

UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST
OFFICE OF THE FACULTY SENATE

Presiding Officer Robert Wilson called the 660th Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate to order on March 15, 2007 at 3:30 p.m. in Herter Hall, Room 227.

A. ADDRESS BY JOYCE HATCH, VICE CHANCELLOR FOR ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE, AND ROBERT FRANCIS, ASSOCIATE VICE CHANCELLOR FOR FACILITIES AND CAMPUS PLANNING
“UPDATE OF THE CAMPUS CAPITAL PLAN INCLUDING CRITICAL NEEDS”

(see attached)

Senator Mokhtar Atallah asked about the precise location of the new Police Department.

Associate Vice Chancellor Robert Francis stated that it will be across from the fire station at Tillson Farm.

An unidentified faculty member stated that there was a question of where the functions are going to go for these buildings, and who to contact about that.

Associate Vice Chancellor Francis answered that faculty should feel free to call him.

Professor Peter Veneman stated that he works in one of the buildings that is scheduled to be possibly demolished, and wondered what was going to happen to the faculty who occupy those buildings right now.

Vice Chancellor Joyce Hatch stated that the Provost’s Office is working with the Dean of the College of Natural Resources, and eventually more people should be included in that conversation. When she referred to that project that is underway, it all needs to be looked at together. It is a comprehensive look at how to relocate people and find or make space.

B. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. The Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Secretary Ernest May stated that he wanted to clarify one point about the openness or lack thereof of Council and Committee meetings. The full Faculty Senate meeting is a public meeting as defined in the State’s open meeting law, and is open to everyone in the community, including reporters and others. The Council and Committee meetings are not subject to the open meeting law, he was told by University counsel, but we do have a tradition of having open meetings that are open to faculty or other people who want to observe Council and Committee meetings. However, as is noted in Robert’s Rules of Order, a Council or Committee, if it wishes, may go into executive session by action of the chair or vote of the Council or Committee. There have been a few cases where the business of the Council was not able to go forward because of the visitors or observers who were there. We will likely bring up a revision of our bylaws at the April 19 meeting, which will be specific about this, and quote the language from Robert’s Rules about how this works. We have broad representation of the community on these Councils and Committees. Faculty, staff, and students are members of all of our Councils and Committees. The tradition is that these are all open, and we welcome observers, but we hope that the work of the Councils and Committees will be able to go forward without disruption.

2. The Faculty Delegates to the Board of Trustees

Senator W. Brian O’Connor stated that Secretary May attended most of the subcommittee meetings that were held in February or March, except on February 14 due to weather. On March 14, Secretary May, Senator Marilyn Billings, Senator Arthur Kinney, and Senator O’Connor attended the Board of Trustees meeting. First, there was an increase in student fees, by approximately 3.4%, which is less than the rate of inflation. The tuition remains at \$1700, which has been the same for at least fifteen years, but that can only be changed by the legislature. The Amherst student Trustee, Marisha Leblum, spoke very eloquently against this increase, as did at least two other Trustees. The question was asked of what would happen if the fee plan was not approved, and President Wilson said that the UMA 250 Plan would be seriously jeopardized, along with several other projects. Chair Stephen Tocco also responded by stating that the two major objectives of PHENOM (Public Higher Education Network of Massachusetts), which is the active group from the Massachusetts Society of Professors and the students, really should increase the capital budget and increase financial aid. Twenty years ago, the state allocated \$20 million for financial

aid, and it is still \$20 million. If you factor in the rate of inflation, it should be at least \$79 million. With those two goals, if we can meet them, this will certainly help with the budget situation. President Wilson also pointed out that this fee increase will allow for \$4 million in new financial aid and will meet 89% of the need for aid, which is very high in relation to our peers. Consequently, the Board voted to increase the fees.

Chairman Tocco also reported on studying the university ranking system, such as peer ranking, and where and how we can fit in with this process. This is high on the agenda of the Trustee meetings and will be discussed at their annual retreat in June. President Wilson also mentioned that the endowment of the University is now at \$250 million, which obviously is not much compared to Harvard, but we could get there. The freshman applications for the system are up by 15%, and the bulk of them are for the Amherst campus.

The Committee on Academic and Student Affairs approved two new PhD programs at Dartmouth: one in Brazilian Studies and Theory and one in Nursing. He announced that Dr. Priscilla Clarkson was named Distinguished Professor on the Amherst Campus. Dr. Clarkson is a member of the Kinesiology Department and is also the Interim Dean of Commonwealth College. Dr. Andreas Muschinski was named the Jerome Peros Professor of Measurement Sciences for this campus.

The Board also passed a resolution to encourage student civic engagement and advocacy, which is the first time such a resolution has been made. This will encourage such civic events as Lobby Day for Public Higher Education, voter registration drives, and a whole list of things.

Under Administration and Finance, there were amendments to the University capital plan here at Amherst: as was mentioned, the academic classroom/office swing space building (\$24 million), the basic upgrades to the Lederle GRC (\$10.3 million), the relocation labs and academic functions from Stockbridge, Hatch, French, Fernald, and South College (\$6.7 million) and electrical service improvements in the Campus Center, as well as in the garage (\$5 million), for a total of \$46.2 million. There was a revised estimate for electrical, plumbing, and elevator repairs for the W.E.B Du Bois Library, from \$2.5 million to \$5 million.

The Athletic Committee established a task force to review the men's hockey team at Lowell. A statement was made that they are looking at the fact that various athletic teams represent the system, as opposed to the campus, which is an interesting concept.

The Development Committee has been renamed to the Committee on University Advancement. There was also a resolution adopted on a coordinated constituent relationship policy. This is for alumni, parents, and friends, and this was to be used by University businesspeople.

The Science, Technology, and Research Committee, which is chaired by Trustee John Armstrong, accepted the report on the strategy for advancing stem cell research and regenerative medicine at the University. They also endorsed a proposed institute for stem cell research and regenerative medicine, and urged the support of the governor and the legislature. Trustee Armstrong also commended the members of the task force, which included two Amherst faculty members, Dean Langford from Natural Sciences and Mathematics, and Dr. Sam Black from Veterinary and Animal Sciences. They also accepted a report on enhancing industry relationships at UMass. This would create a University Research Council, which will promote industry collaborations across the system.

The Board approved the appointment of Congressman Martin Meehan as Chancellor of the Lowell campus. Also, Chancellor Lazar of the Medical School at Worcester has submitted his resignation, effective immediately. He has had some health problems, and he felt that it was time to step down. They are also in the process of searching for a new Dean, so they will have a new Chancellor and a new Dean.

It is a very interesting Board. There are seven new members and a new Chair. He is going to withhold full judgment on their direction for a few more meetings, but he is happy that they are certainly involved and active. They attend the meetings and they are vocal, and it was interesting. At Worcester, the Board went into executive session, so we all had to leave. When that happens at the Medical School, Senator O'Connor goes to the Admission Office to lobby for some of our students. As he was leaving the Admission Office, some of the people walked back with me, and they said that he could go in the special entrance, and there were a lot of security people there. When he went in the door, they were getting prepared for Congressman Meehan, and several of the reporters obviously had not read the newspapers lately, because they said, "Congressman Meehan, what do you have to say?"

3. **The Representative of the Massachusetts Society of Professors**

Senator Steven Brewer stated that he was asked to speak briefly about PHENOM. Many of you have heard of PHENOM now. It is the Public Higher Education Network of Massachusetts. A number of people have been talking about setting up something like this for several years. It will be an advocacy group for higher education that could bring together faculty, students, parents, and all of the interested stakeholders in higher education to try to speak with a common voice about what the issues and priorities ought to be. It was kicked off with the public meeting with Deval Patrick, when he came here, and the MSP was one of the principal players who got it rolling, but we now have participation from people on nine campuses. A steering committee of 13 people has been elected, and we have a number of student groups and a number of unions at the different campus. We hope for it to grow.

The two main things that we are talking about this spring are these signature cards, which Student Trustee Leiblum is passing around. We want to try to have these signature cards ready by April 25, so that we can go to the State House and go around and visit legislators to talk to them about the number of students and faculty who are from the different areas in Massachusetts. April 25 is when we want to have a Lobby Day. Hopefully, we would like dozens, if not hundreds, of people to go to the State House and meet with legislators and talk to them about the five fundamental principles that are described on the cards: (1) to fund public higher education, (2) to make higher education affordable, (3) to make higher education accessible, (4) to hire more teachers, researchers, and staff, and (5) to expand democratic institutions of governance for public higher education. It is a great thing, and if faculty are not going to get involved and support the organization, they cannot expect anyone else to do so.

4. **The President of the Student Government Association**

Student Trustee Marisha Leiblum stated that she is speaking on behalf of the Student Government Association to give an update from the Student Trustee. She wanted to speak about the Board of Trustees meeting and content of the last Committee on Academic and Student Affairs meeting. She also wanted to speak about the increase in student charges and the motion for civic engagement.

In the Academic and Student Affairs meeting, there was significant discussion about the academic proposals that were presented from the Dartmouth campus. There were several proposals: a Women's Studies program, a Criminal Justice program, a Brazilian Studies program, and a Nursing program. For the first time, rather than going through with the motions, vetting the different proposals, approving them through subcommittee, and putting them through to the Board, the agenda for the meeting was essentially brought to a halt by Trustees who were concerned about how these programs fit into the overall mission of the University system. They were particularly concerned about the marketability of these degree programs. While several were approved, others, including the Women's Studies program and the Criminal Justice program, were halted again, based on concerns from the Board that perhaps these programs were not the best use of University dollars. She wanted the Faculty Senate to think about what message this sends about the future of a liberal arts degree and what the Board's current attitude is, particularly several outspoken new members of the Board, and also to note the concerns about the autonomy and governance of the campuses and whether faculty, students, or the Board of Trustees is really going to have the final say on what sorts of academic programs are approved and thrive on our campuses.

Secondly, there was a vote to increase student fees. Much of this increase, as we have seen, has to be directed to capital expenses on campus, and while she talked extensively about this increasing cost on accessibility and on affordability meeting at an early Faculty Senate meeting, several faculty members came up to her after that presentation and said that, in fact, the Faculty Senate understands that we are at a crisis point in terms of affordability and access. What needed to happen was not educating the Faculty Senate about the issues, but encouraging every single member here to exert their agency and to assist us in lobbying the state legislature for things like the capital plan, which would remove the pressure on the budget and hopefully ease student cost, and also on increasing financial aid. The Student Government, along with multiple faculty unions and governance bodies from across the state, is quickly getting behind PHENOM. What we are specifically looking to do this spring is to gather thousands of these cards with signatures from students and members of the University community at large. What we are asking faculty to do today on behalf of the Student Government and PHENOM, is to open your classroom for a student to make a two minute announcement, encouraging students to sign these signature cards, or, if the faculty member is more comfortable, they can make the presentation themselves about the deinvestment of public

funds and the impact that will have on our institution. She passed around a clipboard for faculty members to sign up to allow a brief presentation from PHENOM on that matter.

C. QUESTION PERIOD (10-Minute Limit)

Senator Billings made an announcement about an upcoming program that she hoped people will be interested in. It is called "Showcasing Research and Teaching in the 21st Century: A Digital Approach," and this event is co-sponsored by the Libraries, the Office of Research, the Center for Teaching, and the Graduate School. There will be a keynote speaker from the National Association of Land Grant Schools and Universities, David Shulenburg. There will also be an unveiling of the new digital repository called Scholar Works.

D. ANNUAL REPORT

Annual Report of the Ombuds Office for the Period July 1, 2005 to June 30, 2006, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 07-025.

Ombudsperson Catharine Porter stated that sometimes the numbers on the reports do not go together. For example, the Ombuds Office had 472 clients, but 484 of this and 492 of that. We keep a different kind of bookkeeping; we count our clients, but many clients come with more than one issue, and sometimes more than one issue requires more than one method of disposition. That is why our numbers seem to be irregular. She noted that some of the increases in numbers this year over last year occurred with classified employees, faculty, and professional staff, and, last year and this year, they had more graduate students coming to the Ombuds Office for various concerns. It is not a good-guy, bad-guy thing. For example, the Bursar is listed here. It is not because somebody is necessarily complaining about the Bursar, it is just that they have a glitch in their bill and that is why the Bursar may come up, as well as Housing, or any of the other areas on campus. She thanked John Dubach, the Chancellor's Office, and Andrew Effrat in the Provost's Office, because they rely on their advice and counsel.

The report was received.

E. CONSTITUTION CHANGES

Special Report of the Rules Committee concerning Amendments to the Constitution of the University of Massachusetts Amherst Faculty Senate, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 07-023A with Motion No. 23-07.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Amendments to the Constitution of the University of Massachusetts
23-07 Amherst Faculty Senate, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 07-023A.

The motion was seconded and adopted.

(This motion was read at the 659th Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate on February 15, 2007. The vote taken at this meeting was the final vote.)

F. BYLAW CHANGES

Special Report of the Rules Committee concerning Bylaw Changes, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 07-026 with Motion No. 25-07.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Bylaw Changes, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 07-026.
25-07

Senator O'Connor moved to amend the original motion to strike the shaded portion, under Academic Priorities Council, section 5-3-1, paragraph E. The Academic Priorities Council does a tremendous amount of work and he is concerned that this is an impossible task, if they are to do an assessment of priority of the proposed new program in relation to existing programs. It is his understanding that they do that anyway. Maybe someone from the Council can clarify that, but it seems that it is implying that every time a new program comes up, it has to be thoroughly studied in relation to other programs, and this is going to be a tremendous amount of work.

Senator Richard Bogartz stated that he was a motivator for the version of which this has become the emasculated form. In point of fact, the Academic Priorities Council is not in any position to really review anything in terms of priorities, because it is never in a position to compare the proposed program that comes before it with other possible programs. The idea, as it was suggested, was that the Academic

Priorities Council, when a program is proposed to them, advertise to the various levels of the campus (the departments, the deaneries, and so on) that a program has been proposed. It is being considered, and there being a competition for resources, in order for the Academic Priorities Council to make some kind of informed judgment, those of you who feel you are in competition for these resources should come forward to the Council and let them hear from you. Then, some judgment could be made in terms the priorities with respect to this program versus that program. As things stand, the Council does not do that sort of thing; it basically does nothing because it is not in a position to perform any kind of comparison. That was the motivation behind this. It is not surprising that, as it now stands, you cannot really see what is going on, and the way it reads makes it seem like you are going to have to compare a program with everything under the sun, which, of course, as Senator O'Connor pointed out, is impractical. To consider it versus some other program that feels they could use those resources, that might not be so impractical.

Secretary May pointed out that the original language, to review all proposals for new programs, does not prevent the Academic Priorities Council from doing what Senator Bogartz has described. Including it in the bylaws, however, would require the Council to do that in every case.

Senator Bogartz stated that, in response to Secretary May, he was correct that it would require them to do so.

Secretary May replied that this is an important point, because the campus does have a need to update, revise, and institute new programs in order to adapt and evolve. On the other hand, it is also true that new programs and expanded, old programs increase cost and dilute quality, whether it is in a department, a school or college, or in the University in general. The Trustees are very aware of their ability to look at the dilution of quality and the increase in cost that new programs bring. He is not sure that the Faculty Senate needs to do their work for them. That job is being attended to. The faculty are the ones who propose the programs; he is not sure we also need to be the ones who constrain them. The Deans, the Chancellor, the Provost, and the Board of Trustees are on the job for that. It is not that we might not consider it, but he was not sure that we should require it in every case.

Senator Bogartz stated that currently, the way the Academic Priorities Council functions is a sham. He has been on that Council for a long time, but we cannot do what is proposed here. We cannot follow this instruction of reviewing all programs. In terms of the title of the Council, Academic Priorities, they are never in a position to make a judgment on priority, and that kind of judgment never gets made. Why should we pretend that we are making judgments about academic priorities, unless we are, in fact, making judgments about those priorities?

Presiding Officer Wilson wanted to clarify if Senator Bogartz is suggesting that it might be better to allow for Academic Priorities Council to do that, without requiring them to do it in certain situations, instead of requiring them in all situations to do that, but allowing them when it is necessary.

Senator Bogartz replied that he would require it, but it might very well be the case that no one comes forward and says that they have as good of a case as the proposal for the allocation of resources, in which case, no problem. There ought to be some circulation of that information to other bodies on campus, otherwise there is no question of priority going on.

The motion to amend was seconded and defeated by standing vote (6 in favor, 8 opposed).

Senator W. C. Conner suggested an amendment to the motion to reword the section to say that the Academic Priorities Council may do the assessment of priority, as opposed to will, since the implication that they have to do it for all programs seems to be the hanging point, of whether they can or should. The Council may include an assessment of the priorities. He moved to remove the word "will" and insert the word "may."

The motion to amend was seconded and adopted.

Senator Arthur Kinney stated that on page 5, the Research Library Council, at its last meeting, voted to have the term administration, which is shaded, read as "advising the Director of Libraries, regarding the functions and operations of the University's research library." It makes it the same as the second to last line in that section. We want it to be clear that the person we are advising is the Directory of Libraries.

Senator Atallah stated that the function of every Council is to report to the Faculty Senate, and this would be taken as advising the administration. The Councils are not advising any specific entity within the

administrative structure. They advise the administration, and then the administration can take that advisement, or send it to the Director of Libraries to go ahead with it. He thought that this was the function of the Councils, rather than being directed to a specific person within the administration.

Senator Kinney stated that perhaps Secretary May could give more information, but he thought that the Graduate Council, for example, advised the Dean of the Graduate School.

Secretary May stated that everyone was right. Each of our Councils and Committees is built around a lead administrator, but there may be some issues on which the Research Library Council might want to make a recommendation to the Provost, rather than the Director of Libraries. This does not prevent them from doing that. Either way does not prevent them from doing that, but this way recognizes the lead administrator more explicitly than some of our other bylaws. They are not completely consistent in this respect.

The motion to amend was seconded and adopted.

(Inasmuch as this is a change to the Senate Bylaws, this is the first of three readings of this motion. It will be read again at the 661st Senate meeting and voted on at the 662nd meeting. The motion may be debated and amended at all three meetings.)

G. NEW COURSES

There are no reports associated with the following motions.

<u>COURSE</u>	<u>TITLE</u>	<u>CREDITS</u>
BMATWT 220	“Introduction to CAD in Construction and Architecture”	3
JUDAIC 323	“Jewish Utopia/Dystopia”	3
JUDAIC 343	“American Jewish Diversity”	3
PLSOILIN 140	“Plagues: The Ecology of Disease”	3

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the courses BMATWT 220, JUDAIC 323 and 343 and PLSOILIN 140, as recommended by the Academic Matters Council.

26-07

The motion was seconded and adopted.

<u>COURSE</u>	<u>TITLE</u>	<u>CREDITS</u>
EDUC 636	“Professional Seminar in Educational Administration I”	3
SCH-MGMT 711	“Applied Mergers and Acquisitions”	2
SCH-MGMT 713	“Services Marketing Management”	3
SCH-MGMT 715	“Sport Marketing”	3
SCH-MGMT 723	“A Coach Approach to Improve Leader Effectiveness”	2

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the courses EDUC 636, SCH-MGMT 711, 713, 715 and 723, as recommended by the Graduate Council.

27-07

The motion was seconded and adopted.

H. NEW BUSINESS

1. Special Report of the Program and Budget Council concerning A Report on Facilities, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 07-027 with Motion No. 28-07.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Report on Facilities, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 07-027.

28-07

The motion was seconded.

Professor Joseph Goldstein, Chair of the Program and Budget Council, stated that in the spring of last year, the Program and Budget Council decided that the most important issue to look at was facilities. It turned out to be a very interesting coincidence that the issue has come up in such a way, and it seemed very useful that the faculty would also study, in an independent way, exactly what is going on. The Council was interested in the fact that these facilities issues will impact the budget and therefore the UMA 250 Plan, and, of course, our research and teaching interests. Most of the background has been presented in various Faculty Senate meetings, including this one. Basically, we have a \$710 million capital plan, and that plan is 90% funded by borrowing. In other words, there is an enormous impact on the budget. Some of it comes from operating funds and some of it comes from borrowing, and very little from the state. Around 74% of that \$710 million is going to be borrowed and that has a major impact on our budget, and will raise the amount of money that is borrowed from 3.9% to 6.5% of annual expenditures. What that means to us is that it is the cap on borrowing. It is not going to be possible to borrow more money. This is already a percentage much higher than our peer institutions. When we hear about this \$1.367 billion deferred maintenance issue that was obtained from the Sightlines facilities advisor report, one has to look at where that funding is going to come from, and we are not going to be able to borrow our way into the future. We did a calculation that revealed that it would take 22% of our annual expenditures to pay for that, and no one is going to let us borrow that kind of money. That is obviously a problem that we need to worry about if we are going to pay for all the deferred maintenance. The issue that was discussed about the \$70 or \$80 million need that we have for the next two to three years needs to be funded in some way and paid for. The way that was done can be expressed in different ways, depending on who is the giving the talk, but basically, we were fortunate enough to get \$30 million from the state but we still needed to borrow at least \$40 million. The way that was done was to take \$4 million of the money that we got from the state last year in our budget, which was originally targeted for the UMA 250 Plan, to be used to pay off a loan of \$40 million. The Council was clear in its understanding that deferred maintenance is a very important issue. He thinks that the faculty are not against fixing things, it is very important, but it is just the tradeoff between the UMA 250 Plan and replacing our faculty, and the expenditure that needs to be made for deferred maintenance.

As luck would have it, the Chancellor and others have decided that, because of the increase in the number of out-of-state students who flow into the University, there is about \$2.5 million that will be added, on a continuing basis, to our budget. That \$2.5 million was put against the \$4 million that was originally coming out of the UMA 250 Plan, so that, in fact, only a quarter of the UMA 250 Plan that faculty expected to be present has actually been lost. When you do the calculations, we will get almost another 50 faculty. In the two years, we have about 100 faculty we can add to the institution, and at the same time, we are able to pay down some of the emergency deferred maintenance. That is good, and the faculty, at least on the Program and Budget Council, are happy with that situation. Looking forward to the next three years when we would finish the UMA 250 Plan, we are obviously concerned because there is a continuing need to pay off more of the deferred maintenance. We cannot address the \$1.367 billion problem unless the state helps, and we are concerned that this end up not as a UMA 250 Plan, but as UMA 100 Plan, so there is concern for the future, and the Program and Budget Council will be following this. Anything that we can do to help the administration will be important.

Secretary May stated that we had the obituary for John Lederle, who presided over the campus during that incredible growth period when the faculty grew from 300 to nearly 1200 and all of these buildings were built. That was a growth period. In those days, the state paid for all of the capital and the state supported about 70% of our operating budget and about 30% was generated on campus. Now those proportions are reversed. We are going into another growth period. It is great to see all of those slides about new buildings. It is the right thing to do, but it does create enormous pressures on the budget. Just going to the new heating plant is going to add \$4 million to the operating budget because we are switching from coal to gas. The new buildings need to be maintained at a higher level than we maintain our other, older buildings, so there are increased maintenance costs. The debt service is going to go up, and it will eventually have to stop because no one will lend us anymore money. That money is real and has to come from somewhere, so as the debt service and utilities increase as a proportion of the budget, something else is going to have to be reduced, because we are not generating enough increase in our state budget or in students fees or other sources of income. This comes with some pain and some difficulty at the institution, and we are grateful to the Program and Budget Council for monitoring this situation and staying on top of it, but it is extraordinarily complicated. We thank Vice Chancellor Hatch, Associate Vice Chancellor Francis, the Chancellor, the Provost, and all of their staff, because it takes a great deal of planning for all of these things to happen seamlessly, with minimal disruptions. Smaller projects in the past have entailed much larger disruption, so we are on a good track, but it is going to get increasingly difficult to maintain this unless something changes. The Chair of the Board of Trustees and Chancellor Lombardi are trying to get the state to support us in an unusual way, through capital and scholarships, which will relieve the

operating budget to operate. People should be aware that this report is a warning that, although we are on a good track right now, if we do not have a little relief, we are in for some very tough choices in the near future.

The motion was adopted.

2. Special Report of the University Computer and Electronic Communications Committee concerning Security of Computing and Technical Equipment in Academic Spaces, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 07-028 with Motion No. 29-07.

MOVED:
29-07 That the Faculty Senate approve the recommendations of the University Computer and Electronic Communications Committee to improve Security of Computing and Technical Equipment in Academic Spaces, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 07-028.

Senator Jennifer Parenti stated that this was mostly common sense information. The Committee is trying to spread the word and remind people that little things that we do as faculty members in aggregate can really help our security situation on campus as a whole.

Secretary May stated that it might seem like it is self-evident, but it actually involves a culture shift on the campus. So many lecture halls, labs, and offices are routinely left open. If there is just a blackboard and some chairs, it does not matter, but as we start to equip them with more advanced technology and the rooms are heavily used, it requires new habits, and most people are not doing this. Unfortunately, there are people from off-campus who have noticed this, and while there have not been any disastrous thefts up to this point, there have been attempts and some minor thefts. We really need to change the campus culture regarding access to teaching facilities, and they will not be able to be left open, otherwise we cannot have all of this equipment.

The motion was seconded and adopted.

3. Special Report of the Graduate Council concerning A Name Change in the Department of Art: from M.S.-Art to M.S.-Design, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 07-029 with Motion No. 30-07.

MOVED:
30-07 That the Faculty Senate approve the Name Change in the Department of Art: from M.S.-Art to M.S.-Design, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 07-029.

The motion was seconded and adopted.

4. Special Report of the Academic Priorities, Graduate, and Program and Budget Councils concerning the Dual Degree Option in the Masters in Business Administration and the Masters in Science in Mechanical Engineering (MBA/MS), as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 07-030 with Motion No. 31-07.

MOVED:
31-07 That the Faculty Senate approve the Dual Degree Option in the Masters in Business Administration and the Masters in Science in Mechanical Engineering (MBA/MS), as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 07-030.

The motion was seconded and adopted.

5. Special Report of the International Studies Council concerning The Exchange Agreement between Scuola Superiore di Lingue Moderne per Interpreti e Traduttori at the University of Bologna, Italy and the University of Massachusetts Amherst, Amherst, Massachusetts, USA, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 07-031 with Motion No. 32-07.

MOVED:
32-07 That the Faculty Senate approve the Exchange Agreement between Scuola Superiore di Lingue Moderne per Interpreti e Traduttori at the University of Bologna, Italy and the University of Massachusetts Amherst, Amherst, Massachusetts, USA, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 07-031.

The motion was seconded and adopted.

6. **Special Report of the General Education Council concerning A Recommended General Education Designation for JUDAIC 343, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 07-032 with Motion No. 33-07.**

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the General Education Designation HSG for JUDAIC 343, as presented
33-07 in Sen. Doc. No. 07-032.

The motion was seconded and adopted.

The 660th Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate stood adjourned at 5:03 p.m. on March 15, 2007.

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

Respectfully submitted,

**Ernest D. May
Secretary of the Faculty Senate**