

UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AT AMHERST
OFFICE OF THE FACULTY SENATE

Presiding Officer Robert Wilson called the 640th regular meeting of the Faculty Senate to order on April 7, 2005 at 3:30 p.m. in Herter Hall, Room 227.

- A. ADDRESS BY JOYCE HATCH, VICE CHANCELLOR FOR ADMINISTRATION
AND FINANCE
(see attached)

QUESTIONS

Presiding Officer Robert Wilson asked if the decrease in faculty size reflected in the general decreases in the general fund uses base?

Vice Chancellor Hatch responded right, of the \$20 million of actual budget cuts to the campus, a big piece of the faculty loss came through the early retirements and that is reflected there, even though the Provost received, she thinks, 65% of the costs back. The difference is reflected there.

Senator Brian O'Connor asked a question regarding slide 6, in the first box, the fourth line, "CE" he assumes that stands for Continuing Education. Does Continuing Education give a lot of money to the General Fund?

Vice Chancellor Hatch responded, no, that fiscal year 2006 will be the first year there will be a contribution. The Continuing Education operation is about \$15 million and growing. It's great, distance learning is growing. This is the first time that there is an actual formulaic projection for a contribution to the general fund, starting in fiscal year 2006—hopefully around a million dollars.

Presiding Officer Wilson had a question regarding the Old Chapel. He thought that we had spent millions of dollars renovating it.

Vice Chancellor Hatch explained that this happened before she was involved. She believes that essentially we put our finger in the dike. They were concerned about the integrity of the envelope—as there were things falling from the building—and just protecting that. There are a lot of other building code violations that need be addressed before someone can go in. They still are concerned about protecting the envelope of the building.

Senator W.C. Conner had a question about the new heating plant. She said that we are going to put \$42 million into the heating plant that uses \$2 million a year of energy. That does not sound like a very good investment.

Vice Chancellor Hatch explained that the \$42 million was the energy conservation contract. We have a contract with Johnson Control to do all the energy conservation measures on campus, so all the lights on campus will be changed, all the toilets, the steam line repair.

Senator Conner asked about the utility costs per year of \$2.5 million.

Vice Chancellor Hatch explained that that was the increase. Our utility costs are actually over \$20 million. The increases per year are \$2.5 million. That is on top of the \$20 million in utility costs annually. These are the increases each year to show you where the new money is going. Actually, the \$42 million energy contract will pay for itself in two years. In two years, we will be able to pay the debt and the debt is over ten years. At that time, it will actually free up \$5 million for the campus.

Senator Conner asked what the cost difference would be between using gas and coal.

Vice Chancellor Hatch answered that it would be about a \$3 million increase, if we were not doing other things to bring that down.

Senator Conner noted that we are actually increasing our utility cost by \$3 million a year with the conversion to gas.

Vice Chancellor Hatch confirmed that this was the case; however, we have no choice because you cannot build a new coal plant.

Secretary of the Faculty Senate Ernest May noted that every year we have items which seem to be under the category of one-time uses or unexpected things, such as this year, we have the Diversity Commission; we are hiring several deans which is

going to be expensive; there are opportunities in terms of research. Basically, the kind of things for which we expect the Chancellor to have a drawer full of money to be able to support centrally. Where is the line for that?

Vice Chancellor Hatch replied that actually the one-time uses next year are pretty much accounted for. We are still paying all the early retirement payments over three years and the last one is over four years. There is a small amount there still. The Campus runs with a million dollar contingency, which is nothing, actually. The answer is there is not much.

B. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. The Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Secretary Ernest May was happy to report that our fingerprints are not on the defeat of the law school proposal. Secondly, some of our councils are working on responses to the Diversity Commission report, the Chancellor's response to that, and the Chancellor's Q & A. He understands that there will be a revised Chancellor's response put up on the web early next week. Some of our councils are bringing their expertise to bear on this situation. The Chancellor's Q & A is on the web; it is very interesting and he hopes that people will look at it. Finally, the way for the Faculty Senate to deliberate this any further would be via a report from one of the councils or committees and he knows that several are working on suggestions for this. We look forward to their input.

2. The Representative of the Massachusetts Society of Professors

Massachusetts Society of Professors Executive Board Member Naka Ishii had four things to share with the Senate. First, about diversity, the MSP is considering various proposals and will be sending comments in response to the Chancellor's Draft Action Plan. They are generally supportive of the Community Action Plan and the work done by other committees. Their recommendations will focus primarily on the academic side—how best to structure and fund the best effort to recruit and retain faculty and librarians of color. Second, regarding tenure-track faculty decline, MSP is continuing its campaign for a dramatic increase in hiring of faculty over the next few years. With the help of the Media Education Foundation, they are today filming about thirty students and faculty telling their stories about the impact of the faculty shortage. They are making a DVD that will be shared with legislators and others. They are making it clear that they think that the University is a great place, but we need to fix the shortage of faculty to make it live up to its full potential. Third, there is a MSP general assembly meeting April 27th at noon. They would appreciate RSVPs. At the meeting, they will set their budget for next year, elect officers and board members, and review the MSP's work this year. Fourth, there is a program on women in science, engineering, and other underrepresented disciplines. MSP has organized and is co-sponsoring a forum featuring Lotte Bailyn, a key figure in the gender equity study done at MIT a few years ago. It will be on April 14th at noon in the Computer Science Building room 151. There are flyers around campus. She urges people to attend. RSVP by April 11th to reserve lunch.

C. QUESTION PERIOD

There were no questions.

D. NEW BUSINESS

1. Special Report of the University Computer and Electronic Communications Committee concerning Improving the Student Information System (SIS), as described in Sen. Doc. No. 05-031 with Motion No. 33-05.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate recommend that faculty and other authorized users be empowered to conduct queries against the Student Information Systems database, as described in Sen. Doc. No. 05-031.
33-05

This motion was seconded and adopted.

DISCUSSION OF THE MOTION

Chair of the University Computer and Electronic Communications Committee Steven Brewer explained that he is also chairing the Ad Hoc Committee on the Student Information System and has been meeting with various people and talking about problems using the Student Information System. Through those conversations, it was recommended that the Faculty Senate University Computer and Electronic Communications Committee should take up the issue and look at whether or not there were some simple recommendations that could be put forward that could improve the student information experience for everyone. In talking to people, the number one concern that came up was the inability to make a set of queries in a batch and receive back arbitrary pieces of information about that query in a

form that could be either printed or imported into a spreadsheet. Especially for people who are in advising, where to find out six discreet pieces of information about a list of twenty students, this would require visiting six different screens in the student information system for each one of those students and it could take sometimes half an hour or an hour per student, if the student information system were particularly slow. Therefore, they drafted what they thought were the needs for people to be able to have a query that they could save and share with other people, that departments could have a list of queries that they use regularly where they could get a report back easily that would allow them to make decisions about groups of students for whether or not they have met requirements to move forward in a program or graduating.

Senator Marta Calas said that she thought that the recommendations were reasonable and absolutely necessary, but she is concerned that it would require us to basically patch up something that should have been thought of when the system was implemented. It seems like the system itself is faulty. As expensive as PeopleSoft is, we need to have a system that works as intended for the user.

Chief Information Officer John Dubach had a series of observations and a couple of comments. To respond to one of Senator Calas' concerns, the Student Information System is not in the PeopleSoft stuff that Vice Chancellor Hatch was referring to in the central assessment and it is still run on campus and not through the President's Office. He had three observations. First, the document did not talk about the security issues and he assumes in this it is implied that people should only have access to what they currently have access to now. If they do not have query access, they should not have query access to information beyond their current security walls. He is assuming that was intended.

Second, as written, this brings with it a fair training burden, in the sense that use of the query tool and a particular knowledge of the data structures in the system is non-trivial. He is not sure how many people really want to understand the system in order to write these kinds of queries. If the number is a lot, then they have a serious training expense. If the number is a small number, maybe something can be handled, but that does not necessarily, therefore, distribute the solutions around. There are two reasons for that: 1) If you write a query and are not particularly knowledgeable of the system, you can write a query that takes a long time before it produces an answer. We currently have a timeout of two minutes on queries on the system and you could easily never get an answer out if you used a query not constructed with some knowledge of the data structures. The data structures do change, and that is particularly likely with every upgrade of the system on a two- to three-year cycle. So it is not something that could be written once and never gone back to. 2) Without significant knowledge of the data structures, one could fool oneself into thinking that you have an answer that is actually not the right answer, not all the information you are looking for, etc. So, there is a training burden to this that needs to be recognized.

Third, this is directed to OIT and this is a system that involves OIT and number of functional offices. OIT does not own this data. The functional offices own this data, so it has to involve a discussion—for most of the data that we are talking about here—with the Registrar's Office or the Graduate School. As it says in here, asking OIT to implement this requires a broader look at this question.

He also had two comments. He does agree with the observation that access to the data is one of the important goals of the system. That was one of the things that we said from the beginning straight out and he thinks that we all recognize that it is not where it needs to be. There are two things going on of relevance: First, OIT and the Undergraduate Registrar's Office is putting together a canned query which individuals could run which will then produce in spreadsheet form or presumably other formats, a set of standard fields which could then be downloaded into a spreadsheet. This would probably be most useful in departments. It could be a list of your majors, a list of your students, with a number of data fields from the system, which you would now have in a local copy in your Excel spreadsheet which you could then sort and look for other information as you please, rather than having to write a particular query if you wanted to know all the juniors who had GPAs above 3.0, for example. They think that is going to be out for prototyping probably at the end of May for a few departments to take a look at.

Secondly, as he said, the whole data access has been one of the goals of this all along. Now that we are past the implementation and the upgrade, the whole data reporting strategy really is their number one next development. A few weeks ago, they sent out an email to the academic deans/directors/department heads list asking for nominations, assignments, etc. to a group to really define what we wanted to accomplish with the reporting strategy. The reporting strategy is broader than what he thinks this motion is getting after—getting information into the department—but it would include that out there. There are two steps going forward: 1) this prototype of a canned query, which he thinks contains a lot of the information which he thinks the academic departments would want, and 2) this broader reporting strategy. While he does not object to the concept of this recommendation as written, he thinks that there are some things in progress that might make sense to see how those go before we totally open the field up to this.

Professor Brewer replied that the only extension that he would make is that in looking at the problems that people were having, being able to get access to something that would allow them to get reports, is a capability that simply is

unavailable at the moment. They recognize that support would be required, but if the capability were there, departments could choose themselves to find support in order to get queries written that would solve the problem which is a capability which, simply, to the best of his knowledge, does not exist at the moment at all.

2. Special Report of the University Computer and Electronic Communications Committee concerning Avoiding Dangerous Software, as described in Sen. Doc. No. 05-032 with Motion No. 34-05.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate recommend that the campus administration avoid the use of dangerous software and
34-05 substitute safer alternatives whenever possible, as described in Sen. Doc. No. 05-032.

This motion was seconded and adopted.

DISCUSSION OF THE MOTION

Professor Brewer explained that the origin of this motion stemmed from the fall, when documentation was provided to incoming freshman that directed that they were required to use Internet Explorer in order to interact with the student information system. In discussion in the Committee, the observation was made that many networking groups, including CERT, the Computer Emergency Response Team at Carnegie Mellon, and SANS, which is another one of the big computer security groups, had recommended that organizations move away from using Internet Explorer. Also, there was the observation that Outlook Express had been recommended by the University for a long time after a number of security problems had been identified with it. They tried to draft what they thought were reasonable guidelines for minimizing recommending that students are required to use dangerous software when it is known to be problematic, using every opportunity to educate people about the risks entailed in using such software, and to provide alternatives wherever possible.

CIO John Dubach responded that he had a number of comments on this motion. It is hard to oppose this when it is somewhat like mom, apple pie, and the American flag; after all, who would want to actually use dangerous software? On the other hand, it is hard to know exactly what this means in an operational sense. What is dangerous software? He went to the OIT web site when he received the motion and he cruised around to see what is in the security sites and virus sites and he discovered that the most recent major security release has to do with Firefox, which is one of the things listed in here as the safer software. One of his staff did some research and the vulnerabilities and exposures dictionary shows that there are twenty-one entries for Internet Explorer, fifty-four for Outlook Express, and twenty-one, twenty-five, and fifty-four for Thunderbird, Opera, and Firefox, some of these so-called safer ones. This is a moving target. He agrees that we should try to deal with the safer opportunities when we can, but this is definitely a moving target and it is not clear what, at any given moment, is the safest situation. Take this logic further and one would conclude that they should be recommending that nobody come with a PC because that operating system has been known to be vulnerable all along and that one should actually be moving to Macintoshes. He actually has some staff people in OIT who use Macintoshes, because they do not have the vulnerabilities. On the other hand, in the last month, two organizations, Gartner and Symantec, have both come out identifying Mac OS X as the new emerging targets of joy for hackers and virus authors. His point is, this is a moving target and it is hard to say on any given day what might be considered the dangerous software and what might not.

He did have a slight objection to the wording of the motion, in that it says "That the Faculty Senate recommend that the campus administration avoid the use..." It is not his place to make a friendly amendment here, but he would like to have it understood that we are really talking about all Campus computer users, that there are approximately 20,000 computers on the Campus net at the moment. Only a few hundred of those are owned and operated by OIT and only a few thousand of those are owned and operated by the administration. Most are in the hands of students and a significant number are in the hands of faculty and staff. The motion is really talking about all the computers on campus.

In thinking about and reviewing all of the OIT information that is out there, he is taking the suggestion of including in the documentation some of the pros and cons or identifying the vulnerabilities of the various software. For instance, for browsers, they give a user the opportunity of downloading three different browsers from our site with no pros and cons on the assumption that you already got there, you already knew which one you wanted, so you are just there to get it. There is some education opportunity in all of that.

He does think that there are a number of people on this campus who are perhaps, over the years, have become educated in the needs for computer security. The OIT web site pages on security, virus protection, etc. are now getting an excess of a million hits a year. There are people looking for the updates, there are people looking for the upgrades, etc. This is a much broader issue than dangerous software. There are many issues associated with computer security.

Just two or three weeks ago, Joyce Hatch and he put an end to the sale of disk drives from the recycling facility. A lot of computers on the campus end up in the recycling facility and once, every week or two weeks, they have an open sale where anyone in the community can walk through and buy used computers for a few dollars. Despite all of the recommendations for how to clean these drives, disk drives still have accessible, in principle, confidential information of the University. He used that as an example of one other area where computer security is important. Having had the idea while walking over to the meeting and not having vetted it with anybody, he suggested that maybe the Faculty Senate should be putting together one of its ad hoc committees on the whole issue of computer security. Maybe that should be something that the University Computer and Electronic Communications Committee could take on, but do it as a special topic approach because there are a vast array of things that we need to be aware of on the Campus. He thinks that we have made some progress. He thinks that there is some education that needs to be done. He cannot oppose this on the grounds of who could be opposed to avoiding dangerous software, but he does not think that it really addresses all issues we need to address.

3. Special Report of the Rules Committee concerning Bylaw Changes, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 05-033 with Motion No. 35-05.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Bylaw Changes, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 05-033.
35-05

(Inasmuch as this is a change to the Senate Bylaws, this is the first of three readings of this motion. It will be read again at the 641st Senate meeting and voted on at the 642nd meeting. The motion may be debated and amended at all three meetings.)

DISCUSSION OF THE MOTION

Senator Richard Bogartz, Chair of the Rules Committee, explained that the Rules Committee is charged with updating the Bylaws every year and this motion is from that review. To clarify what the changes are in the document, the additions are shaded and the deletions are crossed out. Basically, the changes let the Dean of the Commonwealth College send a designee to the Academic Matters Council. It names the Commonwealth College Curriculum Committee. It recognizes that the Undergraduate Registrar goes to all the meetings of the General Education Council, so she/he may as well be a member. It names the Vice Provost for Outreach. And it increases membership of the International Studies Council from eight to thirteen.

Secretary May pointed out that, at the moment, these are all technical changes, but he encourages chairs of councils and committees particularly, and perhaps administrators, to think about the charges to councils and committees, which can be broadened. As John Dubach said, we could create an ad hoc committee on computer security. On the other hand, we could charge the University Computer and Electronic Communication Committee to take that up. The Student Affairs and University Life Council has recently been meeting and that charge could be reviewed if there are areas that are not being particularly covered or emphasized in it right now.

Senator Robert Sinclair suggested a change for the Bylaws. He recommended that the Rules Committee consider the possibility of expanding the responsibilities of the Secretary to include: “Coordinate a periodic evaluation of the Faculty Senate to determine if the Bylaws are being implemented and if the Faculty Senate is effective in providing leadership that ensures faculty decision making in academic matters, in schools and colleges, departments, and the University.”

Senator Roland Chilton had a simpler goal for the Rules Committee and recognized that they may be working on it. He is somewhat worried about the size of the Senate, the diminishing size of the Senate, and the diminishing participation. He wondered if this is something that they could take up and see if there is something that they can do about that.

E. OLD BUSINESS

NEW COURSE

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

**MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the course ANTHRO 304, as recommended by the Academic Matters
36-05 Council.**

This motion was seconded and adopted.

**The 640th Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate stood adjourned at 4:34 p.m. on April 7, 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**