

UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AT AMHERST  
OFFICE OF THE FACULTY SENATE

Presiding Officer Robert Wilson called the meeting of the Faculty Senate as a Committee of the Whole to order on October 7, 2004 at 4:00 p.m. in the Massachusetts Room in the Mullins Center.

ADDRESS BY JACK M. WILSON, PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS SYSTEM

Now we have reached the point where at least we have turned a corner. Last September when I stepped into the position, we were at just under \$327 million of state funding. That was where we ended up after many rounds of budget cutting. Over the past year, we have now rebuilt to about \$392 million. So, it has come a long way back.

The other portion of faculty renewal is to try to make sure that the pay, the working conditions, and so on, are as good as we can make them. I was very pleased that we were able to get the contracts funded last fall. I was extremely pleased with that, because not having the contracts funded not only hurt morale, but also hurt our competitive position; so it was a very good thing to see that turn around. We also fully expect—it is currently in process—the retroactive salary increases. I have been told by the Legislature that they plan to take that up in January. I wish that they would take it up sooner, but I expect that they will take it up in January. We remain hopeful that that piece will be picked up and that will be a very, very good thing, because we have to be competitive with other institutions of our kind. The kind of institution we want to be is a first-rate, comprehensive research university that competes with the best research universities in the country. We know, because of the work that we have to go through in order to get there, [that] we have many of the pieces in place to be able to make that claim, but if we are looking at some of our aspirants, we have a ways to go to become a Michigan or a Berkeley or a Virginia or a variety of other institutions and we will continue to work on that.

At the literal level for renewing the faculty as well as rebuilding the faculty, across the System there are 155 new faculty positions. I was just being shown a list here, which I just saw for the first time, and I was interested to look through [it] and see what was on there. I think that the anticipated number here is about 70 new positions. Ninety-three? Ninety-three is even better, because in order to be a first-class research university, it all comes down to quality faculty. Without the quality faculty, you are not going to be a first-class research university so I am very pleased to hear that there is going to be a larger number of new positions than I had pulled out of the database earlier this week.

The other thing to say, is that this past year is the first year in awhile that we turned around net additions to the faculty because, as you know, with the early retirements and other issues and others leaving, we were decreasing faculty size. When you are in that kind of situation, it threatens your ability to be successful, it threatens your teaching program, it threatens your research program, and it threatens your service program, so that rebuilding is very important. I have been very pleased to work with Chancellor Lombardi. Both he and I have come out of faculty positions, different kinds of faculty—I was a physics professor years ago, and have done a number of other things and he is coming out of history—but I think we each share the sense of what it is going to take to create this first-class research university, with comprehensive programs across the board. Quality faculty have to be at the core of that. Getting enough resources in place to support those faculty would be another part of that.

I asked [Chancellor Lombardi] what his number one next priority was from me in term of acquiring resources, and he mentioned matching funds for endowment: endowed chairs for faculty, and other areas of endowment. I had actually gone to see former Speaker Finneran on that issue in September, right after I came into the position, and in his usual way, he was quite honest. He said, “Well Jack, not this year, but come back and see me again next year.” I came back to see him again “next year,” and we got the matching funds. I don’t forget those kinds of things. He was true to his word, and the Senate President, Robert Travaglini, was very supportive, as were the legislative delegations across the board. Senator Rosenberg was a strong force in that. We now have in place \$9 million, which we can use to match other private fundraising at a two-to-one level, so we are being asked to raise \$18 million to match with that \$9 million. I just gave a luncheon speech, and I pointed out to that group of downtown business leaders that Connecticut has a one-for-one match. Somebody also asked me about athletics, and they said, “Well gee, Connecticut is just going to Division I football and they are doing a great job of it.” And I said, “Well, you are looking at a person who is green with envy.” If you look at the investment that has been made in the University of Connecticut, whether it is endowed faculty chairs or a new stadium for the football team, the legislature has been enormously generous with them and that renewal is a good example of one-for-one match is terrific. It is absolutely critical and the numbers are there. UMass Amherst’s endowment comes to about \$71 million. Of that, \$51 million is directly attributable to previous matching programs. That is how important it is, because the conversation that you have with prospective donors, when you are coming from a state university, is a little different, and I have been on the state university side, the private university side, and back to the state university side. It is a slightly different conversation, because donors, when they are giving to a public university, are worried that this is just going to replace money from the state. Will the state withdraw money? If you have the matching there, you can answer that question quite easily, no, they are not going to withdraw the money and, in fact, they are going to put a dollar down for every two dollars that you put down. And that

changes the whole dynamic with the donor, and that is why it is so critical. That same bill promises \$50 million of additional matching, and we are thrilled to have it and hopeful that we will actually see that over the next few years.

In terms of renewal, the Senate has created a task force, and Senator Rosenberg is co-chair of that with Senator Panagiotakos. The rest of the task force is pretty much individuals with strong links to the University of Massachusetts in one place or another. They have been very supportive. We have met with them on the issue of capital, to really encourage capital investment. I think that you are acutely aware of the capital needs of this institution across the board. We hope that the state will step forward a little better on capital needs. We are providing a lot of our own now, our own borrowing, and our own fundraising. We talked about the Medical Center a little while ago, and the new research building, and there is not one penny of the state's dollars that is in that new research building. Is that good? No. We prefer to see the state step forward on that. So, we think that this task force will work with us on a variety of issues, with capital as a big part. Capital is important for research programs, for getting facilities the faculty that are engaged in research [need] to continue to grow their work. I found that the various constituencies have really understood this, I think. I don't find it difficult to make the intellectual argument to legislators, to the governor, to citizens, or to industry groups. I really find that they have a receptive ear on that. Whether there is a receptive pocketbook for the work is the next level.

Now, we know that we are going to have to do private fundraising and we were able to strike a pretty unique partnership with the Nantucket Conservation Foundation. I saw in the press that they described it as a sale and, I guess if you looked at the legal transaction, that there is a sale, but it is my favorite kind of sale. We sold the Nantucket Conservation Foundation land in return for \$20 million, but we get to keep the land. In fact, we get access to more land. Now they have the title in a conservation outlet, but as an environmentalist, that pleases me very much. I have no problem with that; we would want to use it in that fashion anyway. We run a research station out there. The Nantucket Conservation Foundation happens to be headed by a UMass Amherst graduate. That \$20 million, I have now taken, and gone to the chancellors and challenged them to use it as one-to-one matching money. We have \$12 million of it so far, there is another \$8 million that is in the endowment. After we work out the \$9 million, the \$12 million, and then the potential \$50 million, there is other money that will be put in there eventually for matching money. Theoretically, we can turn that \$20 million into \$40 million for endowed faculty chairs. Since this is about faculty renewal, I believe that in order to have the kind of renewal and get to where we want, we need a lot more endowed faculty chairs to beat our competitors. We are trying to roll out the strategy to get there and what we are trying to work on there.

We have great evidence that this works. The example comes right off of this campus: the Engineering Research Center for Collaborative Adaptive Sensing of the Atmosphere. John Armstrong, Vice President for Research for IBM—a Harvard grad by the way, a generous donor to Harvard—gave probably a million dollars to UMass Amherst for a new chair here. That was matched with state funds under the old matching program. It led to the hiring of some outstanding faculty, the creation of a whole research enterprise. Additional funding came in; we got a \$5 million match from the governor, and ended up with an Engineering Research Center of \$40 million. I think that that is a great investment and has been a big piece of faculty renewal in that particular area. We have to repeat these kinds of activities again and again. That is the point of having a matching fund to do that. We have a number of good research wins. I was out here last week for a nanotech conference. It was terrific, and for me, it was a classic bus man's holiday. I got to get out of the office and listen to some very bright people talk about their research. That's happening all over the place, these kinds of successes. I was pleased to see that the Isenberg School of Management was ranked number ten in overall academic experience for the students and for quality of faculty, it is ranked fourth. There is a relationship between those things. We have high rankings in other areas: computer science, artificial intelligence, speech pathology, clinical pathology, psychology, nursing, biosciences. So there is a lot of excellence around UMass.

My argument, going around Massachusetts, has been frankly, that the path to social and economic development for Massachusetts goes through UMass. I really hope that people understand that in a broad sense: social and economic development. Of course when I speak to industry groups, they focus on the economic component part of it. But I truly mean the social and economic development of this state and the path goes through UMass across the board. I have found that that is an argument that resonates with people all over the state. They like it. They see it as a restatement of the original land-grant mission: Why were we founded? What was the Morrill Act written for? It was written to create a university of service to the public. It was funded with public lands, with the original endowment for the Morrill Act. So we see this as the natural outgrowth. To sum it all up, the core of a great university is a great faculty. The product of a great university is great alumni. Those things are related, as well. We are engaged in the renewal process to rebuilding the faculty and we will continue to work as hard as we can. I wish that we had more resources, but I can tell you that we will look everywhere and try to do everything that we can to organize resources.

## QUESTIONS

Senator Richard Bogartz asked a question regarding the percentage of per-year growth that would be reasonable to expect.

President Jack M. Wilson responded that he wished that he knew the answer to the question of what would be a reasonable growth rate, but this year they are looking at something around ten percent. He would love to see us do that again next year, but he is not sure if that is reasonable. If they could do better than that, that would be a good thing; if they had programs, growth in students. One of the cases over his career that he has had to make is to rebut the impression of outsiders who think of faculty as a liability rather than an asset. They see faculty as a consumer of dollars, and he tries to explain that this situation is more like a law firm. They are the asset, they are producing the educated students, which are our product, or they produce the research; they are bringing in research dollars. His position is every time you add a faculty member, you add resources to an institution. He thinks that they have to look at growth rates like that, because it will take awhile to get out of the hole they are in. He pointed out that the Provost was at the meeting, and he wanted to hear what Provost Seymour thinks about the issue.

Provost Charlena Seymour responded that not only is she interested in faculty renewal, but interested in faculty investment. You have to think about what is it going to take in terms of resources to improve, and retain high-level faculty. They have been working on that. Over the last three years, she has been gathering information from departments, from the deans, and the page that was referred to earlier, on the hiring of new faculty, is a result of her collating information from all of the deans. She is certain that the deans spoke to their faculty about the types of positions that they would like to have filled in order to change their departments and raise the stature of their departments, because what they are always working on is the performance-based model to improve.

Now, the issue is not so much how many, but when they get this big number, what are they going to do with them. One of the battles that she always has to fight is although we want to have the numbers of young teachers—she thinks that at one point we had 1,200 faculty—she thinks departments are going to have to realize even if we increase those numbers, the positions are not going to go back to the same places. The positions are going to go to places in which we have a strong record of performance. It is performance that counts. She knows that people have heard this a million times, and we are now collecting information to see who is doing what in teaching and research. The more you do in those areas, and the better that you do, and not in terms of comparing you, for example, biology to history, but biology to biology and history to history, we can get some information about your accomplishments. Then we will be ready, with all those resources that the President and the Chancellor are going to give to the campus, to spend it on new faculty. We know that good students attract good faculty and faculty attract good faculty. The younger faculty, in particular, talk to her about renovations, laboratories, and buildings. The deans talk about buildings as well. The fact is, if we are going to recruit and we are going to retain faculty, there are certain things that we have to promise them. They are also telling her that they come here because of the collegial attitude, because of the reputation of the research, but they are disappointed when they get here, because sometimes the facilities do not live up to standards that they need to move the department along. So we need some collaboration, we need resources and facilities, but it is a reciprocal thing. The faculty will help us raise the money for the facilities and the facilities in turn will attract more faculty. We want as many faculty as we can leverage out of the resources that we currently have, but we need more resources, we need more faculty. When she spoke to the deans to get feedback about the faculty that they wanted to hire, this is off of their budget. In other words, she asked them, what can you afford to buy in regards to faculty? There will also be a Provost pool, and this Provost pool will be used for tenured-track faculty, but in special, targeted places. She wants to take advantage of opportunities. She wants to bring in proof of that focus on special things and we are starting to do that.

Secretary of the Faculty Senate Ernest May pointed out that in addition to the list of new faculty positions to be hired for the next year, this year, we hired a large number of faculty, but a larger number of faculty left last year, so that the net number of faculty actually decreased a little bit, although it was a very impressive year in terms of recruiting. The disconnect that he feels is between the really positive things that both President Wilson and Provost Seymour just said and the way it feels in many departments, where what they react to is a 23 percent drop in tenured faculty, overall, on campus in the last sixteen years, since the high point in 1988. In addition, there has been a 14 percent drop in full-time faculty. This is related to things that are happening nationally, and it is also related to the budget model, which has emerged, where the state pays for the personnel bill and nothing else, and we have to try to finance everything else by our own bootstraps. If we took the faculty number, which is about 930 and raised that to 1,000, which is about the minimum for being a competitive flagship research campus, on an endowment basis, that would be roughly \$240 million dollars, and he does not think that they are going to raise that next year. The way the faculty feel in an average department, like music or English or chemistry, regarding those losses of 14 and 23 percent of the full-time and tenured ranks is not positive, although it is great to be moving in the right direction, rather than the wrong direction. He asked President Wilson to relate that to our aspirations to being a world-class university, and to national trends and developments across the country, and what other institutions are doing, and how faculty are supposed to adjust and view this situation.

President Wilson responded that there are many aspects to that question. On the one hand, looking at the history and how far we have to go sometimes is daunting. In cognitive science, specifically [in regards to] understanding problem solving, you

discover that expert problem solvers are very comfortable with not being able to see the solution, where novice problem solvers have to be able to see all the way to a solution. A key in intellectual development in problem solving is when you can get to that point where you take a problem and break it down and say, OK, I can't see all the way to the solution, but I have confidence we are going to solve that problem. He thinks this is one of those things, because he cannot lay out a path for getting back to those days of 1988 and that number of faculty.

He certainly knows the national trends and that withdrawal of public funding of higher education not just in Massachusetts, but across the board around the country. That said, if you are persistent and you pick the right direction and you keep working on it, and you become relentless about that, eventually you can solve your problem, a little bit at a time. It was suggested that we would need a \$240 million endowment, with which he agrees. At this point, for the whole system, we have \$171 million. So you may say that we cannot add \$240 million to the endowment, but if you look at our competitors, there are 22 universities—public universities—doing billion dollar campaigns. Can we get there? He cannot see a path to get us to a billion dollar campaign, but that does not mean that he does not think that we will not get there one day. He just thinks that we have to do a piece of that, and in that context, a \$240 endowment does not seem unreasonable, even though he cannot see it happening this year or next year, but if we give up, then we cannot get it. If we can figure out how much we can get this coming year, how much we can get the next year. He had the most amazing thing happen to him at RPI. He had a research person call him and ask him if he knew the name of a certain person who had done certain things, and he responded that he knew the name. He was then asked if he realized that that person was an RPI graduate, which he did not. In the end, the individual in question made a \$360 million donation to RPI. Those are the sort of things you cannot expect or predict, nor should you plan on them, but you have to organize yourself and do each piece along the way. That is the key thing in faculty renewal, to understand that.

He heard the Provost speak, and he always has to be very careful when he goes on a campus, because the work of the campus has to be done by the faculty, the Provost and the Chancellor, and he tries to help in any way they ask him. They know it. Provost Seymour knows that if she calls him and asks for help, he will do everything that he can to make that happen and Chancellor Lombardi knows that, too. They will try to organize themselves to help but in the end, the work gets done through faculty governance, and through the Provost, and so on. And he heard that she said that the key thing is going to be hiring tenured-track faculty, so that is one of the issues nationwide—how do you staff up the faculty. Well we are going to meet our aspirations. What I heard from her was that it is going to take tenured-track, quality faculty—we are not going to get there with part-timers. That is not a rap on part-timers. He has taught with some part-timers, some absolute top people, all that is says is that we are also going to have to have full-time, tenured-track people who are the core of the faculty at a research university. He thinks that says that if there is this trend out there for other kinds and forms of faculty that probably will not be going to be as important here as it might be in other places.

Senator Arthur Kinney asked, if they are building a core of full-time faculty, how many part-time people can we sustain?

President Wilson responded that he was certainly not the one to answer that question, but he would like to answer it in terms of philosophy. First of all, he does not think that there should be a standard answer to that. He thinks that each department has to look at that, because in some departments, part-time faculty could be a key part of the strategy, and in other departments, it just may not fit with the strategy at all. If they had a percentage out there and said management has to be like this and physics has to be the same that would not be very wise. So he cannot answer the question regarding a percentage, but you know that if you are going to be a first-class research university, research is being done by full-time faculty. And you know that if you want to have a first-class student experience, part-time faculty can be a part of that, they can actually be key, but you better have the core full-time, permanent faculty.

An unidentified Senator thanked President Wilson for speaking about the endowment, which he thinks is an important part of this, but as Secretary May said, basically the state signs the paychecks. In the last year or so, there had been a considerable amount of talk about increasing the size of the University. So, it seems at some point, the legislature has to kick into this, beyond just matching funds to match private contributions. He asked President Wilson to talk about the role the legislature is going to play in this, and what it is that they are looking for?

President Wilson responded that they will need to do that, which is why he has been very pleased to work with the Senate Task Force convened by Senator Rosenberg and Senator Panagiotakos, and they have a mandate directly from Senate President Travaglini. President Wilson has spoken often with President Travaglini who is really behind this. We are hoping a similar kind of thing happens in the House. Of course, we have had some leadership change, so we probably will have to wait a little while until all the leadership settles out, before we see if that occurs. We would like to see the state step forward and do more on that, and we think that this Task Force is the vehicle. What Senator Panagiotakos has said again and again is that he would like to identify the gap of what we need—benchmarking against other institutions—from where we are, and have a ten-year program to fill that gap. President Wilson would have liked a one-year program, so now we negotiate. If we got it done in ten years, or if they were on track, that would be a good thing for the University. We are going to have to work at that, and defend that.

The fact that our base appropriation went from \$326.7 million to \$391.8 million, is an indication that they recognize that obligation, but if we are going to be what we want to be, a lot of that is going to come out of other pockets: private philanthropy, CVIP, online courses. Again, the mix is different: for management, online courses have become a very key part of their financial preference—the difference between being average and being outstanding, getting into the top ranks. That will not work for every department. Every department will be different in the way that they will approach it. Some departments have access to a lot of research funding, other departments do not. We have to be willing to work with each department according to the needs and the situation in that department, to get the resources for them. We wish we could tell you that the state is anxious to step forward on this, but we cannot tell you that. He has looked at the numbers for every state, and it is dismal. It's dismal, and it's been dismal for a long time.

There is this conventional wisdom that things were good for awhile, and then they were bad. No! Things were not so bad for awhile, and then they got much worse. That is what the numbers actually say, and it has not just been for us. There are some places which have run counter, and we all look at those and turn green with envy at Connecticut, because it ran counter to the trend in terms of investment. More power to them, let's hope it is us next. It has been pretty rough for the publics. The percentage of the funding of the public university has really gone down. What are they looking for? People give to quality. They do not give to need. Don't shoot the messenger, he is just reporting on what he sees out there. It may not be fair, but that is the way that it is. The need argument has not been terribly persuasive. The quality argument, the investment argument, the "they'll make a difference" argument, has been very, very persuasive. If we can step forward, and talk about our contributions to the state, we have a pretty good reception and we can get some investment. There is a whole raft of ideas. We provide through Commonwealth Medicine the psychiatric care for large sections of the state. There are many different ways, but the common theme is excellence and meeting community needs. We just went in and talked about the critical needs we have for infrastructure. We do that, but then you have to turn it around to an investment, what will this investing in infrastructure get us, because if it is just need, they say "get in line." They have a huge line of people with need. What we did in the last year, was convert that. We are convinced that there are two things that got the contracts funded; first, the organization of the faculty, and second, we converted the argument into an investment argument and carried that forward, rather than the need argument. We are not denying that the need arguments that are there, but putting the investment argument in with it changed the dynamic.

Senator Julie Brigham-Grette noted that President Wilson had spoken about the legislature, and then asked about the Governor: specifically, did they have a task force to work on him? He seems to be a problem, not wanting to fund the retroactive pay and so on, so does President Wilson have some ideas for him?

President Wilson responded that working with the Governor has gone reasonably well, with a variety of exceptions where they agree to disagree, and they have been able to work through that, too, in terms of, if funding comes through again, his veto would be overridden. They want friends, they want to get along, make the best argument that they can. They have made some headway in some areas and they try to focus on that. We get a good reception on the issue of capital, and on the issue of additional funding, but we get pushed back on the issue of funding contracts. If someone gives \$20 million to the University for X versus Y, we'll be glad to use that \$20 million. You have to be pragmatic about that, set your goals at a reasonable level, and develop a relationship as best we can.

Presiding Officer Robert Wilson directed a question to President Wilson regarding the fact that a lot of comments have been directed at raising more money from other sources, but one of the things that seems interesting are the steps that you or the University could take that would enable us ourselves to raise the money, as it relates to authority from the legislature or the Governor, and he wonders if President Wilson has any thoughts regarding examples like tuition retention for out-of-state students.

President Wilson responded that that is an example where the Governor is on board, but they have to sell it to the other side, which shows what he means about being pragmatic with a strategy. We are always working that one. We tried the entrepreneurial angle with facilities, for instance, because we want to be able to build faster, and we want our money to go farther if we build more facilities. That was part of the entrepreneurial nature of the grant end of this, and a number of research grants in the past year, where we get a grant, and the grant had money and we also made a commitment of facility and we had to be able to deliver it. We successfully kept our entrepreneurial ability intact, and we have worked with the Governor, the Speaker, and the Senate President on trying to identify more and more flexibility for that kind of entrepreneurship; the matching money is, in fact, some of that. He is open to anything that would help the faculty be successful; it has to be a campus issue, and it is up to the campus leadership to bring these forward. He does not mind using the bully pulpit. He gets excited about faculty, he gets excited about students, he gets excited about research, and he gets excited about service. And they need to tell that story, it is a very important part.

Dan Clawson, Professor in Sociology and the President of the Massachusetts Society of Professors, mentioned that President Wilson had talked about how the budget went up from last year's \$327 million to \$392 million this year; that is absolutely true and it is also the case that by far the largest fraction of that was the funding of the contracts. We were able to win the funding

of the contracts, because we were all on the same page, and we were working together. It could not have happened without the faculty union and the other unions on campus. It could not have happened if President Wilson had not been there, and he was wonderful in this, because he spoke out clearly for it. Now, at least in the faculty union, our priority this year is faculty renewal, which obviously is also President Wilson's priority and he wanted to know, how will we work together to build the same kind of campaign that we had last year, because if it is a low-key campaign, if we do not mobilize people, if we do not generate energy and enthusiasm for it, if we do not reach out to students who are involved in this, then we will not get very far with the legislature. And if we can find a way to do all of that, then maybe we can find a way to change the equation, particularly with the task force that is in place.

President Wilson responded that it is a good point, and he could not emphasize more the importance of unity. One of the things as newcomer to Massachusetts and a newcomer to Massachusetts politics was that he discovered that many people would tell him, with some chagrin, that it was always easy to kind of ignore UMass because we were speaking with so many voices that they were able to wait until we "got our act together." He heard it enough to know that it was true. As Professor Clawson pointed out, last year, we were able to stay united, we talked about the importance of the University of Massachusetts across the board, we got our delegations in various regions speaking across the board about the importance of UMass. He thinks that we all benefited from that. What is next? Next is to shape a program. He is very strong on faculty governance and the shaping of the program coming up through the department chairs, the deans, the Provost and the Chancellor, and shape it to the point, whatever it is that we are asking for—and he's sure that we each have our own lists, and that they overlap—then go in in a unified fashion, and say, this is what we want. Also to design it so that it is a stretch, but not too much of a stretch. People can learn a certain length beyond their horizons, but if you put it too far out there, it is hard for them to do. So, we have to think what could we ask for in terms of our funding next year, in terms of contracts, in terms of matching dollars, in terms of research dollars, in terms of all these things and we would like to shape that from the bottom up. Once we get it shaped, then if we could all sit down and agree how will we talk about this, he thinks we have a good chance to do very well.

Student Andres Gomez recognizing that this might not be the most appropriate forum to ask President Wilson the question that he has, but it is not often that he has the opportunity speak to the President of the University. He was wondering if President Wilson was aware of the recent racial incidents, which have happened here on the UMass campus. There has been a very quickly deteriorating atmosphere on campus for the minority communities. There was an assault last Thursday on some Black students. It is not clear if it was racially motivated, but there is strong indication that it was. And for the last two or three weeks, a very broad cross-section of the University community has been trying to work together with the administration to address this issue. The administrators that we have been working with have consistently diverted attention from the issue, tried to ignore the issue, and we have taken no concrete action to address the issue. And the situation is getting worse and worse. It is not a situation that is conducive to a University of excellence, and potentially a very embarrassing situation for the University. His question is, is there any way that we, as a community, can work with you, or someone higher up in the University hierarchy, since the administrators that we have been trying to work with here on campus have been completely unresponsive to the community and have, in many instances, refused to listen to us—the group includes professors, staff, graduate students, undergraduate students, student government members—so is there anyway that we can involve President Wilson, or what would he propose are ways that we can address this in an institutional way, since there is this link in the chain that is not working for the students at this moment?

President Wilson said that in response to the student's first question, we were aware of it. We were shocked and appalled by the things that we saw. Maintaining a positive, healthy, racial, gender, just general climate, is absolutely imperative for the University and we have to all work incredibly hard to do that. As the student has heard already, we generally tend to speak out on these issues. We have to focus on issues and diversity is an extremely important issue to this campus. Now, we may differ with the student in terms of the response. We stay connected with the campus, with the chancellor, and so on, and we like to see communities address these problems themselves, and not from the top down. There needs to be some strong dialogue on these things, and that seems to be going forward. We need a rededication, a consciousness-raising education program on these issues. That seems to be moving forward. We will do everything we can to help with that, but we would like it to be a campus community issue. We faced some issues like this at UMass Boston last year, and we went through it with a lot of patience, encouraging individuals to speak with one another, taking actions as it became clear that those actions needed to be taken, and we are at a very different place now at UMass Boston than we were last spring. We hope this campus looks at itself very carefully and that we develop a rededication to civility, talking with one another, working with one another, setting up programs. But we very strongly supports the right of the campus to do that as a campus community.

Provost Seymour also responded to the student's question. Our campus is doing a very good job, an excellent job, in terms of dealing with diversity. She has been here for awhile, and she knows the history, but she knows that in this history, there have been points that have been unfortunate and have cast a bad shadow on some of the accomplishments that we have made. For example, we are collaborating in Academic Affairs with Student Affairs, and with other units on campus to make changes and improvements. One of the things that we are focusing on, for example, is increasing diversity in the graduate student body and the undergraduate student body with external funding that we have gotten from the National Science Foundation. We have multi-million dollar grants to increase the diversity of the student body at different levels and to enhance recruitment, to

enhance retention and to bring more diversity to this campus. We are not sure if he is aware of these types of activities, but can go into depth if he would like to come over and speak to her in her office.

The second thing that we are doing is in every hiring plan for the department and the school—and we have faculty here who will support this—we have asked for their diversity plan. They are to tell us what they are going to do to bring in more faculty with diverse backgrounds. We are focusing on it, we are looking at it and we have increased those numbers. The third thing that we have done is that, for the past four or five years, we have been collecting data to support our Community Diversity and Social Justice Program. Right now, every school and college has set up a task force, a unit, a committee, to address community diversity and social justice.

We think that it is important for the student to recognize that all of the things that he wants resolved cannot be resolved in an open forum with people screaming and hollering at each other. What you are going to have to do is take it back to your faculty, take it back to your mentors, and talk with others of us, other students, but in situations where all people feel that they have an opportunity to communicate. We agree with the President that what we need to have is more open dialogue, but in situations where the people are listening to each other and not fighting and screaming at one another.

This has not been a good situation, we agree with the student. We do not want to talk about how bad it is, but what we want to talk about is solution. We are smart people, we are intellectuals, we are the academy, and this is the situation where we are supposed to resolve problems. So, give us some answers, give us some solutions. We have presented you with three ways that we are trying to build community, diversity, and think about and address social justice on this campus. It has been going on for a long time, these various activities. People from the outside come to our campus and ask our faculty to talk to their campuses about some of the issues. We are recognized as being people who have solutions, not problems. We invite the student to come to our office, where they can talk about more solutions, because we know that there are problems, some of them we might not be able to resolve in two or three days, it may take two or three years, but we are working on it.

Andres Gomez responded that he thinks that the programs that she mentioned are very good, it is very important, but he is talking about a more pressing, immediate situation. Right now, many students of color, many female students, and other minority-group students feel afraid to walk around on campus. There is genuine fear, if you talk to the people, of going around campus at night for fear of being assaulted. That is his primary concern. He thinks that on the big scale, [the plans that she mentioned] are very important, but this immediate case of what is going on right now—we have consistently been trying to talk, and he thinks that dialogue is important, aside from not shouting at each other, another point of dialogue is to actually listen when people are talking, and he knows that they have been doing a lot of shouting, but Mike Gargano has not been doing a lot of listening either. So he thinks that there is a big problem with dialogue going on there, but it is also important that actions are taken. For example, when this first happened, there was talk of expulsion and Vice Chancellor Gargano mentioned getting resignations for some of the student leaders involved. All of that has stayed in the air and that is perceived by the students and people outside of the community as the University is not taking concrete action. Talking is important, and the forum was a good place to vent some of the tension that was going on, which was important, but there needs to be more than talking. There needs to be concrete action taken, so that it is very clear, not only in words, but in actions, that the University does not condone that kind of behavior in any way, and that the University stands behind its minority students and all the student body.

We were talking about minority students two weeks ago. Right now, it is an issue that is getting way out of hand, and it is affecting all of the students. Before this gets bigger and bigger—Cosby is coming in a few weeks—if nothing is done to contain this now, this thing could get totally out of hand. There are serious concerns for the safety of the minority students on this campus. He recognizes that he is sure that Provost Seymour is well intentioned, but our experience, and his personal experience as a student, is that when he has gone to speak to Mike Gargano, that he has consistently changed the subject, answered something else, and has refused to agree to any path to action. So those are the specific problems he is talking about, that we, as a community, feel that there is no positive response to this problem and it is increasing, and they are very concerned about it. The big-scale thing is important, but there is a very immediate situation right now. People are afraid that the situation can get out of hand, can be very dangerous to student safety, and to the image of the University.

Emeritus Professor and Alumnus Joseph Larson wanted to make some observations about the effectiveness across departments with respect to matching funds for endowed faculty positions. His remarks come out of an initial investigation that he has done trying to establish an endowed chair in his own academic department, Natural Resources and Conservation. When you realize that to achieve the matching that is necessary and you look at the bases that a department like ours and many others face, you look at alumni, you look at possible industrial sources and commercial sources and the like. In our case, we have alumni that almost 100 percent go into public service, so when they retire, financially they are looking forward to a comfortable retirement, but they have not gained a big pot of gold by working for the state or a federal agency to make a significant contribution. Also in the public sector area, in natural resources, with the exception of forestry, there is not an industry base. So, you start looking at where are we as a department or program going to be able to compete on an even playing field with all the other sciences. He is not looking for a reduction in quality standards to achieve an endowed chair,

but he would like President Wilson's comments on how do you even the playing field for those departments who do not have investment opportunities and produce excellent alumni, but who do not go into Wall Street or industry areas.

President Wilson responded that he has had enough experience to know that in fact that there are many people who may not even be alumni who have a strong interest in natural resources and the environment, who do donate in this area. So he thinks that it is a classic thing to find out who has a passion for the issues to try to connect to them. He would say that the Nantucket Conservation Foundation has \$4 million of matching funds right here on this campus, \$12 million out there and maybe another \$8 million in an endowment fund, any of which could show up here to match money. So that is an example that there are a fair number of gifts that are made in this area. It is true that some departments have better luck at that than others. He does not like to give standard recipes for how we do everything. He thinks that just like people, we are very diverse, and there has to be a different strategy for different groups to be successful. While one group might find fundraising is great, others will find online education is great, and others will find that they have to go to community groups to gain support. Where you can bring in resources from the state, and in some cases, it is just so important—and this is certainly something that every university administrator does all the time—which is that you kind of balance out for those that have, that you have a balanced university program. Some things are not going to attract a lot of funding, but are important to do as a university, so you figure out how to do the transfer payments to make that happen.

Professor Larson responded that he is looking for a little more help in developing those alternative strategies, because it appears to him that the standard requirement was going after industry, going after wealthy alumni, are very easily applied by development people, but in developing alternative strategies, he thinks that we need more help in that.

The meeting of the Faculty Senate as a Committee of the Whole was adjourned at 5:15.  
The proceedings of this meeting are available on audiotape in the Faculty Senate Office.

Respectfully submitted,

Ernest D. May  
Secretary of the Faculty Senate