

UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AT AMHERST
OFFICE OF THE FACULTY SENATE

Presiding Officer Robert Wilson called the 651st Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate to order on March 30, 2006 at 3:30 p.m. in Herter Hall, Room 227.

A. PRESENTATION BY LIEUTENANT COLONEL DAVID T. VACCHI (MILITARY LEADERSHIP): "UPDATE ON THE ACADEMIC AND PROFESSIONAL INTEGRATION OF THE ARMY ROTC PROGRAM AT THE UMASS-AMHERST CAMPUS"

A PDF version of Lieutenant Colonel Vacchi's presentation may be found at:
http://www.umass.edu/senate/fs/minutes/2005-2006/Army_ROT_C_Presentation_3-30-06.pdf

QUESTIONS

Secretary Ernest May stated that he recently saw a movie called the Fog of War in which Robert McNamara elucidated on eleven precepts that he had taken away with him after his service as the Secretary of Defense during a particularly interesting period. He asked Lieutenant Colonel Vacchi if he had a few precepts taken away from this experience that he wanted to share.

Lieutenant Colonel Vacchi replied that what the country learned from Vietnam was that you cannot blame the soldier because an administration decided to send him to war. They learned that lesson and he thought that, so far, they were not blaming soldiers that were coming back; they were trying to treat them fairly. That being said, the soldiers that were going, particularly the senior leaders, needed to understand that, many times, they were going into another culture. He had seen rather effective interaction with the Iraqis and created security and stability. For example, the coalition had not been present in the area that he left in early 2004, yet it still remained peaceful. There were both Sunni and Shiia in that area. The city that had the first democratically-elected council in the Baghdad Province still stood twenty-seven months later. That was because the military personnel interacted properly on the Iraqi's cultural terms to ensure the security and stability. The first precept was that, if you were going to go throughout the world, it was not an American culture out there and you had better understand the culture before you got into it. He had been asked if he would consider an experimental course on Iraq and Iraqi culture. He was going to see if he can dabble into that if he had some time.

Another thing that was important to know was that the media sells what sells and that is all the bad news. There probably was more good news than there was bad news. It was important to know that while, yes, there were some bad things happening, just because that was all the media was reporting, it was not necessarily all that was happening. That was something else they learned in this age of instant media. He had been told by numerous media outlets that some of the good news stories that they had over there would probably not get printed because they did not sell. It was a pretty hard pill to swallow. The other thing that was important to understand about soldiers, particularly as they return, was that there was a mission to do and they were being told what to do. The reason why you saw soldiers that were coming back wounded -- amputees, post-traumatic stress through serious trauma -- and they were willing to go back in a heartbeat if they had to, was always to support their buddies and their unit. The camaraderie that was found in war was something that could really only be understood by people who had been through a shared serious traumatic experience. September 11 in New York City or the Pentagon would be examples. These young soldiers were quite amazing. He had seen young people do things that more senior officers were supposed to be able to do. Quite frankly, these soldiers were not very good soldiers back here in the states but, when they went to war and the chips were down, they were performing at an unbelievable level. They were doing it because they wanted to be part of a solution, whether or not the armed forces should have gone there. They were doing it because they wanted to take care of their buddies.

B. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Principal Administrative Officers

Joyce Hatch, Vice Chancellor for Administration & Finance, stated that there was a quick way to find out and get an update on all of the construction news and projects underway on campus. Many more projects will kick in next week and you will see a lot more signs and detours around campus. On the University of Massachusetts Amherst homepage, on the left-hand side, there was "Construction News." If you click on that, you will see maps, detours, how to get around campus, and what was happening. It was pretty well written. That was the way to get up-to-date information.

2. The Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Secretary May announced that President Jack Wilson will be at the next Faculty Senate meeting to give a "State of the University" address. At the following Senate meeting on April 27, someone from Joyce Hatch's office will give an update on all of the construction renovations.

5. The Representative of the Massachusetts Society of Professors

Professor Steven Brewer stated that there was going to be an outreach to the Legislature over the coming weeks and faculty were encouraged to contact the Massachusetts Society of Professors (MSP) Office if they would like to participate in going to the State House to talk to legislators about getting our current contracts funded. The MSP general meeting will be on April 5th.

D. Special Report from the Nominating Committee for Secretary of the Faculty Senate, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 06-020.

Ernest May was reelected to the position of Secretary by acclamation.

E. ANNUAL REPORT

Annual Report of the Research Council of the Faculty Senate, Academic Year 2004- 2005, University of Massachusetts Amherst, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 06-022.

Paul Utgoff, Chair of the Research Council, highlighted some of the things in the report. The Council was glad to see the Faculty Research Grants so healthy. It was approximately \$470,000 which was half matched by the various deans and then half put up by Paul Kostecki. They had to revise the Faculty Misconduct Policy. That came to them because the government office of Research Integrity said that they had to comply with the guidelines or they would shut off their funding. The Research Policy Subcommittee of the Research Council put forth the recommendation to the administration that they construct a web-based showcase. The idea was that the University should be proud of all of our productivity and it should be displayed. There was a wealth of information that faculty produced annually in the AFRs and it should be listed on web pages. They specifically did not want to do this at a departmental level; they wanted to show the campus. For example, there would be a web page that showed all the refereed journal articles for the campus for that year. If one looked through that AFR, it was not just publications; there were a tremendous variety of things that people did, particularly over in the arts -- performances, productions, etc. The University should be proud of it all and display it. The Research Council put forth a recommendation to that effect to the administration and they were working on that. Last May, he took two days aside and wrote a program so that, if you put the electronic AFR files into one folder and run this program, all of the web pages were produced automatically. There was no labor issue. The only issue was to get the AFR files. During June and July, he met with MSP representatives to talk through the issues and things got straightened out. Administration was currently trying to collect these AFR files which was a larger task than one would imagine, even though everybody was behind it.

F. PROGRESS REPORT

Progress Report by Stanley Hertzbach and W. Curtis Conner, Co-Chairs of the Ad Hoc Committee on Student Plagiarism

Senator W. Curtis Conner stated that the Ad Hoc Committee on Student Plagiarism was formed on November 3. Two organizational meetings were held in December. Professor Hertzbach and he were chosen as co-chairs. They decided on three important areas: detection of plagiarism, enforcement, and education. They formed two Subcommittees: the Policy and Procedure Subcommittee which was chaired by Catharine Porter and the Teaching Subcommittee which was chaired by Donna LeCourt from the Writing Program. Anne C. Moore from the Library has been their liaison with the Library and the software vendors. They had one graduate student and three undergraduate students on the Committee. They were faced with an immediate concern related to detection. In December, the Library had just finished a one-year trial program with a company called Turnitin. They were negotiating a license for the calendar year 2006 during that period of time. The Committee was rather concerned with the legal and procedural uses of Turnitin. They identified an alternative company called MyDropBox. In February, they had several web meetings with representatives from both of those services. Eventually, the Committee decided not to accept the way that Turnitin was operating but convinced them to modify their operational procedures that protected the student's rights more

and would be easier to implement. MyDropBox has provided them with the capability of using their service to also look for and search for plagiarism among documents. Turnitin agreed to provide similar services for them. The Policy and Procedures Subcommittee was looking at revising the current Academic Honesty Policy. This was going to make it a little easier to implement. The Council was trying to detect or set up a new system of reporting dishonesty. The goal was to institutionalize a system that was fair to all students and acceptable to all faculty members who were trying to re-look at the way the procedures were set up so that they would be better to handle.

Professor Stanley Hertzbach said that the Teaching Subcommittee was developing materials for both students and faculty. For students, they were thinking of a plagiarism tutorial, possibly in the residence halls and associated with the Writing Program to support student learning about plagiarism and to make the information more widely available. For faculty, they were developing material that can be inserted into one's syllabus, information on designing assignments that tend to protect against plagiarism, cultural differences in the treatment of intellectual property, and discipline-specific materials on research ethics and intellectual property concerns. The Teaching Subcommittee finished interviewing faculty who participated in the trial period of Turnitin last spring to understand their reaction to plagiarism; how they feel about it and what they needed in the way of instructional support based on that experience. On April 11, the Library will host a Faculty Reception from 11:30 to 1:30 in the Learning Commons featuring a tour, a light lunch, and demonstrations of Turnitin and MyDropBox. The Committee encouraged all teaching staff to come and learn about these valuable tools. It was their opinion that the consistent and uniform use of these tools was efficient and was the most fair and unbiased way to check student submissions for originality of content. These tools could also be used as an aide in teaching about plagiarism. Otherwise, they were not going to Google every suspicious phrase in every paper, but that was effectively what the tool does. Instructors should not be in a position of saying, "Jane, I do not like that paper. I do not believe that you can do that. Your native language is not English. I am going to check it." That was a bias that they did not want to build into the system. That was why they thought that uniform use of these tools was the fairest and most efficient way to deal with the issue. They now had a license for Turnitin and a trial for MyDropBox. They needed many more faculty and instructors to participate in the use of these this year so that they can gather enough data to really understand the nature of plagiarism on campus and the extent of plagiarism. They needed faculty input so that they could develop the ideas and make recommendations to the Faculty Senate as they go forward. The Committee will be making a recommendation in the fall about which of these two, if any, detection services should be used because our license and trial periods will run out. As the two Subcommittees come up with other pieces of their agenda, they will bring it to the Faculty Senate. Presumably, before the end of the year, the Faculty Senate will vote on our proposed edition to the regulations.

Senator Richard Bogartz stated that he did not think it was unfair to use what you know about a student to make a judgment as to whether it was likely or unlikely that they wrote the paper in question.

Senator John McCarthy stated that he was a bit puzzled at the embrace of Turnitin. He thought that it was a deeply-flawed program. It had a gigantic rate of false positives. It made no use of formatting information in the paper itself. It was a fancy search engine but it was extremely unintelligent about the format of documents. It cannot recognize the bibliography; it cannot recognize quotations. It was really a profoundly-flawed program and he was wondering why the University paid money for it.

Senator Conner replied that it was something that was already in motion before the Committee was formed. They were the first to question whether or not the University should do that and to talk to legal counsels about some of the legal implications associated with it. That was why they still treated both of these programs as trial periods. That was why they wanted to have as many faculty participate with them in evaluating the programs so that, before the end of the year, they could make a recommendation as to which one, or *if*, they wanted to go ahead with in the future.

Senator McCarthy replied that the issue was not legal. There was a kind of mythic view of this program that it provided the kind of objective measure of plagiarism and that was just not true. One recommendation that was made was that you should allow students to run their own papers and then allow them to detect inadvertent plagiarism themselves. The thing was that it had such a gigantic rate of false positives, that all you were going to do was get students complaining to you that the program said the students were plagiarizing when they did not.

Professor Hertzbach invited Senator McCarthy to meet with the Committee to discuss this.

Senator McCarthy replied that he had spoken to Donna LeCourt and he also submitted written comments. He was surprised that people were happy with this product.

Professor Hertzbach stated that the Committee knows that Turnitin reported matching text even though it was in quotes. What the software claimed to do was determine something about the originality of the text. It does not claim to determine plagiarism. What you had to do was, if you saw matches, then you had to look and see if it was properly referenced. It was up to the instructor to decide whether there was plagiarism involved and to grade the papers. The software does neither of those.

Senator Marta Calas wondered whether the Committee has had a discussion about the question that they were trying to answer by using these programs. They were teaching the same way, using the same type of assignment they used to before the Internet existed and, therefore, they were still relying on papers. Perhaps, in the age of the Internet, they had to be a little bit more proactive in using other ways to evaluate student learning that does not rely on the old term paper approach. She thought that, in some ways, it was almost like they were stopping time and now they were trying to rely on these types of programs. The company makes a lot of money, but was it really efficient or effective to find out how many people were plagiarizing or what to do with that? It was almost like they were creating another layer of bureaucracy on top of what they already had to do when they were grading papers. The question for her was whether the Committee had gone beyond the question of what to do with papers if they might be plagiarized. There may be other ways by which to evaluate students.

Senator Conner stated that the Teaching Subcommittee was asking the question that Senator Calas posed. They were looking to see if there needed to be changes in assignments to make things different. However, he did not think that they should just dodge requiring students to write because they believed that they might plagiarize if they wrote. He did not think that that was necessarily the way to get around it. That question that Senator Calas posed was something that was part of the charge to their Committee. They had not evaded it; they were encompassing it.

Professor Hertzbach said that just as faculty decided whether they wanted to have writing assignments or not, those who gave writing assignments could choose to use these tools or not use them. It was not mandatory.

G. SPECIAL MOTION

That on this day, March 30, 2006, the Faculty Senate expresses its relief and happiness on the release of alumna Jill Carroll from being held hostage in Iraq and wishes her and her family the best.

The motion was seconded and adopted.

H. NEW COURSES (10 Minutes)

There are no reports associated with the following motions:

| <u>COURSE</u> | <u>TITLE</u> | <u>CREDITS</u> |
|---------------|---|----------------|
| CE-ENGIN 260 | “Probability and Statistics in Civil Engineering” | 3 |
| EDUC 125 | “OASIS First-Year Seminar” | 1 |
| HISTORY 247 | “Empire, Race, and the Philippines” | 3 |
| LEGAL 475 | “Gods and Governments” | 3 |

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the courses CE-ENGIN 260, EDUC 125, HISTORY 247 and LEGAL 475, as recommended by the Academic Matters Council.
21-06

The motion was seconded and adopted.

| <u>COURSE</u> | <u>TITLE</u> | <u>CREDITS</u> |
|---------------|-------------------------------|----------------|
| COMP-LIT 551 | “Translation and Technology” | 3 |
| COMP-LIT 552 | “Medical Interpreting Online” | 3 |

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the courses COMP-LIT 551 and 552, as recommended by the Academic Matters and Graduate Councils.
22-06

The motion was seconded and adopted.

| <u>COURSE</u> | <u>TITLE</u> | <u>CREDITS</u> |
|---------------|---|----------------|
| AFROAM 605 | “African Americans and the Movement to Abolish Slavery” | 4 |
| COMP-LIT 753 | “Advanced Translation and Technology” | 3 |

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the courses AFROAM 605 and COMP -LIT 753, as recommended by the Graduate Council.

The motion was seconded and adopted.

I. BYLAW CHANGES

Special Report of the Rules Committee concerning Bylaw Changes, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 06-023 with Motion No. 24-06.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Bylaw Changes, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 06-023. 24-06

(Inasmuch as this is a change to the Senate Bylaws, this is the first of three readings of this motion. It will be read again at the 652nd Senate meeting and voted on at the 653rd meeting. The motion may be debated and amended at all three meetings.)

Senator Bogartz stated that most of the changes were non-controversial except on page 4 in Section 4-3-2. The phrase, “Or as otherwise deemed appropriate by the Rules Committee,” refers to the appointment of student members to committees and councils. There has been an extended email discussion between various members of the Rules Committee and Uri Strauss, the President of the Graduate Student Senate. Two paradigms seem to have arisen. One was the experience of some of the members of the Rules Committee on a search committee on which a graduate student representative seemed to have his own agenda. These were political matters having to do with the administration that were more interfering and interruptive of the function of the search committee. That person had to be removed and replaced by some one else from the Graduate Student Senate. The experience of members involved in that situation led them to feel that ultimately the Rules Committee should be involved, if necessary, in determining which student representatives sit on a committee. The experience of Uri Strauss resulted in a different paradigm. He was on a Senate committee where he was speaking as a representative of the student government and was disagreed with by the chair of that committee. Uri felt that the opinion being represented as the opinion of the students was not really representative of the students. Uri imagined a situation where such a chair might appoint an additional student or more to water down the position being presented by the representative as opposed to an unrepresentative student member of the committee. He could not be here for this reading or the next reading. His stand was one of concern about having this introduced.

Secretary May explained that the problem had always been that the SGA and GSS have failed to appoint members to all of the councils and committees. There must be upwards of fifty or more slots for undergraduates and graduate students. Recently, the Faculty Senate had instituted a one-credit Practicum where students attend and contribute to Council and Committee meetings and write a short paper at the end of experience. There were ten or eleven students in that course, but that was out of fifty positions. If the SGA or the GSS do not appoint students as indicated in the Bylaws, the Rules Committee would ask the chairs or members of the councils and committees to come up with recommendations. The Rules Committee would then make the appointments. This was so that students would be members of these councils and committees. He thought that it was an appropriate way to make sure that there was a student voice, whenever possible, on the councils and committees. This was not meant to undermine the GSS and the SGA’s role in this, but the fact was that they have not exercised this role as indicated in the Bylaws in a significant way. Uri, Eduardo Bustamante and a few others have been at some meetings, but they definitely have failed to get the forty or fifty needed colleagues to join them on those committees. The time has come to make a slight change and, if anybody disagrees, hopefully they will let them know. The fact was that these were the Faculty Senate Bylaws. The Faculty Senate does not write the Bylaws of the SGA and the SGA does not write the Faculty Senate Bylaws. They have had this privilege of membership for many years and they have exercised it very little. Now that it might be changed, they were hearing a lot because of the GSS.

Senator Mokhtar Atallah stated that it would be good to know the justification for those changes. The changes were apparent, but he did not understand why the changes arose. If there was a front page that said what the reason for the changes was then they would understand why they were voting one way or another.

Secretary May said that there was always an explanation. The Faculty Senate will take his request under advisement. One change Secretary May offered was under 5-14-2. He thought that the membership of SAUL should change from four faculty members to seven. He proposed that as an amendment.

There was a motion of amendment to change the wording of 5-14-2 (a) to substitute the word seven for the word four.

The motion to amend the report was passed.

J. NEW BUSINESS

1. Special Report of the Academic Priorities Council, Graduate Council and Program and Budget Council concerning A Dual Degree: Masters in Business Administration/Public Policy and Administration (MBA/MPPA), as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 06-024A with Motion No. 25-06A.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Dual Degree: Masters in Business Administration/Public Policy and Administration (MBA/MPPA), as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 06-024A.

Senator Arthur Kinney stated that there was a change in the text that was handed out with the agenda. The word “center” in line one of paragraph one and in line one of paragraph three was changed to “program.” The “eagle-eyed” Provost told them that centers do not give courses, they locate courses. The Center for Public Policy and Administration will sponsor the course, but will not be the location of the course. That was the only change.

The motion was seconded and adopted.

2. Special Report of the Academic Matters Council and the Program and Budget Council concerning A Minor in Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 06-025 with Motion No. 26-06.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve The Minor in Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 06-025.

The motion was seconded and adopted.

Senator Bogartz suggested a friendly amendment to change the words “the proposed minor restricts the use of more than two courses to satisfy requirements” to “limiting the use to no more than two courses.”

The amendment will be made in the report as adopted.

3. Special Report of the International Studies Council concerning the Exchange Agreement between the Universidad San Francisco de Quito, Quito, Ecuador and the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Massachusetts, USA, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 06-026 with Motion No. 27-06.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Exchange Agreement between the Universidad San Francisco de Quito, Quito, Ecuador and the University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Massachusetts, Amherst, Massachusetts, USA, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 06-026.

The motion was seconded and adopted.

4. Special Report of the General Education Council concerning Recommended General Education Designations for HISTORY 200 and 247, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 06-027 with Motion No. 28-06.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the General Education Designations HS for HISTORY 200 and HSG for HISTORY 247, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 06-027.

The motion was seconded and adopted.

5. Special Report of the General Education Council concerning the Withdrawal of General Education Designations, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 06-028 with Motion No. 29-06.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve that the General Education Designations be
29-06 withdrawn from EDUC 276 and 517, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 06-028.

Senator Conner asked why the General Education Designations were being withdrawn.

Senator McCarthy replied that the Dean of the School of Education requested it because the courses had not been taught for a long time.

K. OLD BUSINESS
(Tabled from the 650th Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate.)

1. Special Report of the Academic Matters Council concerning the 2007-2008 Academic Calendar, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 04-042A with Motion No. 47-04.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate adopt the revised 2007-2008 Academic Calendar, as presented in
47-04 Sen. Doc. No. 04-042A.

Professor John Jenkins stated that the Academic Matters Council had a status report. They determined that there was a need for representation on the Council by the Director of the Arts and Sciences Advising Center. This was reflected as a Bylaw change proposed and you will see in under the Academic Matters Council in the Bylaws as recommended by the Rules Committee. The Council will discuss this matter again at its meeting on April 5 and refer this back to the Calendar Committee with the express admonition that the Calendar Committee determine the number of students that will be affected by a change in the Registration Day in the Calendar and report back to the Council. The Council will act upon this at its meeting on May 3 and then be back to the Senate on May 18.

Senator David Ostendorf stated that some semesters there were thirteen weeks of classes and some there were fourteen weeks of classes. He had never understood how the University could get away with that in terms of accreditation. He asked if someone could explain that.

Secretary May stated that the number of weeks was not a matter of accreditation. The Registrar was the one who could give him more detail.

Senator Ostendorf stated that he had a certain amount of topics he needed to cover and he could not fit that into 14 weeks sometimes. A shorter semester had a serious impact on how instructors delivered the curriculum. That was accreditation at the department level and not at the University level.

The motion to table the motion until the May 18th Faculty Senate meeting was seconded and adopted.

2. Special Report of the Academic Matters Council concerning the 2008-2009 Academic Calendar, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 05-038A with Motion No. 43-05.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate adopt the revised 2008-2009 Academic Calendar, as presented in
43-05 Sen. Doc. No. 05-038A.

The motion to table the motion until the May 18th Faculty Senate meeting was seconded and adopted.

The 651st Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate stood adjourned at 4:50 p.m. on March 30, 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