Presiding Officer Richard Bogartz called the 743rd Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate to order on December 11, 2014 at 3:30 p.m. in Herter Hall, Room 227, and began by reading “Mississippi Goddam” by Nina Simone:

Alabama’s gotten me so upset
Tennessee made me lose my rest
And everybody knows about Mississippi Goddam

Alabama’s gotten me so upset
Tennessee made me lose my rest
And everybody knows about Mississippi Goddam

Can’t you see it? Can’t you feel it?
It’s all in the air
I can’t stand the pressure much longer
Somebody say a prayer

Alabama’s gotten me so upset
Tennessee made me lose my rest
And everybody knows about Mississippi Goddam

This is a show tune
But the show hasn’t been written for it, yet

Hound dogs on my trail
School children sitting in jail
Black cat cross my path
I think every day’s gonna be my last

Lord, have mercy on this land of mine
We all gonna get it in due time
I don’t belong here, I don’t belong there
I’ve even stopped believing in prayer

Don’t tell me, I tell you
Me and my people just about due
I’ve been there so I know
They keep on saying, “Go slow!”

But that’s just the trouble, do it slow
Washing the windows, do it slow
Picking the cotton, do it slow
You’re just plain rotten, do it slow
You’re too damn lazy, do it slow
The thinking’s crazy, do it slow

Where am I going? What am I doing?
I don’t know, I don’t know

Just try to do your very best
Stand up be counted with all the rest
For everybody knows about Mississippi Goddam

I bet you thought I was kiddin’

Picket lines, schoolboy cots
They try to say it’s a communist plot
All I want is equality
For my sister, my brother, my people and me
Yes, you lied to me all these years
You told me to wash and clean my ears
And talk real fine just like a lady
And you’d stop calling me Sister Sadie

Oh, but this whole country is full of lies
You’re all gonna die and die like flies
I don’t trust you any more
You keep on saying, “Go slow! Go slow!”

But that’s just the trouble, do it slow
Desegregation, do it slow
Mass participation, do it slow
Reunification, do it slow
Do things gradually, do it slow
But bring more tragedy, do it slow
Why don’t you see it? Why don’t you feel it?
I don’t know, I don’t know

You don’t have to live next to me
Just give me my equality
Everybody knows about Mississippi
Everybody knows about Alabama
Everybody knows about Mississippi Goddam

That’s it!

A. UPDATE AND PLANS FROM THE JOINT TASK FORCE ON STRATEGIC OVERSIGHT (JTFSO)
NANCY COHEN, BRYAN HARVEY AND AMILCAR SHABAZZ, CO-CHAIRS

Nancy Cohen, Co-Chair of the Joint Task Force on Strategic Oversight: There was a handout in the back that may be useful to follow along with. In looking at this, I think the birth of a strategic plan is kind of like a baby, so having pink and blue for this graphic is fitting. This graphic is an effort to display what we see as the timeline that is coming up in the next year to year-and-a-half. JTFSO has spent a bit of time (we met twice since the last Faculty Senate meeting) discussing the interplay between JTFSO, the Strategic Oversight, and JTFRA, the Resource Allocation. In this graphic, the blue represents JTFSO activities, and the pink represents JTFRA activities. Elizabeth Chilton and Tim Anderson will be speaking in a little while, with more explanation about what is going on in the pink. The green is us, and the interaction between JTFSO, JTFRA, and the Faculty Senate. That is the large view of what is going on.

We are right at the end of this big box over here; this Status Report to the Senate. Here we are in December 2014. As you know, Unit Planning I has been going on, and the school and college unit plans will be wrapped up in the near future. That brings us to this Part I Review, where we will have the plans submitted, and then there will be some general feedback, and JTFSO review and recommendations. Meanwhile, this spring, Unit Planning II is going to begin. We do not have the specific timelines, but that will happen in the spring and we will have some further information. Meanwhile, as these plans come out, there will be some review and comment going on in the Faculty Senate and among the committees. Meanwhile, JTFRA is preparing for a parallel process. That means developing a model that can be tested and a budget development process. There will be interaction among the Faculty Senate, JTFSO, and JTFRA as far as what that means. I will let our experts explain that further in a few minutes.

So, it is going up and down, up and down, and that is the reality of how this is working. It is going up and down as it is going across; so there is interaction as we go along. Beginning in the summer, there will be some level of synthesis and integration of Part I. Part II Review will begin at some level in the summer and continue into the fall. Meanwhile, we aim to do some level of parallel process and implementation beginning in FY16 in July. So, as these are worked out and tested, and plans are gelling, overall, in the end we are looking for a full planning and budget cycle to begin in FY17. That is the big picture, as we see it now. Details will need to be figured out along the way, and some things may change as we learn from all of these processes.

Bryan Harvey, Co-Chair of the Joint Task Force on Strategic Oversight: This is not a prediction; it is a way of looking at all of these moving parts and saying, “If these co-dependent activities were happening, this is what would likely be required to make it work.” Some of these future dates are obviously an idealized version. We are hoping that, if all of the pieces fit together, this would be possible.
B. UPDATE AND PLANS FROM THE JOINT TASK FORCE ON RESOURCE ALLOCATION (JTFRA)
ELIZABETH CHILTON AND TIMOTHY ANDERSON, CO-CHAIRS

The Joint Task Force on Resource Allocation displayed the following presentation:

Elizabeth Chilton, Co-Chair of the Joint Task Force on Resource Allocation: Tim and I, on behalf of the Joint Task Force on Resource Allocation, want to give you an update on where our Task Force is up to this point. Our last full report to you was last May.

To remind you of where we left off in May, and our previous recommendations, JTFRA recommended that the campus explore a more transparent and decentralized budget allocation system. In May, we presented the campus with one idealized model that we had explored, and that would be at the core of a larger system. Something that JTFRA keeps reminding itself and tries to remind the campus is that we are not talking about a formula-based budgeting system. We are talking about a strategic budget allocation system, as we are calling it, where there is a model at the core but a system that supports decision making at all levels; to use the model as a way to depict what we are doing, but not to, in a formulaic way, determine college budgets and support our strategic priorities.

So that is where we left off last May. We were asking the campus and ourselves to continue this research and exploration process. Over the summer and throughout the fall, the Budget Office staff worked tirelessly with the deans and the deans’ staffs, the Chancellor, and other members of the campus leadership on, first of all, taking that idealized model that we were looking at in May and populating it with FY14 data. As you recall, we had only looked at FY13; we had only looked at one fiscal-year snapshot. So the first thing they did was look at the next year’s data. They also tried to reconcile how we currently look at ourselves and allocate budgets, and import that into this idealized model. There were a lot of adjustments that needed to be made to turn the ideal into the real in terms of how we look at ourselves. There was a process of determining any adjustments that needed to be made. Sometimes there were just inaccuracies in terms of how we were looking at certain kinds of data. Other times, it just wasn’t possible to fit the ideal to the way we are required to look at our resources. So there was a period of adjustments.

JTFRA has had five meetings this semester, most of them in the past six weeks. In our meetings, we discussed this new iteration of the model and some of the adjustments that need to be made. We continue to discuss how this strategic budget allocation system would need to support such a model. So, sort of a two-prong discussion: (1) looking at the model itself, and what might need to change to make it fit our campus priorities; and (perhaps more importantly) (2) what is the system that would need to be in place to support that model well?

We have spent so much time with this, and we are planning to make a full written report, as we did last May, and present that to you in the early spring. It would probably take something like two hours for us to go through each of the changes we have considered. So you will get a full reporting of all of that. We have shared some of it with the Rules Committee, and we met with JTFSO this morning. There is no secret, so if anyone has any questions you can e-mail Tim or me or the JTFRA e-mail, and I am happy to answer any questions during our discussion here.

I just wanted to highlight some of the more significant changes in this current iteration. First of all, the core principles of the model and system that we were looking at in May remain the same. Some of the core values that we outlined include transparency, trying to better align authority with responsibility, maintaining a holistic view of the campus, some of our other strategic priorities in terms of our research interests, and other strategic priorities. So all of our campus values remain the same. I think I speak for JTFRA when I say that, as we evaluated each of the potential changes to the model, we evaluated them against the values and priorities that we underscored in the spring.

Some of the more significant changes that you will find have changed the bottom lines in the model when you see its fuller iteration include how the state appropriation is dealt with. Bryan Harvey made a beautiful graphic to help Tim and me try to illustrate the changes in how we look at the state appropriation. As you may recall, back in May, the two major sources of funds that we looked at in the model were tuition and fees and the state appropriation. Those were the two major sources of revenue; we then looked at how they would be allocated out to the primary units of the colleges and schools.

In the model that we looked at in the spring, tuition and fees were allocated on the basis of student credit hours and major head count at a 75/25 distribution. At the same time, 15% of the state appropriation, a fairly large number, was allocated to cover the difference of indirect cost that we actually recover versus what we know is the actual cost of doing sponsored research. So 15% of the state appropriation in this model, in the spring, was allocated to schools and colleges to try to make up that difference to support our research mission. The rest of the state appropriation was then going to be allocated out, again, based on the 75/25 split between student credit hours and major head count.
That put a lot of burden on student credit hours and majors, meaning that a large part of the state appropriation was being allocated out based on teaching activity. While that is great and that is one of our main priorities as a campus, it also meant that it made college margins very sensitive to relatively minor changes in student enrollment. So, if you looked at multiple years, it meant that there was so much variation there was concern that colleges would not be able to plan well their budgeting from year to year. It also meant that there was not a very large central steering wheel, if you will. One of the rationales for not wanting to recommend a full RCM-like budget system was that we wanted to maintain a certain core of campus priorities; we wanted the central leadership to have a certain amount of funds available to them to meet our campus priorities – to make that process transparent, but to make sure that it wasn’t every school on its own budget kind of model.

In the iteration that we are looking at right now – and this is not a proposal at this time, it is an update on the current model that JTFRA is looking at – we maintain that 15% of the state appropriation going to make up the difference in indirect cost recovery for sponsored research. In addition, the state appropriation would cover things like salary increases that are negotiated, A&S [Administrative and Support] costs going forward, the cost of campus support for auxiliaries, and coving the unit margins. This would provide a sizable, or at least a clearer, strategic investment fund at the campus level. The biggest impact of this is that, essentially, rather than allocating out all of the state appropriation to schools and colleges and then sort of taxing back, if you will, for A&S units, there is not as much allocated out but there is more central support for those central services.

In my opinion, one of the most important impacts of this, when we start to actually show you the numbers in the early spring, is that all of the unit margins end up being negative. In the spring, you may recall that some of the schools and colleges had a positive unit margin, and some of them had a negative unit margin. This led to the perception that there were winners and losers in this kind of an allocation model. By not allocating out all of the state appropriation, or the majority, in the way that we looked at it in the spring, one would see that there is actually state support – central support – that is needed to support all of the schools and colleges. Some of those numbers are more negative than others, but it allows you to see that and track that over time, using that as a baseline.

This is a complicated subject, but I wanted to just give you a taste of what some of the bigger issues are that we are dealing with in terms of changes to the model. First of all, in the version we looked at in May, for undergraduate tuition and fees, we had made a distinction between in-state and out-of-state tuition and fees for both student credit hours and majors. Because the tuition rate for out-of-state students is different from the tuition rate for in-state students, we allocated to the schools and colleges based on in-state and out-of-state for both the student credit hours and the overall major head count. In this current iteration of the model, for the student credit hours, we don’t make a distinction between in-state and out-of-state. This is intended to increase predictability because – especially in units that cannot control their out-of-state student numbers and general education classes, for example – we felt that we did not want to create incentives for “looking up student zip codes” in order to make decisions about enrollment in one’s classes. For student credit hours, at least in the iteration of the model we are looking at, we do not make a distinction between in-state and out-of-state, but we do for majors; we still make that distinction.

Finally, the last point I will touch on, in terms of changes to the model, is graduate student tuition and fee waivers. This is something we have spent a lot of time on and will continue to; it has certainly not been resolved. In the current iteration of the model, we are attributing tuition waivers for graduate students to their school or college of record. In May, the way we allocated tuition and fee waivers was to whoever employed that student. So, if SBS hired a student in Humanities and Fine Arts, the way we allocated the tuition waiver that would go with that employment was to the employing college. The concern about this was that there was a potential disincentive to hire graduate students from outside of one’s own college, because you would be basically offering a tuition waiver for a student whose tuition you did not receive as a primary unit. This still needs a lot of discussion because this may then become difficult – especially for programs/schools/colleges that are counting on full-fee-paying students, and then another college offers them a position where they get a waiver – this may make it difficult to track those kinds of programs. This still needs to be resolved, but I am just letting you know that this is one of the things we are looking at in this latest iteration.

I wanted to say a little about the process moving forward from now. First of all, as Nancy (Cohen) and Bryan (Harvey) indicated, one of the strong possibilities is that, early in the spring, we will recommend continuing the process. I cannot speak for the Task Force completely, but that is sort of the assumption that we are moving towards – that our recommendation will be to begin the parallel process, say in the next fiscal year (2015), with the coming spring semester to prepare for this parallel process. There is a lot of work that needs to be done even to get to the point of running a true parallel process: loading of data, workshops for staff, campus engagement, resolving some of the key model attributes for testing, and the development of a strategic budget process, which would be an ongoing undertaking. Of course, there needs to be really good articulation with JTFSO, as they move forward with their process as well.
In the spring, we will provide a written report on where we have gotten to with the model and our recommendations for the larger system. I did also want to underscore – those of you who have read our report – if you haven’t, you can go online; just Google JTFRA – and I found it really easily – you will see all of the issues that we outlined that remain important questions to resolve. Many of them will be addressed again in our next written report. I wanted to just flag a few of these for you now because I do not want to have you think that, because I have not mentioned something, it is off of the agenda or table. This is just a sample list; there is a much longer list of issues that we are going to be trying to work through.

Maintaining quality. Ensuring quality is something that has been at the core of the JTFRA mission from the very beginning, because the whole point of creating a more transparent resource allocation system is to be able to ensure that we have the funding in place to meet our strategic priorities, as outlined in the strategic plan – that’s the point. Being a destination of choice, increasing our research profile, serving the students of the Commonwealth, engaging with publics outside of the University – all of those things take funding. We want to make sure that any new funding model allows us to do all of those things. However, the Task Force has acknowledged that maintaining quality comes primarily from decision-making at the college level and the campus level. It does not come from a formulaic look at a spreadsheet. It is not something that comes out automatically, no matter what you do with the drivers. JTFRA is acknowledging that there needs to be articulation between the strategic priorities and a strategic budgeting process.

Establishing a reasonable baseline. Establishing a reasonable baseline is something we looked at for quite a while, and will continue to. When we used 2013 as our test case, and then looked at 2014, it became clear that, depending on what year you use as a starting point, there are sometimes one-time anomalies that occur in college budgets, whether it is a particular gift or a particular investment in something. It has also been acknowledged that there are long-term inequities. We do not want to assume that where we are starting from is perfect, and that we are just thinking about moving forward. We need to look very carefully at what we are establishing as a baseline. However, JTFRA is also very wary about a long, drawn-out process of choosing a perfect baseline because, to some degree, we want to make sure that we are looking at this carefully going forward, rather than looking backwards too much or trying to start with something that we think is ideal for now. Instead, we recommend looking at a good oversight process, where we are assessing what those baseline budgets are on an ongoing basis.

Oversight and periodic review. Another issue that we flagged is the need to move slowly and deliberatively. We will need to develop a strategic budget system while we are testing this new model. If we adopt a new resource allocation system, we will need to be very attentive at the beginning because we want to avoid and address unforeseen consequences. We want to try to mitigate any harmful effects and make corrections as we are going when we see that there are issues. And then periodic review continuing over time, perhaps annually at first and then maybe moving to a two- or three-year period, to make sure that our resource system is doing what we want it to do.

College processes for budget development. In terms of the college processes for budget development, the Rules Committee has paid some attention to this, and we discussed this very briefly at the last Faculty Senate meeting. This is something that JTFRA acknowledged in the May report; that if we end up with really clear and transparent means for budgeting at the college level, but then everything below that is mysterious, we will not have accomplished the goal of this exercise. We acknowledged strongly that we needed to discuss, as a campus, and develop procedures for thinking about how we do budgeting at the departmental level.

A&S costs and services (see May report). I will not say much about this, except to say to see the May report. We really think we need to think about, not only the costs of A&S units, but also their services and how they can better understand the needs of their services on campus and how we can better communicate with them so there is more of a collaborative relationship between the administrative and support services and the faculty, staff, and students on campus.

CPE and other fee-based programs. CPE is something we continue to contemplate. Continuing and Professional Education, for a long time, has been really the only sort of more decentralized “RCM-like” activity, where units would engage in either online or face-to-face continuing education programs. They were expected to support themselves; their budgeting was clear – some units invested, some didn’t. It was one way to bring new revenue to campus that we might have not otherwise been able to bring. One of the things you may have noticed in the model we looked at in May is that Continuing and Professional Education is really sort of lumped in with the rest of the activity. It is not pulled out as a separate accounting; you can’t see it very clearly. One of the things we have heard from a couple of deans, very strongly, is that they have come to think of that revenue – some colleges are very dependent on CPE revenue, and the current model makes it difficult for them to know very clearly what the costs will be for new courses and programs, what the revenues will be… We are trying to figure out a way to make that activity more transparent. It may be something that needs to run aside the model while we are trying to get the other aspects of the
model worked out. Stay tuned for that. Continuing and Professional Education is definitely something that we are still working through.

Systems and staffing needs. We acknowledge that, for a resource allocation system like this to work well, there are systems that need to be in place with staffing, staff training, and potentially new staff. We have heard very clearly from the campus that we need to pay careful attention to those needs.

I want to thank the JTFRA members and invite you to send us feedback.

C. INTERIM REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON FBS FOOTBALL (ACFBS) NELSON LACEY AND MAX PAGE, CO-CHAIRS

Max Page, Co-Chair of the Ad Hoc Committee on FBS Football: I am going to just, very briefly, summarize the report that you, hopefully, read in advance, and we have copies in the back. Nelson Lacey, my co-chair, will offer his interpretation or comments on what the report means, and then I will come back and offer my comments as well.

The report you have before you is simply a revision of last year’s interim report. The basic changes are: (1) We have updated the FY14 numbers. Last year, we had estimated numbers; now we have the audited numbers; (2) We have included the FY15 estimated numbers. The season just finished, and I appreciate the Athletic Department quickly coming up with numbers of estimates they have for FY15. Next year, those numbers will be audited, updated, and changed a bit. But they are generally very close; and (3) The third change is the inclusion of the debt service on the McGuirk Press Box and Football Training Facility, and the operating expenses associated with that. Those are the big changes.

We had lots of discussions with the Committee about concussions, lawsuits, how to calculate intangible costs and benefits. But those are not the main purposes of the Committee. You see the charge there on the first page. We are looking at the financial impacts.

So the key questions that we have asked are: (1) How much did we spend before we moved to FBS football? You can see that on the top of page 3 – $3.157 million. That is sort of the benchmark. (2) How much did we spend most recently in FY14? You will see that on the middle of page 4 – $5.844 million. (3) How much will we be spending in the coming year and beyond? The very final number in the entire report is the estimate for the net spending in FY15 – $8.615 million. The purpose of the Committee is to try to get the numbers together as we have; those numbers have been overwhelmingly supported. We can debate about what those numbers mean.

Nelson Lacey, Co-Chair of the Ad Hoc Committee on FBS Football: I would like to use my time to speak about something else. I would like to speak about the future of the Ad Hoc Committee.

About three years ago, this Faculty Senate met and voted to form a committee on ad hoc football to look at the financial implications of UMass’ move from the FCS to the FBS. I was here that day. As I was thinking about it, I remember that, if I could put the most positive view of what came out of that, it was that the Senate realized that the main charge of the ad hoc was similar to or the same as the main charge of the Finance Subcommittee of the Athletic Council. But the Senate felt that that was okay; maybe redundancy was a good thing. If I could put the most negative spin on it, I would say that the Faculty Senate, by and large, had a complete lack of trust about what the Athletic Council was putting out in terms of the football program.

I would like to offer you two updates; it is three years later. The first update is that the whole issue of lack of trust that I just mentioned, I believe has completely dissolved. I will give you an example. We met last week and spoke about the numbers that Max had presented. If I could think of the most left-leaning person in the room that day – I will call him Richard… If I could think of the most right-leaning person in the room that day – I will call her Tracy… Now Richard and Tracy do not agree about anything when it comes to football. But one thing they do agree upon is that the analyses that we were looking at – the numbers that John McCutcheon and the Athletic Department put out – were valid. I think that is one of the most positive things that came out of our three years together.

The second update I would like to give you is that, when we were here that day three years ago, there was a lot of excitement in the room. I sensed it; maybe we could even describe it as electric, if the Faculty Senate could ever be described that way. I would say that that electricity never really materialized. I found that our meetings had very low energy. There were some times that we met – I was at every one of the meetings, as was Max – and only a couple of other members of the Committee came. I want you to think about that because, what I suspect is going to happen is that, very soon, a motion is going to come to the floor, and the senators are going to be asked to think about what to do with the Ad Hoc Committee. It was formed for three years, and the three years are just about up. I believe that there
is going to be a motion that the Ad Hoc Committee should continue. I know it is going to be easy for you to raise your hand and say, “Sure...let’s let the Ad Hoc Committee continue.” I would recommend that, for really good reasons, you vote no. The Athletic Department is going to continue to put out the transparent numbers that they have. The Finance Subcommittee of the Athletic Council is going to review those with scrutiny every year. The Athletic Council is going to come to you with a report at the end of the year and tell you about those. These are good people – good professors and staff who work hard and try to get the job done. I would suggest, “Just let it go.”

Max Page, Co-Chair of the Ad Hoc Committee on FBS Football: I want to give a little more meaning to the numbers that you see before you; the millions of dollars. The most important thing for me is that, over four years, we have seen a 250% increase in the amount we spend on the football program. You may think that is good or bad.

My economist friends always remind me, what are the opportunity costs of your spending? What could we be spending $8.6 million a year on, instead of a football team? How about 80 tenured assistant faculty doing cutting-edge scientific research, teaching small classes to first-year students, writing books, making art? How about 700 full scholarships, not for athletes, but for regular students, so that 700 students each year could leave here with $12,000 less in debt when they graduate? How about 1,700 $5,000 summer internship scholarships? That is what the private schools down the road are able to offer their students, and it is one of those things that generally separate the rich from the not-so-rich schools. Except that we could do that here with the money that we have, if we had the right priorities.

Let me remind us of how we got here. Chancellor Holub made the decision to join Division I, move us to the MAC and into Gillette Stadium, and then left us holding the bag. Now the administration has decided to leave the MAC league, and yet stay as an independent team within Division I – the FBS – with the hope that we will be invited, sometime, into a fancier league. So we are still, after next year, going to be in big-time college football, with all the expensive coaches, expensive scholarships, and a fancy new facility, but with minimal possibility of being in a bowl game, much less television revenue.

We are the runt of the litter. Imagine a baseball team that has no division and begs for league teams to come and beat them up on the field. I know that someone is thinking, “What about Notre Dame?” because they are, indeed, independent. That is what I would call the ultimate “Hail Mary” pass. There are four independent FBS teams right now; we would be the fifth. Two of them have God on their side, and two of them spend the rest of their time with military hardware. We have, therefore, at best, an FCS team that we have purchased at FBS prices. Put another way, we have a minor-league team at major-league prices.

There are two responses that I get to this current situation. The first is, “Forget about it; we’ve already invested so much.” These are, of course, my business friends who remind me of the failure to understand the term sunk costs. In the business school, sunk costs means “We wasted this money on this investment; let’s get out. Don’t throw good money after bad money.” The second response comes from the advocates of FBS and is simply to move the goal posts, so that each of the decisions we make with great gusto, when they fail, we change what the actual mission was. So starting next year, the original proforma said we would start to see a very small decline, which would grow rapidly, in the subsidy to football; that we would start to see a return and a lowering in the amount we subsidize. We are going in the opposite direction. We were told that moving to Gillette would attract tens of thousand of fans, desperate to see a UMass FBS team, would attract big TV revenues, and lead to an invitation to a fancy league. It was a disaster; there was no base. Students didn’t want to go, we had to boost the numbers, we had to have band days so high school bands and their families would come at half time and boost the numbers, we had donors buy tickets which we gave out but never saw the glint of a turnstile because people weren’t actually sitting in those seats. The other idea was that we would move back to Amherst; we never really meant Gillette, we will move back to Amherst where the big base is. Despite a popular coach and a strong team, the people are not showing up. We will, again, just barely make the 15,000-person attendance average that we need to stay off of probation. Each of the predictions we have made has proven false. There is no reason to think this will change, this is the key for me.

The recent articles in the New York Times, analyzing how important college football is in each state, reveals that Massachusetts and New England (except for Connecticut) have the least interest in college football of any states in the nation. If you look at the geographic range of Facebook “Likes” of our team, it stretches from the grand distance of Southwest to Orchard Hill. In Alabama, everyone is invested; it is a different culture, whether you like it or not.

This endeavor has been costing us millions and has been built on the quicksand of faith and false predictions. I just keeping asking friends who say, “Let’s give it a chance,” at what point do we decide this doesn’t make sense? A few observations as we come to the end... For me, one of the saddest days was at the end of August when I picked up the Boston Globe and saw a full-page color ad advertising the start of the year with the schedule of the football
team. We chose to announce our school year – at a cost of $80 thousand, $100 thousand, whatever it costs for a full-page ad in the *Globe* – with an ad for the football team. Two weeks later, I saw a full-page ad in the *New York Times* from the University of California-San Diego. Was it for their football team? No, because they don’t have a football team. It was for their climate change research and teaching. We do that, certainly, as well as San Diego. But that is what they chose to believe in.

Secondly, there are questions also that Mr. Bogartz, I’m sure, will comment on at this time or another time, which he has convinced me of increasingly. We are investing in a sport that we know will cause lifelong injuries to at least some of our players, at the very moment that the rest of the world is starting to recognize this. Parents don’t want their kids to play football – see the recent *Bloomberg* poll. College football attendance outside of the very elite teams has been dropping. The *New York Times* recently wrote an analogy comparing football to tobacco use or boxing. UMass took a lead in making our campus completely tobacco free. My worry is that we will be the last ones – just like we were the last ones into FBS – we will now be the last ones out; waiting while others have decided that this is not the way they want to advertise their university.

Third, four years ago, when we started spending these millions, one of the reasons was we were told that this is one of the key ways that we get into that AAU – the American Association of Universities – the elite group of 62 or so universities at the very top of public and private universities. We were told that you have to have a Division I football team. That background makes the notice this week that our Athletic Director, John McCutcheon, is a finalist for a job at the University of California-Santa Barbara all the more interesting and telling. UC-Santa Barbara is a public university that does not have a football team, but it does have membership in the AAU. So, if Santa Barbara is good enough for Mr. McCutcheon, could it be that its model of no football but an excess of academic excellence is good enough for UMass Amherst?

Finally, and I will end with this, there is a choice to be made. I hear people say, “It’s over. Give it up.” Well it happened from one day to the next, when Chancellor Holub decided we would go into this. We can make a change, just the way the University of Alabama-Birmingham, at the heart of college football country, made the decision that they did not want to spend more and growing amounts of money on this endeavor; they wanted to put that money to other uses. So Mr. Thomas, who is a very fine person, chairperson of the Board of Trustees, was a great college football player (might have been a pro), I understand his commitment to it; Mr. Caret, as well, is committed to it. But that does not mean that we, as a faculty, have to go along with that.

So, we have talked a lot about excellence. We have lots of excellence around here. Let’s invest in areas in which are excellent, that we can be excellent in, and are at the core of what we are supposed to do.

**Senator Susan K. Whitbourne:** I wanted to reflect on an experience from a couple of days ago at the Board of Trustees meeting, where I have been elected by this body to be Faculty Delegate. One of the student trustees went through a written set of comments, where she described the student experience on this campus. It was great and rousing; she did an excellent job and was a very well spoken young woman. But what she led with were football, basketball…and and I kept waiting to hear about the academics. Personally, I am very proud of the 14 Fulbrights that this campus has earned in the past year; that is just something I happen to know about. As we have heard from Senator Page, there have been so many accomplishments across campus; those were not discussed. The Chancellor did an excellent presentation to the Board, also, about the accomplishments on this campus, highlighting all the right things.

But it saddened me that the student chose to speak about athletics. Honestly, if that is the reason students are coming to UMass, they will be sorely disappointed with a 3-9 record. They might be happier about basketball, and she accurately trumpeted the successes of our basketball team. But again, we ask “At what cost?” I think the bottom line in the UAB case was nicely stated in one of their supporter articles, where they said they are worried about student applications going down without UAB football. But, honestly, if we look at the costs, with the fees that this incurs and what we are running into, are students really going to come here for the football record, or are they going to be looking at the economics and academics, and use that to make their decisions?

**Senator Frank Hugus:** I would like to thank Senator Page and Co-Chair Lacey for the report. I, too, am on the Ad Hoc Committee. I must say that my reasoning for being on the Committee was not because I didn’t trust the Athletic Council, but because I wanted to have a closer look at the figures and discuss them in a committee of faculty members as we have done.

I found out some interesting things. For example, there was a lot of money that was spent on what we thought was going to be the renovation of the McGuirk Stadium, but turned out to be the renovation of the press box at McGuirk for the benefit of ESPN, apparently. That is an expense that we probably could have done without. The stadium
The motion to suspend the rules was adopted.

What I think we have missed on the floor of the Senate has been the faculty perspective. I think we all have spoken with colleagues around campus about football. My general experience has been that either people are absolutely indifferent to it or, in fact, hostile to it because they think it takes away from other aspects of campus life that are more important.

For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I would like to introduce a motion, based on the content of this report, that the Faculty Senate request that the Rules Committee poll all University of Massachusetts Amherst faculty early in the Spring semester 2015 to determine faculty support or lack of support for the campus' continuing to participate in the NCAA Football Bowl Subdivision.

**Presiding Officer Bogart:** That motion, not being on the agenda, is out of order. However, what you can move is that that motion be taken up at the next regular meeting of the Faculty Senate.

**Senator Frank Hugus:** Or, perhaps, I could move to suspend the rules to take up that motion.

**Presiding Officer Bogart:** You could do that. Do you want to do that?

**Senator Frank Hugus:** I so move.

**Presiding Officer Bogart:** Is there a second?

The motion to suspend the rules was adopted.

**Presiding Officer Bogart:** We have now suspended the rules. You may now make your motion.

**Senator Frank Hugus:** I move that the Faculty Senate request that the Rules Committee poll all University of Massachusetts Amherst faculty early in the Spring Semester 2015 to determine faculty support or lack of support for the campus’ continuing to participate in the NCAA Football Bowl Subdivision.

**Kumble R. Subbaswamy, Chancellor:** For the last year or so, I think we have done a good job of telling and selling the success story of UMass Amherst, thanks to our university relations work and all of the wonderful things that are going on on campus, thanks to the faculty – student achievements and faculty achievements. We have turned around this notion, somehow, that the Amherst campus is a campus at war with itself many times; most of the time.

So, here we are, waiving the flagship flag, where a sense of pride, both on campus and throughout the Commonwealth and beyond, is beginning to spread. I ask you, do you really want to, yet again, take out something that is less than 1% of our budget? I promised you that you would have transparency. Since neither of the co-chairs mentioned this, the report expressly says that this administration has been completely transparent with the respective numbers without ever questioning your interpretations. That’s it – we will continue to be transparent.

I simply ask you whether this really serves any purpose because, ultimately, the decision is not up to the Senate. Of course, it’s your prerogative to pass any resolution you want to pass. Do you want to put your Chancellor, who is working so hard to make this campus a top 20, academically-recognized campus, as someone who is in a war with its own faculty? Is that an accurate depiction, which is what The Globe will write, which is what The Republican will write, which is what everyone will write because, of course, they are hungry for these stories? Do you really want that to be the story for the next six months? That is your call. As I said, I will continue to work hard, no matter what. I will try to work against the negative that will be written up because of this vote, nothing else. If you want to do so, of course, it is your prerogative. But I urge you not to because I think this is a good moment in this campus’ history. There are good relationships: we have re-built frayed relationships, both on campus and off campus, and in the Commonwealth and beyond. As your advocate, as someone who passionately works every day for the betterment of this campus – wakes up in the morning thinking about how to best advance this campus, goes to sleep at night thinking about how to advance this campus – I urge you not to vote to make this happen. Let’s take this less than 1% of our budget, monitor it very carefully, and make sure that we are not going to do what we promised not to do. I urge you not to do so. Again, I fully understand that it’s your prerogative and, no matter how you vote, I am going to work day and night to really advance this campus.

**Senator Frank Hugus:** I am not speaking of warfare here. I am speaking of common sense. I am also speaking of academics, and I am speaking of the reputation that we want the University of Massachusetts Amherst to have. I do
not know what is in the minds of the Trustees or the President. Frankly, the President of the University has been an absence on campus more than a presence on campus. Perhaps if he or members of the Trustees are so interested in football, they might want to visit the Faculty Senate and make their case. I would be interested in hearing what they have to say.

On the other hand, I have been here long enough to know that many of the stories that appear in the local press are, indeed, puffed up so that they make it look as if something is going on on the campus that really is not. And I have learned not to pay much attention to them. I would also like to say that this is not something that is directed at the Chancellor. Far from it – we are trying to help out in ways that we can to get the faculty voice in a context in which it is meaningful.

**Senator Howard Peelle:** If I understand the intent and wording on this motion, it is not a vote for or against football on UMass campus here. It is a vote to seek information – to poll faculty; to find out what the faculty believe about this issue. There are other constituencies that might provide some valuable information as well. But anyway, this is to poll the faculty.

**Senator Susan K. Whithbourne:** I am in favor of gathering the data. I am also very saddened to hear it being construed as a kind of statement about the Chancellor’s position or any lack of support for what the Chancellor and administration are doing. I think one could flip this and look at it the other way, in terms of what the press might say. “Look at how much they are spending on football. Yet, they keep asking for money for this and that.” You can really take a fact and interpret it in multiple ways. Anticipating what the media will say is a very difficult game to play.

I have been in favor of this idea since I first heard of it. Several faculty have been discussing this because it is a good way of gauging the campus. We don’t have a good sense of where people are on this. And, I’m sorry, but I don’t feel it expresses a lack of confidence to take a poll of faculty. It would be a good idea to take a poll of students as well, but that is not this particular motion.

**Ernest May, Secretary of the Faculty Senate:** I would make a motion to postpone the vote on this motion until the first meeting of the second semester.

**Senator Max Page:** As Senator Peelle said, this is a simple request for information. I am not sure why it needs to be delayed until January. It is the issue of the day that we have been discussing. If I may, I often feel like I go overboard in saying how much I love the administrators. I consider the combination of the President, Chancellor, and our new Provost the best leadership we have had in the past 13 years, since I have been here. This is not an attack on them, and I am surprised, frankly, that the Chancellor assumes that this would be a war with the system, given that we don’t know what the results would be. There may actually be support for this. This is about information that the Faculty Senate, which is the representative body, is seeking from the faculty.

**Kumble R. Subbaswamy, Chancellor:** (Due to recording equipment issues, most of Chancellor Subbaswamy’s comments were not recorded.) Whatever you find out in the poll will not have an impact on what I decide to do. I will eventually always make decisions I think are in the best interest of this campus based on all the information I have available. So this gathering of information, in my opinion, is more harmful than helpful.

**Richard Bogartz, Presiding Officer of the Faculty Senate:** With total, complete, absolute appreciation for this Chancellor, let me point out that the motion on the floor is to postpone consideration until the next meeting – the first meeting in the next year. It is to that that we should be addressing our remarks.

**Senator Frank Hugus:** I don’t know what can be gained from postponing this motion, so I would speak against it. I would also point out that, the last time I looked, a quorum in the Senate consisted of those present.

**Richard Bogartz, Presiding Officer of the Faculty Senate:** The question has been called. The motion before us is the motion to postpone discussion of the previous motion until the next meeting of the Faculty Senate. What you are voting on now is whether to terminate discussion, and consider the question of postponing. There is one senator who has indicated the desire to speak.

The motion to postpone the vote until the next meeting of the Faculty Senate was defeated.

**Senator Rebecca Spencer:** (Due to recording equipment issues, Senator Spencer’s comments were not recorded.)

**John Kennedy, Vice Chancellor for University Relations:** (Due to recording equipment issues, Vice Chancellor Kennedy’s comments were not recorded.)
Katherine Newman, Provost and Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs: (Due to recording equipment issues, some of Provost Newman’s comments were not recorded.) What really amazed me was this incredibly thunderous crowd of people cheering all around me; they were really excited. I don’t know whether these are people who typically come to the campus at all, to be honest. All I could see was all of these people and their little kids with them, watching our students and cheering them on as they struggled down the field. And I thought there are at least two different cultures here at the University. I guess what I was seeing was a demonstration of what at least some of the advocates of the football program must have thought would happen – that it would ignite a kind of spirit in our neighborhood and, perhaps, give people who do not care either way about the University some other reason to care about our presence there. It gave me a different feeling about football without starting with any particular vision about football.

The second point I would like to make – and I say this as a newcomer to the University’s administration, and I say this in full presence of Swamy, with whom I have not rehearsed this – is that this is an extraordinary leader who is very straightforward and honest with us. If the Chancellor tells you this is going to make his job more difficult – and I have already seen how difficult it is; we are out here, way out, 100 miles from the centerpiece of the power in Boston; we struggle to make our presence, our voice, and our importance clear; we are advocating for resources which other campuses would love to get their hands on; all in order to keep this flagship moving forward on its academic mission which, as the Provost, I care the most about – because it is going to make it appear that we are divided campus, with a faculty that is disavowing a program that other people decided, at some point, to put in, then I really listen to that because I know what he is doing every day and what the rest of us are trying to do too, on your behalf, to make this the strongest possible campus – a campus that can claim the resources it needs desperately to pull itself up higher and higher and has made extraordinary achievements just in the last year. I really worry about that – if that is his interpretation, and I have never known him, in my short time, to say something to me that is colored by anything other than a straightforward look at the facts as he sees them. I hope you will take that very seriously. I will take that very seriously because there is nothing more important to me, as a member of that team, than to see this University moving ahead.

I appreciate, Max, what you said about your confidence in us; that means a great deal to me and, I’m sure, to all of the other colleagues here in the administration. This is balanced on a bit of a knife-edge today, and I think it would be extremely sad if we tipped it over in the wrong direction. That doesn’t mean you don’t have the right. But I would ask you about the wisdom of moving in a direction that our Chancellor feels is going to be damaging to the University. And I say that, not as somebody who is a particular advocate of football. I do not know what I would have thought if somebody would have presented a football program to me when it was happening. I am personally not in favor of re-litigating things that have been decided. I would rather move forward and do the very strongest job I can for you, to make our campus the very best it can be. I would ask you to really think about that. I take it very seriously. I have never heard him say anything like this before, and I doubt you have either.

Timothy Anderson, Dean, College of Engineering: I am going to come from the other direction, in the sense that I have spent 45 years at a land grant state university, and I did not go to a football game as a student. I didn’t really care about football; I didn’t play it, it wasn’t important to me, it was something students did on a Saturday afternoon. However, when I got into administration as a department chair, it really struck me how important something on your campus was. In the case of the university where I was, it was football. Football was the rallying point for the students, alumni, and friends of the campus. They came on those Saturday afternoons in the fall and celebrated the university. They also gave a lot of money to the university. The legislators would come. It was a way to bring people to campus to show off the students and values we had. The budget was very minor. It really did make a difference, primarily with the students and the alumni; it was a way to tie them...

One of my favorite trivia questions used to be, “Name the one Division I football team in New England.” Maybe one out of 20 people would get that right. Of course, UConn changed that when they came on, and then UMass was the third school. I don’t know if it is changing in New England, but we do need a rallying point. It has proven, at the universities I have been, to be football.

Richard Bogartz, Presiding Officer of the Faculty Senate: Let me call your attention, once again, to the motion at hand, which is not, “Is football a good thing or not?” but rather, “Should the Rules Committee be requested to poll the faculty?” Please address your remarks to that question.

Senator Frank Hugus: I didn’t think this was going to turn into a debate about football. I would like to point out to the Provost that she would have that same ethnographic experience, regardless of what level of football we were playing. I would just like to say that this motion was intended to gather some information so that we, as the Faculty Senate, would have a more informed discussion on the issue of FBS football.
Senator Susan K. Whitbourne: I had that same feeling, too. I went to that same game, Provost Newman. I mean, it was great to be back in McGuirk. I looked around in those stands too, and it really was thrilling to be back and see everybody, and the students were tailgating; it was like nothing had changed, everybody was back, and Gillette had never happened. As Senator Hugus mentioned quickly, that would have happened whether it was FBS or FCS...

Regarding supporting the Chancellor… I thought it was a good idea to poll the faculty. The administration is expressing a viewpoint that is giving me pause. We don’t want to send the message that we don’t support the administration. Honestly, I think the comments that have occurred are starting to sway me, and I wanted to acknowledge that, however this vote goes. I think that what has been said about (a) football being a rallying point, and (b) us rallying around the administration are both true.

Carol Barr, Vice Provost for Undergraduate and Continuing Education: Mr. Speaker, can you read the motion?

Richard Bogartz, Presiding Officer of the Faculty Senate: Moved that the Faculty Senate request that the Rules Committee poll all University of Massachusetts Amherst faculty early in the Spring semester 2015 to determine faculty support or lack of support for the campus’ continuing to participate in the NCAA Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS).

Carol Barr, Vice Provost for Undergraduate and Continuing Education: Polling the faculty to consider support or lack of support for continuing to participate in FBS football. I ask you to think about the symbolism behind those words and what you will be asking the faculty. It is a reflection on the administration. It is a reflection on the Chancellor. I ask you to think about that very seriously. The information collected is not going to change the decision. But you are going to be signaling to the faculty, through support of this motion, your lack of support for this Chancellor. I ask you to think seriously about that, the symbolism behind this vote, and what you are asking to be done.

Senator Max Page: I am rather stunned by this discussion over whether to poll or not. We, in the Senate, are supposed to be representatives of the faculty anyway. So in this discussion of the Faculty Senate, we could have a poll of the Faculty Senate, which theoretically reflects the views of the faculty. Would that be dangerous? If we invite a speaker to campus who might be controversial, should we first see if the administration thinks it is dangerous or not? I think this is a very dangerous road to go down. Robust debate is a very good thing. Having more information is a very good thing. Everyone has gone out of their way to say this is not an attack on this administration. It is about the Faculty Senate taking ownership of what its roll is, which is to voice the views of the faculty on various important issues on this campus. I cannot believe that we would not want to know better what our faculty think about it.

John McCarthy, Vice Provost for Graduate Education and Dean of the Graduate School: I have been on this campus since 1985. I have never been to a football game, and I don’t really care about football. But I think I have a pretty good idea of how this poll will turn out, and I think it will produce a very bad headline for the Chancellor. It will be very difficult for the campus and Chancellor to function, given the results of that poll. I think it is not such a great idea. I would also like to point out that I have been in the Senate since 1985, and I do not recall the Senate polling the faculty about anything – the last time was a long while ago.

Elizabeth Chilton, Co-Chair of JTFRA: So, being an anthropologist myself, I like to think about what it is I am really trying to get at in surveys. I think we probably all could guess what a survey like that would show. Most faculty are trained in academic subjects, and that is our priority, and we are interacting with our students and our research, and most of us are not directly involved in athletics in any way. So we would probably think, like Max put in his report, that it would be better to put that money into scholarships. If the survey is carried out, I don’t think it will show anything we would be surprised by, which is why I would ask what the purpose of doing it would be.

I also want to point out that, in the resource allocation process, I mentioned to you that one of the ways that we are thinking about looking at the state appropriation is highlighting the central strategic investments. One of the things the Chancellor did personally – he has been involved personally in going through the model with the Budget Office – is he wanted to highlight the investment in athletics in a line item in the model that we have all been looking at, which is not something we are doing in the spring. We were holding auxiliaries off – out of the main drivers of the model – because he said he wants to able to track that over time, to be very transparent about how that looks in the campus whole in looking at our budget, because I know he is sincere in wanting to very closely monitor this. This is very high on his priority list, both in terms of our financial responsibility and in working with the Provost to think about how athletics fits into all the priorities of the campus.

So I think that since most of us could probably guess what this is going to show, I do not think this is going to tell us anything we don’t already know. I think the reason it would harm his ability to keep going forward is that it shows a lack of confidence in his sincerity about close monitoring.
**Senator Maria Calas:** I don’t really know where we are now or what we are talking about. I just wanted to, first of all, wonder about whether we are discussing football or athletics. If we are discussing athletics – and I think you just mentioned athletics as one of the considerations in the budget model – one of the issues here is that we have actually become so focused on the football story that we are not considering basketball; the Provost can go to a basketball game and have that experience as well. We have been winning and have become well known in basketball, we have one of the highest-paid public employees as our coach in basketball, so we are not complaining about basketball being expensive.

Football is not all there is in bringing resources to campus, or having the Trustees support us and alumni being behind us. We are making this up and convincing ourselves that this is a self-fulfilling prophecy – trying to convince ourselves that football is it, and maybe it is not. So I think that the question of voting in this motion for faculty support of football could have a parallel poll of whether the faculty support basketball. Then it would not be a question of football or not, but rather the larger question of “What kind of athletics do we want our campus to be known for?” which is much more the case. Are we going to show the world that we are behind basketball instead of having to make this up football thing that, actually, we were never behind before? The FBS thing has distracted us from the larger picture of what we are trying to do here. We are complicating the story. I would like to see what the faculty think.

**Richard Bogart, Presiding Officer of the Faculty Senate:** The question has been called. The vote will be a vote on whether to terminate discussion so we can have an immediate vote on the motion.

The motion that the Faculty Senate request that the Rules Committee poll all University of Massachusetts Amherst faculty early in the Spring semester 2015 to determine faculty support or lack of support for the campus’ continuing to participate in the NCAA Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS) was defeated.

**D. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

1. **Principal Administrative Officers**

   **Katherine Newman, Provost and Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs:** I prepared a kind of year/semester-end report for you, but I think I am going to dispense with it. I can always do this at the beginning of the year; you have other things to do. So there is just one thing I wanted to mention to you, which is that I have called into creation a new advisory committee to me; I am just calling it the Provost’s Advisory Council. Its purpose is really to give me more faculty input on the kinds of decisions that, by law, rest on my desk. So there are lots of things that the Provost is charged with deciding; things like exceptional merit, CHIP appointments and targeted opportunity appointments, lots of things that end up as kind of a sole decision that I make. Of course, I get a lot of advice and input from departments and college personnel committees.

   But, at the end of the day, there are things I would like to get more advice on. So I have created an advisory committee. There are faculty from every college on that committee, and their purpose is simply to advise me. They don’t vote on anything; they don’t have any power in that sense. But it allows me to make stronger decisions because of that input.

   (The Provost displayed the Provost’s Advisory Council membership slide.) These are the members of the Provost’s Advisory Council. I am pleased to say that 100% of the people I invited accepted this invitation. That is a lot of punishment, because they have an awful lot of work to do. I am not sure they understood how much work they would have to do, but they know now. I am finding it exceptionally helpful. Most of the policy decisions that I want to be able to bring to the Senate, I will run with them and ask for their advice. It is everything from a policy advisory committee to a committee that helps me sort out actual decisions that have to be made that matter to everyone. I wanted those decisions to be well-informed. These are your colleagues who are going to be providing me with that advice, and they will be meeting with me – at least once a month, probably more like twice a month – to work through all those sorts of decisions. I basically looked for people that, I think, all of us have great respect for, whose input would be exceptionally helpful to me, especially on matters of academic judgment. But, again, it is not a decision-making body. It is simply an advisory body.

   I have about 40 minutes worth of other things to tell you, but in view of the time, Mr. Chairman, I will hold that for next time.
John Kennedy, Vice Chancellor for University Relations: We had the Governor-elect on campus last week; it was great visit. We brought him to the Life Sciences Laboratory. He was able to interact with some of the terrific students from ICONS. We introduced him to the recipient of a scholarship that his family funds; it was a really nice moment.

We are also preparing a lengthy transition document for the Governor-elect’s transition team that looks at all of the partnerships, contracts, relationships with the state, broken down by schools and colleges. That is being prepared and will be delivered shortly.

The Town-Gown Steering Committee concluded its work, and will be sending its recommendations to the Chancellor, regarding the work that you three did in developing a master plan, if you will, for the campus and the town to grow together. One of the recommendations, among many, is to create a permanent University-Town Committee that will deal with these sorts of issues.

Julie L. Buehler, Vice Chancellor and Chief Information Officer: We have a new colleague joining us on January 5, 2015 who we are pretty excited about. We are calling this the Associate Provost for Instructional Innovation position, which came out of the campus strategic plan. We are thrilled with the candidate that we ended up getting to agree to come to campus. We were supported by both the Chancellor and the Provost to make this position. Carol is going to tell you who it is.

Carol Barr, Vice Provost for Undergraduate and Continuing Education: Julie and I are both up here because the new Associate Provost for Instructional Innovation will be working closely with both of us. It is actually a joint appointment because of the academic computing pieces and technology pieces in IT that support the academic teaching, and also in my area on the teaching side and innovative teaching taking place as well.

We are pleased to announce that Dr. Allison Gill from Arkansas State University will be joining us starting January 5; she is very excited to get started right away. At Arkansas State University, she is an Associate Professor in their Department of Art and the Director of their Center for Digital Initiatives. Many of you met her when she was on campus interviewing. We had a couple of Skype interviews and informational meetings with her. The search committee did a phenomenal job, and Julie and I are very pleased that she accepted our offer and wanted to join the campus as quickly as possible. She is very excited to join the UMass Amherst community and start working with the faculty on instructional, innovative, new teaching and learning with technology usages.

Julie L. Buehler, Vice Chancellor and Chief Information Officer: Temporarily, she will be in the low rise, but we are going to put her in the Library, but we have to do the renovation of the space first. We are very excited about having the offices being at the center of campus for access. I don’t have the latest update on how long that is going to take. Six to nine months, perhaps; we will see.

2. The Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Ernest May, Secretary of the Faculty Senate: Just a couple of quick ones… A shout out to Patricia Vittum, long-time faculty senator, who was the recipient of the US Golf Association 2015 Green Section Award for Distinguished Service to the Game of Golf, and for career-long work on turf grass.

Also, special thanks to Maurianne Adams, who has been a driving force in the whole Gen Ed renovation project, a former member and chair of the Rules Committee, and, most recently, in her post-retirement capacity, chair of the General Education Council. Maurianne is finally retiring for real; she will fail retirement no longer, and we offer her our heartfelt wishes.

Thanks to all of the faculty senators, members of the councils and committees, and to the senate staff for their dedicated work over the course of the semester. Best wishes for a joyful holiday season.

4. The Faculty Delegates to the Board of Trustees

Marilyn Billings, Associate Delegate to the Board of Trustees: The Board of Trustees was here on Tuesday afternoon and Wednesday. Tuesday afternoon was the Committee of the Whole meeting. The main topic of conversation was deferred maintenance throughout the entire system, and working with outside consultants to develop a very aggressive, I would say, five-year plan to address major deferred maintenance on all the campuses, and then continue on with ongoing maintenance as we do nowadays with the new buildings.
On Wednesday, at the Board of Trustees meeting, Chair Henry Thomas made reference to the support from Governor Patrick. There was a presentation by our Student Trustee, Sarah Freudson; as is always the case, the hosting campus’ student always gives a presentation. She commented on all of the new buildings that were going up on campus, and how wonderful that is for all the students. In that context, she talked about the new Integrated Learning Center, the Football Performance Center, the stadium and bringing the games back to campus. She also talked about the entire UMass pride with all of these new things that are going on. She also mentioned the open textbook initiative that the Library has been sponsoring since 2011, and work with the MassPirg group to continue and spearhead that throughout the state. We had three public speakers: one talked about climate change and fossil fuel, and I think the Board of Trustees will be talking about that next semester; and representatives from PSU and MSP talked about what is happening with our unions and brought the Board of Trustees up to date with that. We heard regular updates of positive things that are going on at all of the campuses and regular passing of various programs that are going on at the different campuses. All of that is on their website.

F. ELECTIONS

Two At-Large Members of the Rules Committee

Nominees: A Yemi Jimoh, Afro-American Studies
James Rinderle, Mechanical and Industrial Engineering

(Further nominations will be accepted from the floor.)

A Yemi Jimoh and James Rinderle were elected by acclamation.

G. BYLAW CHANGES


MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Bylaw Changes, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 15-003A. 03-15

(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 744th regular meeting of the Faculty Senate. The motion may be debated and amended at all three meetings.)

MJ Peterson, Chair of the Rules Committee: Finding out all of the details about the councils is an ongoing process. I move that we amend that motion to add to the membership of the Council on Public Engagement and Outreach the Vice Chancellor for University Relations or a designee, serving ex officio.

The motion to amend was adopted.

H. NEW COURSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>CREDITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANTHRO 353</td>
<td>“Archaeology of Egypt and Nubia”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLASSICS 380</td>
<td>“The Ancient City”</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLASSICS 480</td>
<td>“Pompeii”</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM 335</td>
<td>“Media and Education”</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM 445</td>
<td>“Screenwriting”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM 446</td>
<td>“Film Documentary”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HONORS 321</td>
<td>“Violence in American Culture”</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MKTG 468</td>
<td>“Services Marketing”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLISCI 297</td>
<td>“Power”</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBHLTH 384</td>
<td>“Social Facts and Cinematic Acts: Health through Film”</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBHLTH 389</td>
<td>“Health Inequities”</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIOL 424</td>
<td>“Sex Work in Global Perspective”</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPORTMGT 280</td>
<td>“History of Baseball in America”</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STOCKSCH 118</td>
<td>“Introduction to the Sustainable Food and Farming Major”</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THEATER 447</td>
<td>“Dialects for Actors”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the courses ANTHRO 353, CLASSICS 380 and 480, COMM 335, 445 and 446, HONORS 321, MKTG 468, POLISCI 297, PUBHLTH 384 and 389, SOCIOL 424, SPORTMGT 280, STOCKSCH 118 and THEATER 447, as recommended by the Academic Matters Council.

The motion was adopted.

I. NEW BUSINESS – CONSENT AGENDA (ITEMS 1-7)

[A consent agenda may be presented by the Presiding Officer at the beginning of a meeting. Items may be removed from the consent agenda on the request of any one member. Items not removed may be adopted by general consent without debate. Removed items may be taken up either immediately after the consent agenda or placed later on the agenda.]


MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Changes in the Requirements for the B.A. and B.S. Programs in Psychology, the Revision of the Managerial Economics Concentration in the Resource Economics Major, the Revision of the Consumer and Family Economics Concentration in the Resource Economics Major, the Revision of the Environmental and Natural Resource Economics Concentration in the Resource Economics Major, the Revision of the Requirements for the Science Major in the College of Natural Sciences, the Revision of the Sociology B.A. Degree Program, and the Revisions to the Requirements for the Major and Minor in Portuguese, as presented in Sen. Doc. Nos. 15-013, 15-014, 15-015, 15-016, 15-017, 15-018 and 15-019.

The motion was adopted.


Senator Howard Peelle: To whom does the Ombuds person report?

John McCarthy, Vice Provost for Graduate Education and Dean of the Graduate School: The Ombuds, EOD, and Disability Services all report to the Chancellor. He usually, I think, delegates the report to the Deputy Chancellor. Those three are all at the top of the organization chart.

The motion was adopted.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Nominations to Faculty Senate Councils and Committees, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 15-021.

The motion was adopted.

The 743rd Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate stood adjourned at 5:32 p.m. on December 11, 2014.