

UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AT AMHERST
OFFICE OF THE FACULTY SENATE

Presiding Officer Robert Wilson called the 646th Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate to order on November 17, 2005 at 3:30 p.m. in Herter Hall, Room 227.

- A. **PRESENTATION BY:**
JOSEPH BARTOLOMEO, CHAIR, UNIVERSITY ADVANCEMENT COUNCIL
ELIZABETH DALE, VICE CHANCELLOR FOR UNIVERSITY ADVANCEMENT
JOHN V. LOMBARDI, CHANCELLOR
“THE CAMPAIGN FOR AMHERST, AN UPDATE FOR THE FACULTY SENATE”
PowerPoint presentation available at: <http://www.umass.edu/campaign/docs/facultysenate.ppt>

Professor Joseph Bartolomeo motioned to the presentation on the overhead screen and stated that the presentation is a distillation of the complete campaign plan, which runs hundreds of pages in considerable detail. The UMass Amherst Foundation was established to facilitate the campaign and fundraising. It was separate from the overall UMass Foundation. The fundraising was decentralized. It was not organized around the central development offices, but in the individual schools and colleges, and the other units that were indicated on the slide. Each school and college has at least one development officer. Most of them have more than one and these are some of their responsibilities. Whenever there was a question about development, from a faculty perspective, it was, “Why does this start at the school or college level first?” It was because they have the greatest expertise and investment in the particular activity surrounding their unit.

He announced that the Foundation has hired an Associate Vice Chancellor for Development, Toivo Tammerk, who supervises all of the individual development directors. There was a long search for that position, and they were very lucky to get Toivo. He has had considerable experience and offers the necessary supervision over the individual development directors. In terms of priorities, the four main initiatives were professorships, academic programming, student activities and scholarships, and capital investment. The operative word on this slide is ‘proposed’ because they do not yet know what the goals will actually turn out to be. They hope that they will meet or exceed these goals. It is important to remember that they were just proposed goals. They seemed to be a reasonable estimation of what we can do during the course of the campaign. There were three phases of the campaign itself. The planning phase was more or less completed. They are in the leadership phase at the moment. The consultant felt that it was appropriate to divide the quiet phase of this campaign into two; a leadership phase and a then a major gifts phase. They need to get more boots on the ground, so to speak, in terms of development officers. He heard that the College of Arts and Sciences at UCLA had more development officers than we did for the entire University. They were relatively immature when it came to this activity and it was going to take somewhat longer to identify and cultivate potential donors. That was why the quiet phase was divided into a leadership phase and a major gift phase. In the last three years of the campaign, they will go public with a goal because they will have a better idea of where they stand. Usually campaigns raise more than 60% of the money before they go to a public phase. That is when the campus will be involved and there will be a lot of external communication about the campaign. There was a fairly elaborate committee structure for the campaign, and it was divided according to the phases. The committees that were highlighted in yellow on the slide were the committees in which faculty either were involved or will be involved in the course of the campaign. There were fairly obvious reasons for having faculty involved on those various committees. The only one that was operative was the communications committee. As we get into the next phase, others will come online as well.

The consultants based the \$350 million figure on an analysis of the factors in assessing resources. One of the things that was essential to a successful campaign was an integrated communications strategy. They recently hired a communications director, Lisa Perl binder, for the campaign who had experience in communications and marketing with organizations like National Geographic, AOL, etc. She came very highly recommended and she was just beginning to get her shop in order. The key was going to be the integration of communication - internal, external, and otherwise. In terms of the success factors for the campaign, the two that drew the most directly on the faculty were proactive participation by the entire campus community and aggressive cultivation of alumni. It is very often the case that the donors to these kinds of campaigns will have some direct connection with faculty members. That was certainly going to be encouraged and exploited in some ways. Very often, it will be faculty whom they knew or with whom they worked with when they were students. All of this information was available on the various campaign websites.

Ernest May, Secretary of the Faculty Senate, noted that the organization of this Campaign was quite different than previous organizational models in that it called for more faculty involvement. He asked Professor Bartolomeo to comment on that.

Professor Bartolomeo replied that, as chair of the Advancement Council, he was a member of the Foundation Board, ex-officio. The members of the Council had also been invited to attend a number of events and meetings involving the board. There was a strong sense that faculty involvement will be essential. In terms of the communications committee, Vice Chancellor Dale was drawing on the expertise of people from Communication to help develop strategies for the campaign. There will also be more personal face-to-face contact with donors. Faculty can tell the story particularly well, when it comes down to the individual

experience in the classroom, the lab, etc. with students. Certainly, faculty have been involved in the planning process and will be involved in the implementation.

Secretary May said that there were significant issues. It was one thing to say that we wanted to get faculty involved. Faculty could screw it up, could be misinformed, or not connect correctly with the apparatus that involves stewardship for the gifts. There needed to be a rather smooth pathway for the faculty to interact with the development professionals and to be supported if they were actually going to do this. The support didn't exist ten years ago and maybe we ought to hear how it would work.

Professor Bartolomeo replied that the individual school and college development officers were crucial in this process. They were the ones with whom faculty were going to have the more regular contact. At some institutions, they actually send faculty members to boot camp for development to teach them how to deal with the prospects.

Secretary May said that, in his college, there was one development officer with an assistant for 21 programs.

Professor Bartolomeo said that was something that the Foundation was trying to address. Part of the problem was finding the money to bring the extra development officers on board.

Chancellor Lombardi said that the issue of faculty involvement in campaigns was always a complicated one. On one side, the faculty were the quality that we sell along with the students. That was what the donors invest in, that was why they were involved. At the same time, the faculty job was not to go out and raise money. The faculty job was to teach and do research. The faculty helped us design the programs that we wanted to emphasize. We went to a college and we said, "What kind of professorships, what kind of academic activities should we be trying to mobilize?" The primary input of that came from the faculty, through the deans and the development officers, and on up into the system, and that was what got captured in our case statement. It was what faculty told us were the primary ways in which we could invest to get a significant improvement in the institution. We identified a prospect for a gift who was interested in a particular area of the University's academic enterprise. They were thinking about endowing a professorship, or a chair, or a scholarship program, and often, the most powerful way we could impress upon them that their gift would produce an addition to quality was to get them in front of a faculty member and hear what was going on. What was happening in that program? What kind of a change would take place if their chair were endowed? What kind of improvement in student life would occur if an investment were made in scholarships? We mobilize faculty to participate in that sort of encounter, but don't ask them to do the work of getting ready for the encounter. Their job is to be who they are and talk about what they do. Often, that was the clincher that persuaded that donor that this really was a great place, and that their investment would produce a strong result. That is generally the structure of faculty involvement.

Senator Julie Brigham-Grette stated that the College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics (NSM) was arguably the engine of research on campus, and yet, there was nobody from NSM on the University Advancement Council. Was there some historical reason why there was nobody from NSM on there?

Secretary May said that there was a spot for NSM on that Council, but the problem was that no one volunteered. If she was willing, they were meeting the next morning, and she could be on the Council.

Chancellor Lombardi said that the creation of the University of Massachusetts Amherst Foundation was a critical artifact in the construction of a high-powered development organization because it provided the donor community with a place to take ownership and responsibility of the fundraising enterprise. In every successful university fundraising effort, it was the donors who mobilized support. It was the donors who validate that what we were about was a good thing. It was the donors who said to other donors that this was a terrific investment based on what they were able to accomplish and how great it was. Their ownership of this process was probably the most significant element in the success of such an enterprise. Our Foundation, because it was a private 501C3, had the capacity to speak in an authoritative voice. It had the capacity to exist through this campaign and on to the next one so that it created an institutionalized, permanent, commitment by the private folks who care about this institution. They were going to continue to build, grow, and enhance the development program. It was not just an activity to generate a campaign, celebrate, and go home. It was to create a continuous and ongoing support structure for the academic enterprise. That was what characterizes all of our significant competitors in the public university world.

Professor Bartolomeo said that one of the things the Foundation members had done was to host leadership briefings, which were going to continue throughout the campaign, where they gather, either in their homes or in a restaurant, with people of significant capacity, who were told the story of the campus, of the plan of the campaign, by the Chancellor, by Vice Chancellor Dale, or by other senior administrators. So far, those leadership briefings had been very successful and had helped identify some resources and some needs.

Senator David Ostendorf said that he was not too familiar with the campaign aspects, but, in the past, there was a time when the faculty weren't trusted to do anything autonomous, certainly in the area of fundraising. Was there some sort of local Amherst donor voice in establishing this autonomy in 2002? He thought that it was a recent occurrence.

Chancellor Lombardi replied that the Foundation was a recent occurrence. They had a support group for the previous campaign, but, because it wasn't a permanent, institutionalized artifact, it's value didn't carry beyond the campaign itself. The establishment of this Foundation was a very serious, real, corporate thing. It had been through all the processes, the Board of Trustees had approved it, everybody signed off on it. It had a board of directors; it had articles of incorporation. It was a real serious thing. At the same time, it was not an organization designed to run off in some uncontrolled fashion. As an organization, it had organic links to the institution as well as organic links to the Board of Trustees. We didn't appoint people to that Foundation board unless the Board of Trustees thought that it was a good idea, so that we didn't have any run-away organizations. The budget of the operation was approved by the institution and there were a variety of controls. Some of you who watched the academic landscape have noticed that there have been occasions around the country where private 501C3s that have been created to support a university have not been properly structured and sometimes people decided that they are the university instead of the university being the university. They did things that weren't good for the university. That was not possible in this case. They struck a pretty good balance, taken from the best examples around the country, of how to have a Foundation in which the donors feel real ownership and have real authority and have real ability to drive a campaign, but, at the same time, do not have the ability to disappear into outer space.

Presiding Officer Robert Wilson stated that, in the School of Management, there were six departments. It was obviously easier for that development officer to get his hands around the departments and what the departments were doing and figure out ways to raise money. With some of the other schools and colleges, where there were very diverse and numerous departments, how do you perceive that development officer being able to deal with the situation where there were so many different, possibly unrelated, departments?

Chancellor Lombardi replied that this was always a challenge. The process worked from the donor to us, not from us to the donor. It was very important to understand that the initiative in this conversation was to get the donor interested in us. Once the donor was interested in us, then we could go to the right department to develop the conversation that would emerge. If we were talking to a donor for NSM, which is a large complicated college, and we were exploring with the donor what they might be interested in, we found out right away what area was of interest to them. We went to that area and we said that we had talked to a donor who had an interest in polymers. What could we do to persuade this donor they ought to invest in polymers? It is not that we went to the donor and said there are 39,000 possibilities for investment in the University of Massachusetts Amherst. We went to the donor and asked them why they love us and we talked about why they should love us. After having that conversation, you discovered rapidly what the donor was interested in. Then it was relatively easy for the development officer to then go to the dean and the department chair and so forth. The development officer then told them that they have a donor who was interested in X. What was our best investment opportunity that we could present to that donor to persuade them that this was a terrific opportunity? Sometimes, we found a donor has an interest in something that we didn't actually do in the center of our activity, but it was right on the edge of something we do. Let's imagine that they were in history and, by some miracle, they were interested in Venezuelan history. It was not one of our major focuses, but it was very close to our Latin American Studies program, very close to our interest in Latin American history. We would then go to the department and we would ask if there was any way that we could take advantage of this enthusiasm of our donor to enhance the History department. The History department could say that under no circumstances were they going to do anything related to Venezuelan history because it would distract them from the main event. In that case, we could go back to the donor and tell them that they should really be talking about Argentina. Let's talk about Brazil, U.S., Western Europe, China, or Africa. Venezuela is out. Usually what happened was that the department said that Venezuela wasn't at the center of our universe, but, on the other hand, if there were \$5 million for Venezuela and \$1.95 for Argentina, we might be able to take the Venezuelan stuff and expand it to a conversation about North and South America. All of a sudden, we had a serious activity. We then had a conversation with the department on how to take advantage of that opportunity. This was very similar to what happened when we sent around to the science departments what the NSF and the NIH were interested in. They send out that they are interested in x, y, they want to do research on HIV/AIDS, they want to do research on this, they want to do research on that. The departments didn't say that they didn't want to touch it because it was not the center of their business. They said how could we take advantage of that interest of NIH to leverage A) first rate stuff and B) the expansion of what we were already doing? That was how it worked.

Professor Bartolomeo stated that one of the additions to the development staff, aside from the regularly assigned development officers, was going to be officers from the Discovery Program to help us identify some prospects that we might not be as aware of.

Chancellor Lombardi added that, at the University of Massachusetts Amherst, we have a very large number of alumni but we haven't been talking to them regularly over the years. As a result, the number of alumni and friends that we knew well enough to put them in our prospect pools, people we could call on to see what they would be interested in, was very small relative to the number that we will need in order to run this campaign. We hired a number of entry-level development officers

who's job it was to essentially discover out of our alumni pool, using various statistical techniques, figure out people who ought to be interested and who had the capacity to be interested, but we don't know whether they were interested and to visit them. It was essentially a cold call. You went to see Josephina and you told her that it was nice to see her, and asked her if she remembered her time at UMass. Ninety percent of the time, they said that it was the best time of their life and they were so grateful to the University. They were so sorry that they hadn't heard from us in so many years. Then we talked, and out of that, we discovered that their real interest was in fine arts, business, chemistry, etc. and we came home and put them on our list. We then turned them over to the appropriate development officer for that college for further cultivation and development and got them to be engaged with the institution. Normally, on average, it will take five encounters of substance with a donor before we can really do an 'ask.' It is not that you go visit them and they say, "Oh, yes, I remember UMass, here's \$5 million." It doesn't usually work that way, though, if it did the Chancellor would be a very happy camper and he certainly would take it. Usually the case was you go back, they remembered that they had a wonderful time here, they remembered how good the faculty were, they were grateful for what they learned here and how it made their career successful. They were eager to re-engage. We have to re-engage and get their mind about this institution updated to what we do terrifically well today and connect it to what we did so well when they were here. After two or three encounters, and they come to the campus, and met the faculty and saw the students, and they participated in some kind of an activity, all of a sudden, their enthusiasm grew and then we said, well, here was an investment opportunity. Here was a way that you can help transform the institution. When they closed and agreed to give the money, it was the happiest day of their lives. People may think this was silly, but it was not. Donor, after donor, after donor will tell you that there was nothing more fun than making that gift and seeing it take shape and seeing the change take place in the university that was the result of their investment. It was not a question of trying to squeeze money out of reluctant people. It was a question of realizing both their dreams and our dreams at the same time. In that process, they were truly very happy when they were participating in that investment and return process.

Professor Bartolomeo added that one of the things that these Discovery Program officers did was to help develop some prospects from the schools that were more widely spread out, such as HFA and NSM that have multiple departments and maybe not enough staff right now in the Central Development Office. Through this Discovery Program, some new prospects will be uncovered for those schools.

Secretary May commented that everything had been turned 180 degrees around from a highly centralized system with a significant amount of marginal function or dysfunction to something which sounds like it could really work. It had a lot of community and broad-based potential, especially for faculty. He hoped that the faculty would get behind this effort as it takes shape and work through the bugs and make it a huge success. This was one of the areas that we lag our peers, perhaps by the greatest amount of any in the whole profile of the University and it really needed to happen. He congratulated Chancellor Lombardi on getting that separate Foundation. That was the key element in the whole thing. When he first arrived here, he put his foot down and said, "If you want me, you have to do this." They did it and now we have to make it work. That is not a small task, either.

Professor Bartolomeo stated that, if people would like further information, they could contact him or any members of the Council. They are kept abreast of everything that happens with the Foundation, everything that is going forward in terms of the development and advancement activities. They were very good resources to speak to as well.

B. NEW COURSES (10 Minutes)

There is no report associated with the following motion:

<u>COURSE</u>	<u>TITLE</u>	<u>CREDITS</u>
LATIN 455	"The Poetry of Ovid"	3
PLSOILIN 391A	"Dialogue on Agricultural Issues"	1
		Mandatory Pass/Fail

MOVED: 07-06 That the Faculty Senate approve the courses LATIN 455 and PLSOILIN 391A, as recommended by the Academic Matters Council.

The motion was seconded and adopted.

C. NEW BUSINESS

1. Special Report of the Academic Matters Council concerning The Creation of a Minor in Building Materials and Wood Technology in the Department of Natural Resources Conservation in the College of Natural Resources and the Environment, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 06-011 with Motion No. 08-06.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Creation of a Minor in Building Materials and
08-06 Wood Technology in the Department of Natural Resources Conservation in the College
of Natural Resources and the Environment, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 06-011.

The motion was seconded and adopted.

D. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Principal Administrative Officers

Michael Gargano, Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs and Campus Life, said that about a year ago, he shared with the Faculty Senate that the University was initiating a new admission opportunity for students called Early Action, First Choice. He reported that as of the Nov. 1st deadline, they received 2,955 applications through this program, of which 59% of the applicants are female, and they have a fairly good distribution between in-state and out-of-state. All of these applicants will be reviewed in the next few weeks and they will receive their notification by mid-December. It is a very good sign for the institution and a complement to the faculty and the deans and the academic programs. These students identified the University of Massachusetts Amherst as their first choice. On behalf of the admissions office, we thank you very much.

Joyce Hatch, Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance, gave an update on the Custodial Improvement Project. They started with ten buildings about a year and a half ago. They brought in intensive training. It was a very different program and it was very successful. There were great results where supervisors were held accountable. They tested and tracked a whole list of items that get done every day in each building. We have been working with the training consultant and now we have trained the trainers. We have people to train the next round of custodians in the program. In September, we added four new buildings, for phase two. They had four phases to roll it out to the whole campus. Vice Chancellor Hatch had heard some great feedback from people in the Morrill complex. As of this week, they are including 17 more buildings. By next fall, we will have the whole campus in this program.

2. The Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Secretary May reported that the UMA 250 Task Force had been meeting rather intensely over the last few weeks reviewing the administration's plan for the allocation of positions under the UMA 250 plan. The Task Force has endorsed the process by which the administration is proposing to do this. They are not endorsing any specific allocations because they don't know them yet. They wouldn't try to do that anyway. They are looking at the process to see if it is fair. It is fair to say that this was the most objective process that the campus has seen in his 28 years here in terms of trying to create a solid objective Foundation for the allocation of such positions. We will be watching intently to see if they follow through with that data. Also, the Intercampus Faculty Council met yesterday following the Trustees' meeting. That is a semi-formal, five-campus faculty group consisting of leaders in the Senates on the different campuses. Secretary May was elected as chair of that group. They met with Vice President Lenhardt for 45 minutes and also with newly appointed Vice President Keith Motley, former Interim Chancellor at the University of Massachusetts Boston. Currently, he is holding a portfolio that has to do with development and external affairs. It was a very interesting discussion.

3. The Chair of the Rules Committee

Senator Richard Bogartz mentioned that the search committee for the Associate Vice Chancellor for Student Life completed its initial survey and interviewing of eight candidates and submitted a list of three finalist candidates who they were hoping will be invited to return to campus.

4. The Faculty Delegates to the Board of Trustees

Senator Brian O'Connor stated that Secretary May had attended some of these meetings. He attended the Committee on Academic and Student Affairs on Tuesday as well as the Committee of the Whole, and yesterday, the full Board meeting. At the committee on Academic and Student Affairs, there was a panel of faculty discussing HIV/AIDS which was a very fascinating panel in the sense that it covered the biology, the medical and the social implication of HIV/AIDS, and it really showed the cooperation between the five campuses as well as their relationships both internationally and nationally. Professor Telfer from Vet and Animal Science and Professor Foulkes from Epidemiology and Biostatistics in the School of Public Health were our faculty representatives on that panel. The Trustees were very lively, they were very energetic. They

asked tons of questions. For example, “Are we getting the type of students that we want?” We talked about the improvement of recruitment; are we diverse enough, who are our biggest competitors? Do we go by SAT’s verses GPA? They had a discussion on PMYR. The Trustees wanted to know how effective it was. They had another discussion telling the value of AQADs, especially in giving evidence for departments in terms of future hires. It was probably one of the most lively meetings that he had attended in a long time. In the Committee of the Whole, there was an update of the Master Plan. Joyce Hatch and some other people gave a review, not only of the buildings that are going to happen, but obviously the campus landscape improvement, which go hand-in-hand with the building plans. The aim was to create a safe area for pedestrians and an esthetically pleasing campus. Once the new dirt becomes old dirt, it is going to really be very beautiful.

At the actual Board of Trustees meeting, Chair Karam introduced the new Trustee, Ruben King-Shaw, Jr., who is a senior partner of Pine Tree Health Care which is located in Carlisle, Massachusetts. He talked about a variety of things including the successful opening of the UMass club, which was on the 33rd floor of Franklin Street, where the President’s office is. Currently there are 400 members. The goal is to eventually have 1500 members. There were already 30 lifetime members. President Wilson talked a little about the supplemental budget that was released on Monday. He said that the matching endowment money was in that budget. We have been successful in that for every one dollar gained by the University they will contribute \$.50. It was not 1 for 1, but it was pretty good. President Wilson indicated that they were working very hard on the resolution of the contracts. He was optimistic and hoped it would be approved very soon. The President mentioned the TV ads of the University. He also mentioned a plan that is ongoing to pick a firm from 4 applicants who have applied to develop a strategic, integrating, marketing plan for all the campuses, which will hopefully integrate some of the ideas that all of the campuses have. UMass Online continues to grow dramatically. There was a 20% growth last year - 19,000 students and \$19 million in revenues. The first report of the Science and Technology Task Force was given, which was chaired by John Armstrong, who is our local Trustee living in Amherst and a valuable friend to the University. John Armstrong said that they held their first meeting Tuesday morning in which the Vice Provosts for Research, or their designees, from all campuses attended. The major goal was to learn how the Board of Trustees could facilitate research on each of the campuses. They had a lot of issues that they intended to study and a report will be forthcoming. The Board voted to establish an Endowed Professorship in Polish Language, Literature and Culture to be known as the Walter Raleigh Amesbury, Jr. and Cecile Dudley Amesbury Professorship. They voted to approve the appointment of Professor Lynn Baker of the Philosophy department as Distinguished Professor. They also approved the appointment of Professor Vincent Rotello as the Charles Goessmann Chair of the Chemistry department. Senator O’Connor was excited about the enthusiasm and the engagement that the Trustees showed. He was very happy to report that the Trustees are seriously concerned about the welfare of the University.

Chancellor Lombardi said that the Trustees were anxious to have an update on the plan to build a student recreation center. This project had been on the books for quite awhile. The students had agreed to an increase in their fees to cover \$50 million for a recreation center. At the time they were ready to start the projects, they had a catastrophic budget crisis and, in consultation with the students, they postponed that project so we wouldn’t have to lay off faculty and could maintain the academic programs during a budget downturn. Now that we are beginning to recover, it is time to put that back on track. Last year, we conducted a fairly elaborate survey of the students to find out what they would be interested in seeing inside of a student recreation center; what activities, what programs, what kinds of services. The results of that were quite clear as to what were the priorities. They went out and had a firm design the program: how it would fit in and what we could do and show what was possible for \$50 million and what would be possible in a second stage, in the event that we would be able to find more money. The \$50 million project got just about everything that the students wanted, with two exceptions. The first exception was a large swimming pool. A large swimming pool is nice a thing but that was one of the lowest requested items in the list that the students wanted and it was one of the most expensive per square foot. We put that in the second category. Then, a rock climbing wall was on the list, but again, was a low-priority item compared to free-weights, basketball courts, handball courts, a running track, locker rooms and all the other things that will go into a recreation center. We also talked some length about where the recreation center might be sited and we went through the process of where it should be sited. Students told us that if it was within ten minutes of the residence halls, they wouldn’t drive. The key was to find a location that was within a ten-minute walk of most of the residence halls and, at the same time, didn’t occupy prime academic construction space. After a lot of conversation, it looks like it will be located in a site very near or right on where that old ugly barn is across from the Mullins Center. If you look across the Mullins Center, you see this enormous gray barn that dates back to another era in the University’s history. Some place right on that street is where it will go. There were two virtues to that. One, of course, is that the location is within ten minutes of all the residence halls, and the second is that it is capable of sustaining the second phase. The site is not constrained by just the first

phase. They also decided to put the recreation center some distance from Boyden. It is not a good idea to put the two in the same house. We want to make sure that this is a student recreation center and not a student athlete training center. The next step is we've sent this out to be designed. It is a substantial building. The anticipation is that we are looking at three floors. In the center, there will be basketball-type space that is for intramural basketball. It is convertible space: you can put volleyball in there, you can put anything you want. In addition, there will be some handball courts and a track. There will also be lots of room for free-weights and exercise machines which are the highest priority for the students. They showed pictures and diagrams to the Trustees and they felt pretty good about it because they had been worried that we weren't going to do it. We feel very good about it.

Secretary May said that at the Administration and Finance meeting, both Chair Karam and Trustee Mahoney indicated their strong enthusiasm for moving ahead about twice as fast as the projected plans on building new buildings and renovating space because interest rates are low and it will make us more competitive for the best students. He stated that it was interesting to note that, after all those many meetings he attended, they wouldn't do anything. The buildings couldn't be fixed, the roofs were leaking everywhere, and they just sat there on their hands. Now it is the other extreme. They want to do it faster than it can be done. The other issue had to do with Bill O'Shea who was a former VP at Lucent. He asked what our positive margin on research was. Companies, of course, make money on research. The Medical School came up with a quick answer. It was -1.2 and our folks had mentioned that it was -1.3 on this campus. Like everything else on campus, all concerts are subsidized, but research is also subsidized. It is great to get the money, but it actually costs us money to do the research - here as everywhere.

5. The Representative of the Massachusetts Society of Professors

Professor Robert Paynter gave three brief announcements. They will have an open meeting for MSP members on Monday, Nov. 21 at 4pm in Campus Center 168C to discuss the Chancellor's benchmarking process. At the most recent Board meeting, they passed a resolution in support of the librarians participating in the UMA 250 plan. They held a successful workshop on October 21st discussing issues of recruiting and diversity. They developed literature to inform search committees on how they might go about this and the literature is available from the MSP Office.

E. QUESTION PERIOD

Secretary May mentioned that there were detailed minutes from the UMA 250 Task Force on the Faculty Senate website. All our deliberations were there. The backup information that was developed by the Office of Institutional Research will be up on the web soon. The Task Force's deliberations were transparent and the administration's data was transparent to the campus.

Senator Julie Brigham-Grette directed a question to Joyce Hatch. She said they all received the memo on retroactive pay and it sent a lightning bolt through most of the people she knows. They were scrambling to figure out what to do because, last year, they were told to spend their RTF. They did that. Now they were told that they have to have the back pay. The problem is that there were unintended consequences. She wanted to know whether the consequences were thought about. For example, she understood that the contract was arranged with GEO before there were minimums put on each of the colleges. The college minimums were placed in after the contract. The college minimum floors were then impacted and forced on the back pay. All faculty put in pay increases for the students. We put in 5% raises as OGCA instructed us. When you raise the ceiling dramatically, as in NSM - they have the highest ceiling on campus - and then go backwards, that translates into a 10% pay increase for students several years ago, many of whom are not even here. They are now in a catastrophic situation where many grants are even gone but now the tax that is being passed on to the departments, and even the deans, all because of that unintended consequence.

Vice Chancellor Joyce Hatch replied that there are two issues. One has to do with GEO members, whether they are in a grant or any type of fund. She didn't know the timeline for paying that out, but she knew that it was a complex, hand-done calculation, per student, because of all the issues. Sometimes they got pay increases anyway regardless of this. She knew that it was complex. The HR Office is putting in overtime because the GEO calculation was not across that board. There were these case-by-case instances. In some cases, departments gave increases that were not to be covered by this. That is a separate, very complicated issue. The other issue had to do with the grants paying the retroactive, whether they are GEO or staff. We had some conversations at the senior level and it was a decision that every attempt should be made, in the first pass, to try in every case to get the grants to pay, if possible. The decision was made that it is up to the dean to work with the departments to figure out how to fund the retroactive. In some cases, maybe there was not enough there. Those will be separate discussions that a dean would have with the Provost.

Senator Bogartz asked what the state of affairs was so far as to policy and procedures concerning entry of alcohol into the housing units.

Chancellor Lombardi said that the first rule was that you are not supposed to take it in if you are underage. The procedures that they are going to use to try and control the entry of inappropriate alcohol on the campus were under discussion. The Vice Chancellor has sent out a notice of various measures that they are considering that have to be vetted through the Legal Office. They have to be considered by people on the student government and other people to have a chance to comment on them. The issue was that, on our campus, we had a significant amount of inappropriate alcohol use and abuse in various places on campus. There were places in our residence halls where we had a very significant amount of noise, commotion, and activity that was associated with alcohol abuse. We need to fix that. It was not appropriate behavior because it put both the consumer of alcohol and those around them at risk. There was no justification for us saying that it was ok. We were in the process of working through various ways of improving our control over that conversation. It involves not only checking people in and out of the building, it involves better monitoring of behavior in the halls. It involves educating students so they can use our anonymous hotline when things appear to them not to be safe or appropriate in the way activities in their hall are taking place. It involves community policing. This process has been on going for some time. They have been increasing their efforts in education. Education needs to be combined with enforcement. We need to get students and parents to take ownership in improving the quality of life on campus because security in the residence halls was a joint activity. Nobody can do it alone. Students can't do it by themselves. This was a universal problem all over the country. It drives everybody nuts because it is so difficult to control and take care of because students and others arrive with certain attitudes and ideas about what they want to do while they are here.

The 646th Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate stood adjourned at 4:40 p.m. on November 17, 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