

UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AT AMHERST
OFFICE OF THE FACULTY SENATE

Presiding Officer Robert Wilson called the 643rd Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate to order on September 22, 2005 at 3:30 p.m. in Herter Hall, Room 227.

A. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Principal Administrative Officers

Provost Charlena Seymour introduced the new Deans, Associate Provosts and Directors as a result of the searches conducted in the last academic year. Among them were Janet Rifkin, Dean of the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences, John Mullin, Dean of the Graduate School, Gerald Schafer, Director of Libraries, Christine McCormick, Dean of the School of Education, George Langford, Dean of the College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics, Frank Hugus, Associate Provost and Director of International Programs and Andrew Effrat, Associate Provost for Faculty Recruitment and Retention. She gave a short synopsis of their accomplishments over the years.

She then made an announcement stating that four national searches are planned for this year. Two faculty who hold positions as Deans plan to retire, so there will be a national search in Humanities and Fine Arts and also for Commonwealth College. There will also be a search for the Dean of the Isenberg School of Management, as Dean Thomas O'Brien plans to go back to the faculty at the end of this year, and a search for the position of Vice Provost for Research.

Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance Joyce Hatch gave everyone an update on a lot of maintenance work done over the summer as well as an "intro I" to construction on this campus. Over the summer, a lot of exterior work was done on buildings, but work was also done on five auditoria, four auditoria in Hasbrouck, which was sorely needed, and one in Morrill. On the construction front, one of the things she wanted to communicate was the communication plan. They have hired someone in Facilities Planning to be full time working on a communications plan. He has developed the beginnings of a good web site. The web site will be linked to the home page of the UMass web site, hopefully, working with OIT. There will be construction advisories. There will be a lot of information on the web page on each project, but, the important thing for the campus community is to know the advisories about vehicle ways and changes in pedestrian ways. This web site will be up shortly. To get into some of the construction that you will see, there are actually three major projects underway; one is documented on the web site. If you try to get into the Campus Center, you will see they are rerouting in and out and that is the steamway that is the beginning of connecting the new heating plant to the steamline connections and network on campus. That will be done in March, but, in the meantime, the rerouting will be happening in phases. The other major project that seems to have almost come to completion is the Library deck. That should be done this November before the snow. We had the groundbreaking for student housing to be completed in a year. These are the main projects that you will see and will be interrupting your pedestrian walkways. There are actually 125 projects underway on campus that are over \$100,000. 45 of those projects are over \$1 million. Some of them are just in the study phase; some of them are in the digging phase. Another component of the communication plan is that each project has its own communication, so any abutters or people parking in that area will be communicated at many meetings going on. This will be going on for the next three years.

Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs and Campus Life Michael Gargano stated that they have had a fantastic opening of the first two weeks of the academic year, but most importantly, he wanted to share all of the things done to help students from Louisiana who were displaced because of the hurricane. UMA received approximately 50 telephone calls and inquiries from parents and students on this and, from the 50 phone calls, they actually had 20 students apply to the University for enrollment this fall. Out of that number, 13 actually enrolled, 5 first-year students and 8 transfer students. They took the time to review those cases of the transfer students, on a case-by-case basis, to make sure that the curriculums they needed in the classes that they were able to offer were consistent to keep them on pace to graduate. All of the first-year students were students that were actually admitted back in May and had opted to attend another university. Having their files on hand made it a lot easier to enroll them. All of the first-year students

received their full financial aid packages that we provided to them back in May and any of the students who received any of the state grants, the Abigail Adams or University Scholars or any of those particular programs, were able to get those funds as well. They have been in contact with the students. They seem to have adjusted well and he thought that this campus was very proud for what it is that it did in times of need to help so many out. Vice Chancellor Gargano thanked everyone for that.

Vice Provost for Research Paul Kostecki had several things he wanted to share. Last year, they had another year of increased sponsored research activity awards on campus, going up 3%. It may not sound like much, but that was the third year in a row. It was 2% short of the Chancellor's goal of 5% a year, but, as it was pointed out to him, in a three-year rolling average, it will be over 5%. To be increasing our research activity three years in row is a great accomplishment. They are doing even better this year. In the first two months, they are at about \$20 million in awards which compares to \$13 million from the same period last year. He stated that he thought they were going to have another good year. There are more faculty and more faculty means more activity, more submissions. Last year, our submissions were actually down by 6% and awards were up. Again, they are getting more with less and he thought that that was a tribute to the faculty on this campus. He announced that there was a national effort in terms of grant applications. The federal agency, NIH, was the driver in putting together electronic submissions and that process was called GAMS (the Grant Application Management Systems). UMA was one of eight research universities that participated in the consortium to put that through. It is now up and running. They piloted that last year in Anthropology and Chemistry. That is up now for everyone's use. It has been predicted that, by the end of this year, 75% of the federal agencies will require electronic submission and, so, they are poised very well to accomplish that. Vice Provost Kostecki then announced that they now have a CVIP (Commercial Ventures and Intellectual Properties) director. His name is Nick DeCristofaro. His formal bio sketch is posted on the web site. He comes with twenty five years of experience in the private sector. He is a MIT material, a Ph.D. person who was everyone's first choice when interviewed. He said that it was an indication that they are getting the "best of the best" out there when searches are done. The Faculty Grant Research Program is alive and well for this year. That is a co-investment program with the Deans and, last year, almost \$500,000 was awarded partnering with the Deans in that program. The Research Affairs area is sponsoring an open house on October 28th.

Presiding Officer Robert Wilson then introduced Esther M. A. Terry, Associate Chancellor for Equal Opportunity and Diversity, who stood and received applause from the audience.

2. The Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Secretary Ernest May noted that, last week, Chancellor Lombardi addressed the faculty at the first annual Faculty Convocation at which a cross section of distinguished colleagues was also honored. He wishes to offer a few responses to his address and encourage others to react as well. First, the combination of a huge investment in the Physical Plant plus the effect of UMass 250 on faculty hiring will truly transform this campus, on a scale last seen in the 1960s. While every legislative session is a new session, everything is on track here for a huge change. Society's requirements of a university have also changed, on a transformational scale similar to the GI Bill or the Cold War, and we must be responsive to today's driving issues. Successful 21st century universities are more independent of governmental support; entrepreneurial; competitive; decentralized, diverse; green; and global, and probably a few other things. The biggest challenge for the Faculty Senate this year will be to fully engage in the transformations of the Physical Plant and the faculty which are being set in motion. A huge amount of resources will be committed on a compressed time scale, and anything not done well now could be a serious drag on our institution for years to come, probably decades to come. This really is a once-in-a-lifetime moment.

Second, Secretary May pointed out that he was a little confused by the message the Chancellor was sending to most departments with respect to "national competitiveness," especially in the context in which the campus' national ranking is not in the top 25. The message seemed to be most obviously focused on the campus' limited number of distinguished, truly IA departments, which already rank among the top 25. What about the Division IAA departments? What about the Division II and Division III departments? Do you expect them all to aspire to Division IA status? Is that realistic? If I am an energetic and relatively successful faculty member in a Division II department, how do you suggest that I respond to your "competitiveness" challenge?

Third, who are our peers? Most of the “public” leaders in Division IA academics are nearly twice our size. Couldn’t we eliminate quite a bit of our identity confusion by calling the question and deciding between the Michigan and Berkeley models? In the last great transformative era, the ‘60s, John Lederle moved the campus in the direction of Michigan. Then, in the 1990s, the Saxon Commission brought in the California model. Secretary May was confused!

Fourth, as a result of the UMA 250 process, can we commit to “rightsize” the faculty and departments so that each academic program is fully functional with respect to its mission as defined as teaching, research, and outreach? At the end of this five -year process, will we have academic programs which are significantly under-resourced in relation to their missions?

Lastly, as a result of the projected \$1-\$2 billion in construction which will have taken place over ten years and the renovation processes, can we also assure that every building on campus will be functional? Can we assure that every academic program will be housed in a reasonably satisfactory space?

3. The Chair of the Rules Committee

Senator Richard Bogartz wanted to say a few words concerning Vice Chancellor Gargano and a few words concerning changes in the Faculty Senate meetings. With respect to Vice Chancellor Gargano, he first expressed his appreciation and thanks to him for coming to a memorial for a Psychology student, Alex DeSerpa, and bestowing posthumously both a bachelor’s degree and a mathematics degree summa cum laude. Alex was very deserving and, even in that sad moment, it was a joy to see the administration, overall, and Vice Chancellor, in particular, getting it right (not to say that they’ve been getting it wrong, but this was certainly a clear case of getting it right). The other remark he wanted to make to Vice Chancellor Gargano was an expression of appreciation concerning the three fraternities that he shut down for health code violations. Nothing happened there, but if there had been a fire, if someone had been hurt or worse, and we hadn’t shut them down, the world would have come down on us like a “ton of bricks.”

With respect to changes in the Faculty Senate meetings, the Rules Committee has been active in this matter. We have been encouraging the administrative officers to have a little more to say to us during Announcements and they have today. We have decided to try to accept annual reports en masse as a group and encourage Council and Committee members and Chairpersons to speak to us a little bit about the issues and what brought these things to the floor. We have added a new part of the meeting called “Open Discussion” where faculty Senators and others can bring up matters of interest and concerns without having to artificially cast them in the form of questions directed to particular individuals. We hope that this new segment will provide some of the lively discussion that used to occur in the Faculty Senate. However, because we were not absolutely unanimous in our feelings concerning these changes with respect to introducing “Open Discussion,” we decided that perhaps the first topic in “Open Discussion” might be an open discussion of just what ought to go on in a Faculty Senate meeting.

4. The Faculty Delegates to the Board of Trustees

Senator W. Brian O’Connor had a lot of information and picked out the most interesting. There was the “Trustees’ Priorities for the University,” in a handout, which was given out at the August Board of Trustees’ meeting and packed with information. Since we last met, we have had two Trustee meetings, one in May at UMass/Dartmouth and one in late August at UMass/Boston. Some of the highlights were that at the Committee on Administration and Finance, there was a very long, interesting discussion on financial aid where it was reported that on this campus, we met 89% of the demand. What the Trustees were very concerned about was “are we losing students to the privates?” It’s still a bargain to go here, but, as we all can probably tell from various anecdotes we’ve heard from other faculty, we are still losing some of the best students to the private schools. Even though the private schools are so much more expensive, it is still cheaper for them with their aid to go to the privates.

At the Committee on Athletics, Chancellor Lombardi reported on the results of a recent student poll regarding the long-delayed recreation center. Some of the interesting results of this poll were that the students want a central location; they want fitness and weight lifting, and some want swimming. Now, of

course, the original \$50 million that was temporarily allocated for this about five or six years ago is now probably at least \$100 million. The full Board will eventually vote on this long-delayed recreation center very soon.

In terms of the Committee of the Whole, there was a panel of students and faculty discussing the research university and the value of research in terms of teaching the students. Our campus was represented on this panel by Professor Joseph Krupczynski and his student Robert Cichocki of the Art Department where they discussed their work with the city of Holyoke in various design projects and the involvement of the University in community activities. This generated a tremendous amount of discussion about the value of research in teaching which, basically, was lead by the new Trustees, primarily Trustee DiBiaggio and John Armstrong, our own Trustee from Amherst. It was also reported that \$11 million had been raised at the UMass Boston Pops Concert in which President Wilson was inaugurated and Senator Kennedy was given the President's medal.

At the August meeting, new Trustee Matthew Carlin was introduced. He was just appointed so he did not participate in any of the votes. They gave a well-deserved congratulations and farewell to Grace Fey who was leaving the Board, but will remain affiliated with the University as a member of the Committee that is overseeing the new UMass Club which will be on the 33rd floor of 225 Franklin Street in Boston. This Club will be governed, not only by Grace Fey, but by Jack Welch and Miriam Hird, both alumni of the institution. President Wilson mentioned that there was \$28.7 million this past year in Commercial Ventures and Intellectual Property and that \$1 billion has been spent so far in improving buildings. There will be \$2 billion more in the next five years. A huge fraction of this is for this campus. The endowment now tops \$200 million for the entire university which is the first time ever. There is a new Committee on Science and Technology appointed by the Trustees and John Armstrong is chairing that Committee. Also at this meeting, there was a panel on International Programs and International Relations. This was chaired by our own former interim Chancellor, Marcellette Williams who, as of July 1st, is the new Vice President of Academic and Student Affairs and International Relations in the President's Office, and Frank Hugus represented this campus. A very lively discussion followed among the Trustees and many of the Trustees were somewhat discouraged that not enough of the students took advantage of studying abroad, whereas the cost and everything was brought up. It was also brought up that, at UMass/Boston, almost 40% of their student body is from abroad, so why would they go abroad? This showed the tremendous diversity we have among the different campuses of the University. Trustee James Karam was re-elected to continue as Chair. In terms of campus business, the new Doctorate of Audiology was approved for this campus. It was also voted to establish the Rudd Family Foundation Endowed Chair in Psychology on this campus and the Trustees approved the appointment of Professor Sonia Alvarez to the Horwitz Professorship in Latin American Politics and Studies and also approved the appointment of Professor Jay Demerath as distinguished professor. In conclusion, the newest Trustee has been appointed, Ruben J. King-Shaw, Jr. from Carlisle, MA. Senator O'Connor wanted to personally report that, over the past three years, he has been very impressed with the active engagement, the commitment, the enthusiasm, and especially the attendance of all of the Trustees, particularly the new ones. Trustees Armstrong, DiBiaggio, O'Shea and Cassel have been instrumental in opening up informative and lively dialogs, particularly in the Committee meetings. In the years prior to that, there wasn't much discussion at all. These Trustees surely have engaged the others in lively discussions. As for the fact that only one Trustee is from western Mass, he was not really concerned. His major concern is that the Trustees have a commitment and a passion for public higher education and, those Trustees he mentioned above, have certainly demonstrated these qualities and he certainly trusts the two new ones will do likewise.

In conclusion, Senator O'Connor added his personal congratulations to Chancellor Lombardi, Provost Seymour, their staff and the Faculty Committee that selected the prize-winning faculty for a most successful opening Convocation last Friday. It certainly stimulated, encouraged and applauded the University community and it was one of the most exciting and rewarding University events he had ever participated in his almost 40 years here.

5. The Representative of the Massachusetts Society of Professors

Professor Dan Clawson had three things to report. First, people presumably know that one more installment of the retroactive pay has been owed to us for more than four years. The next installment has passed both the House and Senate and is now sitting on the Governor's desk waiting for him to veto it. When he vetoes it, we hope that the Legislature will override the veto quickly and we assume that will happen, but, if he had a nickel for every assumption he made about the Massachusetts Legislature that hadn't proved true, he wouldn't need his retro. This is the payment for fiscal year 2003 which is July 1, 2002 to June 30, 2003 and that is \$7,751,342.00, according to the President's Office, which will mean that we will still be owed \$3.7 million for fiscal year 2002 which will come last in this. We assume that will happen, but he wouldn't spend anything until it's been received. Second, they concluded the contract and ratified it quickly and the President's Office and the campus moved quickly to get it to the Governor's desk. It is sitting on the Governor's desk and he has 45 days in which to sign it or send it back to us. Again, this is Massachusetts, who knows what happens and, even the 45 days is something of a joke because, if at the end of 45 days he chooses not to sign it, we have two choices: to keep waiting or to say "well, screw you; we don't want a contract. The likelihood is that we would keep waiting and that has, in fact, happened to the State College Association. Their contract started sitting on the Governor's desk in April. We believe this will happen this fall and we believe that, if it happens, the Legislature will fund it this fall. The Legislature set aside money to fund this in the same bill that they voted us the retroactive pay, but, again, nothing happens until it has actually happened. Third, the first meeting of the MSP membership will be on Friday, September 30. There is still time if you want to come. Send a note to the MSP Office. We will be choosing our priorities for the year and the Board and Officers are recommending to the membership five priorities: 1) consolidating and extending faculty gains under the 250 Plan. The 250 Plan is the best thing that has happened to the campus in years and years and we are looking forward to seeing that it really happens; that the Legislature doesn't forget about us next year; that there aren't any glitches that develop in it; 2) If that happens, then the campus, under the Provost's proposal, will be hiring something like 100 faculty a year for each of the next five years. We need to make it a priority to diversify the faculty. If we do that now, we can actually do something to change the character of the faculty so that it is less overwhelmingly white than it is at the moment and that there are more women in various underrepresented disciplines. The people that most likely make this happen are the faculty. It's great for administrators to say things, but, if faculty get together and agree about this as a priority and start getting together and talking about what are the ways to make it happen, what are the ways to have successful searches, we are much more likely to advance on it; 3) Similarly, if we are going to be hiring 100 new faculty a year, child care, spousal hire and a variety of other family issues are just much more likely to be central to what happens on campus. So, thinking about a variety of family issues and how we can address them so that we are ahead of the curve -- not after people are here and we've got 500 new faculty on campus who are unhappy about our policies, but rather we've tried to put things in place -- will help to attract them and keep them from the beginning; 4) We need to think about long-term politics. This whole system has this tendency to rush out and do something about the budget about April and, if we can try to do more to build long-term relationships with the Legislature so they know something about who we are and what we do, all will be better off for that. We need Legislative support to make those things keep happening; and 5) We would need to build our own internal capacity so that we reach out to more members and involve more people.

6. The President of the Graduate Student Senate

President of the Graduate Student Senate Uri Strauss stated that the Graduate Lounge reopened this past Monday after two years of being closed, serving food and coffee from Rao's. It will be serving alcohol most of the day, if that will entice people here to come. The serving of alcohol starts at 11:00 a.m. until 9:00 p.m. A lot of the leg work and initiative for this came from the Student Affairs Subcommittee of the Graduate Council. The effort and involvement was very much appreciated.

A new graduate colloquium series is also being organized by graduate students, the idea being graduate students will showcase their research in a way that is accessible to a general graduate student audience rather than just departmental specialists. The GSS received the retroactive pay the same time that the MSP received theirs. GEO is getting theirs, also. They also have a new contract that is being ratified and hopes this contract will be signed by the Governor.

Some of the GSS's priorities for this year will include a fee freeze. Most of the fees are spiraling out of control and they want to make sure that this place remains an affordable place for graduate students to come. They are also still going to be throwing everything they have against the administration's hostile takeover of a couple of student agencies, the Office of ALANA Affairs and the Commuter Services Office. They still believe that the process that was followed does not respect the University's rules and procedures. They will do anything they can to try and stop that. Another top priority will be accountability. It has now been one year since the University has been ordered by the state to release demographic data that was requested by students. It is illegal for the University to not provide this information and they will be fighting hard to make sure that this kind of practice stops.

B. QUESTION PERIOD

Senator O'Connor stated that there are some proposed possible changes in Commencement ceremonies next May. He asked Chancellor Lombardi to enlighten everyone or tell us what will possibly happen.

Chancellor Lombardi said that, as many of you know, over the last several years, many of our colleges and programs have been organizing various events that take place around commencement time. These have proved to be very successful and popular amongst both the graduates and their parents because there are opportunities for individual students to be recognized in a specific way by name. As those activities have proliferated, some parents have indicated to us their unhappiness that their son or daughter who is graduating in the general commencement doesn't have a college-based commencement in which their individual qualities are recognized. Other parents have been confused because they are invited to multiple ceremonies of commencement spread over as many as three or four weeks and they find it difficult to know where they are supposed to go, at what time, for what purpose. Given that confusion of enthusiasm, he thought probably it was a good time to review how commencements are done, see what each of the colleges has been doing, identify what works and what doesn't work and to see whether or not a more organized, uniform and effective way is needed to recognize all of our students through their various colleges. In doing that, they run into the challenge of logistics because it is not entirely transparent how one recognizes approximately four thousand students who graduate in a space of a day and a half in multiple, individual ceremonies and one large ceremony and manages the traffic, the scheduling and the speeches and all of the other things. They are in a current process of seeing what is feasible in a practical and logical way, working with the Deans, the Provost and our gurus of commencement activities. Once they get some kind of a plan that looks plausible, they will talk about it amongst many other constituencies. These things are very complicated, like moving graveyards. People are not excited about any change unless it's theirs. Of course, if it's theirs, it's the right change, but, of course, if it's somebody else's, it's the wrong change. The core concept we are trying to do here is recognize that, across the country, big universities are finding it more and more valuable to try and have ceremonies where students can be recognized individually and get their name called as they walk across the stage and shake somebody's hand. As you look at institutions like ours, you see a proliferation of these ceremonies. Once you start proliferating ceremonies, however, you have a fairness issue. A fairness issue is "are we recognizing each of our students in similar ways?" Then, of course, we have this tradition issue that we all come together in a mass meeting to say "yes, we are all one university, one campus and we have one pomp and circumstance and we all stand, cheer and do what we do as a university as a whole." Since we believe in all of these things with equal values at the same time and want it to all occur in fifteen minutes, there are certain logistical challenges yet to be overcome.

Secretary May stated that there were a lot of searches at the Dean's level and Associate Provost's level last year. He invited the two Deans, new to the campus community, to say a couple of words about the opportunities and challenges which drew them to their new positions.

Christine McCormick, Dean of the School of Education noted that, when she came here for interviews, what attracted her first of all was the school itself and the faculty here. The School of Education has a tradition of innovative programs that she had been aware of, but what she had been unaware of was the relatively recent growth of research productivity as marked in sponsored research projects. It is very exciting to be with this faculty, even as we have invited six new faculty this year to join us. It's a place that is very promising and she thanked Andrew Effrat for his leadership over the past three years, during budget cuts, to make it that. The other thing that attracted her was the central administration that had a consistent message. She thought that often, with central administrations, what is really important, not so much that you really agree with the message, but that you know where they are coming from and where you can move to. She stated that she was excited about being part of that kind of organization.

George Langford, Dean of the College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics stated that he was very happy to be here and a pleasure to be part of the UMass faculty to be living now in Amherst. He said that it is a wonderful time in the history of the University, a time of faculty growth, a time of transformation, having heard that from all quarters of the University, and that impressed him very much. It is very special to be part of an institution at a time of change as we are seeing right now. As Dean McCormick mentioned, Dean Langford heard the same consistent message from the central administration, from the Chancellor, from the Provost. He thinks there is very strong leadership here and it is very much of a privilege to be part of such an administration. In terms of challenges, he mentioned that the challenge for the sciences when new faculty are being hired are the startup packages and the research facilities. That will be an ongoing challenge to try and identify resources that they can provide to put together a competitive package to really bring on the top-quality faculty here. He stated that that will be his challenge to try and make sure that that happens and to continue to recruit the quality of faculty that we currently have in science and mathematics.

C. ELECTIONS

1. Two Associate Delegates to the Board of Trustees

Senators Seshu Desu from the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering and Arthur Kinney from the Department of English were re-elected as Associate Delegates to the Board of Trustees by acclamation.

2. One At-Large Member of the Rules Committee

Presiding Office Wilson asked that the Chair of the Rules Committee tell everyone what the Rules Committee does.

Chair of the Rules Committee, Richard Bogartz, responded that we listen to Ernie (May) to tell us what to do! The Rules Committee receives proposals and channels them to the appropriate Councils and Committees; we schedule Faculty Senate meetings, agendas, and discuss matters of significance that are raised to us by various members of the University community as a sort of stopping-off place before they move on in other directions. We are a decision-making body, but as a kind of funnel rather than doing the deciding. The deciding actually goes on here (in the Faculty Senate).

Senator Maurianne Adams from the Department of Student Development and Pupil Personnel Services was elected by acclamation to a term on the Rules Committee.

3. Chair of the Rules Committee

Senator Richard Bogartz was nominated and re-elected by acclamation.

D. ANNUAL REPORTS

Presiding Officer Wilson announced that, instead of reading them all and formally accepting each one of them, he will formally receive the group and then have each Chair of each Council and Committee make comments about individual reports.

1. 2004-2005 Annual Report of the International Studies Council, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 06-001.

This report was received.

Donal Carbaugh, Chair of the International Studies Council mentioned that the Council had a very busy year last year and reviewed and approved programs in several different countries: Japan, Italy, Senegal, Mexico, Scotland and India. They reviewed and clarified the procedures used in order to evaluate programs. They restructured the subcommittees of the Council and also spent a considerable amount of time discussing so-called third-party providers, which are educational institutions not of this campus but who bring programs to the campus and ask us to review and approve them. This raised a range of issues that we will continue to discuss this year. In conclusion, Professor Carbaugh gave a sincere thanks, on behalf of the Council, to Ernie May and Frank Hugus who have been a tremendous help to the Council this past year.

2. Annual Report of the Program and Budget Council, AY 2004-2005, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 06-002.

This report was received.

William Richards Adrion, Chair of the Program and Budget Council stated that the Council had a very busy year and met 22 times as a full Council and in subcommittees. He wanted to thank the administrative representatives who were very frequent attendees and very frank in their discussions with them which helped their business to move along quite well. He thanked Senator Rob Faulkner who chaired the Program Subcommittee and Michael Ash and Richard Simpson who split chairing the Budget Subcommittee. A lot of time was spent reviewing the budget and allocation models from every possible side. They looked at the Chancellor's Diversity Plan, the 250 Plan and various stages of the state legislative budget approval process. They reviewed a lot of programs. They began to look at a number of subunits; they have a strategy of taking up subunits per semester within the Budget Subcommittee. They started out by looking at the Mullins Center, Auxiliary Operations. They will be taking up Continuing Education this coming year.

3. Annual Report of the University Advancement Council, Academic Year 2004-2005, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 06-003.

This report was received.

Joseph Bartolomeo, Chair of the University Advancement Council stated that the report was fairly brief and straightforward. He reiterated that the principle activity of the Council was to work hand in hand with the Chancellor and Vice Chancellor to develop the communication of the priorities of the Capital Campaign which appeared in the early spring semester on the web. He also understood that on November 17th, the Chancellor, Vice Chancellor and members of the Council will have a fuller opportunity to present where the Campaign priorities and processes are, and they look forward to doing that.

4. Annual Report of the University Writing Committee, AY 2005-2005, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 06-004.

This report was received.

Dina Friedman, Chair of the University Writing Committee noted that the Committee reviews the First-Year Writing Program and the Junior Year Writing Program every five years and, in the other three years that they work, they try to assess other writing needs on campus and develop new initiatives. Last year was not a review year. This year coming up is going to be the year where they review the first-year programs. Some of the report details some of the preliminary steps taken to put that in motion for this coming year. Two initiatives that were worked on were 1) to assess the needs of graduate students' writing on campus; (this will continue to be worked on trying to get some funding to do a more formal needs assessment and to try to institute some services for graduate students) and 2) an infancy stage "writing for public discourse" and how across campus, they can facilitate more awareness of that, more activities for both faculty and students.

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Special Report of the General Education Council concerning Recommended General Education Designations, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 06-005 with Motion No. 01-06.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the General Education Designations, as presented in Sen. Doc. 01-06 No. 06-005

This motion was seconded and adopted.

2. Special Report of the Graduate Council concerning a Masters Program in Public Policy and Administration, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 06-006 with Motion No. 02-06.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Masters Program in Public Policy and Administration, as presented
02-06 in Sen. Doc. No. 06-006.

This motion was seconded and adopted.

Senator Arthur Kinney explained that this was the first of several motions coming before the Faculty Senate this year and probably next. In the Graduate Council's review of keeping programs and curriculum up to date, this now reflects changes in the profession and it will reflect changes in faculty research and interests as well as student preparation for the job market.

F. OLD BUSINESS

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

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

A motion was made to amend the already amended motion to add two other faculty members to Councils and Committees.

The motion to second was adopted

The main motion was seconded and adopted as amended.

G. OPEN DISCUSSION

Senator Bogartz announced that forever, he has been conducting his own little campaign on how to enliven and alter what goes on at these meetings so that it's not simply a set of announcements followed by "all in favor, say I" a whole bunch of times and then we are done. It seemed to him that, maybe, there are significant matters that the previous format of the Faculty Senate simply didn't allow for or didn't promote discussion of and so, the Rules Committee was pretty much of the mind that we should provide opportunities for that kind of a discussion. We also felt that it would be a good idea to ask the Faculty Senate what they think about what should be going on in this period. Now is your opportunity to tell us.

Senator Mokhtar Atallah stated that to make the discussions more focused on campus-wide issues rather than his own pet peeves, he recommended that the issues to be discussed should be open for discussion in the Open Discussion time and would be proposed by either the Rules Committee, because they are aware of all the issues coming up on the campus, or by the Chairs of the different Councils, if they have an issue in front of their Council that needs to be presented to the whole faculty, maybe even to get opinions from here before the Council discusses those issues in details and come up with a report. That would be a way of gathering public opinion about certain issues before the report of the Council comes up.

Presiding Officer Wilson had one question. Would you like to see this open discussion or open question and answer period as a part of the Announcement and Question Period, to take place at that part of the meeting?

Senator W.C. Conner said that, if you wait for the Rules Committee to do it, we will get the same stuff we've gotten year after year after year. Stuff that gets through there doesn't get through very well. As far as submitting a topic for discussion, he thought it was a very good idea. Ideas should be on the web or in a printed document beforehand. To give one example, he wanted to ask a question of the Chair of the Writing Committee. Do they teach students anything about intellectual property, like not taking documents off of the web for their assignments? That's a question we now have to deal with. Senator Conner is on the Academic Honesty Board and the number of instances where students are submitting stuff taken off of the web has increased immeasurably.

Senator Wilson asked if Senator Conner foresaw topics that people know about in advance or, for example, would he just stand up and raise a topic that could also result in some livelier, fruitful discussion?

Senator Conner thought that submitting something, even two days beforehand, should be allowed, something timely. If one waits for the Rules Committee to decide when something should be submitted, it won't.

Senator Roland Chilton pointed out that the Chancellor's suggestion that many of us are in favor of changes that we suggest, but not changes that other people suggest, he still wanted to question this particular procedure. The utility of the Faculty Senate, from his prospective and experience over a number of years, is that we receive, in advance, written proposals, written suggestions and we would have a chance to think about those. If presented right, we would have a chance to talk about them. When we are finished, we get a motion, we vote on that motion and then we have a faculty voice, a faculty position and we have it in writing. This procedure that you are suggesting might make the meetings more interesting, but much less useful and much less important.

Senator Wilson, in his opinion, stated that it is a business meeting and that we should be conducting business and it shouldn't necessarily be exciting or interesting, but we should be conducting the business we have to do – to get it done and finished.

Secretary May commented he thought that Senators Chilton and Bogartz are thinking back to the "good ole days" when we really mixed it up a good deal more than we are currently doing. That's fine with him. Much of what we do here could be called "deliberative democracy." A great deal of this takes place in Councils and Committees. We ask the lead administrators to justify what they are doing. Since each of our Councils and Committees is built around a lead administrator, that's the place where a great deal of this happens. For the Chancellor and the Provost, this is also a more public space where they justify to the larger faculty community and relate to the community at large, since this is a public meeting, the major things that are going on in the University, and why. They get up and answer our questions, if we want to ask them questions. If we don't ask any questions, then it's not their fault, it's our fault that we are not having a great dialogue in this democratic tradition. If we can make it better by getting people to articulate, as we have today, that's great. We want to hear them think on their feet. We need to have the business part of the meeting, but there's this other part of the meeting as well.

Senator Marta Calas stated that she rejected the idea that this is a business meeting because the day we continue to call everything business, we lose everything else we are. This is not a business meeting, this is a meeting about being in a collegial environment. In many ways, the ideas that you bring are of interest to all of us. This is the only place where we see people from other departments and colleges, and often time, we don't even know what is happening in the rest of the University. For the purposes of doing what for us is important business, the business of the University is really creating the University. She thought that this is a very good opportunity to do so.

Senator Julie Brigham-Grette said that it seemed to her that the most constructive way to use some of that time would be to have it set up and coordinated so that there is a pro and a con: somebody presents each side, and then you've got it pretty clear with some data laid out on whatever the issue is. If it was just left to random chance, and it is not coordinated, it's going to fall apart. If people come prepared with a couple of overheads to present data, and you have someone set up a pro and a con, there are always two or three sides to things, and having that set up ahead of time gives people a lot of fodder to really discuss and get it.

Senator Wilson asked how do you deal with the suggestion that filtering topics through the Rules Committee might not be the best way to do it?

Senator Brigham-Grette said that she would be happy to have it filtered through whomever would like to filter it through, but somebody has to coordinate it so that something happens.

Senator Conner said that something will obviously be debated. Are we going to debate the fact that students will be honest? Who is going to take the con on that one?

Senator Brigham-Grette answered that there are different approaches as to how you implement a change in the culture of the campus. That is what you want to debate in an issue like that, not whether it's right or wrong.

Senator Conner replied that the question is "how should it occur, how can it, how can you change that culture?"

Senator Brigham-Grette added that one topic she would like to see debated and laid out is that the phone system is costing us an arm and a leg. Her department is paying just so much per phone. They've just debated whether they should just scrap all phones, take all of the phones out of the department and get everybody a cell phone. It would be cheaper. She realized they bought into some system awhile ago and they are stuck with it, but there ought to be some other answer.

Senator Wilson said that that would be an interesting topic, but it wouldn't be productive if you just raised the concept right now and we had to discuss it.

Senator Brigham-Grette replied that that's the kind of thing, if someone could prepare the documents on either side, spend a half an hour laying the data out, if it's totally useless to change the system or even to think about it, then OK.

Senator David Ostendorf stated that he didn't think anything will happen when faculty talk to other faculty. From the perspective of the Council, he vested his time in the Faculty Senate on a Council to get things done. Of course, he entered with one particular item, but other things came out of that and he found that the Council structure works very well because there is the interaction of the faculty in that particular area, well set up by the current structure, interfacing with the administrative person who is in charge of that particular area. In this forum, of course, faculty will pop off and say whatever we want, but those guys can't say anything, because they answer to a much more structured hierarchy than we do. In the Council structure, they can and they can speak to the issues in their own disciplines. Things get done. The current Council and Committee structure works real well and, if this can be a forum to put a stamp of legitimacy on our Annual Reports, he thinks this is a good structure. He doesn't know what use an open hunting season, faculty to faculty, serves without concurrent engagement by the administration. In a free-for-all like this, nothing much would happen from their side. He wouldn't ask them to.

Senator Bogartz shared some of the suspicion of the Rules Committee. They're a creepy crowd and, more important than that, they are a small group. While they are busy doing the channeling and funneling and deciding what's going where, it might be nice for them, in advance, at least some of the time, to have heard some discussion on some matter before they decide how to approach something. This would be the place where that could happen. It wouldn't shortcut or eliminate the Council and Committee process, but it might help the Rules Committee in doing some of that and, perhaps, render the Rules Committee a little bit less suspicious.

Senator Wilson asked what is the feeling of the meetings? Should we close the discussion now or should we continue to discuss any one of those other two items?

An Unidentified Speaker noted that it would be good if we had some structure. He looked at this with some dismay, saying "well, how many hours is this going to take to discuss this?" Also he stated that there is a certain attrition of the meeting as the meeting goes on, so democracy in a discussion is excellent. If something were put onto an agenda, then there would be maximum participation. He noted that structure is needed to limit the discussion.

Senator Brigham-Grette stated that this was a good point. She noted that in her department, there were faculty meetings held every week for 50 minutes and they are done. They know they are going to be 50 minutes and that encourages a lot of participation. Everyone knows that at 5 o'clock, the meeting is over.

Presiding Officer Wilson stated that when he was a faculty Senator sitting out in the audience, he would be saying to himself "this meeting should get going, we should do what we have to do, and we should leave." He personally felt that he had other things he wanted to do.

The 643rd Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate stood adjourned at 5:00 p.m. on September 22, 2005.
The proceedings of this meeting are available on audiotape in the Faculty Senate Office.

Respectfully submitted,

Ernest D. May
Secretary of the Faculty Senate