

**UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST
OFFICE OF THE FACULTY SENATE**

Presiding Officer Robert Wilson called the 666th Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate to order on October 18, 2007 at 3:30 p.m. in Herter Hall, Room 227.

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

It is not all over yet, but clearly the expression of opinion and views on this campus, and the way in which it was expressed, has caught people's attention. The most common thing that was being said during that period was, "Why are they so mad out there?" They could not figure out why you were so mad. Now, little by little, because they are asking the question and they are listening to the answers, they are beginning to understand that all is not well and that this campus has been suffering a range of indignities and a lack of adequate support in quarters where you ought to be receiving significantly more support than you are.

People are still paying attention. I called the Governor the other day to thank him for the capital bill which, as you know, has a billion dollars for the five campus system, the largest number of explicitly-funded projects around this campus. There are also pooled accounts from which the campuses will be able to secure additional resources, and we are going to work hard to make sure they are not earmarked so that by the time that bill gets spent out, you should be getting, for this campus, somewhere between \$600 and \$700 million out of the billion dollars. That is my opinion; that is not a fact. If you get your proportionate share of it, you are going to get \$600 or \$700 hundred million out of there, which is about half of the immediate capital needs for the campus. We have ideas about how to deal with the balance of that, which would be discussion for another day, but let us get this one in the bank before we go on to other ideas because we do not want to confuse little minds that sometimes have trouble keeping track of under which shell is the pea.

We will get that done. When I called the Governor, I thanked him particularly for doing a 100 percent of the cost of the projects. As you know, of the \$700 million program on this campus right now, only 12 percent is coming from the state. The rest of it is coming out of the classroom and on the backs of the students. The Governor figured it out, and he said, "You are right. That is not acceptable." He took the policy construct that was the Capital Bill that I filed in December for this term, and so I am very pleased with that, and I called him to thank him. Before the end of the conversation he said, "By the way, we are not done with the Trustees yet." It was not appropriate for me to ask him anything at that point. If he wanted to say more, he would have. He did not. But, it was enough for me to hear that they are not done with the Trustees. That said, we made very significant progress, and I know I stood before you a year ago very excited because Mr. Romney appointed seven new Trustees and he was committed to finding Trustees that would build and support the flagship campus. Things ended up going haywire as a result of Mr. Tocco's chairmanship and the dynamic between the President's Office and the Board of Trustees which produced the One University Plan.

We now have two UMass grads, one very, very close to us; the other we are hoping is close to us. Of the five new Trustees, one is a graduate of this campus, and two are from Western Mass. That is three out of the five people who are going to be paying attention very closely to what is going on and thinking about what the implication is for advancing the agenda of a true flagship Research I campus. When the Governor says, "We are not done yet," that is very encouraging because it means that they have focused on the fact that we do not yet have a majority on that Board to make sure that fair decisions are being made all the time. We will have to stay tuned for future actions.

The final area that I will comment on is the Governor has put together this so-called Readiness Project to look at education in Massachusetts, pre-k through higher ed. lifelong learning. There are a number of people from this area on committees of the Readiness Project. In fact, there are a few from this campus. For those on the Readiness Project, some are still trying to figure out and define what their scope and scale is, and others are clear what it is and are barreling ahead. Their charge is to come up with an interim, preliminarily-type report by November 1st which I think a lot of them are going to use to sort of speak to what they are studying, what they are looking at, and maybe a few ideas, but mainly to give us all a sense of what they are looking at and where they may try to take us. This will then give us the next five months to try to influence the report

that they will submit to the Governor in March. There is one that is focusing on UMass and collaboration, and there is another that is focusing on higher education in general. I think those are the two that have the most direct impact on us, but time will tell whether some of the other pieces are going to intersect with us or not. That is a process we need to keep watch on because it is an opportunity and a venue in which people can propose creative ideas, and this time we would like them to be creative ideas that we participated in developing and that we might have some interest in and support for.

The Search Committee is barreling ahead. An UMass alum who is a Romney appointee is chairing the Search Committee for the Chancellorship, and we have people from the campus on there, and so you have colleagues that you can talk to about how it is going. That said, I think one has to keep a very, very sharp eye because these search processes can sometimes be a bit circuitous. One has to be vigilant and make sure you are paying attention to all the details. The people who are on the Committee are good people from the campus and, hopefully, will be able to help produce an extraordinary candidate and extraordinary new chancellor.

The final thing that I will say is that I sent a letter last week to the President's Office to ask for a detailed accounting of where the \$38 million that the campuses are being taxed is coming from. Is that coming off the appropriation or is that the tax? So, is it the total amount they are getting from state-appropriated funds and from your curriculum fee? I am asking them to explain how they spend \$38 million, how much is coming from each of the five campuses, and how it is actually being spent. When I get this information, hell will probably have frozen over, but, when I finally get the information, I will be happy to share it with people here. I do know that there are a lot of shared services which can be costly, but which also can be efficient and save us money. I do not come into this thinking that there should be no money going into the President's Office. I just do not understand why so much, and I do not know and understand yet how they are spending it. I think that question has been on the minds of some of you for a while, and so I just decided that as long as I have been pushing other things, I might as well push that one, too.

Senator Richard Bogartz thanked Senator Rosenberg on behalf of the campus and those present at the meeting. The campus is fortunate to have Senator Rosenberg working on its behalf, and he deserves a great deal of credit for what he has been doing.

Thomas W. Cole, Jr., Interim Chancellor, thanked Senator Rosenberg as well. He asked if the Senator would say something about the possibility of a phase two. Once the capital spending is concluded in this round, what may be some possibilities for the next round?

Senator Rosenberg stated that once this bill was funded, which is supposed to take ten years, the campus will still need another \$700 to \$800 million to get the job done. The delegation that represents this campus is going to take the lead in convening the legislators who represent the other four campuses in the system for the purpose of identifying an appropriate method to both accelerate the program and find the additional \$700 or \$800 million the campus needs, plus what the other campuses need. The campus needs to support the Governor's effort to increase the bond cap because, by increasing the bond cap, it creates more room in the annual operating budget for more capital spending. The Governor has wisely said that by the year 2010 or 2012 he wants to be at 10 percent of capital spending for higher education.

UMass needs to support the Governor's policy proposals for 100 percent state funding for these projects, a 10 percent allocation which will then allow the campus to go back and ask for a second bond to increase the money available for the capital.

W. Brian O'Connor, Faculty Delegate to the Board of Trustees, also thanked Senator Rosenberg. He stated that he gets bogged by the Governor's tremendous spending plans, which are great, but raise concerns as to where the money is going to be. None of these bills have been funded yet – the Life Sciences Initiative and the building proposals. Is it possible that these are going to happen?

Senator Rosenberg said there are a couple of components to the answer. First, over the last twenty years or so, since the Dukakis miracle and the lessons learned from that, we have been running very substantial surpluses. Those surpluses in a typical year run anywhere from a half a billion to a billion dollars. We are projecting revenues very conservatively, and we are budgeting conservatively against those which means we

are creating intentional surpluses. We now have about \$2.2-2.3 billion in the bank in our Rainy Day Fund which is in the top two or three in the country in terms of per capita rainy day money in the bank.

What that means is, as we get to the end of each fiscal year, we have some choices because you only want to build up that Rainy Day Fund so high before the taxpayers say, "We are giving you too much money." What you will start to see is more of the surpluses being diverted for onetime uses. Many of the things that the Governor is proposing require onetime appropriations not an annual appropriation. For example, the Life Sciences Initiative is \$1 billion, and it was a ten-year program, so that is a \$100 million a year. If you have a \$500 million surplus, which is what we had this year, you could spend \$100 million on that, still put \$400 million in the Rainy Day Fund and keep that commitment.

Let us assume, if you look at the \$19 billion problem with transportation, you could fund a piece of that out of surpluses. That said, that is too big a number to rely upon. You are going to have to ask the question, do we have enough revenue coming in for that function? We may have to look at tolls, fees, and gas taxes because that is so big. Also remember, if you have a \$20 billion program, you cannot build that program out in fewer than about twenty years, so you are actually spending \$1 billion a year, but then you are not actually spending it in cash. You are paying for it over a twenty-or thirty-year period. So, a \$20 billion program may be paid out over a thirty-or forty-year period. Now when you start doing the math, it starts looking different. You have these big initiatives which are desperately needed because we have been starving ourselves in many ways in terms of things we need to get done, and they look like they are impossible to do. But, if you start breaking them down in this way, you can see that with \$100 million a year, you can actually start to do a lot of very large initiatives. Just having \$500 million to a \$1 billion surplus a year, because we are conservatively estimating our revenues, basically gives us the opportunity to reconsider and rethink whether we can build some more of it into the base of the budget and that is where the Governor is talking about adding \$200 million to our spending program in capital.

Senator Steven Brewer stated that last year Senator Rosenberg introduced a higher education bill that would have changed the way the state funds higher education to some extent. It was an omnibus bill tied to caps on tuition and fees. Senator Brewer asked if that bill would be re-introduced this year.

Senator Rosenberg said the bill was re-introduced and he hopes they might still accomplish something with it. Maybe PHENOM, if they get a head of steam, can help with some of those things. At this point, Senator Rosenberg said he would be happy if the bill moves forward, but he is putting his energy into the capital and the operating budget. He is also trying to figure out how to get more money for the 250 Plan.

Senator Brewer said he heard there was a bill that might change the collective bargaining agreement process. If the contract were signed and presented to the Governor, if the Governor did not act on it in 45 days, instead of being sent back, it would be sent to the legislature. Senator Brewer asked if Senator Rosenberg knew anything about that bill.

Senator Rosenberg stated he has misgivings about the bill; it is quite controversial. He has heard no discussion about it this term.

Ernest May, Secretary of the Faculty Senate, thanked Senator Rosenberg for being a rock throughout this turbulence which has been filled with both opportunity and conflict. Secretary May said he could not imagine anyone doing a better job of steering the campus' ship through these turbulent times. A good deal of credit goes to Senator Rosenberg for seizing and taking advantage of opportunities.

B. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Principal Administrative Officers

Sharon Fross, Vice Provost for University Outreach, stated she had an announcement for Paul KostECKI, Vice Provost for Research. They have placed a new publication, *Cross-Campus Collaborations*, in the back of the room. It outlines how the UMass Amherst campus is working with the five campuses and also outlines the commonwealth connection.

Also, the Faculty Senate Outreach Council and UMass Amherst Outreach have planned an all-day symposium on Monday, October 22 called “Beyond Outreach to Scholarly Engagement.” The Faculty Senate Outreach Council has been working over the last three years with faculty across the campus to look at scholarly engagement. The Council has asked the Deans to identify ten faculty to showcase, through a panel presentation and poster sessions, the work they are doing with external constituencies. Dr. Lorilee Sandmann from the University of Georgia is coming to facilitate the conversation on Monday. There are some pamphlets available in the back of the room. Faculty may also register on the Outreach web site. Vice Provost Fross thanked the Faculty Senate Outreach Council for bringing this symposium together.

Charlena Seymour, Provost, emphasized, in terms of the engagement activities, not only are they talking about engagement within the Amherst community itself and the five colleges, but also beyond the campus’ periphery, in Holyoke, in Chicopee, in Springfield.

2. The Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Secretary May stated there has been political activity on many fronts since the last meeting. The Governor’s Readiness Commission has started its work, and a former campus Provost, Pat Crosson, is on the UMass group. The charge is relatively narrow, but the group has decided to put virtually everything on the table. Pat Crosson is being terrific about keeping the faculty informed. Obviously, the filing of the Governor’s Bond Bill was huge for this campus, and a lot of credit should go to Senator Rosenberg for getting a lot of the campus’ issues in there.

Last Friday, there was a lunch for legislators, an annual event here, hosted by Chancellor Cole at Hillside. Vice Chancellor Hatch presented a slideshow there and will present some of those slides today.

Joyce Hatch, Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance, said the really good news that Stan has been talking about is that the Governor actually filed legislation for \$1 billion. There has been a lot of talk that led up to that, but he actually filed, not the draft, but a final piece of legislation which is absolutely terrific news. It is the best thing that has happened, that I have seen, in many years here.

We have a task in front of us to tell our story. Even though we have terrific support from people in leadership positions like Stan, which is absolutely great – we have some friendly legislators from Western Mass – it is not a slam-dunk that this is actually going to be passed. We started to put together some information. This is meant to tell our story, and it was a quick story, put together in a few days. I think we have more work to do, and, in fact, if anyone here has other ideas about how to tell the story from this campus perspective, I would be glad to hear it.

(Referring to the slides)

What we tried to do is to show what the needs are here. There is a lot of hope due to the fact that we are doing so much right now. We have funded a \$700 million plan underway right now. It started in 2005. A lot of the design and things are underway right now, which is absolutely terrific, but we have to put it in perspective because there will be some new space, and all of these projects, as you see here, are underway. The student apartments are done; the Integrated Science Building is underway; the Art Building will be done this spring; the Central Heating Plant will be done this spring; Skinner will be done this spring; the Rec. Center is about to have a groundbreaking ceremony.

However, one of the points to be made – and Stan understands this, and I know this is one of the things that really bothers him so far – is that we have done so much on our own dime. The numbers change – he quoted 12 percent from the state – but, in fact, that has gone down a little. When we were presenting this thing a year ago, we had some expectations that more money would come this and last year under an old authorization. That has not been the case. Money has been pulled and stopped, and, for a number of reasons, there is a very conservative approach going on in the A&F and even under Governor Patrick. Of the \$790 million, 10 percent over this period of work underway has come from the state. The authorization has pretty much expired which is why we need this next authorization that Stan was referring to; we need that bill passed.

However, even when this is done, in a year and a half from now, we will have about 15 percent new and good facilities on this campus. If you put aside housing and dining, we have 6 million square feet. It is called E&G, educational and general, to carry out the educational mission and research mission of the campus. Of that, the new will be about 7 percent, and 8 percent will be good – that is the 15 percent. With the other 13 percent, we have gone through an inventory and targeted buildings that we should not be investing in. How many of these buildings can last 10 years or 13 years? It is just that, at some point after the next 10 years, some need to be invested in during the 10 and some after and taken offline. So 71 percent of our facilities are important buildings to keep. Some date back to 1880; some were built during the building boom of the 1960s and early 1970s, important buildings to keep, but they need to be renewed, the systems need updating, and there is a lot of catch-up and renewal that needs to happen even after we have spent \$790 million.

This is a little more broken out – the same categories, new and good. Even then, we have some buildings built twelve years ago. In the next five years, we need to be replacing some systems, say, in the Polymer Building. We know about some of the things that need to be done. In the first years, 1-5, we need a total of \$800 million for these facilities. In some cases, it is to keep them going – \$600 million for the 71 percent of our facilities. Some we need to replace. That is \$800 million in the first five years, another \$550 million in the next five. We have a \$1.3 billion need on this campus alone, in these 10 years.

Just some other information we have shared before. We have worked with an outside group, Sightlines. How does this \$1.3 billion compare to other institutions? It is high. Now, we picked these institutions only because Sightlines works with these institutions. They happen to be other large research institutions which is why we have access to their data. But, obviously, this is blue – letter “b” is us. These folks were a little shocked when they saw the state of some of our buildings, too, and when they were here working with us just last year.

One of the things we are trying to figure out is what are some measurements that can tell our story of how we are doing compared to some other institutions, and we happen to have a lot of information from UConn and UNH because we meet, work, and share all the data. But, I picked out UConn and UNH because their research is catching up. They have some high growth in research. Now this is federal research. It is not total; it is federal because this is the one piece of sponsored activity we can get consistently. It is reported to NSF, and everyone reports it. So, it is a good number, and a consistent number that we can depend on.

You can see, back in 2000, we were almost twice UConn in terms of federal research. Expenditures equals revenues in the world of accounting because you get the money as you spend it, and UNH was somewhere in between.

Here is what happened in 2006. These are expenditures of federal money. Now a little disclaimer I have to put out there, but I don’t think it changes the picture that much: UNH happens to have a very influential Senator, Judd Gregg. Over these years, and probably even before in 2000, he has been able and does very well for this state and for UNH in getting a lot of earmarkings and federal appropriations. That is included here, but, in fact, they

have to have the facilities in order to do the work, whether it is coming from a competitive NSF grant or through a federal earmarking. So, we are talking about facilities. You can disagree, but the fact is we do not know. In all of the NSF data for federal research, everyone has a certain amount of federal earmarking. We just do not know what it is.

So, you can see the growth, and, in fact, Paul Kostecki wants me to always mention that we have done very well in our growth. Chancellor Lombardi used to talk about our share of the market, and, if the federal dollars are out there, are we maintaining our share of the market? You look at growth and how our growth of federal research expenditures matches other institutions. We have a lot of data on a lot of other publics, and we can do the same thing if we put some time into it.

Just a reminder, back in 2002, this campus lost many faculty during the early retirements and the budget cut, and, as you know, we are still behind with the faculty. That certainly is a big variable here, too. We have done quite well given the loss of faculty.

Here is what is happening with UConn in terms of their share of the market. They are getting an increasingly higher percentage of the research federal dollars that are out there. If you look at their web sites, we share data. We have shared data, and we have got the lists of all their projects. We have shared their projects with them. This shows how much capital money is coming to each of these campuses, and we tried to adjust for size, and we did it per student. You could do it per square feet. We did not have the per square feet, but we had the per student. It would be similar on the per square footage basis. You can see on this campus, \$325 per student per year average over this time. Durham more than twice. And, UConn – well we know the UConn story.

If you go to their web sites, they are very appreciative. This is UNH: “Our science and technology facilities are being enhanced through major capital support from the state legislature.” You go to UConn’s web site. They start off listing that it is a top-ranked public university, but they very quickly go to their facilities. They just keep listing the \$2.3 billion plan and appropriation that the state has made to the campus. Of the \$2.3 billion, \$2 billion is targeted to Storrs, and the other \$300 million to the satellite campuses.

A PDF version of her PowerPoint presentation is available at:

http://www.umass.edu/senate/fs/minutes/2007-2008/hatch_powerpoint_666_10-18-07.pdf

Secretary May thanked Vice Chancellor Hatch for her presentation. He stated that on Monday, Trustee Johnston, an alumnus and newly appointed trustee, came to campus. He is an important political figure in the State. He was the Chairman of the State Democratic Committee for seven years and was in the Kennedy and the Clinton administrations. UMass Amherst presented him with this material as well as the Springfield Initiative, the Capital Program, some student concerns about class diversity and the inadequacy of the student union. He had lunch with the Rules Committee, MSP and Search Committee members and discussed the UMA 250 Plan and governance and the trust and confidence in the central administration. He was very receptive to the talk. Trustee Johnston was the head of the young Democrats when he was a student here. Of course, the former head of the young Republicans is a trustee as well.

There is continued concern on the campus about the physical removal of the alumni and donor database away from the campus, another example of the lack of trust on the campus as to President’s Office actions. It was brought to my attention by a retired colleague from the University of California Berkeley, an authority on higher education, currently living in Amherst, that UCOP (The University of California Office of the President) has been recently severely criticized in a current report commissioned by the California Regents and carried out by the Monitor Group of Cambridge, Massachusetts, a business consulting group.

Among the key findings are: 1. Decision-making processes and the rationale for decisions at UCOP are not transparent; 2. UCOP acts as a gatekeeper rather than as a partner, policing instead of enabling the campus; and 3. UCOP tends to impose solutions that do not meet campus needs and that add to their costs. In their summary, they make statements such as: The persistent underperformance of UCOP on several key dimensions has led to a broad lack of confidence on the part of the Regents and the campuses. As a result, both groups end up working around rather than through the central management structures of UCOP. The Board of Regents has gradually increased the frequency and depth of its oversight and managerial involvement because it lacks confidence in the UCOP. Campuses similarly have developed their own duplicative administrative capabilities and are generally skeptical of any initiatives originating at the campus level with a net effect of increased operating costs. More importantly, it has created an additional source of friction between UCOP and the campuses. UCOP must act quickly to restore its credibility and repair the University's governance model. It can do this in part by streamlining its own operations to demonstrate its commitment to a higher standard.

Does any of this resonate? Do we need a \$7 million study to arrive at some of the same conclusions? Is it possible that the UMass President's Office, UMOP, has any of these same issues of transparency, accountability, efficiency, or effectiveness?

As an example, look at exhibit one (see attached). The President's Office requires the campuses to donate back some \$38 million, \$18.5 million from this Amherst campus, towards the operations of the President's Office. After repeated requests, including the one mentioned by our State Senator, and others as well, to account for the expenditures of the President's Office, that slide is what the campus got back. Does this meet reasonable standards of accountability and transparency? Wouldn't it be nice for the public to know what the rent is on the top floors of a luxury building which teaches no students and does no research, at a time when student fees are crushing many students? Wouldn't it be nice for the public to know what the travel budgets are for high officials compared to the many schools and colleges in which there are literally zero dollars budgeted for faculty travel for research and academic conferences? Secretary May's counterpart, Michael Brown, who chairs the University of California system-wide senate, has used the words "imperial presidency" to describe UCOP. Unfortunately, some might see all too many parallels in Massachusetts.

3. The Representative of the Massachusetts Society of Professors

Steven Brewer, Representative of the Massachusetts Society of Professors, announced that in *The Globe* there was an article about Boston University which has just created an initiative in which they are investing \$1.9 billion to renew their faculty, to hire 150 new faculty, and reduce faculty-student ratios, to build some facilities, and also increase salaries. They are talking about it as investing in themselves in order to break the top thirty private universities rated in the *U.S. News & World Report*. That seemed like an interesting contrast compared to the plan that was floated by the UMass Board of Trustees that focused on reorganizing, streamlining, cutting local services or optimizing the UMass brand. BU's initiative is a clear model for the kind of proposal that is likely to succeed – to re-invest in the institution and, in particular, to re-invest in the faculty. Senator Brewer stated that many are convinced that the faculty is the University. To attract and keep great faculty is what it is all about.

C. QUESTION PERIOD

Senator W.C. Conner stated it seems that in the last several years, the process by which one hires new faculty has become exceedingly more complex and difficult. He asked Chancellor Cole and Provost Seymour if there was a way to streamline the process by which one hires faculty in various departments.

Provost Seymour answered that over the last couple of years, the Provost's Office has tracked how long it takes for paperwork to get from the department to the Provost's Office and from the Provost's Office back to the department. For the most part, it takes no more than two days to turn around from the Provost's Office back to the department once the Office has received it. The Provost's Office has also found that the hiring process does change according to the School and College. There are certain cultural activities that go on with regards to conferences and other types of meetings that many departments use as a point for recruitment. She stated that it is important to let the Office know where the snags occur, but that since people now know that the hiring process is continuous, they can continue to look without putting a stop to the process at any point along the continuum. People should also start finding out who is going to be on the Search Committee a little earlier because sometimes that might contribute to the delay. But, the sooner the Provost's Office can get the paperwork, the sooner people can go out and continue with the process.

Provost Seymour (answering an inaudible question) stated it is important to differentiate between the different types of searches. Replacement positions should be continuous, and there should be no difficulty in trying to figure out whether or not the department is going to be able to hire for that position. The allocation of the new 250 positions is a different story. It has taken some time to make decisions to release that information to the departments. But, there is a process the Provost's Office has to go through with regards to sharing that information with different groups before they can come to their final decisions about who gets what. Yes, the Office needs to do a little better all around, and each year they try to improve.

With regards to the information about diversity, the Provost's Office is having many more conversations about diversity at the beginning of the process as opposed to the end of the process. That begins with conversations at the Search Committee level. The Office cannot have any preferential treatment with regards to the process, but, they are trying to get people to spread the net in order to broaden the impact, so, for that reason, there are more conversations about who is being searched for, why, and what the pools look like. But, again, there is a pretty fast turnaround in terms of conversations between the department, and, for the most part, the conversation takes place with the Associate Provost about the process.

D. ANNUAL REPORT

Annual Report of the General Education Council AY 2006-2007, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 09-005.

The report was received.

Randall Knoper, Chair of General Education Council, presented the report to the Faculty Senate. He noted that the Council had a productive year last year. This was partly impelled by a visit from the Provost in December who urged the Council to review and reinvigorate General Education. This led to the Council forging an action plan which is appended to the report. The action plan includes the commitment to develop ways for General Education to gain more prominence, respect and understanding across campus, to review the curriculum and structure of the program, to build community and camaraderie among General Education teachers, to develop ways to assess the success of General Education, and to pursue resources and support from the administration.

Also, in May, a UMass team including Deputy Provost Andrew Effrat, Director of Assessment Martha Stassen, and myself went to an institute on General Education sponsored by the American Association of Colleges and Universities, and the Council also put together a report which has a variety of recommendations that is also appended to the annual report. But, the main recommendation was to form a Joint Task Force to review General Education. That Task Force is in the process of being formed. Meanwhile, the General Education Council is moving ahead on a couple of fronts outlined in the Action Plan, including building camaraderie. The Council has had some workshops and luncheons planned for General Education teachers and are exploring ways of assessing General Education. One challenge will be to coordinate the Council's activities with those of the Joint Task Force. Another will be to remember the history of General Education and General Education reform on campus in view of the tremendous amount of analysis and work undertaken by the last Task Force in 1997-2000. The Council should perhaps keep the fate of the recommendations

of that Task Force in mind. Many of the recommendations were not put in place much to the chagrin of many of the people involved. The Council needs to keep that in mind also as a cautionary narrative. Even so, there is substantial energy and a trove of good ideas afloat, and Chair Knoper said he is optimistic that improvements and fresh representations of General Education at UMass are on the horizon.

Secretary May thanked Professor Knoper for the extraordinary job in submitting a wonderfully lucid report. He also thanked the administration for agreeing to form a Joint Task Force. One of the problems, last time, was that the Task Force was administrator-driven and the General Education Council was a Faculty Senate group, and there was a great gulf between the two. Making it a joint effort, hopefully, will join together those who have resources with those who have ideas, not that they are mutually exclusive. All of that will be in the room at the same time, and it will probably be possible to get some things going. It will be a rolling process where, rather than having this huge effort that takes three years and comes in with ninety-seven points to implement, and then, of course, there is no money to do it, something that seems to be a high priority and has great consensus can be put in place without waiting for the final results to come in several years later. This will be a different kind of process, and, hopefully, it will be easier to implement.

E. OLD BUSINESS

Tabled from the 664th Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate, September 20, 2007.

1. Special Report of the Academic Matters Council concerning the 2010-2011 Academic Calendar as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 07-050A with Motion No. 55-07.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate adopt the 2010-2011 Academic Calendar, as presented in
55-07 Sen. Doc. No. 07-050A.

Senator Mokhtar Atallah presented the motion with an amendment to change the last day to drop with a “DR” for graduate courses from Friday, February 25 to Monday, February 28 for the spring semester of 2011.

Senator Maria Tymoczko wondered if Senator Atallah could give an idea of the winter session. Also, the fall semester is a 13-week semester. Is it possible to make the spring semester a 13-week semester to provide more room for the winter session?

Senator Atallah answered that the time for the winter session is restricted by the fact that we agreed to start the semester earlier in January. Plans are underway to establish a system where most of the courses offered in January would be online courses or intensive gathering courses where the students would be meeting for a longer time every week. Those are the current restraints concerning the winter session. Continuing Education is working on coming up with a calendar that would be announced along with these new calendars, with the shortening of the January break. We will have to wait, and also there is still the potential, that if we are finishing early, we might insert another session between the end of the semester and the beginning of the summer sessions. That can help the students if they need to make up a course in a shorter time, as they used to do in January. They can do that either in January or after the semester is over.

Secretary May stated there might be an additional constraint. The University is required to offer a certain number of weeks of instruction in order to receive Federal Financial Aid. It does not say whether the University must have a 13 or 14 week semester, but the University might be right on the edge. It is not likely to go down to 13 weeks in both semesters and still meet the federal requirements.

The motion was seconded and adopted as amended.

2. **Special Report of the Committee of Committees concerning Nominations to Faculty Senate Councils and Committees, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 07-038B with Motion No. 42-07.**

MOVED: 42-07 That the Faculty Senate approve the Nominations to Faculty Senate Councils and Committees, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 07-038B.

The motion was seconded and adopted.

E. NEW BUSINESS

Special Report of the Academic Matters, Academic Priorities and Program and Budget Councils concerning A Concentration in Biochemical Engineering in the Department of Chemical Engineering as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 08-006 with Motion No. 04-08.

MOVED: 04-08 That the Faculty Senate approve the Concentration in Biochemical Engineering in the Department of Chemical Engineering in the College of Engineering, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 08-006.

The motion was seconded and adopted.

The 666th Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate stood adjourned at 4:38 p.m. on October 18, 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**