

UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST
OFFICE OF THE FACULTY SENATE

Ernest May, Secretary of the Faculty Senate, called the 656th Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate to order on October 19, 2006 at 3:30 p.m. in Herter Hall, Room 227.

A motion was made to suspend the rules. A special motion was made by Senator W. Brian O'Connor.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate of UMass Amherst offers its sincere congratulations to Dr. Craig Mello of the UMass Medical School upon receiving the Nobel Prize in Medicine or Physiology for 2006 along with Dr. Andrew Fire of Stanford University for their discoveries related to RNA interference. This distinguished achievement is indicative of your outstanding creative, innovative, and meaningful scientific accomplishments. This recognition vividly demonstrates the cutting-edge research being conducted at the University's medical school and also supports the impressive research, artistic, and scholarly activity being accomplished at the other four campuses of the University system. We wish you continued success in your future academic endeavors.

An unidentified faculty member stated that the only suggestion that he had from some of his colleague was to add, "and please stay at UMass."

The motion was seconded and adopted.

A. ADDRESS BY SENATOR STANLEY ROSENBERG
(QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION TO FOLLOW)

(see attached)

An unidentified faculty member asked a question about the Town of Amherst. What were the chances of increasing the revenue from the state to the town?

Senator Stanley Rosenberg answered that the chances were excellent, even better than higher education. Considerably better than higher education, he added, because there are 351 of them, and we each represent them. If you have to make a choice, your number one choice will be local aid. We have no choice but to fund healthcare, so that is actually in the same bucket and higher education comes significantly further down the list for the typical legislator.

Senator Steven Brewer stated that he felt like Senator Rosenberg had come and taken the Senate to task a little bit for not working adequately with the other institutions. He was not aware of this fundamental disconnect. Perhaps Senator Rosenberg would be willing to elaborate a little bit on specifics that we do or support, or conflicts that he is unaware of.

Senator Rosenberg replied that he thought there were many ways to look at this problem. The way I tend to look at it and like to look at it is that there are a series of constituencies, each of which is organized in their own silo, and each of which is looking at the problem only from their perspective. Therefore, when it comes to judging proposals, you are first and foremost looking at it from the perspective of how does it affect my constituency, as opposed to looking at it from the point of view of the whole and being willing, then, to say "well, I can let this little piece go in order to get this." I spent a year and a half; I met with all the unions, I met with the student leaders, the trustees, and the alumni associations. None of them, except for the college presidents, played ball in this whole process. A substantial portion of them went behind the scenes and behind the backs of legislators and basically worked on the House to make sure that the pieces they didn't like would be taken out. So they contributed to this dynamic, which basically made it impossible for the bill to be done. Everybody is talking a good game, but, when push comes to shove, people are not willing to make what I consider to be small compromises to get a \$4 billion package for public higher education done. That is just what the legislature wants because it is an economics problem; there are too few resources being chased by too many needs. We need to say no to a lot of things, but we need to give less to things than we might otherwise want to do. We are always looking for excuses and for ways. When you look at the composition of the legislature, it is still overwhelmingly private higher education-educated members, and so everything is working against you, but the thing that is working against you most is yourselves. It is the community itself, because it is incapable of bringing itself together and unwilling to do so. I met with the students and all they wanted to talk about was actual cuts in student charges, which is impossible. You simply cannot replace the dollars that they would otherwise put in at a rate fast enough to be able to accomplish that. So instead of controlling the growth in student charges, instead of seeing it grow at whatever rate presidents or trustees feel they have to do, you are taking pressure off the legislature from giving you more money. They are not willing to make that compromise, and I can just go down one after the other. The MTA, without discussing this with a single legislator, joined certain presidents in opposing a particular policy without ever discussing it with the legislators who were advancing it, and ever discussing what the trade-offs were, and to this day have still not discussed it with us. They are your union representatives; you are the biggest union, you have the most money, and you have the most clout in this picture. Your guys basically got into bed with the

guys who are responsible for undoing the bill on the House side over this issue. And we can disagree, but eventually, you have to decide: is it worth losing \$4 billion, or, in this case, \$400 million because that is what the bill is worth? Then, we could not even go onto the capital because we consumed all of our political energy, capital, and time on the \$400 million, so nobody even ever filed the bill for the capital.

Senator Roland Chilton stated that some of his colleagues had been quite critical of the Chancellor in regards to hiring new faculty. Did he hear Senator Rosenberg say that this is not a campus problem, that this is a problem with insufficient funding for the whole University? Is that what you are saying?

Senator Rosenberg stated that basically you guys are trying to put ten pounds of potatoes in a five-pound sack, and it just does not work. The decision was made to do the renewal of some of these buildings and things to attract the quality faculty for however many positions you can hire, and to attract those NSF grants. You guys just got another one of these major centers. You need the laboratories, the space, to modernize, and, as has been pointed out to us, grants are actually a net loss to your budget. They are a net gain to your reputation and to the quality of the education and to the quality of the experience, but they are a net loss to the bottom line of your budget. You have got to do it if you are going to compete. I was at a legislative conference about two years ago, and the new president of UConn was the guest speaker and you can just imagine the steam coming out of my ears as I was sitting there listening to this guy saying that they, on that campus and their legislature and their governor, have a strategic plan to make them the number one flagship campus in New England. You know what, they are twelve or fourteen years into that plan, and we are sucking wind here. We have got to get capital money, we have got to get faculty money, we have got to control the growth in student charges, and all of that means we have got to get more support from the Commonwealth. In order to get more support from the Commonwealth, we have to have a governor who supports it, we have got to have a legislature, to the greatest degree, who supports it, and I say, most of all, we need an organized public higher education system to put pressure on the legislature, because that is how the legislature operates.

Senator Richard Bogartz stated that he was sure that Senator Rosenberg was right, about the fact that the various educational institutions not getting together does not pay them off. On the other hand, he also did know that people do what works, so they must be having some success in this individual, going-behind-the-back process to get paid off. That did not fall completely on them, but it also falls on the legislature too, and their methods of doing business. The other thing that falls on the legislature is that they are very happy and proud to say that we are not raising taxes, but discriminatory taxation of students is what they are engaged in, and that falls on the legislature and that needs some addressing too.

Senator Rosenberg replied that he agreed on both points, and what is happening is that people are being bought off for \$200,000 here and \$500,000 here and \$1 million here, or one building there, and that is not only because of the legislature, that is also because of the leadership in the public higher education system being unable to manage and control the process. During the economic stimulus debate this past year, Senator Panagiatokos of Lowell and I teamed up, and we did joint letters to the Ways and Means Committee, to the Senate President, so that we would both get money: they for the Nanotech Center and we for the Integrated Science Building. They were slightly ahead of us because they were part of a coalition of universities that got one of these Nanotech Centers about two years ahead of us. When that economic stimulus bill came out, there was something like \$50 million for the Boston campus, for their garage, which, if we do not fix it, that campus is literally going to fall, the building will fall, so it has to be done. Lowell got something like \$20 or \$30 million for the Nanotech Center. Dartmouth got \$10 million in cash for something that they created out of whole cloth in a six-month period, that did not exist in any plan, and they appeared before us in hearing after hearing, and we never heard anything about this. It did not exist. But the economic stimulus bill was moving, and so they created this, and UMass had \$2 million in it, for an initiative the Senate Ways and Means Committee chair was interested in for an agricultural business center. Well, you can imagine what my reaction was. I stormed into the Senate President's office and I said, "What is going on here? This is an economic stimulus bill for the Commonwealth. The press release says that it is focused on public higher education as the driving engine, and the flagship campus has not a penny for the Integrated Science Building." I called the UMass President's Office and I asked, "Will you send me the memorandum and the paperwork you sent over to the Ways and Means Committee for your request for this bill?" They said, "There was no paper." And I said, "Well, what did you tell them you wanted?" They said, "We didn't tell them anything, because there was no consultation with us." If you believe that, I got a bridge over in Brooklyn that I want to sell you right now. So, the legislature is playing a role in this, the President's offices of the individual campuses are playing a role, because they go to the legislators and they pressure them, and then the campus leadership goes and pressures them to come up with the pork. This is pork, and, in this case, the UMass President's Office basically did not do its job. We ultimately got \$20 million added to the bill in bonding, which means we will probably never see it from that route, but at least we finally got it in. My point here is that you are absolutely correct. Legislators are playing the game, but legislators are, in these situations, they are basically following. They are basically responding to the pressure that is coming from their campuses. So we are in it together. We are doing this with each other, and it is not the right way to do it, especially if something gets funded that is not even in the strategic plan or the capital plan, that just gets created because, well, hey, he is getting \$20 million, I want my \$10 million. So they repackaged a bunch of stuff and they got \$10 million, and they got it in cash.

Secretary Ernest May stated that it seemed to him that the evolution from the time when the UMass system was put together with the Saxon report (and Saxon was from California), one has to have a California mindset. There is also the Michigan system where everybody goes to the legislature separately, and those opposing systems seem to the work in those states. But, we are in between. We have not ever figured this out. If we are really following the California idea, then we really need a master plan, so that everybody understands in the whole system, all 28 campuses, their particular role. Right now, there is no agreement about what the roles are. In California, they get together every ten years and renegotiate that, because obviously things change over time. But then, for that ten years, it is supposed, at least in theory, to stay put for awhile. That is the only way you can get people on the same page, instead of everybody just sort of “all against all” every year, in every budget session. He asked Senator Rosenberg if he had any thoughts.

Senator Rosenberg stated that Secretary May was absolutely right, and, if you read the statute, it requires that there be a strategic plan, that there be a clear mission approved by the Board of Trustees and, in the case of the community and state colleges, also approved by the Board of Higher Education. Then there is supposed to be a strategic plan for a five-year period to achieve that mission. There is supposed to be an annual analysis of strengths and weaknesses, with corrective plans for the weaknesses, which is supposed to be submitted to these Boards. Then there is supposed to be a budget, which is developed based upon the formulas which were designed for each segment, that answers the question, “how much does it cost to run this campus?” Then, the Board of Higher Education, in the case of the community and state colleges, is supposed to comment to the governor and the legislature on whether the budget request is appropriate, whether they deserve it, and whether they are making sufficient progress toward achieving their mission and their strategic goals in order to warrant them getting it. In the case of the university, the Board of Trustees is supposed to play that role in relation to each of the campuses. What part of that do we not understand? I mean, I have only got a bachelor’s degree, and I can figure this out, right? I wrote that language; it has never been implemented.

Secretary May stated that probably it is not in the self-interest of some of the institutions to do that.

Senator Rosenberg replied that that is what leads to mission creep. That is a technical term, by the way, and as a result of the mission creep, you end up with duplication and you end up with resources going to the guy that has got the juice, instead of where it needs to be. This is not rocket science. There is a lot of it that is against human nature, but that is what leadership is supposed to be about. That is what the Trustees and the Presidents are supposed to do, and that is what the Chancellors are supposed to do. I do not want to hear from individual faculty, except how wonderful their projects are, but I do not want to hear that you want money from me. I want to hear that from the Chancellor and I want to hear it from the President. I want to know about what each of you is doing, because I love what you do here, but it is not my job to decide how to allocate the scarce resources that are available to help fulfill the strategic initiatives and mission of this campus, or of the University system. You do not want me in that business.

By the way, there was a retired faculty member who asked me a question, which I said I would answer if it had not been asked, and that is about retirees and the cost of living, from the collective bargaining. The governor vetoed the bill. It takes a formal session to override. We may or may not have a formal session. If we do not, then we will have to redo it again in January, and, under a new governor, hopefully it will not be vetoed, but if that governor vetoes it, we will be in session to override. There is a slight, additional, possible problem, which we are trying to figure out if it is really a problem or not a problem, and apparently some small subgroup of retired faculty are possibly left out of the language of the bill that we are waiting to override. If it turns out that is true, we will have to file a separate bill for that or, if we have to redo this in January, then we will fix the language. The point is, the check is not quite in the mail, but it will eventually be.

Senator W.C. Connor stated that there is political softball and that both candidates for governor are talking about how much they are going to do for education. He asked Senator Rosenberg for his interpretation of what they are going to do for higher education. Is there any significant difference between the two in terms of commitments to higher education?

Senator Rosenberg answered that he thought Mr. Patrick will do a wonderful job on behalf of the University. He met with him a couple of times to discuss this, and his head is in the right place. He did not think he yet knows enough of the detail, truthfully, but he gets the big picture and he was convinced that we will do well if he were governor. Lieutenant Governor Healey has the advantage and disadvantage of being Lieutenant Governor, because when she wants to, she can take credit for things the administration does, and when she does not want to, she can say she had nothing to do with it. In the case of public higher education, this administration has been abysmal, except for trying to give us some pots of cash for capital. Their operating budget proposals have been severely lacking. Their proposals for reorganizing the system were principally politically driven and, once the politics of it played out, they stopped talking about reorganizing the system, so that was a cover, in my opinion, for some political stuff they were engaged in. The fact that they vetoed collective bargaining agreements for higher education over and over again indicates that this administration has not been good to public higher education. Lieutenant Governor Healey, she is not the governor, on the other hand, she is part of the administration and I have heard nothing from her directly and I have never had a conversation with her about public higher education, so I have no idea what she would do differently from what Governor Romney has done. But I am not a single-issue candidate, excuse me, I do not mean candidate. I do not vote on the basis of a single issue.

B. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Principal Administrative Officers

Provost Charlena Seymour stated that at the last Faculty Senate meeting, she had the honor of introducing three executive appointees that were made over the summer. Actually, they made five, and two of them were not there. One was here at this meeting, Dr. Soren Bisgaard. She shared some background information about Dr. Bisgaard. Dr. Bisgaard was appointed as Interim Dean of the Isenberg School of Management in July. He is also the Eugene M. Isenberg Professor of Integrative Studies. He arrived at UMass Amherst in 2002, having formerly been on the faculty at the University of Amsterdam and the University of Wisconsin Madison. He also served as director of the Institute for Technology Management at the University of Saint Gallen in Switzerland. In 2004, he was awarded the Box Medal by the European Network for Business and Industrial Statistics for outstanding contributions to industrial statistics. Dean Bisgaard received his Masters of Science and Engineering from the Technical University of Denmark and his Ph. D. in Statistics from the University of Wisconsin Madison.

Interim Dean Soren Bisgaard stated that it was a great honor to serve as Interim Dean of the School of Management. They have very ambitious plans about moving the School forward, in particular focusing on innovation, providing our students with degrees that will help them go into their future business lives, where innovation, the global economy, and those kinds of issues are key. They are moving on all fronts there, and he looked forward to serving the school, serving the administration as best he can.

Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance Joyce Hatch said that she would just give updates on the construction capital as the campus reached milestones. The one milestone she shared was that Campus Center Way had been opened up, this was the way to the garage, this was now permanently open, and, in fact, it had been completed ten weeks ahead of schedule, so it was going quite well with the steamline work. The other thing she wanted to share was that she just came back from Boston, and UMass Amherst received one of two state agency awards for sustainability: The Higher Education Environmental Purchasing and Sustainability Award. It is for a lot of good things that are being done on campus, the most notable is a 36% reduction in water usage in the past year. It was a result of the conservation program.

Secretary May stated that he remembered that, a few years ago, the Senate had an Ad Hoc Committee on Sustainability, which discussed some of these issues and reviewed much of the work that was already in progress and, actually, initiated a few ideas which got pumped into the system, too. It is great to see that was recognized.

2. The Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Secretary May announced that next Thursday at this same time, there would be a General Faculty Meeting, called by a petition of more than 10% of the faculty to discuss the UMass Amherst 250 Plan. There was an announcement at the back of the room, and there was some information indicated on the web site. A four- or five -piece mailing went out and an email went out to all Senators. It would certainly make a much more informed discussion if people familiarized themselves with the Chancellor's original UMass 250 Plan, as posted on his web site or www.umass.edu/budget, and then the budget update that was on that web site for FY2007.

Other discussions have also taken place. One was with the UMass 250 Task Force meeting on September 5, and also there was discussion with the Chancellor at the last Faculty Senate meeting. The minutes from these discussions were all available on the Faculty Senate's web site. People did not have to read them all, but certainly the first two would provide excellent background for what will be discussed at that meeting.

3. The Faculty Delegates to the Board of Trustees

Senator W. Brian O'Connor stated that Senator Rosenberg told everyone about the selection of the six new trustees and the new Chair of the Board of Trustees, Steve Tocco. He attended the meeting with Secretary May and it did not go at all as they predicted it would go, but that was typical of the way the Board of Trustees operated. It was very democratic, everybody had their say, and, as you all know, Mr. Tocco was approved as chair. The Intercampus Faculty Council, which is a group of faculty delegates from all five campuses, will have a chance to meet with Chair Tocco on November 8 at the meeting that will be held at UMass Lowell.

4. The Representative of the Massachusetts Society of Professors

Senator Steven Brewer stated that the MSP was endeavoring to organize a higher education summit, to which they hoped to invite the governor-elect, sometime late in November (actually set for December 1), to come to this campus or elsewhere and meet with representatives from a variety of groups in higher education to develop essentially a white paper for a plan for higher education, which they hoped the governor might undertake. If anyone was interested in participating in that, he encouraged people to contact the MSP office. Tomorrow, faculty will finally get paid with the retro for 2001-2002, if they were here at that time. Enjoy it! Finally, MSP undertook a voter registration drive for students on the UMass campus, and registered approximately 1500 new voters in Massachusetts. Hopefully, they would turn out to the polls November 7th and elect a new governor.

C. QUESTION PERIOD (10-Minute Limit)

Senator Arthur Kinney said that he was a little puzzled, and even a little puzzled about whom to ask. He did not know if it went to the Chancellor or to the Provost or to the Editor of UMass Magazine, but, under the "New Faculty 250" on page seven, the first faculty member who was talked about was Chris Bachelder in the English Department. Actually, the English Department applied for two faculty positions and got none, so we hired him out of our own funds from retirement. He wondered how this got misidentified as one of the new 250 faculty positions.

Provost Seymour answered "mea culpa." She wanted to talk about a process to do things better. It was important that before publication some information about things that were happening in academic affairs be reviewed by her office, and she regretted that, in this instance, that did not happen and there might be some miscommunications. They were working to change it. They actually were now organizing a new office for communications, so that all of that information could be vetted and they could be solely responsible for whether or not it was accurate. They would accept the responsibility for that, and she regretted again that it happened.

Senator O'Connor stated that he thought this was a question for Vice Chancellor Gargano. They heard a lot about a lack of cooperation between the UMass Police and the Amherst Police. Did he have any indication of how that is progressing? The reason he asked is that he read in yesterday's Boston Globe that Chair Tocco was very disturbed about the behavior of some of the students on this campus, and he was quite surprised that in the Daily Collegian there was a special insert on "touring the bars of Amherst."

Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs Michael Gargano replied that there had been continuous, ongoing conversations between the UMass Police department, Martha Nelson, the new Town Manager, and Chief of Police Sherpa as well. They had not come to a formalization of a plan yet, but they had better working relationships and they were looking at different means of using both of their staffs to engage in more community service-type policing in and around Sunset Street and Fearing Street and those particular borders, which were closer to the Southwest side of the campus. They were still working through these various details, because it involved mutual aid, the unions, and a whole variety of other legal issues that still have to work their way through this particular process.

Senator Roland Chilton asked about the machine scoring service (OpScan) that they had before they shifted the office from one place to the other. How could they get a message across that it was not working? He knew that it was an old technology and it would disappear, but at this time, it was the only technology they had for the large classes and they were told that the new software just would not operate the way that the old software did. He did not know who was in charge of that, but there ought to be somebody who could say, "let's fix this," and give the faculty the services that they used to have on the scantron sheets, at least until we get rid of them.

Chief Information Officer John Dubach stated that he was pleased to say that it did not quite fall to him. The only thing he could tell people was that Richard Rodgers, the Faculty Advisor to the Provost, has been meeting with the folks from Office2Office as late as yesterday afternoon, to try to identify what the real issues were and what could be done about them. He could assure everyone that somebody was aware of them and somebody was working on them.

Senator Marilyn Billings stated that she had a question about SPIRE and PeopleSoft. Generally speaking, where was all that going and what were the timelines?

Chief Information Officer Dubach answered that the good news was that nobody apparently noticed that the SPIRE upgrade happened. When was that now? A week and a half ago, he guessed. The largest problem that was reported to him was that some people were seeing transcripts double-spaced instead of single-spaced. They were far from declaring victory until they get through the registration period. That would be the big load on the new system, but, so far, it had been miraculously smooth.

Senator Billings asked about the financials and the HR end of things.

Vice Chancellor Hatch said that she just wanted to make sure that she understood the question. What is the question about them?

Senator Billings stated that she was asking about the enhancements to PeopleSoft, about all of the financials and HR components of that.

Vice Chancellor Hatch said that it was operated, actually, in Shrewsbury by the University-wide system, but the “finance” will undergo an upgrade. The “student” upgrade just happened, and the “finance” upgrade is going to happen sometime in January, and then the “HR” upgrade probably not for about eleven or twelve months after that. So they were all sequenced. Folks in your departments were being kept up with information about how and when and any training that needs to take place, like for procurement for the finance system, so that would all start in the next month or so. But it would be January when there would be the next conversion.

Secretary May stated there had been some issues about security in buildings, especially as they get new equipment in classrooms. Were there any plans for using card-swipe systems when we do renovations and build new buildings, or something that would provide better security?

Vice Chancellor Hatch answered that it was a good question. They had a whole consultant review on security and that was one component of security issues on campus. The other issues had to do with radios, the police radios talking to the EH&S radios, so they had a lot of security synch-up to happen. What she could tell people was that, in any new building going up and any renovation, as in Skinner, the card-swipes would be incorporated and that was part of their policy to do that. This consultant report did point out that existing buildings, not the new ones, but the existing ones did need some coordination, too. It took money. That was what was stopping them, and part of the considerations as they talked about using the next funds available for capital; security issues, particularly around animal care and some other areas, but to upgrade in those areas, the real key areas, there needed to be some upgrades. In other places, there needed to be more consistent technology to do that. It was all about money.

Secretary May stated that it was also about preserving the investment in \$30,000-\$50,000 worth of equipment in classrooms, and if the classroom was left open and it disappeared, that was not a good investment. He said that he had a question for Vice Provost Kostecki. Could he give them any update on increasing the ability of OGCA to service the research community promptly and effectively? They had had quite a discussion of that last year.

Vice Provost for Research Paul Kostecki replied that they were presently being given two new positions that they were searching for and they just met this morning with Bruce McCandliss from Research Affairs. They were trying to go full-steam with those searches, and they were hoping to have people in place by December 1. Also, when they had those people in place, they needed a place to put them, and so they just met with space planning this afternoon as well to see where they could put them. He thought that when they got those two, people would see an increase in efficiency. They will need more, but he thought this would go a long way.

Secretary May stated that he had one final question for the Provost. One of the recommendations of the UMA 250 Task Force last year was that they try to get whatever searches were going to take place started on an earlier schedule than they were able to do last year. Was there any indication of how well they were doing on getting things authorized and going?

Provost Seymour answered that it depended on the search, but, for the most part, she thought they were doing a very good job with regards to getting things out of her office. She had been tracking this with Associate Provost Andrew Effrat and she said that they had a pretty good turnaround time with regards to requests that come to her office and eventually getting them out of her office. She thought it was probably two days maximum before they got out of her office. Now, they had a faster turnaround time with regards to some of the discussions that took place over email for some of the searches. She said that, from her perspective, the delays came, and this was to be anticipated, in terms of negotiations with some of the individuals either coming to campus or about to make decisions whether or not to accept the position. People had to keep in mind that all of these searches were not working in isolation. They were attracting very, very good people who were being observed, watched, recruited, and enticed by other institutions as well. So while the University was in a hurry, in a big hurry to get them here, they were looking at other places and sometimes they took their time, because they were trying to make decisions about what to do. She thought that if people were to look at the whole process for tracking searches, she felt comfortable in saying that there was not a bottleneck in the Provost’s Office. People can reach them 24-7 on email, and, as she mentioned earlier, by the time the paperwork got to her office, she was there to sign it, sometimes eight o’clock in the morning, sometimes eight o’clock at night.

Secretary May asked if they have any idea how many searches had been authorized so far this year.

Provost Seymour stated that for faculty searches, she could only begin to give an answer on that. She suspected that at least 25, perhaps up to 50 faculty searches, and two administrative searches: one for the Dean of the Isenberg School of Management and the other one for Commonwealth College.

D. ANNUAL REPORTS

1. Annual Report of the Status of Minorities Council, AY 2005-2006, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 07-005.

The report was tabled until the next meeting.

2. Annual Report of the Program and Budget Council, AY 2005-2006, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 07-006.

Professor Joseph Goldstein stated that it had been a pleasure being chairman of a faculty council after some dozen years as an administrator. The faculty were just as good as he always thought they were, and it was a pleasure working with them. They spent a lot of time in the Council (other than the normal looking at the budget and the like), looking at the details of the 250 Plan from a financial viewpoint. In particular, they were interested in the amounts of money that were being allocated per faculty member in the budget as they started to hire. They made some suggestions along the way to the administration, both coming from the Council and, also, from a number of members of our Council on the 250 Task Force itself; those suggestions have gone forward. He thought that one of the problems that they saw was in cost-sharing start-up funds for faculty as to the distribution and how much was coming from the University and how much was coming from the departments and the colleges.

Also, they conducted an in-depth study of the finances of Continuing Education, looking at outreach, the revenue sharing plan, and the like. They looked very carefully at that plan, which was being presented to the Provost by a faculty committee and an administrative committee, and we were quite comfortable with it, although it was complex. They returned this year to find that it had been completely changed over, which he guessed was the prerogative of the administration, but they were comfortable with the first one.

Finally, they discussed a number of new programs. There was a new MS, and new professional doctorate, a BS in Public Health, a Dual Degree and so on. The Council was very busy this year looking at all of those, and they did have some influence, as the others did, in making these programs as good as they could.

This year, they are going to be looking at the finances of the "New" and "Old Dirt" and how they are being funded, and they will be looking at future priorities for the "New Dirt," in particular, monies being used from the 250 Plan. Finally, he wanted to thank Council members for their contributions and the administration for their openness and willingness to supply them with endless amounts of data, in particular, from the Treasurer's Office, David Murphy, who was part of our Council, and from the Provost's Office, Susan Pearson.

The report was received.

E. OLD BUSINESS

1. Special Report of the Academic Matters Council concerning the 2008-2009 Academic Calendar, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 05-038B with Motion No. 43-05.
2. Special Report of the Academic Matters Council concerning the 2009-2010 Academic Calendar, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 06-043A with Motion No. 48-06.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate adopt the 2008-2009 and 2009-2010 Academic Calendars, as presented in Sen. Doc. Nos. 05-038B and 06-043A.

Professor John Jenkins moved that these two items be returned to the table until the November 16 meeting of the Faculty Senate. The calendar remains under consideration by the Calendar Committee. They spent the last meeting time a day ago in Academic Matters making sure that everyone concerned knew what the issues were and what needed to be resolved. They were persuaded that more time was needed.

The motion was seconded.

Chancellor John V. Lombardi stated that he wanted to make a brief comment about the consultation process that did not involve the campus in this calendar conversation. As you all know, anything that we do at this campus about the calendar has an impact on our colleagues in the other colleges of the Five College system. As a result, it is very important that we maintain close and careful collaboration with those colleges as we explore various, alternative ways of doing a calendar that might benefit our students in some significant way, but at the same time, might create difficulties amongst the Five Colleges, each of which uses the J-term, that winter term, in a different way. We are in rather elaborate conversations with them about how these calendars can be accommodated so that everybody is disadvantaged the least and advantaged the most. At the same time, it is also important to remember that, if we change nothing at all, the calendars amongst the Five Colleges do not match now. They do not begin at the same time and they do not end at the same time right now, so that, while some rearrangement would probably end up with them not matching either, they would not match differently, so that will generate certain senses of both optimism and despair, depending on who sits where and for what purpose, and so this conversation is sort of a five-sided dance that we are engaged in to both respond to what it is that the faculty of our campus tells us is optimal, and at the same time respond to what our colleagues in the other four colleges tell us is essential for maintaining the collaboration that is the essence of the Five College system. Most of this has to do with certain things that are critical for all of us. The first is that the spring break has to be the same time for everybody. Now, this might seem trivial, but it is actually not, of course, trivial, so the first requirement was that we got the spring breaks to happen at the same time in all of the models that we are working on, and then see what the consequences were around doing that. The second issue has to do with when Commencement happens and when our students have to be out of the residence halls, because it is possible that a Five College course would run three or four days longer than our normal revised calendar would expect students to be in the residence halls, so we would have to make arrangements to make sure that our students could stay in the residence halls so they could complete a Five College course that would run a few days later in May than our own ending date. A third issue has to do with the shortening of the winter term. The way in which we achieve this earlier graduation date, and one of the advantages from many points of view if not all, is that winter break becomes more normal and not as extended as our current version is and comes to match what most of our colleagues around the country do with the winter break. When we do that, while it might be advantageous for us, there are some of our colleagues on some of the campuses of the Five Colleges who actually have a significant winter program which is integral to the way in which they run their entire academic year. So we have to be careful that what we do does not make it impossible for them to carry out their academic mission or to recognize what adjustments might need to be made. He cautioned that this conversation, while it appears hideously complex from our point of view, can be multiplied by five to represent that complexity that we need to deal with in order to be appropriately sensitive to the needs of our colleagues in the Five Colleges.

Professor Brian Ogilvie stated that he would just like to add to Chancellor Lombardi's remarks the request that the impact not only on collaboration, but also on Five College programs and departments, like the Astronomy Department and the UMass-Five College graduate program in History, be taken into account, and also the increasing number of Five College faculty.

Chancellor Lombardi answered that he thought the issues were the same for everybody. That is that every subset of the institution and every subset of their institutions have different interests, practices, and sensitivities around the times that things start and the times that things end. The goal of this conversation is to recognize that, in the first instance, those things do not match today and we have accommodated them in some fashion. And so, if we change, they will not match in the changed version and we will have to also accommodate them. The question is: does the accommodation substantially damage a valuable academic enterprise or relationship and, if so, how can that be avoided to get the good that would come from changing the calendar. Now, if it turns out that changing the calendar, while it produces good news, produces a huge amount of bad news, then, obviously, it is not the thing to do. But at the moment, at least in our conversation amongst the Five Colleges, it appears that we should be able to find a solution to most of the issues that have been raised, but we are not sure they have all been raised. So, for this point, we need people like you to be clear and write us and say, "hey, have you considered X, Y, and Z, because we look at it this way" and then we can send it to our colleagues in the Five Colleges and say, "yeah, is this a real problem and how can we solve it?"

Professor Ogilvie stated that he was speaking in respect to the people, not the programs. Some people who are based at UMass, like Sergei Glebov, actually teach at all of the colleges; changing the calendar would give some individual faculty a longer semester than others.

Chancellor Lombardi replied that there were a lot of these issues and people needed to send them to him and it was his job to work with the Five Colleges to figure out what it was that was the issue and whether or not it was fixable and how to fix it.

Secretary May asked if the Chancellor wanted to receive those emails.

Chancellor Lombardi replied that he would be happy to receive them.

Senator Marta Calas stated that unfortunately she was not at the meeting on September 21, she was out of the country, but it was really a surprise to encounter the sudden, new calendars. Therefore, as a good representative of her faculty, she proceeded to send the calendars around to the other people in the School of Management, which, of course, provoked an incredible amount of emails in her life from her colleagues, or at least cordial emails in her life from my colleagues. The argument raised most was: how could this be happening? How could you be voting on something that faculty know nothing about? She had pages of answers or concerns and opinions, many of which she thought were extremely valuable. For example, during Intersession, the MBA program makes \$400,000 in their Intersession classes. Referring to the Intersession international programs, it was the only time that students in the School of Management got an international experience that was associated with the academic program. There were multiple issues, but all of them, in many ways, reflected the faculty side of the story. One of the concerns that they had was that it was very easy to send an email around letting all of the faculty of the University know that these changes were being considered and that, in many ways, the faculty was, in fact, a party to the equation and should be heard. She wanted to bring to the attention of everybody that she thought that if they were going to have this conversation, it had to be made very public, and faculty should, in fact, participate fully because they were all involved in this issue. It was not just the Five Colleges or the students and parents. She thought the process could be done much better.

Senator Marios Philippides stated that this was a very big problem. They went through that maybe thirty years ago, twenty-five years ago, and they came up with this calendar that they have now as the best solution of all. What he was wondering was, given the complexity, given the problems the Chancellor brought up, he thought they tabled it for the next meeting. He thought they should table it until the end of the spring. This needed a great deal of discussion, thought, and everybody on campus had to be involved. It cannot come out of the Space and Calendar Committee, really. Something like this, it was a major, major change. A radical change.

Secretary May replied that they had it on the agenda of all the Faculty Senate meetings this year and he thought it started to come up last year, so he thought eventually the word was getting out.

Senator Philippides stated that he was sorry, but he had to protest on that. It might have started in the committees, but the faculty as a whole knew nothing about it. It just came up now. He was surprised himself last meeting when they came up with this mess over here that they were going to vote on. They were nowhere near ready for this. They were going to have to wait on this.

Secretary May said that they would take that under advisement, and, if the Provost will let them, they will send out an email to the whole faculty.

Chancellor Lombardi stated that he wanted to offer a procedural suggestion. It seemed to him that one of the difficulties in dealing with calendar issues is that there was an infinite variety of calendars that one could propose, and each variation, plus or minus a day at every place there could be a day plus or minus, produced its own difficulties. What they are prepared to do to try to help this conversation was to finish the first round with the Five Colleges, and come back with a model that said, "this is a model that has the appearance of being plausible." Please understand the words carefully. The appearance of being plausible as an alternative to address most of the major issues that had been identified. Then take that model and distribute it in all of the forums that we have: put it online, on the web, all the ways we do these kinds of complicated issues so everybody was speaking to the same text, which helps us in our arguments. Speaking to the same text, and then calibrating what it was the issues were that then arose were we to imagine that we might implement such a plausible calendar proposal. Then, at that point, what comes back is a total set of random issues, and they would go and massage it again until we began to get some form of convergence before they asked this group and its committees and its activities to engage it in a formal and substantive way.

Senator Richard Bogartz stated that since it was inevitable that whatever calendar he came up with was going to make a lot of people unhappy, what was the resolution process?

Secretary May answered that, since they were not there yet, he thought they would regard that as a rhetorical question.

Senator Bogartz stated that no, it was a serious question. There was nothing rhetorical about it.

Senator Brewer stated that, as the representative of the MSP, the MSP expressed their opinion that they had also received many calls from faculty who were shocked that this decision was about to be made and who were unaware of the proposed calendar changes. Also, the opinion of the MSP was that this was a bargainable issue, and cannot be made because it fundamentally changed the working conditions and employment conditions of the faculty.

Senator Chilton stated that he would like to add to those comments about all the calls that he received from his colleagues, who were upset that this was being sprung on them. He did think that the motion to table was not debatable, and they should move on and vote on the motion to table.

The motion was again tabled to the meeting of November 16.

3. Special Report of the Committee on Committees concerning Nominations to Faculty Senate Councils and Committees, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 06-044C with Motion No. 49-06.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Nominations to Faculty Senate Councils and Committees, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 06-044C with Motion No. 49-06.
49-06

Senator Kinney stated that he would like to offer an amendment before they moved to the motion. Professor Bing Liang from the Isenberg School was unable to serve on the Academic Matters Council, and they proposed that he be replaced by Professor Carol Barr, also from the Isenberg School.

The motion was seconded and adopted as amended.

F. NEW BUSINESS

1. Special Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Online Learning concerning The Recommended Revision of Teaching Mode Classification in SPIRE, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 07-007 with Motion No. 05-07.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve The Recommended Revision of Teaching Mode Classification in SPIRE, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 07-007.
05-07

Senator Billings stated that she would like to offer an amendment. The amendment was that the graphic in the particular document needed some slight changes, in that, if they looked at number two, which was an In-Person Plus, it was supposed to read “some required online activities, but most contact hours are in-person.” In the third classification, the Blended classification, it should read, “a combination of required online and in-person sessions with approximately equal contact hours in each mode.” In the fourth classification, which is Online Plus, it was supposed to read, “some required in-person activities, but most contact hours are online.” The amendment happened because, in the original graphic, the contact hours, for example, in the fourth one were reduced by over 60%, and there was concern in the faculty that this was not an accurate depiction of what actually did happen in the online environment.

Secretary May stated that he had the text of the revisions. If anyone wished, he would read them again, but otherwise, without objection, they would pass on restating them. They were simply a clarification, on page two of this report, of number two, three, and four. This was a rewording, to be more clear; the ideas had not changed, it was just a restatement of the words.

Senator Mokhtar Atallah asked if it was the graphic or only the text.

Senator Billings answered that the text was correct; it was the graphic reflecting what was in the text.

The motion to amend was seconded and adopted.

The main motion was then adopted as amended.

2. Special Report of the Graduate Council and Program and Budget Council concerning The Dual Degree Option in the Masters in Business Administration and the Masters in Science in Civil Engineering (MBA/MS), as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 07-008 with Motion No. 06-07.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve The Dual Degree Option in the Masters in Business Administration and the Masters in Science in Civil Engineering (MBA/MS), as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 07-008.
06-07

The motion was seconded and adopted.

3. **Special Report of the Graduate Council and Program and Budget Council concerning The Dual Degree Option in the Masters in Business Administration and the Masters in Science in Environmental Engineering (MBA/MS), as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 07-009 with Motion No. 07-07.**

**MOVED:
07-07** That the Faculty Senate approve The Dual Degree Option in the Masters in Business Administration and the Masters in Science in Environmental Engineering (MBA/MS), as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 07-009.

The motion was seconded and adopted.

4. **Special Report of the Graduate Council and Program and Budget Council concerning The Dual Degree Option in the Masters in Business Administration and the Masters in Science in Industrial Engineering (MBA/MS), as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 07-010 with Motion No. 08-07.**

**MOVED:
08-07** That the Faculty Senate approve The Dual Degree Option in the Masters in Business Administration and the Masters in Science in Industrial Engineering (MBA/MS), as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 07-010.

The motion was seconded and adopted.

The 656th Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate stood adjourned at 5:05 pm on October 19, 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**