

UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST
OFFICE OF THE FACULTY SENATE

From the 663rd Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate held on May 17, 2007.

ADDRESS BY JACK WILSON, PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS

Thank you all for being here and I'm sorry that it is not a larger room so that everyone would have a chance to sit down, but I think the fact that you are here shows your passion for the institution, your interest in the issues before us and I understand there are many issues before us. I came really prepared to speak primarily about the recent news reports and to try to bring some information about them. I just had a nice meeting with the Faculty Senate Rules Committee, and one of the things they suggested is that I begin by telling you what did not happen this week, and what the intent is to have happen. We have been in discussions on a variety of things, working on a variety of appointments that you've read some things about over the last few months, and we are putting together plans of meetings. I was scheduled to be here in a series of meetings tomorrow. I was actually scheduled at this time to be in some meetings at UMass Boston, and so on. On Tuesday, press reports came out which changed the nature of all of the meetings from a discussion about our proposed plans, where we could get the plans on the table, to an explanation of the plans once they had been in the press.

Let's go right to the Amherst situation. What I would encourage you to do is to look at John Lombardi's statement and look at Jack Wilson's statement, rather than the press reports. I didn't see it right away, so I didn't really realize why I was getting so much email until somebody got the Daily Hampshire Gazette article to me, which says "Lombardi out, Wilson in." Let me begin there. That's not it. The truth is that John Lombardi and I have been in long discussions over the issue of how university governance should work, how we should be able to put these things together and I was reminded recently that another member of the Faculty Senate was in some of those discussions four years ago. And the question is: is this the right model? A model with five campuses, each with a chancellor and a president in Boston. And the question is: is this the right time to put on the table alternate models? The alternate models could include, of course, a five-campus system with a president in Boston as we have right now, with chancellors on all the campuses. That model is still on the table. There have been no decisions made about anything. At the other end of the spectrum, there are advocates for a different model, a model which is often called the "lead-campus" model, and there are a number of universities who have this model. Every university is a little different, but Indiana University is an example of that, Penn State is an example of that, where you have more of a lead-campus model, where the president and the chancellor of the flagship campus are co-located or the same person. In discussions with John Lombardi, who is actually a very strong advocate for that point of view, we have gone back and forth about that for some time, and decided mutually, over the last few months, to work together for the next year. Remember now, I am talking about a process, not a result. We will work together over the next year to put a lot of these models on the table, understand them, and see if an alternate model would work and John's desire, at the conclusion of that year, is to take a sabbatical and return to the faculty as Chancellor Emeritus, Distinguished Professor, and Special Advisor to the President. That is the discussion that we had, that is the agreement that we reached, and by mutual agreement, that was where we were prepared to go.

Now, the press report said we had already decided on the lead campus model. Certainly not true. We have decided on a process, and even that is not decided, because this has to go to the Board of Trustees. We have decided to recommend a process in which we delay the search, have John and I work together for the next year, and then, over that next year, while getting commentary from all of the constituencies, including our friends in the Legislature, to find out what should it look like at the end of the year. Maybe it will be back to five campuses, one president. If it is, I am absolutely comfortable with that model. Maybe, the recommendation of the constituencies will be a lead-campus model. If it is, I am reasonably comfortable with that model. Maybe it is even more likely that it will be some thing in between those things, because there are many other potential models going forward for university governance. But, the important point is that the press suggested that we have reached a conclusion and a result and it was going to happen and the proposal, and you can read John's statement, you can read my statement and you can read the other press reports other than in that one paper, is that we are proposing a process, a year-long process that has four Trustee meetings, beginning with the June 20th meeting, and continuing on through the next year. That also means lots of consultations with legislators. That also means lots of consultations with the Faculty Senate, the Intercampus Faculty Council, and a variety of other organizations.

Through that year, try to understand, if there is a way that we can be even more successful in making the University of Massachusetts Amherst the most powerful flagship campus that we could possibly make it, and boost it into the top ranks of universities as the flagship university of the University of Massachusetts, a much more closely coupled system.

I was asked to give some examples of how that close coupling can work. There are a lot of them. We have done a lot of things. Some of them are kind of on the trivial end. Years ago, we had five payroll systems, we now have one payroll system. That is one university. It saved us some money, the payroll system works, but that is pretty trivial. That's not very interesting. Let me give you something at the other end of the academic spectrum. This past year, George Langford, the dean here, worked with Bob Finberg of the medical school, and put together a stem cell proposal for \$66 million, which I then took to the Governor, and which the Governor included in his announcement of a \$1 billion life science initiative. I made a long story short there of all the work that they had to do with their colleagues and with their faculty, putting that together, but that proposal was so strong because it married the complimentary strengths at Amherst, particularly in the animal areas, with those of the medical school. The fact that they were different was a strength, not a weakness, because it made it a much more powerful proposal. That is an example of how working together, we can really make a difference. Let me give you another example. Six years ago, we decided to take some fledgling online efforts at the various campuses, and put them together into a single, joint effort. Now, this was very difficult. Some in the room were part of that. I see some smiles, I remember how difficult it was. All the rivalries, the wrestling back and forth. The fact is, the thing has grown at 40% year on year. We've blown past every other university. It brings us \$28 million in annual revenue. Amherst went from third to first in terms of the revenue brought in, which helps to support everybody's programs. It's got national recognition. It's huge. Those are some examples of how you can begin to put the strengths together of each of the campuses, and led by a flagship campus right here at the University of Massachusetts Amherst.

So, John and I agree. Let's give it a shot over the next year. Let's try to work out a plan. Let's try to move it on. Are there tensions and rivalries? Yes. Will the other campuses immediately think this is a great idea? No. Will you think it is a great idea? I don't know, but I am open to hearing what you have to say about that, of whether it is a good idea or not. But that is what we're proposing at the University of Massachusetts Amherst. We're proposing a year-long work-together study. That was in John Lombardi's statement; that was in Jack Wilson's statement. It's hard for me to address what was in the press, because I can't defend what I didn't say. There are many different voices speaking on this, and I can only speak for myself as to my impressions of where we are going here and, speaking for myself, I would like to ask the Board of Trustees at the June meeting to delay the search, to go through this study process, and to work with all of us to understand if we can make this a stronger flagship with this different model. I will stop there, but I am happy to take questions.

Professor Robert Paul Wolff, Afro-American Studies, Graduate Program Director of the Doctoral Program and the Director of the Program for Undergraduate Mentoring and Achievement – this campus has a long and very distinguished history of campus governance which involves the widest possible consultation as I'm sure you know. Whenever any administrative position is to be filled, especially a senior administrative position, a number of candidates come to the campus and present themselves to various constituencies, who then have the opportunity to give their opinion. I want to know if you decide, after this experimental year, that the new model is the desirable one, are you prepared to step down as President and have a national search in which you will be simply one of the candidates? If not, then what you are doing is not administratively reorganizing, it's a palace coup, and that's incompatible with the traditions of this University.

President Wilson – You know it's hard to kind of predict what the future looks like, but the fact is, I have support for doing searches in this case. And so, if we go through to a new structure, I will support a search for that position.

Distinguished Professor Ray Bradley, Geosciences – Since I came to campus, we have had seven chancellors. We have had more provosts, and, in my college, we have had six deans. What this campus needs more than anything, I believe, is some stability. Every time we go through these turmoils, a year passes when nobody makes any decisions because everything's up in the air, then we have a search, then the new person comes in, then they have a review, then they put in their own staff. So, what I see here is another year or two of complete inertia, where nothing will get done, nobody will know what decisions to make, and the campus doesn't need that. It ain't broke,

it don't need fixing. So I don't understand why this plan was not carried out while we continued with the Chancellor in place, just as it was. You could have gone on and done your review and your evaluation, then made a decision, instead of imposing this rather bizarre structure on the campus, which will only lead to a period of complete indecision, as far as I can see.

President Wilson – Well the agreement that John Lombardi and I made was made for exactly that reason, to try to make sure that there was not a loss of time and John, in fact, agreeing to stay on through the year, to be a part of it, and me spending time out here was to address that issue. The question is if you feel that this is a bizarre arrangement, then I think you've made a decision that you feel that the status quo is a better situation in terms of the five-campus model. I respect that, and I think we should allow the faculty to have some voice on exactly how that goes forward. Whether we make the decision right now not to consider any other models or whether we make a decision to go through the next year considering a new model, I think, is the question that's on the table before us.

Professor Bradley – But, after this year, you're going to have to have a search, right? At the end of this year, you will have to implement a search?

President Wilson – Yes, and we don't know what for until we know what the model is.

Professor Bradley – Well then we go through another year of indecision?

President Wilson – Well I'm prepared to stay in place, and I think we're going to have continuity of leadership, and John Lombardi wants to come back as a Special Advisor, so I think that we are trying to build in as much continuity as we can. However, I must say, all campuses go through this. The average time in office of a head of a campus I believe is five years at research universities, roughly. What we have to do is get better at doing transitions. There are going to be transitions. Chancellors are going to come. I am going to leave at some point, and I'm planning on being back here teaching when I do. That's the goal and that's not that far ahead, quite frankly. So, instead of always agonizing about transitions, what we have to do is figure out how to do them more smoothly. I would say that that's something that we could work on and do a little better. I do agree with that.

Senator Richard Bogartz – Models, schmodels. I would like to know what kind of effort you made to keep John Lombardi in office here as the Chancellor. He's only the best chancellor we have ever had. I'd like to know what you did or didn't do along those lines.

President Wilson – I appreciate your sentiments. I think the world of John Lombardi. I think he's done a terrific job, and I do not intend to get into any of the things that we worked on together. So, I'm sorry. I'll let John Lombardi discuss that with you if he would like to do that. I don't violate those privacies. Thank you.

Professor Michael Thelwell, Afro-American Studies – Mr. President, I must have missed something in your presentation, although I listened very carefully, sir. On the one hand, you present that there is a process in which no decisions have been made. What I fail to understand is the value and the goals of this process. I mean, what triggered this process? If no decisions have been made, why, apparently, is the Chancellor, who has done a very commendable job here, why is he stepping down in advance? It seems to me that, despite the circumlocution, we are being presented with a fait accompli and it's not the process that is involved, but that there are certain specific goals to be reached. I certainly am unclear as to what this transition will be towards and what values, precisely pertaining to this particular campus, it will serve. Maybe you could explain the goals of this whole process.

President Wilson – I'll try. My comments about the process are a process of going through understanding what structure the University of Massachusetts Amherst, as a flagship campus, would like to have within the University of Massachusetts system. The decision that John Lombardi and I made mutually, over the last few weeks, to go through this process and to suggest this to the Trustees, that is done. The next question is where do we go from here? None of that is decided. So that's what I was saying. Now, as far as what values, what values guide where we need to go from here? I think the most important value that we have is to, in fact, make sure that we can make this University, and that means make the faculty, make the students, make the staff, to enable them to be as successful as they possibly can be. That is an overarching thing that you then come back to and say "what are the things that we need to do to do that?" Well, we need to raise funds, obviously. We need to have great students.

We need to hire good faculty. I've been a complete supporter of the Faculty 250 Program. We have worked very hard to get resources under that. By the way, in this Governor's initiative, we proposed and it's in there as part of that \$1 billion initiative, start-up funds for faculty to help us with the hiring in those things. Now, we have to compete with the privates on that, right? It's up to us to organize ourselves to compete with the privates for some of these start-up funds, but this is a \$1 billion initiative and we have to do that. What I am proposing here is a process which is built on the philosophy that it's really the community that is going to have to define how they want to organize themselves and how they want to live and how they want to work within the University of Massachusetts and within the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. That's why I object to what was reported in the Hampshire Gazette, that we have a result. We don't have a result. If the fact is that it comes out here and says "we don't want that result," then that result is off the table, in my opinion. There is no result on that. It's a process that we go through during the year to determine whether or not that would be a useful structure: the lead campus model with a president and the chancellor serving in the same thing, or something in between, or the original model. President Lederle served in that model. We're now in a different model, and so some people say, "well, we had it, why didn't we keep it?" I do not know, I wasn't here.

Professor Thelwell – it's been predetermined, sir, that the present arrangement is not functional and not effective. It has predetermined somewhere that the present arrangements are not functional and effective. Could you explain that to us so we could understand that a little better.

President Wilson – Well, I think that's what we have to decide. You know, if you feel that everything is great, then that is it. What I've heard as President wasn't that, though. What I've heard as President is that we need to get more support to the flagship campus. We needed to get more faculty appointments made. We needed to get more resources. We needed to get more infrastructure. We need to get a whole variety of things. So, I haven't heard that people are happy.

Professor David Ostendorf, Civil and Environmental Engineering and a past Chair of the Research Council - I have been doing research here with many of his colleagues since 1980. I guess we are being asked now, the campus research community, I think it's fair to say, has the confidence in the ability of the Chancellor, that's Lombardi, to manage and advocate fiercely for campus research. He knows all of us on campus. He walks around without an entourage, 24-7, he's always around. He knows when it's time to invest in research, he knows how to separate the likely returns from the unlikely returns. He knows how to do that. That is a 24-7, full-time job, in our view and our experience. I think the campus has certainly progressed from a research point of view to a certain level of productivity under his stewardship. I think it's fair to say that. How would you prioritize your campus research, and, if you agree, it is curious that you would want to change that? How do you track research productivity, how do you know your PI's without being here seven days a week, twenty four hours a day and looking them in the eye?

President Wilson – I think that's a fair kind of question to ask in this process. It sounds like you have already answered the question. I'm not sure that it can or can't be done without being here twenty four hours a day, seven days a week. I'm also not sure that you couldn't have a lead-campus model in which that was true. I know that John Lombardi or any chancellor is never on the campus 24-7. I understand research very well having participated at research universities throughout my career, and have had many NSF grants myself and have run labs. I understand what you are saying about the need for support. How do you measure research productivity? Well, we shouldn't probably get into that, because there are many ways to do that, and I really feel that it has to be professional activity, because, in the sciences, it is pretty easy to measure it through external funding, but that's not true in the humanities, or the arts, or social sciences. Other places measure it through citation indices. When I was serving in the Provost's Office at RPI and when I served as Vice President for Academic Affairs at the University of Massachusetts, you sit there and you read the tenure files of many, many faculty, and many of them are outside of my area. How do you judge that? Peer judgments. Peer judgments. So, that's what it all comes back to, and then the question is how do you get those peer judgments, whether it is through letters, research grants, peer-reviewed articles? It's peer judgments.

Marisha Leiblum, Student Trustee – President Wilson, you said that people on this campus have expressed that they are not happy with the current administration of this campus and that they are not happy with the current priorities of the campus. I would like to reiterate that, but I would say that this unhappiness stems from a loss of the public mission on this campus, a lack of support for the social sciences, a lack of accessibility, and most

particularly, a lack of accountability and a lack of democratic structures on this campus. My concern is that this transformation, in fact, further undermines this lack of accountability and this lack of democracy. As a Trustee on the Board, she was notified about two weeks ago of a meeting. Actually, it was not a meeting, it was a “dinner” that the Trustees were having where this conversation about this reorganization would be discussed. I was presented with a PowerPoint that said “Confidential” on it. And repeatedly throughout this meeting, oops, “dinner,” Trustees referred to this as a meeting, which means it should have been open to open meeting law, but in fact, it was n’t. Before the last round of Board of Trustees meetings, your contract was addressed and you were given a 10% bonus and an extension of your contract in order to push through some difficult decisions that the system would be facing. So, I guess my question is if the discontent on this campus comes from this shortage of accountability and shortage of democracy, if, in fact, this process has undermined state open meeting law and has undermined the very bylaws of the Board of Trustees, which is, of itself, already a fairly undemocratic body, then how to do you plan to increase accountability and to increase democracy on this campus under this new configuration?

President Wilson – As you know, everything that’s been discussed in the papers and I’ve said today is a proposal to the Board of Trustees which has got to be discussed and voted on at the June meeting and meetings thereafter and these are open meetings. The dinner, in fact, did not discuss many of these issues. At dinner, they discussed many, many kinds of issues, but these were not the issues which were discussed, as you are quite aware. We did discuss the issues of what are the synergies amongst the universities, how can we collaborate together. That was a dinner discussion. There were no decisions taken. The decisions are decisions that need to be taken at upcoming Trustee meetings. There have been no decisions made no matter what the press says. The press could say whatever they want. I can’t stop that. The decisions are decisions that are going to have to be made in a coming time. There are some other things – OK, I’m sorry, I’ll stop there.

Jeff Napolitano, President of the Graduate Student Government – My question is related to Mishy’s question. It is sort of emblematic of the way that this plan is being proposed and the problems that need to be addressed. I don’t think that many students and faculty believe that the problem is necessarily that there needs to be more synergy or bureaucratic shuffling around of people, but the bigger problem is accountability and democracy of this University and, if there is to be a plan that is proposed by the Board of Trustees, or by the President’s Office, shouldn’t that plan take into account expanding the accountability and expanding the democracy at this University, rather than just shuffling around of bureaucracy. I think that everybody here and everybody within the UMass system agrees that there is a very real shortage of that. There is a very real shortage of open discussion. It’s symbolized in this issue about Andrew Card that is coming up. There are no voices; there are no real ways for students, staff and faculty, in addition to administration, to have an impact on this University. I’m wondering, instead of talking about bureaucratic shuffling around, could you speak about the concrete ways to increase accountability and democracy at this University.

President Wilson – It is a great question. Remember, what I am proposing, what we are proposing to the Board of Trustees at the June meeting isn’t a plan. It’s a process. A process to develop a plan. It’s about that openness of democracy. That is what it’s about. We don’t know where that thing is going to lead. As I said, it could lead to no change. It could lead to recommendations for change. It’s a year-long process that we defined that was in Chancellor Lombardi’s statement and was in my statement from day one, no matter what other things were reported in the press. If you feel that that’s not true and what the press reported was the truth, all I can do is tell you the truth is it’s a proposal for a process.

An unidentified person – that’s not really the issue. The issue is that any plan that you have come up with so far does not have the input of students, of faculty and people who work here. Just by the fact that there are 20 Board of Trustee members, only 5 of them are elected and those are the students. And, of those 5 who are elected, only three can get a vote, whereas you have political appointees who live in Colorado, in Delaware who have never gone to this University, are making decisions about what this University does whereas the people who were actually elected and supposed to be the most accountable have very little to no say.

Ed Rubin, Alumnus, Class of ’69, Member of the Board of Directors of the Alumni Association – I am speaking as Ed Rubin, the individual alum. Simple question, I’ll make it easy. Over this one -year process, while we have administrative positions that are open, that are important positions which are now, say, under the search process that would, in particular, be something that would report directly to the Chancellor, will these positions be continued to be searched and filled or will there be an additional delay?

President Wilson – We will try to continue those searches and try to fill them and, by the way, we’ve had to do this on other campuses when there are other transitions. So, this is something that you have to do from time to time. Some candidates will choose to stay in and continue. Other candidates may choose not to do so, but our effort is to put everything we can into keeping things going. I actually agree with the comment that made a little earlier here. What you have to watch out for in transitions is you can’t postpone everything. You have to keep moving it forward and we will do that.

Professor Barbara Osborne, Veterinary and Animal Sciences – Just one quick question. If this is an ongoing process, how do you intend to involve us as professors, staff, administrators in the process here at Amherst?

President Wilson – By coming to regular meetings, by coming anywhere I am invited, by meeting with the Intercampus Faculty Council since this has intercampus issues and by working through the processes on the campus.

Professor Osborne – Will there will a formal, ongoing meeting process so that we will all participate in?

President Wilson – You know, I think this seems to me to be a good idea. I hate to commit to things like that without the Board first saying that they want to go through this, without finding out whether we have sufficient support to have the study, but, if we are going to have the study, I believe that that, as a great suggestion, is that you are going to put together work groups to work out various parts of this.

Professor Emery Berger, Computer Science – I have two questions, both quick. First, the explanation, obviously, that you’re giving is at variance with the press report which you say is false so I’d like you to explain why (John) Armstrong is quitting and whether he’s going to be brought back? Second, I would like to understand what the assumptions are behind this idea that the current model is incompatible with a world-class flagship institution? Examples that come to mind include the University of Texas at Austin, University of California Berkeley and they all have chancellors and there is a Board at the state level. This seems to work well for Berkeley and Austin. I’m not sure why it doesn’t work here.

President Wilson – I think that’s a good question to ask and that’s a good question to answer. If that’s the answer the community comes to, I am absolutely perfectly comfortable with that answer. Oh, John Armstrong, Trustee Armstrong. You know, I never can answer about other peoples’ motivations, but I can answer specific questions. When I got the email from him that he was resigning, I was very shocked. He’s an outstanding Trustee. He’s been a good friend; we have been very close. I had no clue as to how this could have happened, but, then again, I hadn’t seen the press report which I saw about three or four hours later. After I saw the press report, I began to understand what had happened there. I called him even before I saw the press report. You asked, “would he be brought back again?” I would be delighted. We are doing everything we can to try to say “John, there’s plenty of time for consultation. This has gone to the Board. Look at the statement, not the press report. Look at what we said, not the way it was reported. Look at the proposal. The proposal is John Lombardi and Jack Wilson will work through the next year, working together, to put models on the table that the community can either support or not support, and we are comfortable with that.” We hope he comes back.

Senator Stanley Rosenberg – The state reps representing Hampshire and Franklin Counties and I met yesterday in Boston and I am speaking on behalf of them, but I am reflecting, at least in part, some of that conversation. We want you all to know that we first learned about this 48 hours ago and we are the legislative delegation that represents the flagship campus. We want you to know that we’ve had dozens and dozens of phone calls with people and we’re pretty good sleuths and we’ve pieced a lot of stuff together. We want you to know that we think Chancellor Lombardi was doing an excellent job and I believe each of us in the group would agree to this statement “we believe he’s been forced out” and we believe that he hasn’t been forced out this week or last week or last month. We believe that there has been a steady effort to undermine his administration and his service here and, in spite of that, he has served exceptionally well. And we believe he is being forced out because he is a strong leader, a knowledgeable leader and the folks in Boston were just not willing to support him. They recruited him as they did John Lederle forty years ago to build, forty years ago, a research I public university second to none in the country and they recruited John Lombardi to make this the true flagship forty years later. He got almost no support under the Bulger administration and, although we recently got some new trustees who are committed to

the flagship concept, between then and now, he got very little support. I don't know what to make of this proposal. I want to believe that this is their honest attempt to make this a flagship campus, but I and my colleagues do not know what to make of this proposal and we don't know whether to believe and trust the people who are putting this forward. (applause) Please, no, no, I am not here to grandstand. I don't need the applause. I've been working twenty years in the legislature to help build this institution and at every turn, the Board of Trustees and the other key players have manipulated the system, manipulated the situation so that other people got what they needed over us. Do not applaud, do not say anything, please. I have been through president after president, trustee chairman after trustee chairman promising that this campus was going to become the flagship and they were going to make it a priority and every one of them broke their promises. Not a single one of them kept a single promise about making this the flagship campus. In 1991, when the Saxon Commission was appointed to answer the question "what does it take to make these three campuses in this university system an excellent university system, and excellent campuses, what did they do? They added two more campuses to an underfunded system. They took one-third of the trustees from this existing system, added one-third of the trustees from Lowell, one-third of the trustees from Dartmouth. Now I only have bachelor's degree, not a Ph.D., but I can figure that one out. And, since 1991, there has been virtually no progress for this campus and I desperately want to believe the Trustees who have talked to me and the President who has talked to me that this is the strategy to make this campus the flagship. But, I want to know how am I supposed to do that given this history of broken promises and how am I supposed to believe that when I find out 48 hours ago that, for months, they have been working on this scheme, this idea, which is not unusual in America because other places have done it, true enough, but why did we find out 48 hours ago only because there was a press leak. You heard the President. They were going to present this concept which they considered to be a management decision, they were going to present this at the June meeting. What is the date of the June meeting? June 21.

President Wilson – after carefully consulting with you and your colleagues.

Senator Rosenberg – Mr. President, you should have been consulting with us months ago, not after you lined up the votes, not after you lined up the votes of the Board of Trustees.

President Wilson – I have to say, there is always a time to consult.

Senator Rosenberg – I have talked with people on the Board of Trustees. I have sources. I have friends. I can do my homework. This is another of those dynamics that we've seen repeated over and over again. We do not have a five-campus university system. We have six warring factions and that is the truth and I want to know how this plan and this approach are going to change that? I studied organizational development on this campus. You do not change the organizational structure before you study it and decide what your objectives are and what the organizational structure should be.

President Wilson – Which is why we proposed a year-long study.

Senator Rosenberg – Excuse me. Taking our Chancellor out of the power position on this campus – that's the issue. It's not about the study or the plan. You're removing our leader without consulting with us, without discussing it, without defending that action.

An unidentified person – I apologize. I want to ask you a question. Would you be willing to trade positions and become the chancellor of this campus and let John Lombardi become president?

Professor Thomas Russell, Polymer Science and Engineering – I must be an oddity because I came to this campus ten years ago and I've been very happy. Actually, I've been very happy with the administration on this campus. If I look at the campus now, I see Chancellor Lombardi has been very supportive in terms of the research and, if you look at the Amherst campus now, the number of initiatives that range from life sciences to nanotechnology, etc., there is a tremendous amount that has gone on and that has been ushered in by Chancellor Lombardi. Not only him, but also the other administrators and I could go through Seymour, Kostecki, etc. The question I have is, with all of these initiatives that are in there starting stages, why now? I'm trying to get a logical explanation as to why this change would occur – that you have someone who is in this leadership position who has ushered in these initiatives – why change now?

President Wilson – And the answer, you know, is really that, circumstances. The discussion went on for three or four years about, you know, what direction to go and when to do this. There is never a good time to pick to go through a transition. Campuses go through transition; people come and go; it happens all the time. I appreciate your comments about that and, as you know, you have received funds from the President's Science and Technology Fund to help make that Nanotechnology Center go. We've helped, you know, put together the matching funds for that so I can assure you that we're absolutely supportive of your research and we have gotten behind it and supported it every way that we can over the last few years. The question of when is a good time for a transition, if not now, why not now? When are we going to consider this? I, I agree that, as we talked about this, the thought about going forward; for years and years, people have talked about do we need a lead-campus model for the University of Massachusetts? I heard the Senators say that, ask that question. The question is do we ever put it on the table or do we never put it on the table? And, if you're telling me never put it on the table or put it on the table later, that's perfectly reasonable. You know how much I respect your approach to things.

Professor Stephanie Luce, Labor Relations and Research Center – I'm probably one of the most vocal critics of our current administrators on campus and their priorities and, if you had come in with a vision of a different university and a process, I might have been one of the first to congratulate you on that vision. But, I return to Michael Thelwell's question which is what is the content of your vision? You said it was for people to succeed but that sounds pretty empty and I have to say that the timing of this is particularly outrageous given you've just passed through an additional increase in tuition and fees after raising tuition over 64% in five years when the mission of this University is meant to be accessible to the residents of the Commonwealth and we know they are being priced out of the education market, when we are being forced in faculty bargaining to hear week after week that we have to accept a contract for one year at conditions worse than the Romney administration offered us, that the administration says they're committed to a model of moving to more and more adjunct faculty teaching classes and reducing the flexibility of faculty to do their research and their work and particularly right now when you have almost 50% of your faculty here who have signed a petition calling on you to revoke an offer of an honorary degree to Andrew Card and you refuse to entertain any discussion of that topic whatsoever. So I ask you, what grounds do we have to trust you, to trust that you have a vision of a public university that serves the public mission of this Commonwealth, that you will listen to the voices of your faculty when we have 50% signing on to a petition, kind of unheard of in just a week's time, and I want to ask you who do you represent? That's not clear to me. It seems you represent yourself, but who else, the Board of Trustees? Who represents me, other than Mishy who has no vote? Who represents our interests here at UMass Amherst on the Board of Trustees?

President Wilson – Let me start with the student fee issue. As you know, since I became President four years ago, we have never raised fees more than the cost of living, never once have we. That's a fact. That's not a question for argument. You can look it up on the web site. Never once have we raised them more than the cost of living. Not only that, we've raised them less than other universities. Nobody is more passionate about making this institution affordable and, by the way, we put our own money – we went from, when I came in here, the state put \$19 million in financial aid, the University put \$10 million in. Today, the state puts in \$19 million and the University puts in \$72 million. Now, on Andrew Card.

First of all, the decision of who gets an honorary degree, let me tell you how that process goes. Well look, you're asking me to do some thing, I have to tell you how it happens. Andrew Card was nominated by a faculty member on this campus, vetted by a committee, put on a list that went to the Board of Trustees, the Board of Trustees discussed that list and voted it. And, by the way, that's the way I think it should be. It's not that different than the appointment of a faculty member for tenure and, in general, my recommendation is that the Board of Trustees not change recommendations that come from a campus. That was the way it was done. The decision to revoke it is a Board of Trustees' decision, not a presidential decision, if that's going to happen. The Student Trustee has called for a meeting of the Trustees, any five Trustees can do that. If there is a meeting, they will have a discussion and the Trustees will decide what they're going to do. Let me go further than that. I actually am very happy to have you address the issue by speaking out on the issue and to sign petitions and to speak out. That's what a university is all about. It's difference voices. That part, I completely support. I think it's a wonderful thing. You're going to have different kind of voices, you know, on issues of the day and you're speaking out on Andrew Card, I commend you for that. Thank you.