

UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AT AMHERST  
OFFICE OF THE FACULTY SENATE

Presiding Officer Robert Wilson called the 642<sup>nd</sup> regular meeting of the Faculty Senate to order on May 16, 2005 at 3:30 p.m. in the Campus Center Auditorium.

A. ADDRESS BY SENATOR STANLEY ROSENBERG  
(see attached)

QUESTIONS

*Secretary of the Faculty Senate Ernest May* noted that many of the faculty had gone through these budget processes a number of times before. He had just a couple of questions. He knows that Senator Rosenberg has done a great job of putting together ways of presenting the needs of higher education this time, but this has happened at least a couple of other times. It seems, though, that the reception in Boston is building to a better conclusion. He asked Senator Rosenberg to say something about what is better in the political landscape this time and also something about what legislators are expecting in return for these investments, should they make investments anything like the numbers that the Senator has mentioned.

*Senator Stanley Rosenberg* responded that there are a couple of dynamics that are going on now. The first dynamic is that it is finally sinking in that two-thirds of the Massachusetts high school graduates who go onto college do so in the public system. And the business community is finally speaking up and saying, “We need more people coming out of the public higher education system, and we need them to be very, very well prepared.” The situation, as they are beginning to see it and understand it, is that the quality is being compromised by the inadequate investment. So there is a very interesting change in dynamic in that way.

The second thing that is different is that there are some new voices. Historically, it has been the Senator and the Representative from Amherst who have had to carry public higher education, and now, finally, some other people are speaking up. So someone like Panagiotakos, for example, who has two daughters, who has a law practice on the side, stands up at a caucus a year ago and says, “I am just worried to death about how I am going to educate my two daughters. Boston College went up to \$41,000 per year tuition. Where are my kids going to go to school?” Now, he can afford it, if he chooses and they choose to do it. That said, he is hoping that there is quality public higher education so he does not have to invest \$41,000 a year. Then Panagiotakos, who represents one of the poorest communities in the state, Lowell, and next to him is Lawrence, which is even worse off, sees what is going on around him, and he says, “If my kids and I are struggling with how I am going to pay for and give my kids a college education, what about all of those other people?” It is finally sinking in.

The third area is—and he is glad that Secretary May asked the question, because it reminded him of the last thing he wanted to share—that for years, Senator Rosenberg has been talking about organizing the public higher education system in a way that it has never been organized before. Not that he specifically is doing the organizing, but that it needs to be done. The way that he has been putting it that finally got people’s attention is that, on any given day in Massachusetts, there are more than a million people who have a vested interest in the health and welfare of the public higher education system: the faculty, the students, the employees, the parents, the employers, the alumni, but nobody has ever gotten them together and we have never been able to get people to buy into a single plan. When he did the Fair Share plan a decade ago, basically, he got a lot of lip service. Everybody said the right things, but then, behind the scenes, they were all undoing it. They were “yes-ing” him because he was the Chair of Ways and Means, so they knew they had to be really nice. He was delivering the record-breaking increases every year, and they were going behind the scenes trying to make sure that the stuff that they did not like would not get into law.

But this time, it is different. They actually got all of the Chancellors and all of the Presidents of all of the campuses in the room buying into the plan. He knows that that is not going to be easy to hold together. You cannot build a building without the bricks, but you also cannot build it without the mortar, and he intends to create the mortar. The Chancellors and Presidents are the bricks, and all of the parents out there are the bricks and all of those students and the labor unions and on and on and on and on are the bricks, but we need the mortar. The mortar is to create this organization. We got every President to put \$10,000 on the table to help support a campaign to help launch our effort on the Senate plan. They put \$250,000 on the table. There were radio ads for the first time for public higher education. You saw the UMass campaign on TV, that was going to happen anyway, but they changed the message a little bit so that it dovetailed with our message. That is only the beginning and they will be coming around now, over the next few months, to all of the unions, to the alumni associations, to the student government associations, and to the trustees association and they are going to try and build on what they just did.

He noted in the newspaper this morning that the Massachusetts Teachers Association spent \$1.3 million on a media campaign to say why we needed to spend more on local aid for K-12. \$1.3 million. If they can spend \$1.3 million to promote K-12—and they have done it many a year, this is not the first year that they have done that—you fill in the blank on what they should

spend on the next five years to build up pressure on the legislature and the governor so that they have no choice but to say yes. People cannot divide and conquer and go around each other and so on. That is the other piece of what is going on here. He is hoping that, when we get to this time next year, the campaign will not have just been the Presidents, because it was only the Presidents and the Chancellors this time, but this time next year, we want the campaign to have involved hundred of thousands of people, if not the whole million people—conservatively, the million people—connected to UMass out there. He is going to need our help to do this. He noticed that some of the labor leaders for the campus are in this room. They are going to be asking for some very serious commitment for the next five to ten years to build the Massachusetts Public Higher Education Council which will become the organizing force to make sure that they never can say no to public higher education again.

Senator Joseph Donohue had in mind the statistic that per capita spending on higher education in Massachusetts is somewhere down near the bottom of the charts, 47<sup>th</sup>, right down there with Mississippi supposedly. He had a two-part question. First, he wondered if Senator Rosenberg had an opinion about the facts attendant on that low status. Second, how does the Senator think the initiatives that he has been describing, which sound very welcome, might move us up in the charts?

Senator Rosenberg responded that his opinion about the facts is that they are accurate and bad, and we need to change it. The question of how far does the \$400 million take us? It is based on formulas. If the formulas are well crafted, then the formulas fully funded, means that the campuses are fully funded. The formula is supposed to measure mission, program mix, enrollment, and age and condition of physical facilities. In the case of this campus, mission includes things like research and library, etc. If we fully fund the formula, then you theoretically should have the money you need to operate this campus at the level that it should be operated as a Research I, public, land grant university. Will it move us from 47<sup>th</sup> to 45<sup>th</sup>? We do not know the answer to that. What is relevant now is that being 47<sup>th</sup> is part of what is capturing people's attention. Why are we consistently in the low forties? It does not matter if you do it on a per capita or per \$1,000 of income. We talk per capita and per \$1,000 of personal income and, using those two measures, we are either 49<sup>th</sup> or 47<sup>th</sup> in the country. We will move up if we do the \$400 million. Remember, the \$400 million, if done over a seven-year period or so, would be about \$640 million with inflation, and then add collective bargaining to that, and it is about three-quarters of a billion dollars.

Professor Jenny Spence, Massachusetts Society of Professors Vice President asked Senator Rosenberg to talk about the letter which Senator O'Leary was circulating with twenty signatures, including Senator Rosenberg's.

Senator Rosenberg responded that it was a tactic. It calls for \$57 million rather than \$40 million because they were trying to sell the seven-year plan. They did not think that they would get that far and they did not, but they also were not sure that they would even get to the \$40 million, which is what their goal was. Their goal was to double whatever the House did. It worked. The \$57 million was sort of the pressure that was needed. The fact is that the majority of senators, by far, have a vested interest in the public higher education system: they are either a graduate, they have a kid there, they have a niece or nephew there, they have a relative who works there. Just on that basis, you have the majority of the Senate, but then you go the next step and say "well, what about the contiguous districts?" Now you have a supermajority. Then, if you look at the fact that every senator has between 200 and 500 families with somebody in public higher education, now you have the whole Senate.

Senator David Ostendorf noted that Senator Rosenberg speaks for the whole UMass system and for the whole higher education system. We speak for things that we can control on this campus. If we do well in fundraising or research generation, are we simply exchanging money that we are earning and bringing in for state support?

Senator Rosenberg responded, no, absolutely not. The way it works is that, in the Ways and Means Committee, after they subtract the amount that they are obligated to cover from the total, they have a little bit left, and then they figure out what to do with that amount. Higher education has typically received between 4% and 7% of those funds. Therefore, you are almost never going to get more than 7% and, except in the fiscal bad times, you are rarely going to get less than 4%. Those who read the *Chronicle of Higher Education* know that things have changed very dramatically, even in the best of the public higher education states. Student charges are going up; students are paying a larger share everywhere. Legislatures, even in the best of the states, are cutting back in the amount that they are giving to public higher education and they are demanding more research and more fundraising on the part of the campuses, because everyone has the same problems: healthcare, pensions, and infrastructure. We are all fighting the same three problems.

Senator Rutherford Platt asked if the law school purchase is off the table.

Senator Rosenberg responded no, it will come back.

Senator Rosenberg responded (to an inaudible question) absolutely, the marching band makes a difference, when the choir comes down and sings at the Annual Awards Ceremony, it makes a difference. Anytime they see excellence coming out of this campus, it makes a difference and we need to find more and more ways of communicating about more and more of the excellence on the campus. In the State House News Service (which is now owned by a UMass Amherst graduate, Craig Sandler) frequently there are announcements of events—often done in Boston, but now always, sometime on their own campuses—sponsored by the Dartmouth and the Lowell campuses. Everybody in the State House reads the News Service. He

never sees anything about stuff that UMass Amherst is doing; we need to find a way to correct that. But, every way and any time we can show them the excellence that is happening here, it matters.

**B. ELECTIONS**

**1. PRESIDING OFFICER OF THE FACULTY SENATE**

**NOMINEE:** Robert Wilson, Hospitality and Tourism Management

*There were no further nominations from the floor.*

**MOVED:** To close nominations for the Presiding Officer of the Faculty Senate.

This motion was seconded and adopted.

Senator Robert Wilson was reelected as Presiding Officer by acclamation.

**2. FACULTY DELEGATE TO THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES**

**NOMINEE:** W. Brian O'Connor, Biology

*There were no further nominations from the floor.*

**MOVED:** To close nominations for the Faculty Delegate to the Board of Trustees.

This motion was seconded and adopted.

Faculty Delegate to the Board of Trustees W. Brian O'Connor was reelected by acclamation.

**C. ANNUAL REPORT**

2004-2005 Annual Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Online Learning, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 05-040.

This report was received.

**DISCUSSION OF THE REPORT**

*Secretary May* invited the Co-Chairs to make a statement. The Committee has been very active in a very important area of the campus: 16% -18% of our courses have some online aspect to them now. It is a growing area. The report is pretty comprehensive, and he requested a brief summary of the past year and plans for coming years.

*Senator Sara McComb*, Co-Chair of the Ad Hoc Committee on Online Learning, explained that they took the charge that the Faculty Senate gave them and split up into four subcommittees which have been working very hard. They also had committee-of-the-whole meetings where they invited Sharon Fross to talk about her experiences with Penn State's World Campus; David Gray from UMass Online and several of his staff; Andy Churchill, Assistant Director of the Center for Education Policy, who had a report on insuring quality in online education; and Steven Tello, from the Lowell Campus, all came to speak to the Committee. The subcommittees were charged to go out and do an environmental scan and figure out how we were fairing in the different areas. Those areas are Academic Standards and Security, Comparative Outcomes, Infrastructure and Library, and Instructional Design. The Committee is forwarding three recommendations to the Faculty Senate. The first one is that we need a consistent set of terms that can describe online, face-to-face, blended courses and what do they mean. "Blended" in particular could be a wide spectrum: from professors having a web page to students taking exams online on their own time. The second one is a recommendation regarding better ways of reporting, so we have a good feel for what is out there. The third recommendation is for a central source for faculty seeking information and support. Lastly, she thanked all the members of the Committee for their hard work.

*Senator Mokhtar Atallah* asked if the Committee had a chance to discuss programs and certificates that have no equal on campus, that are generated specifically for online marketing? There are several certificate programs that are certificates of completion for a certain accumulation of courses and these have not been approved through any of the campus processes, except the departments.

*Senator McComb* responded that the Academic Standards subcommittee has been looking at those types of programs, but so far they have only had time for an environmental scan. However, those are the types of things that they have on the list as they move forward. This is a three-year charge, so they are still at the beginning stages, but that is important, and they will make sure that that is on their agenda for next year.

**D. NEW COURSES**

There are no reports associated with the following motions:

<u>COURSE</u>	<u>TITLE</u>	<u>CREDITS</u>
JUDAIC 363	“Negotiating Religion and State: Jewish Secularism and the Emergence of European Modernity”	3
JUDAIC 373	“Jewish Travelers and Travel Liars: Exploration and Imagination, Ancient to Modern Times”	3
JUDAIC 376	“Post-Holocaust Thought”	3
JUDAIC 383	“Women, Gender, and Judaism”	3
PLSOILIN 285	“Sustainable Living”	3

**MOVED: 45-05** That the Faculty Senate approve the courses JUDAIC 363, 373, 376 and 383 and PLSOILIN 285, as recommended by the Academic Matters Council.

This motion was seconded and adopted.

<u>COURSE</u>	<u>TITLE</u>	<u>CREDITS</u>
ENVIRSCI 555	“Environmental Toxicology in Context”	3

**MOVED: 46-05** That the Faculty Senate approve the course ENVIRSCI 555, as recommended by the Academic Matters and Graduate Councils.

This motion was seconded and adopted.

**E. NEW BUSINESS**

1. Special Report of the Academic Matters Council and the General Education Council concerning The Application of General Education Requirements to Returning Students, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 05-041 with Motion No. 47-05.

**MOVED: 47-05** That the Faculty Senate confirm to the Registrar that students who were admitted when CORE requirements were in effect and who now return to the University to complete their bachelor’s degrees will be required to fulfill the same General Education requirements currently applied to all students entering the University, effective in the Fall 2005, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 05-041.

This motion was seconded and adopted.

**DISCUSSION OF THE MOTION**

*Senator O’Connor* confirmed that this is only General Education; he is concerned about a statute of limitations. If we are only dealing with the old CORE, the returning student would have nothing counting toward General Education and would have to do all of the those requirements.

*Senator Atallah* responded that the statute of limitations has to vary by the department and the subject. For example, Calculus or Math 101 is not going to change so, if a student took it, then the department might want to waive it. For other fields, five years is usually the time limit even for accreditation, so the student would have to take the course again. It depends on the course and on the department.

2. Special Report of the Program and Budget Council and the Research Council concerning The Creation of the MassNanoTech Institute, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 05-042 with Motion No. 48-05.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Creation of the MassNanoTech Institute, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 05-042.  
48-05

This motion was seconded and adopted.

3. Special Report of the Academic Priorities Council and the Graduate Council concerning a Clinical Nursing Leadership (CNL) Concentration within the existing School of Nursing Master of Science Degree Program, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 05-043 with Motion No. 49-05.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Clinical Nursing Leadership (CNL) Concentration within the existing School of Nursing Master of Science Degree Program, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 05-043.  
49-05

This motion was seconded and adopted.

4. Special Report of the International Studies Council concerning The Auroville, India Program in Sustainable Practice sponsored by Living Routes, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 05-044 with Motion No. 50-05.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve, for the period from September, 2005, through August, 2007, The Auroville, India Program in Sustainable Practice sponsored by Living Routes, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 05-044.  
50-05

This motion was seconded and adopted.

#### DISCUSSION OF THE MOTION

Professor Donal Carbaugh, Co-Chair of the International Studies Council, noted that the International Studies Council (ISC) is invested in the faculty and students of this University being involved all over the world as much as is possible, and in our academic programs being involved in a variety of international scenes. The ISC has been discussing a variety of programs that have been proposed to it this year as designed and executed by so-called third-party providers, which design the educational programs. The programs they have been working on are to design a procedure whereby the campus, in some way, examines those programs, endorses them, approves them through some departmental procedure, then they go on the books with these particular programs or courses that students can see and then take. These are unique programs for our students in that they are provided elsewhere by staff who are associated with the campus, but are not necessarily faculty members at this campus.

Senator W. C. Conner had a concern regarding the separation of church and state and noted that part of the Auroville, India Program included spending a night at an ashram and a trip to Arunchala Mountain, which is believed to be the body of Shiva. Is this religious education which we are sending somebody out on? Are we approving this?

Professor Carbaugh directed Senator Conner's question to Professor Gerber and Daniel Greenberg from the Living Routes Program. He made sure that they had heard Senator Conner's question, asking if the Auroville program was in some way an endorsement of religion or a particular slant on religious practice.

Daniel Greenberg, the Director of Living Routes, explained that the programs are not religious, but they look at various traditions, so an ashram or looking at Hinduism would be part of the program, but it is not indoctrination or dogmatic in any way.

5. Special Report of the International Studies Council concerning The Findhorn, Scotland Program in Sustainable Practice sponsored by Living Routes, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 05-045 with Motion No. 51-05.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve, for the period from September, 2005, through August, 2007, The Findhorn, Scotland Program in Sustainable Practice sponsored by Living Routes, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 05-045.  
51-05

This motion was seconded and adopted.

#### DISCUSSION OF THE MOTION

Senator Atallah asked why the programs were approved for only a limited time.

Professor Carbaugh explained that, since the two programs being considered here are relatively new, they have established and approved them for a limited period of time so that it can be assessed during this time and to see whether it warrants further unlimited time.

Senator Ostendorf noted that looking at the faculty listed for the program, he sees only Masters, no Ph.D.s, and asked Professor Carbaugh to comment on that.

Professor Carbaugh explained that for the programs being proposed, they are being proposed through a departmental approval procedure. This is a relatively new procedure. Each department has looked at these syllabi, approved the subject matter, has access to the CVs of the people, and has approved that these people are adequate for the course that has been presented. He appreciated Senator Ostendorf's question and noted that it is the kind of question that the Council has been entertaining throughout this year. The general issue that it raises is what kind of approval procedure should the University put in place in order to assess whether or not a course is staffed adequately that is not being held on campus, but is being held elsewhere.

Secretary May further explained that, from the Senate's point of view and that of academic quality control, once the Senate approves courses under the regular system, we then delegate to departments the quality control for the ongoing conduct of that course. It may be assigned to a TA; it may be assigned to someone who has not yet achieved a graduate degree at all. That is a departmental decision, however. With these courses, the quality will be handled the same way. The structure of the thing will be approved by the Senate for a limited period of time, subject to review when that period is up, and renewal if that seems appropriate. The quality control for each individual course is up to a department, so, in addition to this approval, each course within these programs will have been approved by the department chair, or the personnel committee and the department chair, whatever the mechanism is in each department, for each course. Secretary May saw that as being roughly analogous in terms of quality control to what happens within the University's general curriculum.

The question of quality control is a good one, and it is a serious issue in this area, especially with third-party providers in the picture. It is also true in UMass Online, which is why Senator Atallah's earlier question is very relevant, especially in terms of an agreement which we just passed about the exchange among the Five-College System, because we are now going to count, as UMass Amherst residency credits, courses from other UMass campuses. Basically, what is happening is that degrees on this campus are turning into something of a collage. If you consider that, if a student does well, we also accept the entire transcript from community colleges towards the UMass Amherst degree, and they get automatic admission here if they do well.

After all is said and done, the majors and the requirements of the majors are the most significant quality control mechanism. It is the major which actually defines a UMass degree because most majors require that a significant percentage of the course content will be conducted face-to-face on the campus. That is not to say that there is something wrong with individual majors allowing online courses or programs such as this to count for their majors, but we assume that the personnel committee and department chair have taken an active role in assessing the quality of what they are allowing to count towards the major. For better or for worse, this is a national trend.

Students are now migrating from campus to campus much more than they used to, and, when they get their degrees, frequently, it is not on the same campus where they started. As long as the quality is fine—with online courses or third-party providers—he does not see that there is anything necessarily wrong with it. It is a very significant and rather new duty of the Senate and of academic departments to monitor the quality control of this evolving situation.

The International Studies Council is taking the responsibility for monitoring, particularly, these (third-party) providers. That is why they have chosen to approve them for a period of time, rather than indefinitely. With our own programs and courses, we approve them indefinitely.

Professor Spencer said that what it sounds like Secretary May is suggesting is that, what is going to happen with international programs, is that departments are going to be taking a much more active role than in the past and actually vetting and assessing the international program that the University has already approved, and that does not make sense to her. Her question is to the International Programs Office. What was the vetting process, what is it for these outside vendors who come into the University? Do they give a presentation, we say yes, and then we assess it over two years? She asked them to speak to the vetting process.

Secretary May said that he would speak to the courses. (There are two levels.) Always, when a student is going to get course credit on their transcript for something with an international experience off campus, the department already must approve that.

Professor Carbaugh responded that Professor Spencer's question is a good one and that they have wrestled with it this year on the Council. In a nutshell, the proposals that come to the International Studies Council are then passed to the COPE Committee, which is a subcommittee of their Council, which reviews the proposal, the budget and the academic credibility of the program. They vet that proposal and bring it back—if it is approved—to the Council. Then the Council discusses it. The providers have been involved in both stages with COPE and with the Council. Then the Council votes whether, finally, to approve or not. The process involves a link with the department and the approval of some department through the procedure that Secretary May just mentioned.

Senator Marta Calas had a question that had to do with money. Is there any kind of relationship that is budgetary or otherwise between the service provider and the University? Is there a percentage that the University receives from what the provider gets or does the student just pay regular tuition to be able to participate in this program?

Professor Carbaugh said that the specifics of the agreement both Director of International Programs, Frank Hugus, and Daniel Greenberg know. The cost of the programs are roughly aligned with the cost of similar programs on other campuses, so they have checked into that. The amount that goes to the different parties, he did not know.

Director of the International Programs Office, Frank Hugus, explained that, in fact, these are not offered in isolation. There is a process by which transcribing is done by the Registrar and International Programs and, for that, there is a fee. He is not sure exactly what that fee is. It varies from program to program, whether it is a short-term or long-term program. He would have to defer to the budget officer in International Programs to get the exact answer.

Presiding Officer Wilson asked a clarification of the question. Was Senator Calas basically asking if the department or any other on-campus entity receiving funds or a percentage of the funds that are paid by the student?

Senator Calas responded yes, she was asking if the University gets any kind of financial benefit from these agreements. Is this a money-making operation?

Director Hugus responded that it was not much of a money-making operation for IPO, in particular, or the University.

Secretary May added that it was his impression that the tuition is paid mostly to Living Routes, but there is a small—maybe too small—fee which goes to the services which IPO provides, which is basically doing the transcribing, but it is very small in order to keep the cost to the students as reasonable as possible.

Senator Conner asked with which department this particular program was affiliated.

Daniel Greenberg responded that it was connected with the Department of Landscape Architecture and Regional Planning.

6. Special Report of the Health Council concerning Campus Violence, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 05-046 with Motion No. 52-05.

MOVED: 52-05 Whereas sexual assault, rape and relationship violence are critical problems affecting this campus, and because these problems have significant acute and long-term health impacts on individuals, families, and communities, be it resolved that the Faculty Senate will annually distribute the UMASS Amherst Sexual Assault & Relationship Violence yearly data report and corresponding resource guide on responding to reports of sexual violence to all academic departments, faculty, and teaching assistants, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 05-046.

This motion was seconded and adopted.

#### DISCUSSION OF THE MOTION

Senator Richard Bogartz stated, after reading the document, that it was not clear to him what the anticipated consequence of dispersing this data. What do they envision as happening after this information is distributed?

Senator Robert Sinclair, Chair of the Health Council, responded that his understanding is that faculty are in a key position for the identification of possible violence of this nature that has taken place and also for being able to make referrals in the proper form, thus they should be well aware of the nature of what is happening. The consequence would be to increase the consciousness and awareness of the faculty towards these issues. He also thanked the Everywoman's Center and the Community Advisory Team who have been helping to prepare this motion and provide the rationale for it.

7. Special Report of the Research Council concerning Procedures for Dealing with Charges of Misconduct in Research and Scholarly Activities at the University of Massachusetts Amherst, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 90-038A with Motion No. 53-05.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate adopt the amended Procedures for Dealing with Charges of Misconduct in Research and Scholarly Activities at the University of Massachusetts Amherst, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 90-038A.  
53-05

This motion was withdrawn by Senator David Ostendorf, Chair of the Research Council.

8. Final Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Coordinating Functions and Responsibilities of the International Programs Office, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 05-047 with Motion No. 54-05.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate recommend that all study-abroad programs on the Amherst campus be required to work through the International Programs Office and that the attached fee schedule (see Attachment #3) be adopted by the International Programs Office to cover the cost of the listed services, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 05-047.  
54-05

This motion was seconded and adopted.

#### DISCUSSION OF THE MOTION

Professor Philip Nasca, Chair of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Coordinating Functions and Responsibilities of the International Programs Office, explained that the Committee met a number of times over the last year. The collected information was done through a survey of all on-campus programs so that they could see who was doing what, and how many of these were currently being run through the International Programs Office. They also collected information from a number of peer institutions, such as the University of Indiana, Ohio State, SUNY Albany, etc. to see how they were handling these IPO issues and programs for study abroad. After all of the discussion and all was said and done, the main motivation behind this motion was a concern for the current international situation and the health and safety of our students, and really the need was for a central repository of information that would insure that the administration, as best they could, could insure the health and safety of students who were involved in international programs. The Committee voted unanimously to support the motion.

Professor Spencer asked approximately how many international programs are there on campus that do not go through the International Programs Office?

Professor Nasca responded that the sense of the Committee was that there were very few at this point. In a sense, making this a rule probably is going to capture most of what is already going on, but occasionally though, there have been programs that have been what he would call rogue programs. They found one where a graduate student was organizing one of these things and collecting money. He thinks that this would help to preclude that sort of thing from happening, so they think it is important to have this motion in place. They also want to tighten up on the kinds of and amount of information that is being collected as a student becomes involved in an international program and goes overseas. By having this, everybody understands where they need to go to and what they need to do, and it will help to eliminate some of these problems.

Senator Calas said that first, she thinks this is a great thing. It is fantastic that they have come to this conclusion. Precisely, her concern is up to what point do they feel that, in fact, they are going to make a difference in terms of the quality of the programs, by making sure that they go through International Programs as the clearing house? In many ways, the questions regarding the two programs discussed earlier are in many ways related to the question of how international programs are being evaluated. For example, programs used to be a full semester or a full year, and now there are programs as short as five weeks.

Professor Nasca agreed that there is a wide variation in what is happening and he thinks the fact that because the faculty and the department heads would be working with a central office, where people have a clear understanding of what the quality should be in terms of a study-abroad program, will really help. If, in fact, we also collect a lot of information on who are the sponsors, where are the students staying, what are their travel plans, this information will also enhance the health and safety of the students as well. This is a good start and we may want to revisit this sometime in the future, but this is a good start to assure the things that Senator Calas mentioned.

Director Hugus elaborated specifically on Senator Calas' question, which is a very good one, because the traditional study abroad experience was a year or semester abroad. Lately, however,—and this is a nationwide trend—the tendency has been toward short-term programs, which can be anything from a summer six- to ten-week program in

one place, to a five - to ten-day program during intercession, or January programs as well. These, by and large, are faculty led. Because they are faculty led, in some cases by experienced faculty who have done this before, in other cases, by faculty who are just starting, and he thinks that the faculty who have gone through IPO would agree, that in many ways the program is enhanced by the work of their office. Of course, as Professor Nasca has mentioned, in post-9/11 days, we need to be very, very conscious of safety and security.

Senator Conner asked a question about NATO ASIs. (*Advanced Study Institutes - scientific meetings supported by NATO.*)

Director Hugus responded that this motion is for undergraduate students and only those programs that are run by UMass faculty members.

Senator Conner responded that he runs two NATO ASIs.

Director Hugus asked if they were for undergraduate students.

Senator Conner responded that they brought some graduate students over there.

Director Hugus responded that he and Senator Conner probably needed to talk. But in any case, this motion is basically to cover programs that are run by UMass faculty and involving undergraduates.

Senator Conner brought up concerns regarding the 5% charged to faculty starting new programs and if the Living Routes programs were also being charged that amount.

Director Hugus responded that it is a very complex situation, as he is sure that Senator Conner can understand, and he would be happy to talk to him about this at some point, but basically what they are concerned about in this particular instance is the security and safety of the students as well as the viability of the program.

Secretary May pointed out that the 5% is for first-time programs and repeat programs if they use all of the IPO services. For repeating programs which do not use all of the IPO services, it is just \$100 for the entire program. Living Routes is an established organization which has sent students abroad for many years.

Director Hugus added that both programs, the ones in Auroville and Findhorn, are established programs that have been run for about five years. We are just essentially buying into those programs.

Senator Howard Peele asked if they had found a need to survey students' views on the changes.

Director Hugus asked for clarification on what changes, specifically,

Senator Peele explained that he was referring to the changes that are embodied in the motion.

Director Hugus responded that no, they have not surveyed students, but they have not had any complaints from students either—or parents.

Professor Nasca said that really the design here is to make sure that the campus administration has clear access to information about ongoing programs, the academic quality of those programs, and the health and safety of students. The first charge that will come to this is fairly minimal and the IPO is not going to get rich on this particular program. He thinks that the charges have also been kept low so that once a new faculty runs through the program, knows how to do this and maintain academic quality, health and safety, that the next time around, the charges are fairly minimal. Overall, what this would add regarding charges for the students is, in fact, not very large at all. We did not have any students as members of the Committee but, again, he does not think that this will have a major impact on their ability to study abroad. We are not adding a substantial cost to the students as a result of the motion.

9. Special Report of the Rules Committee concerning The Establishment of an Ad Hoc Committee on Campus Communications, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 05-048 with Motion No. 55-05.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve The Establishment of an Ad Hoc Committee on Campus Communications,  
55-05 as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 05-048.

This motion was seconded and adopted.

## DISCUSSION OF THE MOTION

Senator Bogartz noted that the *Campus Chronicle* just does not go away. Even though it is gone, its absence keeps coming up, especially in Rules Committee meetings. The Rules Committee decided that it might make sense to look into what might be done to revive the *Campus Chronicle*. Assuming that we cannot get any money out of the administration to help support a renewed *Campus Chronicle*, the Rules Committee needs to look into what other ways to fund it, advertise it, and so on. Then the question got generalized to considering what we can do about the *Campus Chronicle* and what we can do with communications in general.

Senator Platt agreed completely with the purpose of the motion, but he is a bit reluctant to support it because he thinks it creates yet another committee to hopefully come up with the obvious proposal to bring back the *Campus Chronicle*. He personally has felt less connected to the University community and that there has been an overall lack of information regarding what is going on on campus since the *Campus Chronicle* ended. He has heard the same complete story from many other people.

Senator Barbara Stewart from the Library, spoke from an archival point of view and a historian's point of view on the importance of having a paper copy of campus news. Currently, when people come to campus to do research, they have that paper copy from years past. With campus news now only being online, that leaves no historical record for future research. Her second point is that *In the Loop*, although it is excellently written, although it has many interesting features in it, does not allow for a more comprehensive view of what is going on on campus. It is kind of like the party platform that is presented there—everything is positive. Whereas the *Campus Chronicle*, although we did not have negative features, did give room to give more attention and perhaps a few different sides to issues that were going on.

10. Special Report of the Academic Matters Council concerning Academic Regulations Updates, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 05-049 with Motion No. 56-05.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the changes to the “Academic Regulations,” as recommended by the  
56-05 Academic Matters Council in Sen. Doc. No. 05-049.

This motion was seconded and adopted.

11. Special Report of the Committee on Committees concerning Nominations to Faculty Senate Councils and Committees, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 05-050 with Motion No. 57-05.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the nominations to Faculty Senate Councils and Committees, as presented  
57-05 in Sen. Doc. No. 05-050.

This motion was seconded.

## DISCUSSION OF THE MOTION

Senator Arthur Kinney noted that the Councils and Committees contain 270 positions to be filled each year and they have filled 268 of them with this document. There is an opening in the Admissions and Records Committee and there is an opening in the Service Departments Committee. He also had an amendment to the motion, because Eleanor Vanetzian has resigned from the Research Council and they would like to replace her with Jean Swinney.

The amendment to the motion was seconded and adopted.

12. Special Report of the Committee on Committees concerning Membership to the Academic Honesty Board, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 05-051 with Motion No. 58-05.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the nomination to the Academic Honesty Board, as presented in Sen. Doc.  
58-05 No. 05-051.

This motion was seconded and adopted.

## F. BYLAW CHANGES (Third Reading)

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

(This motion was read at the 640<sup>th</sup> Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate on April 7, 2005 and at the 641<sup>st</sup> Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate on April 28, 2005. The final vote was taken at this meeting.)

This motion was seconded and adopted.

#### DISCUSSION OF THE MOTION

Senator Sinclair asked if this meant that the suggestions for changes in the Bylaws were incorporated into the final document.

Senator Bogartz responded that the ones that came in in time for them to be included were included.

Senator Sinclair asked if the suggestions which were made on the floor of the Faculty Senate this year have been incorporated.

Senator Bogartz explained that Senator Sinclair's suggestions were not incorporated.

Senator Sinclair reiterated his suggested change and then asked where the matter was discussed.

Senator Bogartz explained that it was discussed in the Rules Committee meeting.

Senator Sinclair asked what the rationale was for not doing an evaluation.

Secretary May explained that the issue that Senator Sinclair brought up merited some consideration, but that the bylaws cycle, as it has been interpreted in the past, is that the changes must already be in place for all three readings at Faculty Senate meetings. Therefore, Senator Sinclair's change came after that deadline.

Senator Sinclair noted that his suggestion for a change to the Bylaws was made at the first reading. So it seemed to him that there was plenty of time to consider it.

Secretary May explained that would be true only if one interprets the Bylaws that a change can be made at any of the meetings where the changes are read, but it has been interpreted in the past that the final version of the Bylaws must be on the floor for three meetings. The Bylaws are somewhat ambiguous, but past practice has been that the final version is on the floor at three meetings.

Senator Sinclair noted that looking at the actual numbers of Faculty Senators, his calculations suggest that about half of the Senator positions remain unfilled. In other words, those departments and schools that are supposed to have Faculty Senators here have not yet elected their Faculty Senators.

Secretary May confirmed that there are a lot of vacant seats.

Senator Sinclair continued that his point is that almost half of their membership has not been elected for this year, he thinks we need to do something to take a close look at their effectiveness. He suggests that one way of doing that is to make sure that they periodically evaluate themselves and determine if they are doing a good job.

Senator Bogartz pointed out that one of the problems regarding Senator Sinclair's original suggestion was that the Rules Committee found it to be sufficiently vague, that they really did not know how to implement it, and therefore they wanted to hear more from Senator Sinclair about it. Now they are getting some specifics and, although he shares Senator Sinclair's concern about attendance, he is not sure that there is much that the Faculty Senate can do about elections. These are things that need to be discussed.

Senator Sinclair pointed out that if the Rules Committee was interested in specifics, he would have been happy to provide them, which is why he gave his suggestion in the beginning of the process. He would think that the normal procedure for being able to get clear on motions could have been followed. He is particularly in agreement with Senator Bogartz. He thinks it is important for the Faculty Senate to not have great tolerance for vagueness and to strive for more specifics.

## G. ANNOUNCEMENTS

### 1. The Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Secretary May thanked colleagues for participating in the Senate and the Councils and Committees. A lot of work was done, as was indicated by the final agenda. It has been a very good year.

### 2. The Chair of the Rules Committee

Senator Bogartz noted that the Rules Committee has actually been thinking about some of the problems that Professor Sinclair brought up. Although he has thought of the Senate as moribund, or more accurately, torpid, he thinks perhaps it should be considered as dormant. To deal with this, the Rules Committee has decided that they would like to promote a few ideas: First, that they go for a consent agenda. If someone has an objection to one of the motions included in the consent agenda, they can talk about it, but otherwise it would be one vote for several motions. They also thought that it might be a nice idea to have some panel discussions here of some issues that are of some consequence and importance to the faculty. They hope that that might facilitate discussion. At one point, the Senate was too big for discussion and so there had been a trend to move away from that, but now that the Senate is smaller. Bringing back discussions would be a positive change.

### 3. The Faculty Delegates to the Board of Trustees

Senator O'Connor explained that the Trustees have not met since February. It was really just a quirk in the schedule. They are meeting next week at the Dartmouth campus. The next meeting after that will be in August. In September, he will have two meetings on which to report, but he does not have anything at this time.

### 4. The Representative of the Massachusetts Society of Professors

Professor Spencer noted that when Senator Rosenberg mentioned the \$1.2 million that the Massachusetts Teachers Association recently spent in a public relations campaign, about one-third of that money went to higher education ads as well as ads to support our ESPs and higher education staff. The Massachusetts Society of Professors is currently in the heat of this budget cycle, and they have been going in smaller groups to meet with legislators, talk about the 250 Plan and show them the DVD, which many of them are willing to watch and they are quite impressed. If any other faculty member would like to join that effort, they will be making a big push in the next week because that is when the budget comes out and that is when they really need to make their pitch.

## H. QUESTION PERIOD

Senator Sinclair thanked Vice Chancellor Gargano for the work that he has done in addressing the issues of alcohol abuse and misuse on our campus. Senator Sinclair thinks that the Vice Chancellor followed the report of the Chancellor's Task Force in ways that were very productive during this past year. He also wanted to express appreciation to the Chancellor for his attention given to improving the conditions of our campus, not only in preparation for graduation, but throughout the year. Even with the building going on, it is pretty obvious that there has been extensive and high-quality work being done to make our campus more presentable. He thinks that we should express appreciation for that good work.

Senator Atallah shared that the Academic Matters Council is looking into the issue of restricting access to majors. There are conditions that force a major to try and limit the number that is coming into the major. There are several ways that programs do that, by raising the bar in one way or another to get only a certain number of students. A concern of the Academic Matters Council is that a student might come to this campus and might end up by not having a major to graduate in, if every major restricts itself and takes only the top ten percent of students into their major. He thinks that that is elitist and that we have to figure out a way to make the campus open, with the spirit that the student who comes to this campus will have access to the major that s/he wants to major in. It is not a simple issue, so please think about it. If you have any comments please email them to the Academic Matters Council.

---

**The 642<sup>nd</sup> Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate stood adjourned at 5:27 p.m. on May 16, 2005.  
The proceedings of this meeting are available on audiotape in the Faculty Senate Office.**

**Respectfully submitte d,**

**Ernest D. May  
Secretary of the Faculty Senate**