

UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST
OFFICE OF THE FACULTY SENATE

Presiding Officer Robert Wilson called the 678th Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate to order on November 20, 2008 at 3:30 p.m. in Herter Hall, Room 227.

- A. ADDRESS BY JOYCE HATCH, VICE CHANCELLOR FOR ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE
(QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION TO FOLLOW)
(See attached)

Judy Van de Geer, GSS Graduate Women's Network Coordinator, stated some of the old buildings, including the School of Education's Furcolo Hall and Hills North and South are dealing with single-pane windows, drafty conditions and either extreme heat or cold. Faculty have to provide their own air conditioners, and it does not seem that these buildings can be replaced right now. What are the University's plans to save energy in those buildings? Also, what currently fuels the steam: oil, coal?

Director Daly stated that the University is currently making steam with oil and coal. This is only because it is operating on the old steam plant to use up the coal pile. Starting by the end of December, the University will be fully on the new steam plant and will be making steam with natural gas and ultra-low sulfur fuel oil.

Housing was trying to get window replacement into this project because they had a lot of single-glazed windows. They wanted to add some money to see if they could get the cost down to meet the seven-year payback criteria. The University could not make the double-glazed windows fit into the seven-year payback criteria. The windows contribute a lot to making the buildings comfortable. It certainly seems it should pay for itself, but in terms of saved energy, it does not pay for itself. Housing is trying to do it through their deferred maintenance funding. The University has not figured out how to do it yet.

In terms of steam-heated buildings, the University is putting controls on the steam valve coming into the buildings. All the radiators are supposed to have a hand valve, a manual control to set the temperature. That was part of the project. We are also going to start setting reset temperatures. This looks at the outside and inside temperature, and in steam-heated buildings, it shuts the valve off for periods of time to cool the building down. Those buildings are hard to get to an even heat because one radiator is running hot and the other is shut off. But, we are working on putting the reset controls into all the steam-heated buildings.

Ernest May, Secretary of the Faculty Senate, thanked Vice Chancellor Hatch, Director Daly and Manager Ruberti. This is a good news story that needs to be told and underlined. There is a lot more to do, as we all know, from the buildings we occupy, but this seems to have been a win-win situation where at little cost to the campus's capital expenditures, we managed to produce, especially in the water area, rather significant reductions that are good both for the budget and for the environment.

John Jenkins, Chair of the Academic Matters Council, asked a question about the renovation of the Fine Arts Center. He stated that the new thermostats installed in the faculty offices only give a range of 69-75 degrees, and many of us are used to dealing with conservatively lower temperatures than that. Is there any way that an adjustment could be made to those thermostats so we could have lower temperatures?

Director Daly stated, in individual offices, the Physical Plant could reset the thermostats. Those thermostats were probably set for a comfort area for most people. At most times at night, they do lower the temperature down through the Energy Management System.

Professor Emeritus Joseph Larson stated that last spring Preserve UMass gave a report to the Senate about a number of concerns. In recent months, some very positive actions have been taken, particularly by the campus administration. Professor Larson complimented Vice Chancellor Hatch. He also thanked Chancellor Holub for his recent correspondence.

Senator W. Brian O'Connor asked when the new heating plant is going to be online. Also, what are the plans for the old heating plant?

Director Daly stated that the new heating plant is running today. The gas turbine is putting out around 8-9 megawatts. It is capable of 10. There has been some trouble with the gas turbine running on oil. They fixed the problem. Now the turbine is running on oil. It is not the cheapest fuel. We would rather run it on gas. One

of the boilers in the Central Heating Plant is running. The coal boilers in the old plant are running to use up the old coal pile. Otherwise, the new heating plant will be online. It is not at the substantial completion phase which is 95-98 percent complete, but they are going into what we call a punch list and substantial complete. The Physical Plant operators are running the plant under the direction of the start-up engineer who works for the general contractor. If all goes according to plan, we will be operating and maintaining the plant December 12.

Part of the project is to demolish the old plant. There have been a couple of meetings with the UMass Building Authority to start talking about what to do with the old plant and how to manage it, taking care of the asbestos and the sulfur. Once the University is really comfortable with the reliability of the new plant, there is a phase of the project to close and demolish the old plant.

B. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Principal Administrative Officers

Robert C. Holub, Chancellor, briefed the Senate on the budget. As soon as the administration heard about the 9C cuts, Chancellor Holub stated he put out a message to the campus, established a web site and also asked for the recommendations and contributions of the entire campus community. Some of the recommendations were in the areas of energy, some of which the Chancellor's Office has passed along. In cooperation with the Faculty Senate, Chancellor Holub established a Budget Planning Task Force which he hopes will present recommendations regarding ways to deal with the budget situation. The original task force was going to be a faculty task force, but because of the feedback that the Chancellor's Office received from various places, including the Faculty Senate, it decided to expand that to include students and staff. Now it is a more comprehensive task force. That Task Force will have all the information that the Chancellor's Office has about the budget, and the Office hopes to get some good, reality-based recommendations to add to its thinking.

Any of you who have read the newspapers know this is a serious situation. It is not apt to be one that will go away quickly. There are going to be things that will hurt some areas of the campus. The Chancellor urged faculty senators to get in touch with members of the Task Force and make contributions or to write to the web site that the Office has established. The Office will be continuing to put information up on the web site to keep you informed of what is going on as we move forward.

Paul KostECKI, Vice Chancellor for Research and Engagement, stated that the new research report is now available on campus and in the Research and Engagement Office. It is something the research office is really proud of. It has worked hard to pass on the good story to legislatures, alums, donors and colleagues.

Also, the Clean Energy Connections Conference will take place in Springfield at the Mass Mutual Center this Saturday. It is being driven by the Amherst Campus and by Research Liaison and Development. The Conference is partially funded by an S&T grant from the President's Office. It has been a tremendous success. Over 410 people are signed up. Sponsors, including a lot of companies from the Pioneer Valley, are covering the entire cost of the Conference. This is Clean Energy Week in the Commonwealth. Ninety-five percent of the activities occur in Boston. The University, in partnership with Springfield, wanted to make sure it was represented.

2. The Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Secretary May stated he attended a meeting of the Subcommittee on Administration and Finance for the Board of Trustees in Boston yesterday. They put together a long slideshow. Secretary May included a few slides to try to update the Senate on the condition of the University as it was on June 30. The Trustees also presented on what the Governor, the President and some of the other campuses are doing about the current situation.

Secretary May stated there is a good news piece to this. Everyone believes that the overall context is going to mean that many more good students apply to come to the University. There is going to be strong demand for what the University does. But, balanced against that, the University is going to have fewer resources available to provide its product.

A PDF version of the below presentation is available at:
http://www.umass.edu/senate/trustee_doc_annual_fin_report_11-19-08.pdf

This is a review of last year (referring to slide 3). As you can see, the Boston campus showed a significant increase in FTE students and staff. Dartmouth had some increase; Lowell had a considerable increase; our campus had a modest increase. UMass Amherst, as you know, is chock full of students because of the facilities issue. The University cannot teach more students in a responsible fashion without constructing more buildings.

The revenue trend (referring to slide 4) essentially shows where the money is. The state appropriation is more than one-third. Tuition and fees are approximately one-third and grants and contracts are another piece. Then, Auxiliary Enterprises and Worcester have their own deals. The biggest piece of money comes from the State appropriation. If you look at where the money goes (referring to slide 5), you can also see that a majority of the money goes to the academic enterprise. Administration, operation and maintenance, depreciation and all the rest are much smaller pieces.

The Trustees look at the operating margin (referring to slide 6). This is the surplus that is generated at the end of the year. As you can see, Amherst does pretty well. Worcester has a bigger margin and some of the other campuses are much closer to the line. The Trustees also pay attention to the financial cushion (referring to slide 7). In other words, how long can the campus exist if cash stopped coming in tomorrow? Amherst is in decent shape. You can see the Medical School has a big cushion. The other campuses are closer to the line.

Debt service to operations (referring slide 8) is a significant metric. UMass Amherst used to have a fairly low debt service because it was not addressing deferred maintenance nor was it constructing new buildings. The rating agencies consider 7 percent to be the responsible limit. The University is up to 4.5 percent, so it still has a little ways to go. UConn was doing a huge building program and their debt service to operations is up around 11 or 12 percent, but the legislature has pretty much bailed them out of that problem in most years.

A PDF version of the below presentation is available at:
http://www.umass.edu/senate/trustee_doc_budget_situation_11-19-08pdf.pdf

That is a summary of where the University was last year. The financial team in the President's Office has put together a best and worse case scenario for the coming year. As you know, the University has to set fees and plan its operations before it even knows what the final state budget will be. The biggest piece of the total budget will remain unknown until mid- to late July or early August of next summer.

The University has already had its state 9C cuts. This is the best case scenario (referring to slide 2). There will be no more cuts in FY09. In FY10, there will be an 8 percent cut in state funding, a 3.3 percent fee increase and some inflation. In FY11, there will be level state funding, a 3.3 percent fee increase and a continued inflationary increase on spending.

The worst case scenario (referring to slide 3) is that you would have an additional 3 percent 9C cut this year, spending cuts to the operating budget and some additional changes. In FY10, a 10 percent cut in state funding, no fee increase and a 5.2 percent inflation on spending. In FY11, there would be something along the same lines.

What would happen to the operating margin (referring to slide 4)? You can see that even in the best case scenario, next year the University would go negative.

This is the metric on return on net assets (referring to slide 5). The University was in positive territory previously. It would stabilize in the best case scenario and would go negative in the worst case scenario.

Whereas the operating margin in FY09, in the best case scenario, is projected to break even, in the worst case scenario, it would go negative. In FY10 and FY11, it would go extremely negative (referring to slide 6).

This is the return on net assets which shows that in FY09, it would be manageable and in FY10 and FY11, it would be quite unmanageable (referring to slide 7).

This is the history of the state appropriation (referring slide 8). That is the total University appropriation, ending with the best and worst case scenarios. In a chart such as this one, they do not look too far apart, but they would have a serious impact. Ten to \$40 million does make quite a difference.

A PDF version of the below presentation is available at:
http://www.umass.edu/senate/fs/minutes/2008-2009/may_slides_678_11-20-2008.pdf

Following this presentation, there were some comments from the President and Chancellors about how this is playing out at the system level and on the different campuses (referring to slide 1). The President's principles, which he says are supported by Governor Patrick, are things we have heard before: make cuts faster rather than incrementally. The first cut of 5 percent will be paid for by reducing expenses rather than raising fees. That has already been done and there will not be fee increases for the second semester. The fourth principle is to manage the FY10 cuts of 8 percent with a combination of expense reductions and fee increases. The fifth principle will be to eliminate some programs rather than starving everyone. That is easy to say, not so easy to do.

The President's commentary on this says: we are not alone. Almost every university in the country is facing similar issues. Locally, Harvard sent out a letter indicating they were cutting back by \$225 million and BU has also announced austerity measures. Students are the first priority. Financial aid was mentioned prominently. Recruiting and maintaining the faculty to teach the students is a high priority, and continuing the capital program was mentioned as a high priority.

The President's Office is abandoning the 12th floor of 225 Franklin Street which is in a high-rent district of Boston, although they claim they are paying a very low rent for that space. It does not look frugal to be stationed there. They are moving to a building they own in Shrewsbury. They will probably not save any money this year because they are still paying the rent, but presumably by next year they will start to save money. The President claimed that a proportional reduction in the President's Office will be about \$400,000, but they are planning on reducing their expenses by four times that amount.

Then, the meeting turned to the individual chancellors. Lowell has a tradition of not waiting and pulling the trigger when things of this nature happen. Chancellor Hogan did this in previous years. These are Secretary May's notes on what was said at this meeting. He is pretty sure that they are accurate but are subject of revision. According to Chancellor Meehan (referring to slide 2):

- The cuts will not prevent the institution from moving forward.
- The cuts will not be across the board. They will protect the core mission: teaching, research and learning.
- A "town meeting" was held to discuss the crisis.
- The outreach which is not part of the core will be cut.
- Centers will be given the choice of becoming self-sufficient or dying.
- The campus is planning layoffs of around 50.
- The cuts will be "strategic." The institution will be stronger in the long run. For example, according to Chancellor Meehan the Lowell radio station is being paid for by student fees. He said it looked like it would probably be discontinued or it would have to become self-sufficient.
- Decisions will be made "on the merits." Nothing will get in the way of excellence and strategic growth. Students will pay for excellence, and they have expressed being willing to pay for that excellence.
- The campus instituted college fees. In other words, at Amherst there is an engineering fee, but this fee would be for every college at Lowell. According to Chancellor Meehan, students are willing to pay the fee when they can see the results with equipment and the classroom support.
- The specifics of the Lowell cuts will be announced on December 1.

The Worcester campus does not have the same level of problems (referring to slide 3) because it is only 8 percent state funded. Their cut amounts to \$2 million. They operate a business operation called Commonwealth Medicine where they provide medical services to the prisons and maybe some other state agencies. If there are reduced revenues, they will simply reduce their expenses. They are

planning to delay discretionary spending, but they are going to invest in new programs which include a new building which will double their research space and will be staffed.

Here are Chancellor Holub's comments from Amherst (referring to slide 4). The 9C cuts of \$11.3 million were taken by a cancellation in the base increase which the campus received last year; it was about \$4.7 million which included the money for new UMA 250 positions, some money for library acquisitions and a couple of other items. There was a 1.6 percent reduction in units which resulted in \$4.8 million. Another \$2 million was taken centrally. That does not exactly add up, but that gives you a general idea of the cuts.

That is an important update. We are in the middle of a national and global financial crisis. Fortunately for the University, we offer a quality product at a reasonable price. The University is in a little bit better shape than General Motors because the demand for our product is going to remain strong. However, the funding base for it is something the campus is going to have to work on. The Budget Planning Task Force is going to assist the administration in trying to devise high-level principles, but this difficult period is going to have to play itself out and the Faculty Senate has an important role to play there.

4. The Faculty Delegate to the Board of Trustees

Faculty Delegate W. Brian O'Connor stated he spent all day Friday attending meetings. The first meeting was with the relatively new committee on Science, Technology and Research which presented a lot of good information. Paul Kostecki gave an enthusiastic report about the future of life sciences in the University and the State. Some of the other things that were presented were the progress towards improving energy consumption, green energy buildings and so forth. It was certainly an upbeat meeting. That meeting was followed by the Development Committee which was not as upbeat. Every campus did mention the fact that the contributions have slowed as have promises to contribute money. But, they were still optimistic in that area, too. In the noon meeting, the Committee on Academic and Student Affairs held a very lively discussion on what Periodic Multi-Year Review (PMYR) means, the progress of PMYR and what happens to AQAD reports. Faculty Delegate O'Connor thought that was very good and informative to the Trustees. Needless to say, there were a couple of Trustees who brought up the issue of tenure and very strongly recommended that tenure is basically a waste of time and faculty should have 5-10 year contracts. That is never going to go away. Faculty have to be vigilant, but Faculty Delegate O'Connor thought the meeting was very informative on the PMYR, especially in terms of allowing departments, colleges and programs to look at themselves and see what to do.

The final meeting at 2:00 was the meeting with the Faculty Delegate Representatives from the five campuses in which we basically discussed the budget. The Trustees and President's Office are keeping the lines open and trying to do things as transparently as possible.

5. The President of the Graduate Student Senate

GSS Coordinator Van de Geer reported for GSS President Otaño-Gracia. President Otaño-Gracia would like to reiterate that the Graduate Student Senate is interested in improving the quality of life for all graduate students. To improve life, we must start with the peripherals and the issues that are most difficult to discuss. With this in mind, GSS is trying to create a protocol against relationship violence and a system for students to bring up civil rights violations. Also, in conjunction with the Graduate Student Civil Rights Committee and the Graduate Employment Organization (GEO), GSS is hosting a forum entitled "What do you know about justice? Past, Present and Future: Civil Rights at UMass and in Western Mass." The forum is on December 3 at 4 p.m.

On another positive note, despite the impact of serious budget cuts to the campus, GSS is proud to provide childcare vouchers in adequate amounts for graduate students who are parents. GSS' commitment to maintain, continue, or even increase the amounts it is giving to students is priority.

C. QUESTION PERIOD (10-Minute Limit)

Senator O'Connor asked if the fences around the low-rise of the Graduate Research Center are ever going to come down.

Vice Chancellor Hatch stated she did not have an answer. It is a state project, and a lot of the work is nearing completion. But, even once the project is done the fence needs to stay until they are sure that the soil is not contaminated.

Don Robinson, Director of Environmental Health and Safety stated they are reviewing results from the soil testing around the low-rise and that will determine the remediation plan. They have found PCPs in the soil which they expected to see as part of the runoff from the building. The plan will be how to best remediate that. Once that is done, the fences will be taken down.

Secretary May stated it is commonly said that the research enterprise, because they bring in so much money, should be held apart from other operations. But, Secretary May stated he remembers that a few years ago an analysis was done showing that this was not completely true. Research actually costs the campus budget money. Former Chancellor Lombardi was asked that question at a Trustee meeting, and the answer he gave was for every \$1 of research expenditures, it costs the University \$1.28. The Medical School gave that number as \$1.20. Secretary May wondered if Vice Chancellor Hatch could give a little background and explain the details of that.

Vice Chancellor Hatch stated Secretary May's memory is accurate. It is still about \$1.28. The calculations are pretty thorough on what it costs the campus to support research. It is called the indirect, overhead rate. There is a calculation we do and it gets audited by HHS. They are federal auditors that come in and confirm that it costs \$0.56 on the \$1 to support the research enterprise. Vice Chancellor Hatch's Office showed them something that it costs about \$0.65, but there are so many things that they do not allow even though the cost is there. Then, we get down to the 56 percent rate that they authorize and we charge when we charge the full rate. That is where this cost comes in. Most grants do not recover the full rate, so if the full rate is 56 percent, very few but some do recover 56 percent, but on average we cover only 28 percent. That means we do not recover half of the calculated overhead rate that is audited. That is where the discrepancy comes in.

Secretary May asked if he was correct that the state grants only return an 11 percent overhead rate.

Vice Chancellor Hatch stated it used to be 10 percent but, under Vice Chancellor Kostecki's leadership, the campus is now recovering 22 percent.

Senator Marilyn Billings stated she thought she recalled that a little further down the line the campus is going to be completely self-sustaining as far as the electricity cost is concerned. Is that true and, if so, when would those savings go into effect?

Vice Chancellor Hatch stated that, according to Director Pat Daly, the new heating plant will be turned over to the campus in December. When the new plant is up and running the campus will be producing 80 percent of its total load. The campus will be doing 100 percent of its average load but not the peaks. Eighty percent is terrific because it also gives the campus a lot of flexibility in emergencies. We can switch from one side of the campus to the other, so the campus will be in really good shape then.

Chancellor Holub responded to the research question, stating that some of the overhead costs would be spent by the campus whether or not the campus supported research. The campus would not exactly accrue a savings if it stopped doing research.

Chancellor Holub also stated that the figures in Secretary May's presentation were accurate, but he wanted to clarify a few points. The campus has taken cuts to the base budget for some of the additional money given to us this year. It was originally given to the campus by the budget that was passed last spring. The rest comes from a one-time budget. The administration is attempting to prepare rationally for the next fiscal year. The campus has felt very little from the current budget situation. It is a mistake to think that the campus has already taken \$11.36 million in cuts. It has not. The campus has taken approximately \$4.67 million in cuts. Also, there will be an estimated \$17 million in additional cuts. When people use the phrase "in spite of the current budget situation," they are being inaccurate. The campus has not chosen to cut out the base budget this year. The University cannot rip faculty members out of the classroom or cancel classes in the middle of a

term. That is what it might have had to do if the campus took the cuts this year. These are all postponed cuts. The administration is deferring these cuts in order to allow the Task Force to make recommendations and to plan for next year. Next year will not be like this year. Chancellor Holub wanted that to be perfectly clear.

D. ANNUAL REPORTS

Annual Report of the General Education Council, AY 2007-2008, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 09-014.

The report was received.

Randall Knoper, Chair of the General Education Council, stated that last year was like this year is—the year of the Provost-appointed General Education Task Force. Much of what of the General Education Council did this year was done in coordination with the Task Force. This included: rearticulating and reevaluating the goals of the General Education program. That is going on. It included developing a web site which should be launched soon. The Council also worked closely with the Office of Academic Planning and Assessment (OAPA) and its Director, Martha Stassen. The OAPA assembled a survey of the faculty who are teaching General Education courses, and the responses to that are continuing to provide the Council with some directions in what it is doing. The Council worked with the Center for Teaching and, along with the Provost and the Task Force, it sponsored the General Education Fellows program this summer as well as an institute for all General Education teachers.

Also, the Council and Task Force were involved in revising procedures for the review of General Education courses, participating in workshops for General Education teachers, incorporating Information Literacy more fully and explicitly into the General Education program, supporting diversity education and overseeing the grant program that supports it and continuing to build a community of teachers and supporters of General Education. In short, those are among the things the Council did this past year and will be continuing to do this year.

Chancellor Holub asked if the Council reflected upon what might be done to make the General Education requirement less expensive.

Chair Knoper responded that he thought that the Task Force had been thinking about how to make the General Education program better without having any more money. A cut will be something that will be on our minds soon.

An unidentified speaker asked if the Council addressed the availability of General Education courses for students and if there are any problems with that.

Chair Knoper stated that the Council did not address this issue, but that was because nobody said that there was a problem like that.

Secretary May stated there was a draft report that came out of the Academic Priorities Council on supply and demand of courses in which that issue was sketched out. It is not a definitive report but it is a very indicative report. We realize that there is a misalignment of supply of classroom seats and the demand for classroom seats. That is something that is taken into account by the people who do it but cannot be solved because the faculty from year-to-year are not always located in the places where the biggest demand for students occurs.

Senator Maria Tymoczko stated she was the former chair of the General Education Council. In the Executive Committee, she did hear reports that there were simply no General Education seats for the incoming freshmen in July. As somebody who taught a course that had 180 students last year, Senator Tymoczko noted that a flock of desperate people registered for the course on the very last day when a bunch of other desperate people dropped it. As a result, she had the least engaged group of students in her 30 years of teaching the course. They were unhappy because they did not really have a choice of General

Education courses. She stated she is particularly concerned about this in light of all the canceled searches and the increasing number of students.

John Cunningham, Deputy Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education, stated it is a difficult problem and it is hard to segregate General Education from undergraduate education because many of the students taking the General Education courses are not taking them for General Education. They are taking them because they need a total of 120 credits to graduate.

In April, the administration tries to set aside seats and pull them out of SPIRE for first-semester incoming freshmen. There are a set of courses in May, June and July for the yet unknown number of freshmen who are coming to the campus. In some years, it gets tighter than others. As that happens, we start to ask colleges and departments if they can offer another section. We do run a very lean operation and seats are tight as we approach Labor Day. This Labor Day was as tight as any. We asked faculty if they could take extra students if it did not affect their pedagogy and their capacity was less than the fire code of the classroom. Faculty were very responsive and good about doing that so that students ended up with full schedules. We supplemented the departments at \$200 per seat for activity of that kind.

There are a lot of variables that go into this, and it is a question of what is General Education versus a good quality elective course. Do we enforce the use of General Education courses for the General Education requirement and push the problem into the realm of departmental electives? In tight situations, these are the kinds of issues you have to examine and think about. As Council Chair Knoper mentioned, the Task Force is trying to look at the quality of General Education and give students course options that will catch their interest and maybe not just fulfill a criterion on the sheet. That is what we want to get to. Senator Tymoczko's comments address the distance the campus has to go to get to that scenario.

Senator Tymoczko stated that when the campus set up the General Education program decades ago, it was very concerned with making these courses attractive and the core of students' education. If students do not get their choices—and by increasing the student body they are going to have fewer choices—it really undermines the whole enterprise.

Deputy Provost Cunningham stated he does not totally disagree, but it also depends on how informed the students are about their choices. Most of the freshmen who come here have not made a choice about anthropology. However, most of the students who go into Anthropology 104 come out liking it. Many of them do not think about taking geoscience, but if get them into a geoscience course, they often come out the other end saying, "That was one of the best freshmen courses I have had." Of course, you do not want to force them into a bad fit. This morning, the General Education Task Force talked about trying to minimize "bad fit" courses. The Task Force shares that goal, and that is something it needs to work towards. At the moment, the focus is on capacity, classrooms, technology, support for the instructors and helping to give a sense of community to the General Education instructors some of whom do not always realize they are teaching a General Education course. There is some work to do on all fronts.

E. BYLAW CHANGES

Special Report of the Rules Committee concerning Bylaw Changes, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 09-007A with Motion No. 03-09.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Bylaw Changes, as presented in Sen. Doc. 03-09 No. 09-007A.

(Inasmuch as these are changes to the Senate's Bylaws, this is the second of three readings of this motion. It will be read again at the 679th Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate and voted on at the 679th meeting. The motion may be debated and amended at all three meetings.)

F. NEW COURSES

There are no reports associated with the following motion:

<u>COURSE</u>	<u>TITLE</u>	<u>CREDITS</u>
CMPSCI 145	“Representing, Storing, and Retrieving Information”	3

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the course CMPSCI 145, as recommended by the Academic
13-09 Matters Council.

G. NEW BUSINESS

Special Report of the Academic Matters and Undergraduate Education Councils concerning the Overload Credit Increase from 18 to 19 in the College of Natural Resources and the Environment, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 09-015 with Motion No. 14-09.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the change from 18 to 19 in the number of undergraduate
14-09 credits that can be taken in the College of Natural Resources and the Environment without the need for an overload approval, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 09-015.

Senator O'Connor wondered why the motion was only for Natural Resources and the Environment. The College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics (NSM) has the same problem, especially for the Biological Sciences Talent Advancement Program (BIOTAP) students who have to get overrides every semester. Did the Academic Matters Council consider making this a universal policy?

John Jenkins, Chair of the Academic Matters Council, stated the Academic Matters Council holds the same point-of-view as it does with four-credit courses and some other areas of the campus. If this becomes a widespread campus move, then it should go to the Council's Subcommittee for Policy Change. As long as it meets a clear, genuine need, this is not regarded as precedent-setting.

Deputy Provost Cunningham stated this is a college-level decision and the undergraduate deans are the ones who control this kind of business. It might be a little dangerous to automatically put the override at 19 for something such as the School of Nursing that does not want their students signing up for 19 without their approval.

The motion was seconded and adopted.

The 678th Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate stood adjourned at 5:03 p.m. on November 20, 2008.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Ernest D. May
Secretary of the Faculty Senate