

UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST
OFFICE OF THE FACULTY SENATE

Presiding Officer Robert Wilson called the 679th Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate to order on December 11, 2008 at 3:30 p.m. in Herter Hall, Room 227.

Senator Marilyn Billings sadly reported that former librarian Jeff Tenenbaum, who had retired from UMass Amherst in 2003, was hit by a train on Tuesday and died. She requested the Senate have a moment of silence for him.

A. ADDRESS BY PAUL REVILLE, SECRETARY OF EDUCATION
(QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION TO FOLLOW)

Robert Wilson, Presiding Officer, introduced Secretary of Education Paul Reville. The Secretary oversees the three education agencies of the Commonwealth: the Department of Early Education and Care, the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, and the Department of Higher Education. Prior to becoming Secretary, Governor Deval Patrick appointed Secretary Reville as the Chairman of the Massachusetts State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education. He is also a member of the University of Massachusetts Board of Trustees. Before his appointment as the Secretary of Education, Secretary Reville was the President of the Rennie Center for Education, Research and Policy. He was also the Director of the Education, Policy and Management program and a lecturer on educational policy and politics at the Harvard Graduate School of Education.

Paul Reville, Secretary of Education. Thank you very much for the opportunity to have a few words with you. It is a damp and rainy day. We already had a UMass Board of Trustees meeting, but I have been warmly welcomed by people like Senator Marilyn Billings, Senator Brian O'Connor and Provost Charlena Seymour. It is a pleasure to be here. I come to you as a former faculty member. I feel like I am in familiar terrain and am among colleagues and friends. This is an institution that I have long revered and have had many opportunities to visit. I grew up in this part of the state, and so it is a real treat for me to be back here with you, although this is my first official time visiting as the Secretary of Education.

I am visiting during difficult times. I know these are very challenging times for you as faculty and for you institutionally in terms of the kinds of cutbacks we are experiencing. Somebody asked me what I spend most of my time doing these days, and it is pretty much all budget all the time right now because of the totally uncertain nature of the economy, the unpredictability of state revenues and the impact of those on our budget this year. We are already well into the budget planning cycle for next year. We have many challenges ahead. We are trying to proceed in addressing these challenges as judiciously as possible to preserve those things that are most important and to not lose capacity that we are going to want in the future. But, we have both the moral and legal obligation to balance the budget in any given year and to present balanced budgets as we move forward. That is the difficult challenge that we have inherited. Frankly, when I came to office, it was more about helping the Governor to implement and move forward on the Readiness agenda. Some of us had the opportunity to contribute to that agenda about which I will talk in a moment. But, we are still fully committed to the implementation of a 21st Century vision of public education in Massachusetts because we feel it is vital to our future, to our prosperity, to maintaining our standard of living as the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and it is also our moral obligation as far as children in this society goes. We are fully committed to that vision and to moving forward on it. At the same time, we have to recognize that the current economic circumstances make it difficult to achieve adequacy in the current system that we have, let alone to purchase, even on the installment plan, the vision in terms of where we are headed now.

I wanted to take a moment to appreciate your flexibility in the face of these uncertain times. The bulk of our time this morning was spent analyzing how each of the five UMass campuses are going to cope with not only this year's shortfalls and cutbacks but also the kinds of adjustments that will be required to survive next year. We know those are painful. We appreciate the flexibility and cooperation in doing that. The fact that we have to do that in no way reflects the Governor's esteem for what happens at an institution like this, our flagship campus. It reflects, rather, the exigencies of what we have to do in order to put together a budget that meets the revenue line that we are looking at now. The revenue line that we are looking at right now might change dramatically with respect to our predictions this month and certainly probably by January.

We have made a round of 9C cuts. You are obviously familiar with those and the impact of those. We hoped at the time that we made them that those would be the only cuts to the existing operating budget that we have to make in the course of this year. We are still hopeful in that regard, but the signs are troubling. Even in the

month of October, revenue was down relative to what we had hoped but not by much. November was a little worse. We will see what it is in December. Sometime in January, we are going to have to right-size expectations with what we have coming in the way of revenues. We know that as the University looks at its budget for the coming year, it is going to be at least \$100 million in the hole looking forward. That is going to require some significant cuts and also recourse to revenue measures including student fees and maybe tuition as we go forward that are going to have to make up the difference.

We are hopeful with respect to the new Obama administration coming into office. The Governor was in Washington yesterday conferring with the President-elect and his team about the economic stimulus package. We expect that to be prepared for the new President's signature shortly after he assumes office. We are hopeful that that will be a bright spot for us in the not-too-distant future. As you know, there has been a fair amount of talk about that stimulus package directly aiding states. The way in which it might do that is still under discussion. Our Governor is having a shaping influence about the way in which that plays out. Under consideration are various mechanisms for supporting states that will indirectly, if not directly, have ramifications on the budget of the University or on the budget of the public education system generally. Among the possible buckets into which money might fall as a result of the stimulus package are counter-cyclical elements of the budget like Medicaid, food stamps or welfare payments, things that you can expect to rise in response to the economic crisis. There may be some aid in those categories. There is under discussion the possibility of some direct, unrestricted operating expenses in the form of block grants to states. Finally, probably the most discussed and perhaps the most likely form of aid will center on infrastructure needs. There will be a fair amount of jostling in respect to what the definition of infrastructure is. I know we are hoping to see that we get a fairly broad definition of infrastructure to take into account not just what we traditionally think of as vertical construction but also the kind of capital investments that this administration has proudly made in higher education with the \$2 billion Bond Bill that we put up in this state. We hope that some of that work may be addressed through the work of the infrastructure section of an economic stimulus plan. We also hope that that will be defined in such a way that it may alleviate the burden on some of the operating budgets for capital-related expenditures, more like ordinary-maintenance expenditures that you might carry on the regular budget. If we can alleviate that from your budget by virtue of those funds, it then frees up money to be spent on preserving faculty positions and faculty compensation and a whole variety of other expenditures that we might want to make under other circumstances. Also, we hope information technology and things of this nature will be an aspect of this bill.

The Cabinet spent the better part of yesterday afternoon preparing so that over the course of the next six weeks we as a commonwealth and we as an education sector are well-organized to take advantage of this opportunity. We think the funds are going to go to those who are most prepared. The Federal government will be looking for projects that can begin quickly, within a six-month period, that can be concluded relatively quickly, within probably a two-year period, and that generate a fair amount of employment. At the same time, we hope acquisitions in information technology and research will be included in this package, particularly with a focus on the connection between research and economic development. We have a number of rich demonstrations in the Commonwealth, particularly in association with the University of Massachusetts.

We are convinced that there is going to be opportunity there, and that should help a little bit with respect to some of the financial woes that we are looking at. At the same time, as the Chairman of the Board said this morning, it has been predicted that there will be an incredible increase in demand. We have already experienced this and are likely to continue to experience this for public higher education in the future. The Governor and I are convinced of the centrality of not only the University's role, but of public higher education generally, into ensuring a bright and prosperous future for the Commonwealth. We have to build and strengthen this system in response into this increased demand, and that is the front and center most challenging aspect of the predicament in which we find ourselves. On the one hand, we have scarce resources, and on the other hand, there is an escalating demand. We need to find a way to take advantage of that situation in such a fashion that we continue to build a public education system that will be the envy of the rest of the nation. That institution will serve to promote the development of our economy and at the same time recognize that there are so many other features within state and local government that we have to attend to simultaneously. We will do our best to be attentive to that.

I know that the subject of collective bargaining is a sensitive and important topic here. It is a sensitive and important topic to the Governor. At our level, we recognize the sort of uniform underpayment of faculty in our public higher education system. We are concerned. Prior to the financial crisis hitting at least full force in our Readiness Project agenda, this issue of faculty compensation was high on the list of our priorities within the public higher education sector. We are determined to do something about that in the long run, and the

plans that we are putting forward are long-term in terms of what we want to accomplish in the future. The Governor has laid down a ten-year plan, and he continuously reminds us at the level of the cabinet that he is not governing for the short-term. He is governing for the long-term, and he intends to stay and fulfill that plan. We are attentive to that. We are looking for opportunities wherever we might find them.

The issue of parameters is a tough one. The administration was slow in getting parameters out earlier this year. All the advice we were getting from Administration and Finance was telling us there was a financial crisis on the horizon but not telling us sharply enough that we could predict what we would have on the table as we went forward to settle agreements. Those agreements were part and parcel of why the Governor saw fit to veto elements of the budget the legislature produced. He did not think it would be affordable in the long run. Turns out he was correct. We have had to go in and make 9C cuts. Education, relatively speaking, was a privileged sector relative to those cuts. In other words, it took a lower rate of cutting than the other sectors over which we have control in the executive branch. That will continue to be the case as we prepare budgets for next year or if we have to look at further cuts in the current year. We will make an earnest effort to see what we can do. I know the administration is eager to put out parameters as soon as it feels it gets a stable view of what is coming in this second quarter of the year. I expect that to happen before too long, and that is about all I am able to say on that topic.

When the Governor first came to office, he saw, first and foremost, a fairly fragmented education system. There were four separate distinct silos in the world of education: early childhood, K-12, the Department of Higher Education and the University. From the standpoint of both the consumer and the Commonwealth in developing a cohesive, coherent, integrated system, his feeling was that this form of governance did not serve us very well. So, he started to organize. Along with President Antonucci of Fitchburg State College, I have had the opportunity to chair a Governance Commission that took a look at the way in which we govern public education. We considered everything from the education tsar model to the status quo. We wound up settling somewhere inbetween. I argued strenuously against the notion of having an education tsar. I felt it ought to be a secretary with limited powers but significant enough authority to bring about greater coherence, consistency and integration through that system so that we could truly have a seamless educational experience pre-K through higher education.

The Governor then set about commissioning a diverse group of people, more than 200 different citizens and professionals working on the Readiness Project, to design a set of strategies designed to realize a 21st Century vision of a public education system that would serve both students and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts well. That group of people organized into 13 different task forces and into a leadership group. The Governor went out and sought feedback on a variety of other topics. From that comprehensive report, the Governor ultimately drew a set of strategies to realize a transformational vision of 21st Century education that was incorporated into the Governor's education action agenda. That action agenda, broadly speaking, has two major thrusts. The first is we have to improve the quality of teaching and learning as it transpires in each and every classroom in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. If we view the core business in our industry as the transaction between teacher, student and content, we have to optimize that transaction in ways that we have not before. We are now setting out to create an education system that does for all children what we heretofore have only been able to do for an elite few. If we are going to do that, then we have to improve the quality of teaching and learning within the boundaries of conventional school organizations throughout our system.

The second piece is we have to build supports outside of schools or extend the role of schools in ways that all children come to school ready to take advantage of optimized learning environments. This is one thing that strikes us most forcefully in a state that really is admired throughout the country. Earlier this week, we announced the Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) science results. When Massachusetts was disaggregated from the nation and looked at a nation by itself, it was among the leading nations in the world, at least of the 59 tested in math and science at 4th and 8th grade levels. Notwithstanding achievements like that, our leadership on instruments like the SATs or AP tests, student persistence in secondary school or our leadership on the National Assessment of Education Progress, the nation's report card, we still have persistent, disturbing achievement gaps between various subsets of our population. More importantly, there are gaps between even our most talented students and those against whom they will be competing internationally. We are concerned about those achievement gaps, and the Governor is deeply focused on closing those gaps.

For the first time in my experience in this state, we have a Governor who could truly be called an education governor. He is someone who has experienced the transformational power of education in his own life and wants to make that experience the rule rather than the exception for students across the Commonwealth. As well as we are doing in the Commonwealth, there is nothing that we have done so well that it is so highly

perfected in terms of our approach. The education system can be improved and developed in ways that would serve students more effectively. That is the second element of the theory of action. We have to build a system that enables us to meet every child where he or she is in early childhood and give him or her the level of support, understanding, guidance and academic challenge necessary to be successful at each stage of the education system. These students can then emerge after some measure of post-secondary education ready for success. Success is defined economically in terms of holding a job in a 21st Century economy. Success means being a head of a family with the traits that we associate with family leadership. Success is also defined as being an active citizen, a potential leader in our democratic society, a lifelong learner. That is the goal of the system. The goal of the system is to do for all children what those of us who have had privilege have been able to do for our own children.

How do we build a system to deliver on the promise of American public education, the promise of excellence and equity? That is what the Readiness Program is about. When we organize these more than four dozen strategies into different categories, we have some that focus sharply on making pre-school universally available and doing much more in the 0-3 age bracket. This is a highly-leveraged education investment. We know we have problems, for example, in language development, where we have children who come into kindergarten or early childhood learning centers with one-third of the vocabulary of their peers. That fact alone means that their learning opportunities through life will be neurologically constrained as they go forward. We need to make afterschool opportunities more available and expand learning time. This is something the Governor and the legislature have already invested in as they have in universal pre-K education. There is an idea to develop a data profile on each of our children as they come into health and human services and then enter our early childhood education and care system. We are talking about differentiated instruction for each of our children to meet them where they are. We do not have the records that allow teachers to know what particular challenges these children are addressing. We need to do a better job of that, putting social workers in schools with high concentrations of low-income children. We know from an educational performance standpoint that our most troubled schools in the Commonwealth are the schools with the highest concentrations of low-income youngsters. We have failed to make one's socioeconomic status irrelevant with respect to educational achievement. It is still a very strong predictor of educational attainment and achievement. What do we need to do to address that challenge? It is clear that schooling alone is not enough on average. We know of notable exceptions, certainly in terms of many individuals. We know of notable exceptions in terms of schools that are outperforming the averages and the norms. We have got to do much more if we are going to succeed in that regard.

We have a variety of interventions with respect to the child. In the area of strengthening the quality of teaching, we are very concerned about attracting, developing and sustaining the highest quality talent in the Commonwealth and the nation to teach in our schools at all levels. We have to reinvent the profession in order to do that. If I just focus on the K-12 area, we have to think about how we recruit, prepare, induct and mentor people into the field. In particular, we have to think about how we attend to their needs and help them grow and develop in their first three years on the job. We need to look at differentiating compensation for assignment for special talent and skill. We need to look at career ladders. We need to look at creating communities of adult learners in some of our elementary and secondary schools where teachers feel like they are part of a team of adults working on the challenge of improving student learning. There are a lot of things to do in the teaching area. We want to involve the higher education system in this by bringing together higher education, K-12, early childhood and readiness centers, regional consortia of people from all three sectors and outside parties, businesses and communities, to help us think through how to pull regional capacity to improve the quality of teaching. We want to focus on supporting those teachers early in their teaching careers. We would also like to focus on improving the learning of English language or early literacy learners in which we have recently seen some dips in our scores. The Readiness Centers are going to be an important part of our agenda.

Task force areas just reported on 21st Century skills and knowledge. It has created a fair amount of controversy, but it is clearly the direction we need to be moving in. In addition to the basic skills that we now set as standards, employers are repeatedly telling us we also need to have a well-rounded education for our children, an education that includes a suite of 21st Century skills. Colleagues of mine like Dick Murnane have written about this for some time. These skills include the capacity to work in groups, to present persuasive oral arguments, to solve complex problems with contemporary technology, innovation and creativity. It also includes problem-solving and awareness of the United States and its position in the new global economy and world order. Those kinds of skills are more difficult to measure at the state level. Nonetheless, it is important for us to send signals to local schools, colleges and universities that these kinds of capacities are important for young people to have as they come into the system. Twenty-first Century content is important as well.

The next part of our agenda is organized around the area of higher education and the prediction that we are going to need everybody to have some level of higher education in order to be successful in this society. We have to address the financial aid question. Again, we are challenged by the economic times in which we find ourselves, but our position is not a good one in terms of financial aid. We have let that slip over a number of years, and we have to do something to build that back. College affordability is a top priority for us. An aspect of that is this notion that the Governor committed to at his graduation speech at UMass Boston about a year and a half ago. Community colleges should be an entitlement for everyone in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. We intend to deliver on that in our next budget by offering it in this first installment to all low-income parents and to people who are teachers or aspiring teachers in the early childhood education system. College affordability is important to us. We have been working hard in the higher education domain. It is important to get young people to qualify for all the federal aid for which they qualify. We think \$10 million is currently left on the table. We are eager to have that money and alleviate the burden on local funds. This will make it more possible for us to offer adequate financial aid.

I mentioned the Capital Bond Bill. We continue to be committed to that. I have talked about faculty compensation. That is an important aspect of the list. Another topic that is important to us is this issue of the transfer of credit within our public higher education system. The Joint Committee issued its report last June. The Governor is very eager to see that report adopted and to make fluid transfer of credit within the public higher education system a reality by the fall of 2009. There has been a great deal of talk about it over the years, but, in the interests of students we need to find a way to get that done. I know there are problems and issues associated with that, and I would be happy to chat with you about that. I mentioned the Readiness Centers. We are also giving rise to a new category of public schools called Readiness Schools, and we are inviting our universities to take an active role in helping us mount some of these. These are autonomous and semi-autonomous schools that will exist within the framework of school districts. It is our answer to the challenge of public schools which currently are serving only a little more than two percent of our students in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. We think that kind of autonomy is good for more students than that small minority, so we are going to attempt to make this possible and invite higher education to participate.

We continue to be committed to the higher education funding formula. That is part of the Readiness agenda. It is a challenge in current economic times, but it is certainly an important part of our agenda. Dual enrollment is critically important. We want to find ways for young people, particularly those young people who have not had experience in their families or directly in their lives to get on college campuses, to experience college courses and see college as a legitimate aspiration for themselves. We want to create more opportunities. We invested in that this year and expect to continue to do so next year. When the Governor and I asked the Superintendent of the Boston Public Schools recently what was the one thing we could do to help her do a more effective job with her secondary school students, she immediately shouted back, "dual enrollment." We think that is critically important. The whole matter of better articulation not only between secondary and higher education but also between and within higher education as per the transfer policy is important to us. We are concerned about signals we get from data. For example, 37 percent of our public high school graduates who move on to higher education require remediation before they are ready to take college courses. That is a problem. That tells us that there are significant issues with respect to the signaling between our respective institutions. We want to do something about that.

Those are a few of our priorities in the area of higher education. Finally, we have a few measures that deal with the way in which we organize public education more generally in Massachusetts. This notion of regional collaboration embodied in the Readiness Centers is one of them. Our secondary and elementary schools are organized right now in 391 school districts. We have less than a million children. That number is expected to decline over the next decade by about 5 to 10 percent. The state of Maryland has a comparable population. They have 24 districts. New York has more students than Massachusetts and has one district. Somewhere between 1 and 391 is a more efficient, effective way to operate public education systems. We are trying to find that balance. We are talking about things like a master teacher contract that would allow greater flexibility in terms of presenting compensation plans, for example, to teachers who do not intend to spend their career in the teaching profession. These teachers, therefore, are less interested in long-term benefits than they would be in short-term, front-loaded compensation. We are beginning conversations on that kind of topic. The Readiness schools are a break-out innovation. There are a number of items in that category. Once again, we are committed on this agenda as a whole. In the near-future, we can only do a modest share. We can only establish a beachhead on some of these topics. Some of these are topics the Governor has been working on and have been reflected in his budget, and we will expand on some of those items going forward. But, we believe that the cost of not doing what we propose will, in the long run, far exceed the cost of doing it. We are going to work our hardest, in collaboration with various allies, to make a case to the legislature and to taxpayers that this kind of investment is worthwhile.

Senator Steven Brewer stated he was pleased to hear Secretary of Education Reville talk about these broader kinds of measures that he is interested in implementing. A lot of people have talked about the culture of measurement in education producing parishes of facts in terms of teachers trying to teach to the things measured by MCAS and neglecting the other kinds of richer outcomes that you are talking about like citizenship, economic success or being the head of a household or the other 21st Century. If you look at the biology department website, you could see that our learning goals include many of these things. How are you actually going to change the culture which is focused on things that you can easily measure? It is like looking for the keys under the streetlight not because that is where you lost them but because that is where you can see. It is a real challenge to look at things that are intangible.

Secretary Reville stated that Senator Brewer asked both a substantive and political question. In terms of the political aspect of this question, the impulse to work beyond what has already been established in our standards assessments and accountability comes principally from the employer community. Employers are saying that the students we send them do not have sufficient preparation. They are not broad or deep enough in their range of skills and knowledge to meet 21st Century demands of high-skill, high-knowledge employers. In this kind of economy, and given the cost of living, climate, housing and the lack of natural resources in Massachusetts, we are only going to attract high knowledge, high-skill jobs in the future. We frame this in terms of where the future is headed and the felicitous coincidence between what we want to do for children and what we need to do for the economy to move forward. We also want to take pride in what we have achieved today. We do not apologize for an emphasis on basic skills or for the premise embodied in our early reforms that all students need gateway skills like English and math. That is particularly a challenge within the time paradigm that we have in schools. In our secondary schools, we have students for 6-6 ½ hours a day, 180 days a year, for 13 years. They are with us for 15 percent of their waking hours during that period of the year.

We said to schools that, as of 1993, we wanted them to get all of their students to a level that previously it was okay for only a few students to meet. We have a system that was built to meet the needs of another era. During the early 20th and late 19th century, we were rapidly socializing lots of immigrants. We were rapidly industrializing in terms of lots of low-skill, low-knowledge jobs. We were rapidly urbanizing. We needed a system that could produce a bell curve of distribution in terms of skill and knowledge. We needed a few very well educated people to be managers, lots of people to do modest skill and knowledge level jobs in factories, and a few people to do no skill, no-knowledge kinds of service jobs. Fast-forward to the 21st Century, and we are saying that basically we need just about everybody at the high end of the distribution. We have a system that was built to give us, in the early 20th Century, a single digit graduation rate, and that was just fine. Now the Board of Education is challenging all of our schools to deliver a 100 percent graduation rate. It is a big jump. I think we have the aspirations right in terms of the goals. We do not have the capacity to get there and meet what we aspire to accomplish.

This is the way we frame the argument for why we are doing this. We say that it is complimentary, not compensatory. In other words, take this issue of being able to make a persuasive oral argument. We know that in some respects that is a very hard skill. Most of us are judged on our capacity to make oral presentations on a fairly regular basis. We view that as something that can be measured. It is not a “soft skill” which is a pejorative that gets applied to this suite of skills. It is something that is critically important to the success of young people as they go forward. But, because we are not actively measuring this skill in schools, it gets pushed aside as the curriculum narrows. The time paradigm is too narrow to accomplish everything we are asking schools to do. In one way, there is a paradox in what we are asking for regarding 21st Century skills. We are asking schools to do much more for students than they have ever done before and to do it at higher levels of proficiency than was expected before. Yet, we know that they are having enough trouble getting all students proficient in English and math within the time boundaries in which they are already constrained. Nonetheless, we think the first step of leadership is to articulate where we are going.

We were at the Medical School earlier today talking to faculty about how they measure the competence of family practitioners. One of them was saying we could measure simply by doing a fill-in-the-bubble standardized test about their knowledge of pharmacology and what they would prescribe in the case of a particular patient presented with a particular set of ailments. But, what we would rather do is a 360 degree observation about how an aspiring doctor would interact with a patient around a whole set of complex systems, personality characteristics and environmental situations that that particular patient presents. We know how to evaluate that. We have developed a fairly hardnosed rubric and a system of quality control that enables us to measure that in ways that we are quite confident about. I think it is that kind of measurement technology in partnership with local educators that we need to bring into the elementary and secondary

system as we move to what we think of as MCAS+, the next generation of assessment. This assessment should build on, not displace, our current system. Our critics will say we are introducing all of these new features in order to subvert or dilute the focus on basic skills that have brought us to a position of national leadership in education reform. We say, it is not an either/or proposition; it is a both/and proposition. We can do this if we develop the right tools and set of standards and measure appropriately. Then, we can simultaneously work on giving teachers the capacity and support necessary to do what we are asking them to do.

John McCarthy, Chair of the Rules Committee, stated, on behalf of Secretary Ernie May and the Rules Committee, he wanted to thank Secretary Reville for coming here to speak. He stated that Secretary Reville described a very ambitious agenda for education. In a situation of declining resources, there is a danger of having a very ambitious agenda because you could end up throwing small amounts of money at each of the plans that makes up this ambitious agenda, producing some demonstration projects but never having transformative effects. It seems to make more sense to abandon some of those goals and focus on a small number of things where we can really make a difference using scarce resources.

Secretary Reville stated we have gotten this advice from a number of quarters, and we are following it to a certain level. Given the cutbacks in the existing budget and the likely cutbacks in everything from local aid, low-income slots in our early childhood system, right up to financial aid and faculty compensation, there is not much new we can put on the table. One response is to think about working smarter and using the opportunity we have in these trying times to make changes that under more flush circumstances we would not be able to make. It is not always the case that change equals more money. When I was first on the State Board of Education in the early 1990s, we had a gentleman who was head of one of major hospitals in Boston on that Board. He would periodically erupt in frustration at a Board meeting when someone proposed a dramatic reform or change and the immediate response was to ask for money. He would say, "Why is it that in education when we talk about change, the hand goes out? In my profession, we have to make the changes when the revenues go down. We cannot work the same way because the existing model is not working and we are going out of business. That gives us the opportunity to make some changes we have to make."

I think we have to think about that a little bit in each of our sectors. Notwithstanding, we cannot do everything that I have talked about. It is obvious that we cannot. We can project a vision that gives us a goal and a lighthouse toward which to navigate in however stormy seas, but our progress may be much slower in getting there. We have to pick out a few priorities. In fact, we have already done so in certain respects. Barring a catastrophe in the next couple of months, as we mount a budget, we are looking at things like a continued commitment to universal pre-school education. We are looking at some additional investment in early language development in the 0-3 age bracket. We are looking at a continued modest investment in expanded learning time. We think we have to pioneer that model because it takes more time and differentiated time to educate all our children.

We are looking at a few things such as transfer credit. We are looking at taking advantage of all the financial aid we can get our hands on at the Federal level. We are hoping to expand our use of technology. We can work on some of those low to no-cost items, but we are going to have a constrained agenda. Nonetheless, it will be an agenda that suggests we are moving forward at the same time admitting that it is unrealistic for us to think that we can do this all at once. The Governor is in this. We are all in this. I only came into government for the purpose of advancing this vision. We will wait this out, and we are confident that we will get by it. Then, we will have the advantage of knowing where we are going.

B. BYLAW CHANGES

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

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

(This motion was read at the 677th and 678th Regular Meetings of the Faculty Senate on October 30, 2008 and the November 20, 2008, respectively. The final vote will be taken at this meeting.)

Chair McCarthy added the Director of the Office of Family Resources or a designee serving ex-officio to the Status of Women Council.

The motion was seconded and adopted as amended.

C. NEW COURSES

There are no reports associated with the following motions:

<u>COURSE</u>	<u>TITLE</u>	<u>CREDITS</u>
CMPSCI 577	“Operating Systems Implementation”	3

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the course CMPSCI 577, as recommended by the
15-09 Academic Matters and Graduate Councils.

<u>COURSE</u>	<u>TITLE</u>	<u>CREDITS</u>
CE-ENGIN 614	“Advanced Concepts in Traffic Safety”	3
NURSING 725	“Leadership in Health Care”	3
PUBHLTH 725/NURSING 725	“Leadership in Health Care”	3

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the courses CE-ENGIN 614, NURSING 725 and
16-09 PUBHLTH 725/NURSING 725, as recommended by the Graduate Council.

Chair McCarthy stated the motion is only for two courses. Public Health has asked that the cross-listed course, PUBHLTH725/NURSING 725, be referred back to them.

John Cunningham, Deputy Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education, stated that NURSING 725 and PUBHLTH 725 are the same course that has been asked to be withdrawn altogether.

Chair McCarthy stated, as Deputy Provost Cunningham points out, the entire course has been withdrawn. The Senate is voting to approve the course CE-ENGIN 614.

NURSING 725 and PUBHLTH 725/NURSING 725 were referred back to Public Health.

The motion was seconded and adopted.

D. NEW BUSINESS

1. Special Report of the Rules Committee concerning a New Honors Designations Proposal, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 09-016 with Motion No. 17-09.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the New Honors Designations Proposal, as presented in
17-09 Sen. Doc. No. 09-016.

The motion was seconded and adopted.

2. Special Report of the Academic Matters Council concerning Enrollment Regulations for Continuing and Professional Education Courses for Dismissed and Suspended Students, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 09-017 with Motion No. 18-09.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Enrollment Regulations for Continuing and
18-09 Professional Education Courses for Dismissed and Suspended Students, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 09-017.

The motion was seconded and adopted.

3. Special Report of the Academic Matters Council concerning Supplemental Guidelines for Undergraduate Certificate Proposals, as presented in Sen. Doc. 09-018 with Motion No. 19-09.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Supplemental Guidelines for Undergraduate
19-09 Certificate Proposals, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 09-018.

The motion was seconded and adopted.

4. Special Report of the Academic Priorities, Graduate and Program and Budget Councils concerning a Graduate Certificate in Film Studies, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 09-019 with Motion No. 20-09.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Graduate Certificate in Film Studies, as presented in
20-09 Sen. Doc. No. 09-019.

The motion was seconded and adopted.

5. Special Report of the Academic Priorities, Graduate and Program and Budget Councils concerning a Graduate Certificate in Public History, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 09-020 with Motion No. 21-09.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Graduate Certificate in Public History, as presented in
21-09 Sen. Doc. No. 09-020.

The motion was seconded and adopted.

6. Special Report of the Committee on Committees concerning Nominations to Faculty Senate Councils and Committees, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 09-021 with Motion No. 22-09.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Nominations to Faculty Senate Councils and
22-09 Committees, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 09-021.

The motion was seconded and adopted.

E. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Principal Administrative Officers

Charlena Seymour, Provost, stated she wanted to provide the Faculty Senate with an update on some of the activities being driven out of the Provost's Office. She wanted to share this information but also wanted the Senate to keep in mind that this has been a very difficult time for everyone and she appreciates the fact that we have all pulled together to make a very difficult time as easy to deal with as possible. As we go through these difficult times, it is extremely important to share information and obtain feedback from the faculty, staff and students of this campus. We all need to pull together to make the campus more competitive, more attractive and positioned for the future.

Approximately 70 percent of the campus' general operating funds budget is in Academic Affairs. As a result, when there is a significant budget shortfall such as the one the campus is now facing, it is inevitable that the effects will be felt deeply in the academic area. While we do everything to find cost savings and budget reductions in administrative and support units, we will not be able to avoid significant reductions in the schools, colleges and academic departments. We must consider every cost savings possible while minimizing the damage to our core research and teaching mission. There will inevitably be fewer faculty and staff next year, but there will not be fewer students. It is essential to do everything to provide these students with the best possible educational experience. We will be asked to do more and find creative ways to continue the outstanding work that the faculty does in the areas of teaching and research with fewer resources.

The Deans have all provided proposals for responding to various levels of possible budget cuts, and we are in the process of reviewing those proposals to determine what is feasible given our commitment to teaching and research of a high quality. Until this review is complete and final decisions about the budget have been made, we have taken two immediate steps to maintain some flexibility and avoid foreclosing any options. First, we have sent notices to all lecturers who are due notice of reappointment or non-reappointment by December 15. These lecturers will not be reappointed beyond the current term of their appointments. It is possible that we will be able to rehire some of these individuals next year, but because we cannot guarantee appointments to any of them, it was critical that we provide them with timely notice of non-reappointment. We wish we did not have to take this step, and this action is in no way a reflection on the quality or importance of the

contribution of these lecturers to the campus. There are 31 affected individuals. Twelve of them are full-time, and nineteen are part-time. All of these lecturers are in their first or second year of service.

Additionally, we have asked the Deans to consider and to consult with their faculties about the possibility of various reorganizations of Academic Affairs that might allow us to fulfill our mission more efficiently. School and college consolidations and mergers, as well as mergers at the department level, will be an important component of our attempts to achieve administrative savings that do not negatively impact the academic units. Provost Seymour has discontinued the searches for a Dean of Social and Behavioral Sciences and the Dean at the School of Nursing. She will be seeking advice about viable next steps for those units.

These are difficult times, but this campus has faced difficult times before and has remained an institution of remarkable distinction. Although these budget cuts will be extremely difficult to achieve, in part because they come on top of previous reductions, Provost Seymour is confident that working together, the campus will emerge from this difficulty as a strong and vibrant institution that will continue to attract highly-qualified students and outstanding faculty and staff.

2. The Faculty Delegates to the Board of Trustees

W. Brian O'Connor, Faculty Delegate to the Board of Trustees, stated he could not attend the Board of Trustees meeting this morning.

Senator Billings stated that at the Board of Trustees meeting this morning, Secretary Reville talked about what the Senate already heard today. There were votes from the various Committees on things like the Life Sciences Initiative and clean energy. Faculty Delegate O'Connor will agree that the subcommittee meetings are the most important piece, and the General Board of Trustee meetings are usually just votes. They also went into executive session to talk about tenure and honorary degrees.

3. The Representative of the Massachusetts Society of Professors

Steven Brewer, Representative of the Massachusetts Society of Professors, stated he had a couple of statements he was asked to present today. On Tuesday, the MSP filed a second unfair labor practice charge because of the failure of the President's Office on orders from the Governor to bargain in good faith. Although the MSP has accepted the employer's offer, which was made only following our previous unfair labor practice charge, they have refused to discuss the salary offer, claiming that the Governor has instituted a bargaining hiatus. There is no such thing in the Collective Bargaining Law. The Governor does not have the right, no matter how bad the economic crisis, to choose which parts of the Collective Bargaining Law he would like to honor.

Also, the Administration is proposing radical plans to merge various colleges and departments. While the MSP is open to any and all organizational changes that benefit teaching and research, it does not believe that these major changes should happen very rapidly in the midst of a budget crisis. The MSP understands that the Faculty Senate has a process which it would go through for any merger, and MSP urges careful consideration of the full implications on teaching and research for any restructuring plan. MSP believes it would be ridiculously short-sighted to try and save money by making dramatic changes in the organization of the University. It is the wrong reason for making the changes, and usually it does not save the kind of money they hope to save.

The 679th Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate stood adjourned at 4:47 p.m. on December 11, 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