

UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST  
OFFICE OF THE FACULTY SENATE

Presiding Officer Robert Wilson called the 657<sup>th</sup> Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate to order on November 16, 2006 at 3:30 p.m. in Herter Hall, Room 227.

A. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Principal Administrative Officers

PRESENTATION BY JOYCE HATCH, VICE CHANCELLOR FOR ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE

(see attached)

*Senator Marta Calas* stated that the numbers were very interesting, and that was good. At least we knew what was happening financially. She was curious to know up to what point, when they had all of these discussions and they had all of these capabilities to produce data, when it came down to the strategies to raise the money necessary to do all of these things now and in the future, was some kind of policy discussion in which the question of maintaining the state institution versus a private institution was part of the discussion? She was particularly struck by having read, at the beginning of the semester, when the new dorms were being opened, that the new facilities that were so absolutely beautiful were also much more expensive and, therefore, the students who were going to live there are actually paying more. They were creating a class system, literally, by putting the rich people in the new buildings and the other people who could not pay in the old buildings. It seemed that something of the like, in a different way, was also happening in terms of who could occupy labs when you went into the market privatization model, that we all know was an economic experiment. It was not like it was the best way. Not even economists would agree on that.

*Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance Joyce Hatch* answered that she was right. When Senator Calas talked about the student housing example, there were some similarities. One of the things that did happen when it came to student housing was that Vice Chancellor Gargano's office put out a survey to students that asked for input. They put out three options: fully cost the new housing so that the students living in them paid entirely the amount, spread that amount across everyone so it was cross-subsidized and everyone's rates went up, or a middle-of-the-road option to have the rates be higher and some of the costs be spread in the other areas. Students voted. They voted for the middle-of-the-road. About the research space, again, the campus was subsidizing the majority of that space; it was just the variable costs that were being looked to for the next person who came in who had grants and it fit with the Chancellor's wanting to incentivize grant-getting and research-getting. She was not sure if that was the comparison Senator Calas was trying to make, but she was probably right. There is some of that going on.

*Secretary Ernest May* stated that, thirty or forty years ago, the campus was about 70% state-funded, with all of the capital taken up by the state, and 30% from fees, tuition, and the like. Now, it was just the reverse: it was 70% tuition, fees, and other income, and 30% state-funded. As far as the state was concerned, all of the capital was on us. That was the situation which Senator Stanley Rosenberg was very concerned about. We were all very concerned about it, but we have not been able to reverse that, and Senator Rosenberg has not been able to reverse that situation either. He knew that there was the feeling at the President's Office, the Trustees, and the campus administration that the way the state could help us was to come up with a large capital bill that would relieve our operating budget from having to spend all this money on facilities and allow us to use the operating budget to operate. Hopefully, with a newstate administration, we would get a better response than we had gotten from this administration, but it was not at all clear, because there was a lot of competition for state dollars. In terms of long-term competition for dollars, he wanted to ask Vice Chancellor Hatch, who wore two hats, a question. She had been reporting on the administrative side of her job, because it was her responsibility to make this information available to the Chancellor and to us regarding the condition of our buildings, and she had done an excellent job there, but as the finance director for the institution, charts like this were created, which, the first time he saw them, were hard to comprehend. This was the third, fourth, or fifth time he had seen them, and he had had a chance to think about them. The issue he saw was that debt service to operations went up from 3% to 10%. That looked just like borrowing a lot of bonds, but actually it created an issue in the operating budget itself. Every year, we actually had to find a few million dollars more than the previous year to cover the actual debt service, which made it possible to build and renovate these buildings. He just wanted to know if Vice Chancellor Hatch could comment on the competition that was likely to develop among all parts of the University. Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, everybody was probably going to have to tighten their belts because of the debt service. Was that a fair assessment?

Vice Chancellor Hatch answered that she thought that, as long as we did not have an influx of more state capital money, we would be faced with having to choose between fixing buildings and choosing other things, such as financial aid or additional positions. It was just a choice and it was not just within the institution. There was an article recently just about infrastructure throughout the state. It was not just about higher education; it was talking about a report where it was in the billions, the gap in terms of the statewide infrastructure gap between what was funded and what was needed in terms of infrastructure. So there was competition for us to get the next capital dollar and the Chancellor, since he had been here, got this. He did not need a Sightlines report. He walked through buildings; he understood and was probably the first Chancellor who had understood to that extent. He could walk through a building and he could tell you almost the same information that our professionals came up with. He had understood, right from the beginning, and every time he visited the State House and talked with legislators, he had been pushing this. We pushed it with the President's Office, and she thought it was only in the past year that they understood our plight to the extent that it existed. They had been in the Administration and Finance Office looking for money for capital, but the feedback was, "you think you have troubles? You should see about the bridges." It had not been for a lack of trying. There had been a push and we needed to do more, now, with the different administration. Maybe there was some hope that we would come to the top of the list, along with some other infrastructure needs.

Senator Richard Bogartz stated that he had heard this presentation before also and, each time, there was the mention of the buildings that might be "do not resuscitate." But they were never mentioned by name, or at least, he did not recall that they were. He could, on the one hand, understand them not wanting to start a panic. On the other hand, it seemed to him that the more advance warning that people had that their building might just go away, the better it would be. So, would it not be a good idea to start to mention a few candidates?

Vice Chancellor Hatch stated that not until we knew for sure. There was one that was rather complicated and we had a study going on. It should not be a knee-jerk. For example, and Secretary May was familiar with the building he probably had an office in, Hampshire. We knew that we were not going to keep those buildings forever, but they were fine. They were an example of buildings that were fine; people could work in them, and as long as you could get enough heat and electricity and be safe, those buildings were fine. But we were never going to do major renovations. Those buildings were not slated to stay on this campus forever, they should not, but they were safe. As long as we could house people and put people in them, they were okay. But, if we needed to do something significantly major and put in an elevator, we were not going to put millions into those buildings. It was "don't put in millions" in some of these buildings, but keep them going, keep them safe, keep them clean.

Senator Bogartz stated that he presumed that there was a list, in somebody's mind at least, and there were some criteria they had in mind.

Vice Chancellor Hatch answered that yes, was it safe? Was the roof about to cave in? Sure, those were some basic criteria. She meant, was it safe when the roof caved in? The roof was about to cave in in a couple of buildings. Was it worth fixing the roof?

Senator Bogartz stated that in his infinite naïveté, he still had the feeling that it would be better for people to know than not to know. He did not think people were really going to start jumping off the roofs of their buildings when they heard this, and they probably, in some intuitive way, know that their building was on the list. When they opened the door and it shook, they had an impression.

Vice Chancellor Hatch answered that that would happen. As things happened, there was also the need to have a plan of what to do with people. In some of these places, there were not many people. In some of these places, there was not much going on. We needed a plan to move people out, make them safe, and move them into comparable space, such as an office or a lab. So part of what you saw up here was money for swing space. Modular swing space. So that was a factor, too. We needed a plan, and that was happening, too. It was not a panic situation. The point was, some of these buildings would never be totally renovated, and we just needed to start sharing that when it was appropriate and we had enough information to do that.

Senator Calas asked if there was any way that historical society money could be found for some of the buildings. By naming them "legacy," it was already like giving them the status of a historical artifact of some sort. She wondered whether they were trying to get some historical preservation funds for them.

Vice Chancellor Hatch stated that, in any of their conversations so far where that had surfaced, it did not seem like there was a lot of money out there. When someone said, "you know you might be able to get \$300,000 to help," we were talking millions. So, it was not to be ruled out, but we were talking a lot of money.

## 2. The Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Secretary May stated that he would like to briefly welcome two new Senators: Michael Begay from Public Health and Brian Ogilvie from History.

### 3. The Faculty Delegate to the Board of Trustees

Senator W. Brian O'Connor stated that there were tons of meetings over the last two weeks, and Secretary May, Senator Marilyn Billings, Senator Arthur Kinney, and/or himself managed to make it to most of them. He invited his three colleagues to add or subtract from what he said or may have forgotten to say. The new Chair of the Board of Trustees, Stephen Tocco, gave a presentation to the Intercampus Faculty Council. This was the governance group of faculty representatives from the five campuses and they meet after the Trustees meet. At this meeting, Chair Tocco met with them for about an hour and fifteen minutes, which was the longest any Chair of the Board of Trustees had met with them in his memory. Many of the things that he said had already been reported in the media, but these were some of the highlights. He mentioned that there would be some changes in Trustee meeting protocol, in which the Trustees will have more time to prepare for meetings. Agendas and minutes of all of the subcommittees would be distributed. There seemed to be somewhat of a complaint among some Trustees that they did not have enough time to consider certain things on the agenda. He had a feeling that there would be more meetings per year. Right now, there were four major meetings per year. Several years ago, there were six. He could remember when there were eight. He did not know that they would go up as high as eight, but it was clear that there were going to be more than four meetings per year. Chair Tocco plans to institute a Trustee planning process over the next three months to see how the University can increase its rankings, and he planned to develop an aggressive game plan to achieve this goal. He congratulated Governor -elect Patrick, and Chair Tocco planned, and this was a quote, "to hold his feet to the fire on higher education." Chair Tocco was very concerned about student fees and these were a high priority for him. This went along with what Vice Chancellor Hatch just talked about. He was a strong advocate for an increase in the capital budget. Currently, the University system gets 2% of the state capital budget, and Chair Tocco's goal was to get it to 6-8%, which would really be a tremendous shot in the arm if he was able to do that.

One of the other items that was approved at the Trustee meeting was the Bachelor of Science degree in Public Health for this campus. There was also a resolution honoring Dr. Craig Mello and Dr. Andrew Fire for their recent Nobel Prize in Medicine or Physiology. Everyone knew that Dr. Craig Mello was from the Medical School in Worcester. This was a resolution that came from the newly constituted Committee on Science, Technology, and Research, which was chaired by our own John Armstrong, who lives here in Amherst. The very last paragraph in the resolution was very interesting because it basically asked people to be aware of the tremendous burden that a Nobel Prize caused someone in terms of their day-to-day activity. They were constantly being asked to speak or to comment. The Medical School will appoint a committee that one must go through, to protect Dr. Mello. He thought it was very interesting, and that it was a very good idea, because he did not personally know Dr. Mello, but he had been told that he was just a real good fellow and did not know how to say no, and this time he was going to have to learn how to say no. The new Committee on Science, Technology, and Research, and was an excellent addition to the Trustees. This Committee would have the responsibility of considering, reviewing, and making recommendations to the full Board on matters concerning science, technology, and research at the University. One of the first concerns that they were looking at was stem-cell research opportunities.

In another matter, the Student Trustee from this campus, Marisha Leiblum, gave quite an impassioned speech, urging the Board of Trustees to give serious consideration to the student fees. The Trustees had a policy of raising the student fees every year no more or no less than the cost of living, and she was hoping that they would not even do that in the upcoming meeting, which will be in March. She also gave several examples of students who were not able to pay the fees on this campus and were dropping out of school, or they were joining the Armed Services to help support them. She also said something that bothered him and he hoped would bother everybody in this room, if we taught. She claimed that many professors were "dumbing down" courses and this raised the eyebrows of many Trustees. In fact, he was scolded by some Trustees for not standing up and saying "that's not happening!" He felt it was a little bit inappropriate for him to say that at that time. He had talked to Marisha privately, trying to figure out who was really "dumbing down" courses, but he did not know whether we were or not. It was open for discussion, and it was something to think about. Following her speech, a representative from the Graduate Student Senate gave a talk on how, for the most part, our graduate students were really poorly paid compared to our peers and their fees were much too high. He had a lot of other things to say, but those were the highlights. He encouraged Secretary May, Senator Billings, or Senator Kinney to add or subtract from what he said. Lastly, there was going to be a survey. The request for proposals had apparently been sent out to various groups to do this survey on where we rank in various things. It supposedly was all going to be done by January.

Secretary May stated that they put out an RFP to get some consultant to tell them what it would take to get us into maybe not the top ten, but the top fifteen university systems. You get what you pay for in a consultant's report, and he was sure they would get someone to tell them exactly what they wanted to hear. The other thing was that

the Board of Higher Education had already performed an affordability survey. This was a rather extensive analysis of affordability of the whole higher education system in Massachusetts, ranging from the University to the community colleges. It was available on the BHE website ([www.mass.edu](http://www.mass.edu)). It was done by a group, including some people from the Harvard School of Education and others, and it had some very specific recommendations, like that community colleges would become free. It really did talk about some options which were different than what we were doing now.

#### 4. The Representative of the Massachusetts Society of Professors

Senator Steven Brewer stated that the bargaining team had been put together for this round of contract bargaining that was slated to begin at the beginning of January. There was a strong commitment for it to be finished by the middle of March so that the contract would be not only signed but funded before the current contract expired. That was one of the highest priorities that faculty indicated in the survey that was done, and the MSP was going to work diligently to try and make sure that happened. Right now, there were public meetings going on where the different subcommittees who had been looking at trying to establish the positions that the MSP wanted to advocate for in bargaining. You could check your e-mail and see what committees were meeting. Friday morning, the Family Issues Committee was meeting and had a number of interesting ideas that they hoped to bring to the table. There will be a general meeting of the faculty in the beginning of December to try to finalize priorities for the bargaining team.

#### B. QUESTION PERIOD (10-Minute Limit)

Senator Bogartz stated that it seemed to him that when the student trustee, or anyone else, said that the faculty of the University of Massachusetts was “dumbing down” their courses, then someone should ask, “where’s the data?”

Secretary May answered that she did not present it in a way that all faculty were “dumbing down” courses. She presented it extremely anecdotally, that she had heard of one or two faculty who were making this response. It caught him off guard, so he did not jump up and say that, because she did not say that it was the whole faculty, just one or two. It was an offensive statement, and one that, for all of us who were there, tried to correct in the hallways afterwards. In a way, stated like that, in a public meeting, the damage was done and the Trustees’ reaction was sort of mumbling around the table, that if faculty were doing that, they should be fired. He heard that comment. In any case, it was water under the dam, it did not stick, it did not make the Boston Globe or anything like that. It was of concern to us that someone would represent us that way. His thoughts were that, indeed, we did accommodate students, we accommodated many students, but we do not lower the final standard. We accommodated athletes; they have strange schedules. We accommodated students who got sick, students who had a death in the family. We did a lot for students with disabilities. We did a lot of accommodations, but it meant that we helped them meet the standard of the course, not that we changed the standard of the course to meet the abilities of the students. That was his view of the situation. She might have talked to somebody; maybe she got a couple of very specific examples where students feel that faculty have done that. It needed further exploration, but she was just talking about a couple of people, she was not talking about the whole faculty, as he understood it. But maybe we could talk to her and see what she was talking about.

He had a question, since it was out there in the public domain, about Romney’s cut and his 9C powers. Maybe Vice Chancellor Hatch could explain how it was being handled and what it meant for the campus should it stick.

Vice Chancellor Hatch stated that she could tell them what she knew so far, and what had happened. As what had been reported, this campus had on the order of \$2.5 million in our main appropriation, and then it was stated by the Governor that another \$7 million of retroactive payments was reduced also, and then a few other smaller appropriations. What we were finding out was that the Governor’s Office was surprised when they learned that we paid them out. By law, we had ninety days to pay them out, and we got them out, pretty amazingly, on time, and so we paid it out of our appropriation, because that is where everyone is based. When they went through the list for budget cuts, they did not realize the payment had already happened, or so they said. So, we were sitting here now with the payments, which were actually appropriate and legal to have happened, and no reimbursement, so that was a loss of approximately \$7 million. Another \$2.5 million out of the appropriation was just reduced and taken out. It was a net of about \$9 million to this institution. What, obviously, everyone was hoping was that when the legislature came back in January, they would offer legislation to restore money. They could not veto his 9C cuts. And so everyone was hoping, and they had gotten some good feedback from some of the legislators that there was intention to do that, and then there was also the hope with the new governor. A new governor could restore some of the funding, too. That was the background, and we had high hopes and the probability of seeing restoration of at least some of the funds. In the meantime, the funds that we had that had not been spent were funds that we had put aside to fund the next \$50 million in capital. Of the new money from the state, \$6 million was going to the 250 Plan, \$2 million was going to faculty and support staff, and \$4 million toward facilities to create a \$50 million pool to get at a lot of the issues that she was talking about. We would be forced to cancel some

really critical work and we will have to have a discussion, this would be up to the Provost and the Chancellor, about any new hires. The \$7 million was a one-time, so that did not jeopardize hiring, what was intended for the retroactive increase was just a one-time. We were more concerned about the ongoing amount too, but there will be discussions about what we do. It put the plan for the \$50 million of critical deferred maintenance in jeopardy. Beyond that, the Chancellor is away, so those conversations had not happened in more detail than that.

## C. ANNUAL REPORTS

1. Annual Report of the Status of Minorities Council, AY 2005-2006, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 07-005. (Tabled from 656<sup>th</sup> meeting – report previously distributed.)

The report was received.

Professor Mari Castañeda stated that she was the Chair of the Status of Minorities Council for this year and last year as well. Although the Council had been in existence for a very long time, it really had not been active until the Spring of 2005. One of the things they were looking at was the UMass 250 Plan and the ways in which that Plan was going to increase the diversity pool for faculty on this campus. Obviously, there had been a lot of discussion this year about the 250 Plan, but, last year, we did spend a lot of time reviewing what the plans were for that particular initiative and what role the Status of Minorities Council could take in both supporting and expanding the various processes that were going on on campus. There were initiatives from various departments, especially from the Provost, in terms of recruitment, hiring, and retaining faculty of color in particular, and, obviously, the Status of Minorities Council had a wide array of ways of interpreting “minority.” We were not only including, obviously, faculty of color, but we were also considering women as an important minority pool on this campus, as well as people with disabilities, and issues of sexual orientation that actually had come up quite a bit as well, in terms of faculty, graduate students, and undergraduates. Last year, we spent a lot of the time reorganizing the Council, trying to get people to both participate on the Council, which had not been active for a very long time, and, at the same time, trying to develop an agenda that was going to be proactive, productive, and supportive of the various initiatives that were going on on campus. There was a lot of participation now from people who were faculty, and also staff and graduate student representatives. There was a lot of concern about the fact, in particular, that we did not have a very diverse faculty here on this campus. We paid attention to the issues that a lot of faculty who were minorities were facing in their classes, in their departments, and also the graduate students and undergraduates as well. We were trying to create a climate on this campus that was not simply tolerant, but that was truly progressive and was truly committed to thinking about and opening up the conversation about diversity in a real way that was not just simply about addition, but was really seeing minority faculty as a critical core of this campus, as well as thinking about the experiences of graduate and undergraduates in the experience of UMass in general. That was really what we focused on last year, in both reorganizing the Council and really trying to make it something substantial, not just something that met once a month. There was a good core of people who were committed to thinking about how we could diversify the faculty pool, as well as addressing the issues of minority undergraduates and graduates on this campus. The other thing that had been happening was that, because she was a minority faculty member and she was the chair of the Status of Minorities Council, her name had been referred to a lot of people, so she had been getting a lot of phone calls, e-mails, and people coming to her office (undergraduates, graduates, and faculty) who had been trying to share in both anonymous ways and also just shared their experiences on this campus. It was not entirely positive, so there was still a lot of work that had to be done that was supportive of minority faculty and students. Her biggest concern, as well as the Council’s, was how they could support these different folks so that people did not leave, and actually felt like they could stay on this campus, do great work, and, at the same time, transform the experience of the non-minority students as well as faculty on this campus. We saw that as a very important agenda at UMass. That was our work for last year, and we were continuing our work for this year as well.

Senator Calas asked about whether or not the Council had reviewed the University’s Affirmative Action plan.

Professor Castañeda answered that one of the things we started looking at were the affirmative actions plans of both this campus and the other UMass campuses as well, which were all available on the Status of Minorities Council web site, so that people could see what the plan of action was that the universities were taking. In fact, one of the things that we were also trying to discuss was how diversity was defined on this campus and in the UMass system in general, how “minority” was defined on this campus and in the system, and also the differences between federal regulations of what was considered a “minority” versus the state regulations. It was not as if everyone had the same kind of definition. There were different definitions of that, and having an affirmative action plan was not necessarily contrary to federal law, at

all. One of the things that the affirmative action plan did was try to make a commitment to document the different minority pools that did exist on the campus, as well as encourage the diversification of the faculty as well, but not necessarily setting up a quota of any kind at all. That was not the kind of affirmative action plan we had on this campus, so it was not as if it had any kind of quotas, but it was documenting what the minority pools on this campus were, trying to set up definitions of those, and then, at the same time, reporting that to both the administration here on this campus, and the system, and federal regulations as well. It was the Equal Opportunity and Diversity Office that developed the affirmative action plans. They were required by law to develop it and also report on what the status was of that on this campus.

Senator Bogartz asked about sexual preference for faculty.

Professor Castañeda stated that it was one of the issues that came up in the discussion in the Council, just in terms of sexual orientation and sexual preference for faculty who were gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgendered, and some of the climate that was often created in the classroom or in the university about not just being tolerant, but really understanding these particular faculty folks that oftentimes feel marginalized on this campus.

Senator Bogartz asked if they were looking at the sexual preference for new hires during the hiring process.

Professor Castañeda stated that it was not about hiring. Of course, that would be great, but we were not at all saying that there must be this sexual orientation or preference, but in terms of the faculty who were already here, we had been receiving quite a bit of feedback. Again, a lot of this was very informal, where people found out you were on this Council, and sought you out and said, "I want to share with you my experience on this campus as a minority in this way." A lot of faculty were still feeling very marginalized in departments and on the campus overall. So, we were trying to develop strategies to support all faculty here, and we also felt very strongly that, if we supported minority faculty in their various dimensions, all faculty will also benefit from that as well because you also had a very important, core group of people who were going to not only be happy, but be productive and do the kind of work that needs to be done here, but then also affected the other faculty and colleagues that they work with. They felt that was a very important part of creating a very progressive and open environment for all faculty, not just minority faculty.

2. Annual Report of the University Writing Committee, AY 2005-2006, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 07-011.

The report was received.

Professor Steven Olbrys Gencarella stated that he wanted to take a moment to publicly thank Anne Benz for helping to walk him through this process and also to thank Professor Donna LeCourt, who was the director of the Writing Program. It was his honor to work with her, and he looked forward to working with Professor David Fleming, who will take over the program next year. It was a busy year for us, it was a busy year every year. In addition to our normal duties of looking over requests for changes in syllabi, to such things as a junior writing program, we had a major five-year review of the freshman program (Basic Writing and College Writing), which was in the report that was distributed. He would not walk through all of the recommendations, although he would like to discuss a few recommendations in general of things we would like to monitor and might ask the Faculty Senate to address, and then specifically he would address the review of the First-Year Program. One thing that we found was that there was a movement, in terms of junior-year writing, for many faculty to ask for changes in the structures. Some of this had to do with the move to have graduate students teach the classes, rather than faculty. Some of this had to do with just the mission statement of the need for writing to have long been lost as a true transmission of time. We believed that this was something that we would need to address. Additionally, as student enrollments increased in general, that put an emphasis and put extra needs on both freshman- and junior-year writing. As we have seen the University move toward increasing TAP and RAP programs, this brought with it new pedagogical issues and strategies that we might need to address, that is, when students were taught in the dormitories where they lived. Finally, there was the question of online student work presentation. These were all issues that came up last year outside of the first-year review that we had chosen to monitor this year and possibly address with the Faculty Senate in years to come. The major recommendations we made for the first-year review were very good. We thought that the staff was doing an inordinately good job with resources that were not always readily available, that we were pleased on every level in terms of the curriculum. We did the curriculum analysis portfolios of student papers, interviews with all sorts of staff and graduate students, up to the directors of programs, a very detailed analysis of the Writing Center, and student evaluations of the Basic Writing and College Writing, the two

forms of freshman writing. We were very happy with the program and very happy with everything in there. We did recommend that the numbers be reduced from 20 students to 15, on the grounds that that will have a pedagogical benefit. We also encouraged the full funding of the Writing Center, specifically to move it out of the general operating budget and to move it toward a base budget, and to hire an instructional technical staff. Increasingly, these questions were more and more going to be pressing for our assistance for undergraduate writing. The other two things he mentioned were that we did very strongly encourage discussion over the creation of a sophomore writing component, University-wide, or at least electives for sophomores to take. We were finding that there was often a gap between the writing program in freshman year and then the junior writing connection, which was meant to be in the major, and we felt that our students would benefit very greatly if we addressed this at the sophomore level. Finally, we would just like to recommend, also, to put pressure on the University, that they address ESL. There was a good amount of attention paid to entering ESL students, but we would like to remind the University that ESL was an issue that would require advanced classes, and required, as it did with all writing, advanced practice from that point on. Those were the major issues at stake.

Secretary May stated that this report was extraordinarily thorough, and he congratulated the University Writing Committee on such a thorough examination. Our annual reports were not usually this thorough, but it had a series of recommendation in it. When we received the report, we were not necessarily endorsing all of those recommendations, although they were very good ones. He encouraged Professor Gencarella and his colleagues to meet with the Rules Committee, and perhaps break them down into a series of special reports that could come from this Committee, or the Undergraduate Education Council or the Program and Budget Council, and that we send it out in a normal way for possible consideration of the full Senate. It may or may not be adopted, but it certainly affected us all, and the quality of writing that our students achieve or did not achieve affected us in all of the courses they took thereafter.

**D. NEW COURSES**

There are no reports associated with the following motions:

<u>COURSE</u>	<u>TITLE</u>	<u>CREDITS</u>
HISTORY 253	“Asian-Pacific American History: 1850-Present”	3
MARKETING 450	“Direct Marketing”	3
MARKETING 455	“Internet Marketing”	3
MARKETING 460	“Non-Profit and Social Marketing”	3
MARKETING 465	“Retailing Management and Technology”	3
SCH-MGMT 313	“Organizational Communication”	3
SCH-MGMT 315	“Marketing Communication”	3
SCH-MGMT 316	“Leadership Communication”	3
SOCIOL 240	“Sociology of the Asian American Experience”	3

**MOVED: 09-07** That the Faculty Senate approve the courses HISTORY 253, MARKETING 450, 455, 460 and 465, SCH-MGMT 313, 315 and 316 and SOCIOL 240, as recommended by the Academic Matters Council.

An unidentified faculty member asked if there were real differences between the different SCH-MGMT courses, and whether they were necessary.

Senator Mokhtar Atallah stated that he did not know because he did not teach the courses, but he could assure them that the committee that reviewed these courses gave attention to how much effort they put into each one of those credits.

The motion was seconded and adopted.

<u>COURSE</u>	<u>TITLE</u>	<u>CREDITS</u>
NUTRITN 503	“Nutrition and Health in the Science Classroom”	3

**MOVED: 10-07** That the Faculty Senate approve the course NUTRITN 503, as recommended by the Academic Matters and Graduate Councils.

The motion was seconded and adopted.

<u>COURSE</u>	<u>TITLE</u>	<u>CREDITS</u>
SCH-MGMT 845	“Theory and Research in Sport Organizational Behavior and Sport Strategic Management”	3
SCH-MGMT 846	“Theory and Research in Sport Marketing and Sport Consumer Behavior”	3
SCH-MGMT 847	“Theory and Research in Sport Law and Sport Economics”	3
SCH-MGMT 883	“Seminar in Tourism Theory and Research”	3
SCH-MGMT 884	“Decision Models for the Service Industry”	3
SCH-MGMT 885	“Seminar in Service Marketing/Management Research”	3
SCH-MGMT 888	“Seminar in Hospitality Research”	3

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the courses SCH-MGMT 845, 846, 847, 883, 884, 885 and 888, as  
11-07 recommended by the Graduate Council.

*Senator Calas* stated that this was probably something that should have happened in the School of Management, rather than having this conversation in the Senate, but unfortunately, she never heard of these courses being anywhere in the School of Management, so she had to ask the question here. These courses were definitely for the Sport Management and for the Hospitality and Tourism Management programs, and therefore, they were courses that were doctoral seminars for either Sport Management or HTM. However, in the tradition of the School of Management, we had the supporting disciplines, such as Organizational Behavior and Strategic Marketing. They had always been disciplines in the field at large, and not in the doctoral program, and not specialized by Sport Management or HTM. In our understanding of the world, these were our peer disciplines, so it did not matter whether it was Sport Management or HTM or the small businesses or multinationals down the road. In many ways, organizational behavior was organizational behavior, and, at the doctoral level, there were no applied courses; they were research and theory in general, with examples that may then pertain to a specific organization. She wondered why, at the doctoral level, these courses that were research and theory seminars for disciplines that were within the larger purview of the School of Management were necessary, especially since, as far as she remembered, the doctoral students, at least in the Sport Management, have been taking our courses in organizational behavior and strategy and so on.

*Professor Linda Shea, Chair of the Graduate Council* answered that they would continue to do so, because both of the degrees are Ph.D.s in Management, and then they had specializations, so these primarily six courses and an elective, were designed to familiarize students with the research that was published specifically in journals within those two disciplines. Of course, all of these courses had been reviewed by the School of Management Ph.D. committee. She could speak to the HTM. It was hospitality and tourism, and it did have a body of theory and research, and so we were not using the terms like Organizational Behavior and Strategic Management, but also she believed that the faculty in Sport Management were also able to convince the committee that there was a substantial body.

*Senator Calas* stated that, for clarification, these were advanced seminars, but the core courses were still going to be taken within the core of the School of Management.

*Professor Shea* stated that they were slightly different.

The motion was seconded and adopted.

E. OLD BUSINESS

1. Special Report of the Academic Matters Council concerning the 2006-2007 Academic Calendar, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 03-038B with Motion No. 42-03.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate adopt the amended 2006-2007 Academic Calendar, as presented in Sen. Doc. No.  
42-03 03-038B with Motion No. 42-03.

*Senator Roland Chilton* stated that he had no trouble with this specific motion, but he did want there to be an open discussion when we got to the point when we did away with the January break. He understood that what they had done was go back and rethink that for this year.

Senator Atallah stated that the only amendment to the 2006-2007 calendar was that Stockbridge was included in the Friday commencement. Stockbridge was excluded from that motion before, and they requested that it be included. Their graduation date will be on Friday, similar to the Graduate School. That was the only change in that calendar.

Presiding Officer Robert Wilson stated that what we had done was divided up these calendar items into four motions, and the first three did not involve any changes in Winter Session. It was the last one that did. He believed that someone was going to make a motion to postpone that last item for further discussion.

The motion was seconded and adopted.

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

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

The motion was seconded and adopted.

(\*Tabled from the 656<sup>th</sup> Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate.)

- \*1. Special Report of the Academic Matters Council concerning the 2008-2009 Academic Calendar, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 05-038D with Motion No. 43-05.

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

The motion was seconded and adopted.

- \*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 2009-2010 Academic Calendar, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 06-043A  
48-06 with Motion No. 48-06.

Senator Atallah stated that the Calendar Committee and the Academic Matters Council recommended that this motion be tabled until the second meeting of the Spring semester of 2007.

The motion to table was seconded.

Senator Marios Philippides asked that the motion be tabled until this matter was settled. There was no point in this coming up at every meeting and postponing it again and again. We should postpone it until it was settled. He asked to charge the Calendar Committee with coming up with an alternative schedule.

Secretary May stated that he was not sure it was appropriate to postpone indefinitely.

The motion to postpone indefinitely was seconded and adopted.

## F. NEW BUSINESS

1. Special Report of the Graduate Council concerning Electronic Dissertation Submission, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 07-012 with Motion No. 12-07.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Electronic Dissertation Submission, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 07-  
12-07 012.

The motion was seconded and adopted.

2. Special Report of the General Education Council concerning Recommended General Education Designations for HISTORY 253, PHYSICS 190Q and SOCIOL 240, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 07-013 with Motion No. 13-07.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the General Education Designations HSU for HISTORY 253, PS for

**13-07                    PHYSICS 190Q and SBU for SOCIOL 240, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 07-013.**

**The motion was seconded and adopted.**

**The 657<sup>th</sup> Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate stood adjourned at 5:02 p.m. on November 16, 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**