manage?

Senator Calas responded that she was thinking of the Commission's plan.

Secretary May responded that the Rules Committee has already submitted to the councils and committees selected portions of the original document with the Chancellor's response for their considerations. The councils and committees have already been charged to consider the recommendations of the original report.

Senator Calas responded that for the Faculty Senate to be able to speak on the merits of the alternative plans for diversity, they need to be discussed by the Faculty Senate and that the plans should be viewed not as responses to the Chancellor's plan but viewed on the strengths of their own individual merits.

Secretary May explained that he was trying to understand what procedure Senator Calas was looking for, because the councils and committees can provide input to the Chancellor, they can provide separate reports to the Senate, they can act as dependently or independently as they wish in relation to the whole report or to the particular items which the Rules Committee has already forwarded to them. Secretary May further clarified that he was trying to understand to which groups Senator Calas was referring. He knows that there is a student group which has already produced their version of what they think that the Chancellor should have included. There may be more and he does not see that we could handle an unlimited number of such reports or responses to the Diversity report in the Senate agenda. If she could clarify, that would be helpful.

Senator Calas asked if there should not have been a formal presentation of the Diversity Commission's report to the Senate? That report should have been given a very prominent place in the Senate meeting. It should be taken seriously.

Secretary May explained that the Rules Committee had considered that, but it seemed to them that the Diversity Report was widely publicized, it is available on the web site, it was presented to the entire community. What is critical is what is going to happen in response to that, therefore they decided to focus on the campus response. Because there are such complicated issues, both in the report itself and in the Chancellor's response, the Senate, on the floor, cannot really do that, so it has to be done in the councils and committees. They are channeling it that way. If she can think of ways which will focus the councils and committees to some degree, he is happy to have help.

Chancellor Lombardi said that one of the issues that is clear in this conversation is that we now have some detailed responses both to the Commission's report and to our draft proposal. As you may remember, the purpose of providing the draft proposal was to try to make concrete what would be a possible response and how one could deal with these issues. Some of our colleagues have different ideas; some student colleagues have different ideas. Some of them have presented a very thorough and well-organized response of their own to the Commission's report.

What they will do, since they are going to extend the comment period, is to post the students' view as an item on our diversity web site to give it exactly the same space and visibility as the report that they have prepared. Then they will proceed to revise and think about how they can improve their proposal. Drawing on that, the campus community can review what the student group has developed as a response to the Commission's report and everybody will be on the same footing. It is important to recognize that one of the great virtues of cyberspace is that we are not restrained to the physical places where we live in order to participate in these conversations. This will allow us to expand the conversation; it will provide alternative solutions that people can consider, including those members of this Senate who choose to engage on these subjects. They are eager to be sure that everybody's voice that is carefully thought out and presented, as the student proposal was, will be heard, will be made available on the same footing and on the same space and in the same capacity as anything provided by the administration or the Commission itself.

Senator David Ostendorf, as a council chair, had a suggestion that may achieve both ends, that would be simply, have the council chairs—wherever the Rules Committee sent this—solicit the appearance of the various representatives who have an informed and constructed opinion on the matter. That is where the work gets done, not in the chaos of

this room, but in individual councils and committees. Those meetings are a more intimate setting and you will probably get something more concrete, more positive coming out of that. That is the way the Faculty Senate seems to work.

This motion was not adopted.

**The 639th Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate stood adjourned at 5:34 p.m. on March 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**