

UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AT AMHERST
OFFICE OF THE FACULTY SENATE

Presiding Officer Robert Wilson called the 648th Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate to order on February 9, 2006 at 3:30 p.m. in Herter Hall, Room 227.

A. COMMENTS BY CHANCELLOR JOHN V. LOMBARDI
“UNIVERSITY PRESIDENTS SUMMIT”
(QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION TO FOLLOW)

Chancellor John Lombardi stated that the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Education had convened a University Presidents Summit on International Education about a month ago. The purpose of the exercise was to talk about the administration’s intense new commitment to try and develop a broader range of activities that connected the academic world and the international world to improve our language training, our culture training, and our relationships with our colleagues overseas. While there was a great deal of activity, the fundamental purpose of the exercise was to talk about their new program to try and increase language training in the less commonly-taught languages, which is one of their major pushes. Some of the programs they will invent will be the kind of thing we might want to apply for. Others will probably go to the service academies or they will go out to the Language Institute in Monterey and other specialized training activities. They are also focused pretty intentionally on improving the exchange of scholars. They have greatly improved the visa acquisition process for international students. They have now reduced the cycle time to days rather than months. They are much more efficient in clearing our student applicants to be in the visa process to come to the United States and they also know they need to do better with their international scholars. They recognize that they are not very efficient on those yet and they are trying to improve that because they recognize that the loss of international scholars to the United States is actually a serious loss to the capacity of the United States to engage in the world and participate in science technology and other kinds of educational activities. The Chancellor thought that while there was a lot of talk and commotion, the most important part of the conversation was the symbolic recognition that the administration needed to take a more aggressive and supportive stance in encouraging international scholarly exchange in all of its various forms. While they didn’t have a lot of money to put on the table, they were talking about a program of about \$114 million which, spread around the United States, is not a lot of money. Nonetheless, it is money that was not there before. More importantly, it recognizes the administration’s commitment to doing something about these bottlenecks that have caused everybody in the American Academy to struggle both with the admission and recruitment of international students on one side and the management of international scholars on the other. They talked at some length about improving the process of renewing visas for international scholars who were here for one year and will want to renew them for two or more years, which has been fairly clumsy and inefficient. They are going to try to make that better. All in all, it was a good event in both its substantive and symbolic process. The Chancellor thought that the university presidents felt pretty good about the change commitment. They heard from everybody who was anybody, from the President all the way down to the 43rd Assistant Secretary of something. The administration made a big effort to demonstrate to this group that they were committed to this. Often in Washington, presence is as important a commitment as anything else because everybody wants everybody’s time. All in all, the Chancellor thought that they should feel that there is going to be some progress in these areas. There has been some already, but the Chancellor thought that there would be more. He imagined that we will see more programs focused on language training in various forms. There was a lot of conversation about whether they were interested in training people who had a full understanding of the language or if they were interested in people who were capable of dealing with newspapers and telephone traffic and interrogation and other kinds of issues of more immediate interest to the national government. He thought that it was clear that they are desperately in need of people who can deal with the practical aspects of language, rather than the literary or cultural aspects of language. He did not think that we will see a lot of support for Ph.D.s in Arabic Literature, but he suspected that we will see a good deal of support for immersion programs in the less commonly-taught languages that will prepare people to be effective overseas in the various theaters where they have risk, challenge and concerns.

Frank Hugus, Director/Associate Provost of International Programs, appreciated the fact that the White House seemed to have finally gotten the message that we needed to do more proactive activities internationally. He was curious about the specifics of next steps. Was this program in language training for the less commonly taught languages to be put into effect more or less the way of the old NDEA Title 6?

Chancellor Lombardi said that he was not sure. On the government’s website, there was some information on how they anticipate spending the \$114 million and, as he said, it was scattered about in different agencies. It was not enough money to fund a major program like the National Defense Foreign Language Program that

many of us remember. What they did was put it in various agencies. There was some money in the Department of Defense and there was some money in the Department of Education – mostly in programs that currently exist, but which will have a new subsection devoted to this. Part of the reason for the conversation was for them to test us on what it was that we thought we might be able to do. Naturally, being academics, we did not want to do what they wanted to do. The conversation had a certain disconnect about it. They have very pragmatic, direct and specific needs that are relatively short-term in nature and the university representatives are always thinking about language and culture. We are always thinking about comprehensive programs that include both language training and understanding of literature and history and sociology and art and all the other good things that we think are an important part of understanding why a language is important and how it connects to society. The Chancellor thought that their immediate needs were so great and the money was so small that what they will see is a great focus on existing immersion programs to make them better. If you have one, there will probably be an opportunity to apply for some more money to be more effective. In terms of inventing big, new things, the Chancellor did not see that right away.

Director Hugus stated that the leap from studying languages to study-abroad programs was not a great one. Was this addressed?

Chancellor Lombardi replied that there was considerable conversation about study-abroad programs. A lot of it had to do with the fact that the large volume of our students that study abroad go places with commonly-taught languages, like English. Their concern was that we do not have very many programs that take our students and immerse them in languages that are of critical national interest. Part of their conversation was about how we would be helpful in creating these overseas immersion things, where you go to a culture and you live there and acquire the language in some kind of intense way. The Chancellor did not know whether the university presidents persuaded them that they have the capacity to actually run those programs overseas, since most of the ones we run are not of that kind. He thought that, if this actually rolls out to be a big thing and University of Massachusetts Amherst wants some of the money, they will have to do something differently. We run most of our programs for cultural enrichment, rather than the production of returnees who are completely or reasonably fluent in somebody else's language.

Director Hugus thanked the Chancellor for his report and offered his department's help if needed.

Chancellor Lombardi said that the things that they were really interested in were Chinese, the various varieties of Arabic, and maybe Korean. There was a lot of conversation about the relationship between native speakers and Americans who learn the language and what the value of that tradeoff was. These are the kinds of things that we have been all discussing for 40 years.

B. COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

RESEARCH AND PUBLICATION IN THE DIGITAL AGE: DEALING WITH THE ELSEVIER PHENOMENON

PANEL

1. Moderator: Marilyn Billings, Coordinator, Five College Cooperative Library Systems and Special Initiatives
2. Panelists:
 - a. Jay Schafer, Director of Libraries
 - b. Bruce Wilcox, Director of the University Press
 - c. Robert Rothstein, Professor of Comparative Literature and member of the Research Library Council

Senator Marilyn Billings, Moderator, welcomed people to this edition of the Committee of the Whole, stating that all have been concerned about what has been known as the crisis in scholarly communication for some time. Some of the key players who are involved in this have been scholars, journal publishers, and libraries. Academic authors rely on publishing for tenure, promotion, and recognition. They give up their ownership of their works to these publishers. Journal publishers, in turn, package, market, and distribute the information and libraries turn around and purchase these materials from journal publishers at inflated prices.

So, how did this crisis come about? Starting as far ago as the 60s, there was a significant increase in scholarly communication so commercial publishers saw a profit potential in this market. By 2003, after a series of mergers, takeovers, and buyouts, the publishing market became controlled by a small number of these journal publishers. That set the stage for where we are going today with this Committee of the Whole.

* The Panelists' presentations are available at: <http://www.library.umass.edu/presentations/>

Senator Billings announced that this conversation will continue on April 6. The Vice Provost for Research, the Center for Teaching, the Libraries, and others are getting together for a half a day of conversation about this topic. They have a keynote speaker from the National Science Foundation, Chris Greer. Stay tuned for more information on that event.

QUESTIONS

Senator Marta Calas commented that a missing element in the panel was an editor of one of the journals that was published by a private publisher. Another big element was being in the middle, which we are. On the one hand, we have to attend to the interests of the publisher; on the other hand, we try to attend to the interests of our colleagues and peers. Publishers have changed their management teams from scholarly ones to market-oriented teams; therefore, the question of the bottom line comes up constantly. At the same time, we are attending to the question of who is buying the journal or whether they are, in fact, having the journal in different aggregators that would then make it available in digital form and so on and so forth. That other side is something else that should be attended to in this argument. In the professional fields the journal article is really the prime outlet.

Professor Robert Rothstein replied that one of the people involved in the discussions about open access made the point that in the traditional model of publishing, a lot of the labor was provided, in a sense, for free by faculty, authors, editors, reviewers, and so on. What the journal publishers provided was distribution, the physical publishing, and so on. One of the things that was involved in the open access model was what they call the disaggregation of these various elements. Faculty members would write articles, they would review them, edit them, but there would be no value added by a publisher because there would be no printing and the distribution would be through the internet rather than through whatever mechanism there was for selling and distributing journals.

Senator Seshu Desu stated that, when we write an article, we get copies from the publisher. He said that he can distribute those copies to whomever he wants to without contacting the publisher. We also get a PDF file. He can put the PDF file on the internet, most of his colleagues do it, and he does it. If you go to anyone's CV in science and engineering, they have the articles and, next to that, the PDF file is there. Is it not a legal thing what we are doing?

Director Bruce Wilcox said that it depends on the terms of your contract with the publisher. One of the things that Jay Schafer is suggesting is that those terms should be looked at very carefully and that some of the new models that are being proposed should be incorporated.

Senator Desu stated that if some funding agency funded his research, even though this was done with the University salaries and state salaries, the funding agency had the right to use those results for non-profit purposes. In the same way, if the University was doing the work, our University resources were being used to do the work, and if the University wanted to use that particular thing for non-profit purposes, under those circumstances, we should have the right. That is the reason we put those things on our website, for other people to access them.

Director Jay Schafer replied that he thought that Senator Desu should read his license very closely. Even though many publishers were now allowing authors to put their publications up on the web, Elsevier, particularly, does not allow people to put the PDF of the final article up. You can put up a preprint or some other thing, but to put a PDF of the article that was published in the journal, he would talk to Brian Burke about that.

Senator Desu replied that he did not have to put up the PDF file of the published article. The article that he wrote had small modifications that the publication provided. He could put the article he wrote, before publication, on the CV. He said that he could use that word file he had written and put it in a PDF file. Then it would be free to everybody. You don't have to subscribe to that particular journal if you don't want to.

Professor Robert Rothstein replied that he was not a lawyer, but there was a stage that Senator Desu omitted. The publisher provided or facilitated the peer review. There was the article that you wrote and submitted, there was a published version, but, in between, there was also a version that had perhaps benefited from peer review and editorial suggestion.

Senator Desu stated that very little was changed in his articles by the publisher. This was a way to counter rising prices. If universities started doing that, then the journal people would come to your desk and start negotiating a price with you because you had the power now. The power was not with journals, you had the power. If my name is known, they will take the PDF file I put on the web as my work. They do not worry about somebody's comments made or a few changes here and there. If you want to have a negotiation, you need to come with the power. You cannot negotiate with somebody who has all the powers. He believed that the University should start doing this and they should exercise their rights, then you can have the power of negotiation and the prices will come down.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Principal Administrative Officers

Michael Gargano, Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs and Campus Life, announced that January 15 was the regular application deadline. He was happy to report that they received nearly 24,000 applications for the class of 2010. That represented over a 13.5% increase from the previous year. It was a credit to this institution. The applicants were 53% female; 68% of the applications have come in over the web, 64% were in-state, 35% were out of state, and 2% were international. The 23,000 plus represented 48 states. They were still having a difficult time in South Dakota and Wyoming, and will work on that for next year. They did get applications from Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia, as well as 63 foreign countries. All of the schools had considerable increases in their applications. From that pool of 23,000 plus, they will enroll a class of 4,000 students in the fall.

John Cunningham, Deputy Provost, said there was the equivalent of over a thousand extra seats being occupied in the classes this spring. There were 250 students more than last spring. He thanked everyone for putting them in their classes.

2. The Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Secretary Ernest May welcomed everyone back. He announced that in two weeks, at the next Faculty Senate meeting, Stan Rosenberg would be here. He will talk to the Faculty Senate about a plan for the improvement of higher education, in which he is one of the principle architects.

4. The Faculty Delegates to the Board of Trustees

Senator W. Brian O'Connor, along with Secretary May, attended the meeting of the Board of Trustees Subcommittee of Administration and Finance and also the Audit Committee. There were two major items. Each campus reported on their affirmative action policies and Esther Terry gave the presentation from our campus. It generated a lot of good questions from the Trustees. He believed that they learned a lot, including that there were certain areas within the University where it was very difficult to recruit people from minority faculty and also women in certain areas. Other areas seem to be much more successful. It generated a very good discussion. The second item was the student fees. He stated that you have probably read in the paper that the freeze on the student fees that the student trustee recommended was defeated. It failed to get a second, so it was defeated. It was a discussion that lasted a little over 45 minutes in which the Trustees were very gracious. They really tried to point out to the students in the audience as to why the fees were the way they were and what would happen if this fee increase did not go through. It was a very good discussion.

(Senator O'Connor referred to his slide presentation which is available at:
http://www.umass.edu/senate/fs/minutes/2005-2006/Student_Charges_AY_2006-2007.pdf)

This was basically a summary and, as you can see, the bottom began to fall out in 2001. Starting in the fall of 2001, the Board of Trustees voted annual increases in student charges. There had been two mid-year spring increases approved, as well. During the years 1996 to 2001, the Trustees did not touch student fees or tuition at all. There were absolutely no increases at all for a period of five or six years. If you had sons or daughters who went to school here then, that was great. Beginning in 2001,

we paid the price for having no increases at all. The current rates for this past fall and the rates prepared for next fall were shown here. This reflected the practice of limiting the increases in total mandatory student charges to no more than inflation for resident undergraduate students. The mandatory raises that were in this current increase ranged from \$275 to \$317, which was still a little bit less than the cost of living, which was 3.6 %. The fees average out to about 3.4%. This slide was the comparison of the cost versus the other core campuses. This slide showed the cost of fiscal year 1996 to the proposed fiscal 2007 and, roughly, we go from \$5000 to approximately \$9000 over a period of eleven years. You can see that compared to public universities, the average annual increase was about 9.5%. The University of Massachusetts Amherst, over that same period of time, was about 7.5%. They have managed to keep it down a little bit below.

This slide basically compared the total percent change in tuition and fees with the total percent change in state appropriations. From FY 1996 to FY 2001, we actually went up in state appropriations and, of course, to welcome our Chancellor Lombardi, the bottom fell out and he was able to somehow or other keep us afloat here, even though we went down 20%. We began to go up a little bit between 2004 and 2006. Now we are about 23%. This was the entire ten years. This slide was the average annual change in tuition and the average annual change in state appropriations. Senator O'Connor had never seen the legislature very sympathetic and he didn't think that they were going to, by any means, double their contribution. That doesn't mean we can't try, that doesn't mean we can't lobby, and all of that stuff. The legislature was not the only answer.

This slide contained a diagram of how University of Massachusetts Amherst rates among other national universities. We came across as number 11. This could change dramatically. Other states around the country were going through the same thing we were going through, in terms of trying to adjust the budget for the upcoming fiscal year. This slide compared us to where we were in New England. We used to be well up there behind UVM. We are now fifth out of the six New England state universities. Looking at this particular slide, comparing the University of Massachusetts Amherst to Massachusetts private colleges, Boston University was \$42,000 versus our \$17,000.

This slide showed the bottom line. The proposed increase was about 3.4%. For the fees, adding up the room and board, it was going from approximately \$15,795 to \$16,000, or about 5% increase, which is still well within the cost of living. This slide showed how much financial aid University of Massachusetts Amherst students receive. There was need-based and non-need-based. You can see the figures that, over the years, had been a significant increase in financial aid, both non-need-based and need-based. This slide is how much financial aid the University of Massachusetts Amherst provides to students from University funds. You can see it had almost doubled, from \$31 million to \$56 million. This slide was the percent of need met. Some of you may have seen the article in the *Boston Globe* about Joe Drury who couldn't afford to come here. President Wilson made it very clear that Joe Drury will be here and will graduate and we will continue to have students like Joe Drury. You can see that 90% of the need was met, which was very high. It was higher than our other state universities. The University was doing an excellent job in meeting the financial aid. This next slide generated a lot of controversy among some of the Trustees, justifiably so. You could look at this in many ways. This was the average debt at graduation and the percentage graduating with debt. You can see that 61% of our students graduate with some debt and the average debt is a little bit less than \$15,000. Then the Trustees began to talk about - well we have students on this campus with high incomes, as opposed to Boston, in which almost 90% of the students work 20 hours a week. Senator O'Connor still thought that \$14,000 or \$15,000 was a realistic figure that can certainly be paid back. He dealt with students who, if they don't get into UMass Worcester Medical School and have to go to Tufts or BU, they are talking \$250,000 debt. So, at least these people do not have major undergraduate debt to pay off.

Needless to say, this generated a great deal of discussion. The Trustees, especially the newer Trustees who were heavily involved, were very gracious to the students. It was a good course in economics and basic math and basic understanding of statistics and so forth. He reiterated that the Trustees go to the meetings and are actively involved. He feels much better than he did about 5 or 6 years ago because he was getting pretty cynical about the attitudes of the Trustees.

5. The Representative of the Massachusetts Society of Professors

Professor Max Page, Vice President of the Massachusetts Society of Professors, gave an update on the activities of the Massachusetts Society of Professors (MSP). They were hard at work on behalf of faculty, librarians, and the University as a whole. They were fighting for good funding for the

University this year, especially for the continuation of the UMA 250 plan. They have been overjoyed that the Chancellor had joined them in calling for this plan for hiring 250 faculty and they were on their way to doing that. They will also be fighting for the passage of Senator Stanley Rosenberg's new higher education bill which had just left the committee and will be heading for the full Senate. It could be one of the most important bills affecting and improving the University in many years. In late March and April, they will be calling on their members to go to Boston to have the face-to-face, one-on-one discussion with legislators. It was enormously effective last year in improving the funding for the University.

The MSP had been very active in monitoring the benchmarking process. The Faculty Senate had been involved in that, as well. Many in the MSP were very concerned about that process and were worried what it might do to the culture of the University and also to the way their members were evaluated. It was a plan that was moving forward, but the MSP will be monitoring it carefully. They also supported the general thrust of the student's efforts to slow the cost of attending the University. It was obviously a critical issue. Senator Stanley Rosenberg's bill stated that one of the purposes of the University was to provide all the Commonwealth citizens, regardless of economic means, with the opportunity to participate in high-quality, post-secondary academic and educational programs. They were rapidly losing that mission by the cost of attending the University of Massachusetts Amherst and it should be a concern of all of us. The MSP supported the effort of the students to slow down the growth in fees that has doubled in the last four years. The MSP also recognized that a freeze, without an increase in funding by the legislature, could have horrible effects on the University as a whole. The MSP passed a resolution at the board meeting on February 8 which called on the Board of Trustees to join them in supporting and working for a University budget that contained sufficient funds to support 100 new faculty and librarian positions in line with the 250 plan, and to freeze mandatory student fees which have almost doubled in the past four years.

The MSP had been increasingly concerned with fighting for the University as a whole, but they were also fighting for the funding of the current contracts. After the Governor decided to caress the contracts in his office for many weeks and months, he had finally moved it forward, and it was in the legislature. They hoped that the latest contract would be funded in the coming months. They were fighting for the final installment of the retroactive pay from the last contract. The MSP was very committed to not having contract negotiations go on for years and years. They were going to be ready to negotiate and they were going to be talking to the members this spring about their concerns and what they would like to see in the next contract. They are going to be ready in the fall so they can have a contract by June of 2007, in advance of the end of the current contract.

D. QUESTION PERIOD

Senator Roland Chilton asked Secretary May whether we were gaining or losing ground in filling out the membership of the Faculty Senate so that it is reasonably representative of the faculty.

Secretary May replied that we are slightly losing ground with the Faculty Senate. The councils and committees are chuck full and the Faculty Senate, itself, is just slightly losing ground. He regrets that. If anyone has any ideas, they can contact Secretary May.

E. ANNUAL REPORT

Annual Report of the University Press Committee for Academic Year 2004-2005, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 06-017.

This report was received.

Professor Gerald McFarland, Chair, University Press Committee, pointed to some parts of the Annual Report, including the bottom of the second page and all of the third page, along with other materials that were in the back of the report. He said that one way we measure who we are and how we are doing was through recognition from outside the University. This Press is a small and very high-quality operation. If you look at the number of prizes that books published by this Press have won in the last few years, you get a sense of what a terrific job they are doing and what a terrific outreach the Press is to the rest of the nation. Every quarter or so, 4 to 6 new book awards were made. They were very prestigious and a strong recognition of the quality of the publications. Professor McFarland said that he hoped that people would pick up the Annual Report. He directed the audience's attention to the publications as a source for textbooks. Professor McFarland was using University Press books almost every semester in his courses. They are strongest in

American studies, humanities, and the social sciences, though they are also on the list of recent award winners for a section on the contentious political waters of Boston Harbor and all the issues of ecology. He liked the one on gypsy moths that came out. There was a wide array of things that you could draw on. Professor McFarland called for congratulations to Bruce Wilcox and his staff.

F. NEW COURSE

There is no report associated with the following motion:

<u>COURSE</u>	<u>TITLE</u>	<u>CREDITS</u>
COMM 426	“Media Violence”	3

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the course COMM 426, as recommended by
14-06 the Academic Matters Council.

The motion was seconded and adopted.

G. NEW BUSINESS

1. Special Report of the Academic Matters Council concerning the Revision of the Two Undergraduate Degree Programs in the Department of Veterinary and Animal Sciences, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 06-018 with Motion No. 15-06.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Revision of the Two Undergraduate Degree
15-06 Programs in the Department of Veterinary and Animal Sciences, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 06-018.

Senator Mokhtar Atallah stated that the purpose of this revision was so that both professional students who work in the application and those preparing for graduate school will have their needs met in the program.

Senator O’Connor decided to speak against the motion. He believed that these revisions set a very bad precedent in terms of allowing faculty to be gatekeepers for professional schools. One of the things that Senator O’Connor had tried to do in 35 years as a pre-med advisor was not be a gatekeeper for the medical schools and not do the work that they were supposed to do as admissions committees. His job was to be an advocate for the student, regardless of their major, regardless of their GPA. This goes totally against that grain and makes it very easy for the vet schools to say that students did not “cut the mustard” at the University of Massachusetts Amherst; therefore we aren’t even going to look at them.

Professor Samuel Black, Head of the Department of Veterinary and Animal Sciences, said that this in no way substitutes for the needs of committees in various professional schools to make their own choices. The choice that was made by faculty of the department was to better serve the students. They have a wide category of ability of students coming into their department. They try to serve the students by offering those classes that will most appropriately direct them to good career choices. Most of the students entering the department do so with the ultimate intent of going to veterinary school, if they can achieve that. In principle, 15% of their students make the grade and achieve that process. En route, many of the students struggle highly with the core sciences to the extent that they cannot participate effectively in electives to prepare them for career choices that will be more suitable for them. This makes it very difficult to effectively advise the Veterinary and Animal Sciences students in terms of activities that will fulfill them as individuals and fulfill them academically. Over the years, we have found it necessary to provide layers of courses that provide skill-based and experience-based training at the same time as we provide layers of courses that are stringent in content. When the faculty re-initiated these two degree programs, they were recognizing the variant interests of their student body. Many of their students will achieve effectively in the academic areas and direct themselves into the core sciences; at graduate schools, professional schools, or other professions that will utilize those skills. Yet others move into the producer groups that represent various aspects of the community that use different skills in the core sciences. The programs that we are advising recognize these different interests and skills and try to serve them, not with a view of acting as a substitute for choices made by professional schools, but with a view to better serve the students that come to our department.

Secretary May asked Professor Black if there was anything to prevent a student who graduates with a BS in Animal Science from applying to veterinary school.

Professor Black said absolutely not. You can graduate with a degree in English and apply to vet school. These professional choices are made in the context of advising students.

Senator Atallah said that, in the Academic Matters Council's discussion with the department, they recognized that if one wants to advance to graduate studies, you have to prepare yourself that way. This is the same way that we tell students that you can go to Medical School with any major, but you have to take these courses and do well in them. That was the mechanism that was established here.

The motion was seconded and adopted.

The 648th Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate stood adjourned at 5:08 p.m. on February 9, 2006.

The proceedings of this meeting are available on audiotape in the Faculty Senate Office.

Respectfully submitted,

Ernest D. May
Secretary of the Faculty Senate