Presiding Officer Richard Bogartz called the 745th Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate to order on February 19, 2015 at 3:30 p.m. in Herter Hall, Room 227, and began by reading “One River, One Boat” by Marjory Wentworth:

Because our history is a knot
we try to unravel, while others
try to tighten it, we tire easily
and fray the cords that bind us.

The cord is a slow moving river,
spiraling across the land
in a succession of S’s,
splintering near the sea.

Picture us all, crowded onto a boat
at the last bend in the river:
watch children stepping off the school bus,
parents late for work, grandparents

fishing for favorite memories,
teachers tapping their desks
with red pens, firemen suiting up
to save us, nurses making rounds,

baristas grinding coffee beans,
dockworkers unloading apartment size
containers of computers and toys
from factories across the sea.

Every morning a different veteran
stands at the base of the bridge
holding a cardboard sign
with misspelled words and an empty cup.

In fields at daybreak, rows of migrant
farm workers standing on ladders, break open
iced peach blossoms; their breath rising
and resting above the frozen fields like clouds.

A jonboat drifts down the river.
Inside, a small boy lies on his back;
hand laced behind his head, he watches
stars fade from the sky and dreams.

Consider the prophet John, calling us
from the edge of the wilderness to name
the harm that has been done, to make it
plain, and enter the river and rise.

It is not about asking for forgiveness.
It is not about bowing our heads in shame;
because it all begins and ends here:
while workers unearth trenches

at Gadsden’s Wharf, where 100,000
Africans were imprisoned within brick walls
awaiting auction, death, or worse.
Where the dead were thrown into the water,
and the river clogged with corpses
has kept centuries of silence.
It is time to gather at the water’s edge,
and toss wreaths into this watery grave.

And it is time to praise the judge
who cleared George Stinney’s name,
seventy years after the fact,
we honor him; we pray.

Here, where the Confederate flag still flies
beside the Statehouse, haunted by our past,
conflicted about the future; at the heart
of it, we are at war with ourselves

huddled together on this boat
handed down to us – stuck
at the last bend of a wide river
splintering near the sea.

[The rules were suspended to allow Kumble Subbaswamy, Chancellor to address the Faculty Senate.]

Kumble Subbaswamy, Chancellor: Certainly one of the major items on the agenda is the draft report of the Diversity Strategic Planning Steering Committee. I would like to address the elephant in the room. This past week, this campus has taken a beating locally, nationally, and internationally. As your Chancellor, I accept full responsibility for the missteps that led to this state of affairs. The campus, with its proud history of standing up for social justice and inclusivity and openness, came across to the whole world as if we had taken a giant step back. Notwithstanding what the circumstances were—which I will try to explain a little bit later – the damage was done. We did listen, we reversed course, and we are now headed back with values that are consistent with our core values and proud history.

So I want to just take a couple of minutes to explain the context – not make excuses – but explain the context, explain the process, and talk about lessons learned as we move forward. I first want people to understand the broad context that has existed for some time on American university campuses. That is the intersection of various laws passed by Congress pertaining to international matters – treaties and various other things – including the most recent ones, which have names that I shudder to talk about, such as the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012, for instance. Then there are things called export control laws. The intersection of those – which are real things on campuses, particularly in the science and engineering fields, where our faculty and a lot of international students work – is something that is very delicate, and many of the faculty members and your colleagues can tell you about some of the delicacies associated with them.

This campus has never restricted admission, and has remained at the forefront of this movement of progressive admissions and being an international player, which I am very proud to be a part of. Let’s face it – I would not be here if it were not for such open policies at a great many American universities, and this is why I am here.

On December 22, 2014, or so, just as the University was pretty much closed and few people were around, a particular issue involving a particular student who had gone home for the holidays and wanted to re-enter the country came up. This was a student who would be coming back for the third semester. Without getting into privacy issues and so forth, let me simply say that that changed what was simply a hypothetical and theoretical to a practical question of having to answer certain things and certifying whether we were in compliance with specific acts and specific rules. Because of various issues that the University System as a whole had been dealing with, we have been directed always to address these questions to our legal council, which, in fact, has retained a Washington firm that specializes in compliance with these kinds of regulations.

So, that was sort of the first stop for us, as we asked, “Hey, what do we do?” The response was, “You are really more out on a limb than most institutions. You should have been really doing a lot more than you currently are doing, but you are okay now. This particular result is one in which you have to not only correct what you have done and not done, but you have to change some policies.” This was the answer that came back. Right at the point, the Graduate School was in the process of trying to decide on a whole host of admissions. So there was a time factor of having to make some decisions about compliance with existing rules. Even with that short turnaround, I did ask – as is my habit – to do at least minimal consultation because, notwithstanding the time factor, this is not the kind of thing we
should unilaterally do. I think you all know my penchant for having a lot of discussions and consultations before I come to conclusions.

We did have some consultation. I am not going to say it was extensive because, as I have said, there was a time factor. We consulted with the Research Council, Graduate Council, and mentioned it to the Rules Committee as well. Based on some of the responses we received – in fact, we even added a sentence in what we were developing as a way to go forward – we clearly stated that the policy that we were reluctantly accepting is not consistent with our core values. That statement, in fact, came from one of the consultations; in fact, it came from a student group.

We did then say, “This is our policy.” You also know my penchant for doing everything out in the open. I believe in transparency, so if someone asks, “What is your policy?” I say, “Here is the policy.” It is in that spirit that it was made widely known. In fact, one of the students wanted to know, “What is your policy now?” So we wanted to make it known.

There are a lot of universities that are quietly doing things. I don’t want to really go into that. The point is that we were first doing something that we thought was in the best interest of our students – I will explain why. Just imagine starting a PhD program. After two or three semesters, you go home for a holiday, or a family emergency, or what have you, and you are not admitted back; you are now being denied a visa based upon what you are working on. That is a disruption in that individual’s, that faculty’s, that student’s degree program and life, and also, of course, an interruption in a research project that faculty members may also be involved in. I’m not even going to go into the issue of what penalties there are in the law – both personal and institutional – forget the institutional – there are individual penalties that are actually specified there. In terms of the export control laws, all you have to do is Google “Tennessee Faculty Member Prison,” and you will get a particular story that, if you haven’t read, you may want to read.

So there is a very complex terrain in which universities are operating, caught as pawns – in fact, foreign students from some particular countries are also caught as pawns – in a much larger diplomatic game. So we were the first one to, sort of, openly say, “This is how we are grappling with a very complex terrain.” That was, understandably, as I have said, misinterpreted as somehow unilaterally backing away from our openness and our commitment to being a global leader and being a very inclusive university. For that, I apologize.

What is the lesson learned? I think that what we should have done in hindsight – even though, as I said, we did, within the time available and with what consultation we could – would have been to suspend the admissions policy until we had more time to study, analyze, consult, come back, and take more time to establish an ongoing policy. Nevertheless, I appreciate all of you standing up for the University’s core values, and saying, in no uncertain terms, that this is certainly not the way to go. We have reversed course and, hopefully, as I have said, the commitment of this University to inclusiveness and diversity is unquestioned going forward.

A. PRESENTATION BY ROBERT FELDMAN, CHAIR, DIVERSITY STRATEGIC PLANNING STEERING COMMITTEE WITH NANCY COHEN, BRYAN HARVEY AND AMILCAR SHABAZZ, CO-CHAIRS, JOINT TASK FORCE ON STRATEGIC OVERSIGHT (JTFSO)

“The Diversity Strategic Planning Steering Committee presented the following PowerPoint presentation:

Diversity Strategic Planning Steering Committee Presentation-02-19-15.pdf

Robert Feldman, Chair, Diversity Strategic Planning Steering Committee: Thank you. I am very pleased to have the opportunity to speak with you about our diversity strategic plan. This has been an endeavor that started quite some time ago and has taken on real importance, partially of its inherent importance and partially because of events that have affected our university community.

I want to first talk about the Steering Committee. It is a wonderful committee, as you look at the list of individuals who make it up and see how they represent every facet of the University. We have faculty, students, staff; in fact, there are actually more people who have been part of our deliberations because we have had frequent visitors, particularly among the students – we have had a really rich environment in which to discuss these issues which, as you know, are very difficult issues to talk about.

I want to talk about the process that we followed because I think it’s really quite important. The Chancellor appointed the Committee in April or May, and we started meeting in May, and met also in June. Beginning in the fall, we met every two weeks or so. We had several events to gather input from people. I think the most impactful event occurred in November, when we had a campus-wide town hall meeting, where we had about 800 people,
depending on who is doing the counting; a very emotional and impactful kind of meeting, which was, in large part, due to events that were happening in the world outside of Amherst and the University. I think what it did was to make us redouble our efforts. We were taking this very seriously to begin with, but I think we saw, in very concrete ways, how these issues impact the lives of a significant portion of our students, faculty, and staff. So I think it really, in that sense, was helpful in terms of our deliberations – to be able to see the very tangible emotions that were brought about by the issues involving diversity and inclusion. Starting in November, we met once a week through just about right before Christmas. We also did outreach to numerous groups on campus, and finally came up with a draft that we put up on the web at the end of January, which is still up on the web. We have been soliciting feedback ever since it was posted, and getting very useful kinds of feedback. We are now gathering more feedback on the draft; I am making presentations all over the place; other committee members are meeting with all sorts of groups. We are really trying to get input from all constituencies that are relevant to this issue. Our goal is to have a final draft that will be done by the end of spring break, and to deliver it to the full Strategic Planning Committee, where they will incorporate it into the larger plan. Ultimately, it will go to the Chancellor, who will make some decisions about the recommendations that we make.

We tried to go through this process – this is done in every phase of developing the campus-wide strategic planning – taking a look at where we are now, talking about what kinds of things could be changed, with a focus on concrete outcomes. We tried to avoid generalities and talk very specifically about the kinds of things that needed to be done. We also talked – in the plan – about who should accomplish the tasks. So it is not enough just to say, “We should be doing X, Y, and Z,” but also to say who should be doing that, so it is very clear who has the responsibility. We tried to get a sense of relative importance and, ultimately, talk about the sequencing of things because, obviously, there is a set of events and outcomes that need to be done before other things can be done.

We came up with five broad themes that helped us structure the report. First of all, we wanted to show that UMass Amherst could be a destination of choice for students of color and other underrepresented groups. You may know – if you are familiar with the ongoing planning process – that destination of choice is a theme that repeatedly comes up. We wanted to focus on how we could be a destination of choice for students of color and other groups. Secondly, we wanted to focus on how we could improve the campus climate of inclusion. There are an increasing number of data points that help us understand how people perceive this campus. For many students and faculty members, this is not seen as an inclusive of a place as it could be. We wanted to look at that and think about ways we could improve the climate. Third, we wanted to talk about how we could use instruction as a vehicle for helping us become a more diverse and inclusive campus. We wanted, fourth, to look at faculty – faculty recruiting, faculty retention, and ways we could increase the diversity of our faculty. Finally, the last theme we established was looking outside of the University and how we could build bridges to the communities outside of the campus, including the local towns and cities – Holyoke, Springfield, Boston. So we spent some time talking about that as well.

It is very difficult to summarize a 38-page report in a short presentation, so I wanted to just focus on a few notions. One is specifically looking at faculty recruitment, retention, and promotion and where we stood against our peer institutions. These are the percentages of white faculty. As you can see, UMass Amherst is kind of in the middle of this group at 74% white, which means 26% faculty of color. You will also note that, at the top of the list – Stony Brook, Rutgers, and Maryland – are universities that are closer to urban areas than we are. That has proven to be one of the biggest challenges that we have heard in terms of recruiting diverse faculty. We are a rural or semi-rural area, and this is not always the easiest place to recruit faculty to. So we are very cognizant of having to actually overcome that barrier that we face.

We also looked at diversity among tenure-line faculty as well as instructors. You can see here that there is 74% white, non-Hispanic, 12% Asian, only 5% African Americans, and only 4% Hispanic and Latino faculty. So the numbers of any particular group outside of white, non-Hispanics is really quite low and problematic.

Finally – one more piece of data here – we looked at the minority make-up of each of the colleges. You can see that there are huge disparities. Nursing only has 6% minority faculty; CNS 16%. At the other end of the spectrum, we have engineering at 22% and SBS at 26%. So there is a really broad range of differences in terms of the percentages of minority faculty, and you can think of all of the reasons of why this might be. Some of these colleges just traditionally have had great difficulty trying to attract minorities to their disciplines.

So what are our recommendations? First of all, we suggested that we implement exit interviews for every faculty member. This is already in place and already being done. The reason for this is that we don’t really have a good handle on why people leave the University. We have some anecdotal evidence; I think every department knows or thinks they know why a faculty member is leaving. But it turns out that we have no systematic data. That means that we are really unable to get a good sense of the specific reasons for why faculty leave. This is particularly critical in terms of minority faculty, when they leave, because they are not always leaving for better opportunities. They may be
leaving, in fact, because the climate at UMass is not what they would like it to be. So we need to get clear data on that, so we are going to recommend that there be a policy on exit interviews.

Number two... There are also some programs that have proven to be very successful in terms of increasing the numbers of minority faculty. Both CNS and SBS – CNS is beginning to implement a program and SBS had a program in place, for probably the past three or four years, which turned out to be very successful in terms of helping to increase the number of minority faculty that were hired, as well as helping the faculty to be mentored and in terms of career development.

Number three... We want to suggest that we implement campus-wide standards regarding diversity training for all faculty, instructors, and staff. We are not saying that all faculty, instructors, and staff should receive that training. We are saying that, if we are going to do training for our faculty, we need to make sure that it does what it is supposed to do. There is very little data, nationally, looking at what is a good program; what is helpful at the end of the day in terms of diversity training. We want to figure out ways to do it more effectively.

We also – number four – recommend that we expand minority pathways in terms of the some of the research initiatives that are going on in terms of the STEM Diversity Institute, and look at programs at other universities. There is absolutely no need for us to reinvent the wheel here. There are many good programs at other universities, and we have never really systematically looked at those. We are recommending that we do that.

We also really need to look at tenure and promotion processes for minorities and women for potential bias. Probably everyone is familiar with the idea of unconscious biases. We all have them; I think it is well established that we do. When you look at the data, in terms of tenure and promotion, you find that minority and women faculty are not always promoted and tenured at the same rate. When I was in SBS – and SBS is a college where people study gender bias – we found that women were being promoted at a slower rate than men. So I think it is very important that we look at those data.

The next recommendation is to analyze spousal hiring data. We have had a very robust hiring program in place. We don’t really know how well it has worked or how effective it has been, and we need to take a look at that.

Finally, you will have noticed that I have been speaking of only one kind of diversity – racial and ethnic diversity – and didn’t talk about LGBTQ, disability, and first-generation students. There is a huge – a really wide – swath of different kinds of statuses that we need to look at in addition to race and ethnicity. One of the very clear messages we got in the feedback that we have received so far is to include more kinds of diversity when we are putting this report together. So we are going to add that to what we do.

So that, in a nutshell, is a very small slice of our entire report, and what we have been up to. I really would strongly urge you to read the whole report. It is actually quite interesting, as far as reports go. It has a lot of data, and I think it has a number of surprises about diversity; things we just didn’t know about and that we are getting a better handle on. It is on the website, and you can leave your feedback on the website; we will be collecting that. At the same time, right now this is an opportunity to ask questions, provide feedback. We have the broader Strategic Planning Committee here – the chairs of it – so any of us would be happy to respond to any questions you might have or comments.

Dani O’Brien, Vice President of the Graduate Student Senate: I am concerned about the timeline. It sounded like you are doing this round of feedback now. Then you will create a new draft that will go to...

Chair Feldman: ...the larger Strategic Planning Committee.

Vice President O’Brien: Will there be another feedback round, so that students or faculty or others who might not be happy with the way the feedback was implemented -- maybe they will be thrilled; I am not making an assumption -- but will there be another step for that kind of process to happen?

Chair Feldman: Yes, there will be. This is an iterative process. There will be continual opportunity to provide feedback.

Kumble Subbaswamy, Chancellor: I am a physicist. Iterative processes need to be convergent. So if it is not converging at some point, I have to intervene and say, “This is the converged answer.”

T.J. Lakis Mountzjarias, Professor of Chemical Engineering: This is very commendable, what you are doing. I think the first thing you have to implement is a reward system for the departments that can actually do this successfully.
Unless we have a reward system, this is not going to catch fire; so you have to think about how you can reward departments that show progress. Would that be an extra faculty line? Would that be TA lines? I know other universities that, with a reward program, have had tremendous success. Otherwise this discussion can go forever. Then we will have a new administration down the road -- say in ten years -- and still the discussion will be going. This is my tenth year at UMass, and I have not seen anything implemented. I have seen many discussions going, going, going... Why don’t you say, “One, two, three...let’s do it.”

Chair Feldman: First of all, I want to say that there is some inherent goodness and value in increasing diversity. So, in a concrete way, we have had several programs coming out of the Provost’s Office that help provide new positions that can be targeted towards diversity. We have some programs in place that do allow departments to hire targeted kinds of positions.

Bryan Harvey, Co-Chair of the Joint Task Force on Strategic Oversight: At this moment, the Diversity Steering Committee is processing feedback from earlier rounds; that is going to produce another draft which will go out to everybody. Right now, what you are looking at will be amended quite considerably; there are quite a few different things that are going into that. After that is when there will be a final product that will come out of that Committee. It will then go to the larger committee, where we will be able to have the advantage of all of that stuff. So there a couple of different steps to this; I wanted to make it clear that what is currently posted is the original version of the draft that will be replaced by a more refined version, and then we will be able to have that conversation.

Just in terms of the implementation of recommendations... Back in June, when the Committee first met, there were some very early conversations because there were issues that related to that first theme that Chair Feldman talked about – the destination of choice for underrepresented students – and we were about to enter an admissions cycle and didn’t want to lose time having an impact on that. So a couple of early recommendations went right to that. One was the expansion of the Community Scholars Scholarship Program, which is a very effective tool for increasing diversity in terms of both racial and ethnic minorities, and also low income and first generation students; that got expanded right away, and we went out and got approval from the Chancellor to do that. The Capital Campaign has added a new focus on UMass Rising Scholarships to be able to further expand our ability to effect the choices that a tremendous number of very attractive candidates that we have offered admission to to try to get them to accept our offer and come here. The creation of the Assistant Provost for Diversity to try to bring together the pipeline in recruiting and yield enhancement activities on campus. These are all in place now because early recommendations were implemented. There are other recommendations in the pipeline that are being implemented. So it is not, “Wait for the report to come in and see what happens.” These things are going on as we come up with them, and others will be rolling out as they become available.

Ernest May, Secretary of the Faculty Senate: I am not sure if everyone in the room has read the report. There are many metrics and a ton of data in there. Some of us enjoy data; others don’t. On most of the metrics, we come out in the middle of the pack in comparison with our peers. Especially compared to rural universities, we are not doing that badly. It may seem that the numbers are low, and they are. But the fact is that it is a problem for most flagship rural universities like us; we have very similar kinds of problems, which is what I took away from that data, and that is what was shown in the data presented on the slideshow. So, we would like to become more of a leader in this area, as in many areas.

I would like to offer Professor Shabazz or Professor Cohen the opportunity to speak about the directions in which we are going. I know that the CHIP program for faculty hiring, the community college admissions program – these are all great things, and you mentioned a couple of others. With student scholarships, we really need to raise private money for community scholarships in a large number. I remember that I was asked at the central office once what was the one thing we could do to really move this problem along, and the answer is that we need $3 to $5 million in flexible scholarship money. That would be $80 to $100 million in endowment; that is a lot. So this is what happens at places that are doing better than us, such as the private institutions down the street or in other locations. It is a pretty steep hill to climb to actually move the needle quickly in this area. But I would like to offer the opportunity for Professor Shabazz or Professor Cohen to comment if they would like to.

Nancy Cohen, Co-Chair of the Joint Task Force on Strategic Oversight: I would like to briefly say that there is a lot in the report, and I think the report outlines five themes. Deputy Chancellor Feldman really focused on one of the themes, but there is really a lot more in that report and a lot more potential action. I am not sure that any one of these actions is going to move the needle altogether. I think all of them need to happen to have an inclusive environment where both students and faculty want to come and stay. I think all of those five points and areas are going to be really important.
Amilcar Shabazz, Co-Chair of the Joint Task Force on Strategic Oversight: Thank you for the nomination and support of the Chancellor, all of you here, and the University community. I am a Fellow of the American Council on Education this year. This spring semester, I started my placement at New York University. I am learning a great many things as a part of this experience.

In relation to the discussion and questions here, I think, strategically, the greater emphasis I would recommend in our plan right now is “How do we work harder to produce better outcomes for the 23% we already recruit here?” Make them feel really “Go UMass,” and going out of here being great ambassadors for saying, “This is a wonderful place.” Yes, it's rural and most people of color are in big cities. But yes, you can come here, get a fantastic education, and a fantastic launch into your future lives. I think we can prioritize that more – working on the inclusion side of this, working on the community engagement side of our work – and, of course, continuing the recruitment efforts. But work harder on getting right what we do here in the time that we do recruit our diverse students here, and give them a great experience. That will help to get a greater buzz out there and work to make a lot of recruitment efforts more successful.

B. PRESENTATION BY JAMES SHEEHAN, VICE CHANCELLOR FOR ADMINISTRATION AND FINANCE

“NEW VIRTUAL BOOKSTORE”

[The presentation by James Sheehan, Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance, was postponed.]

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Principal Administrative Officers

Enku Gelaye, Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs and Campus Life and Dean of Students: Just a couple of things that are going on in Student Affairs and Campus Life that I would like you to know about broadly, and many of you are already involved. One is the Student Experience Master Plan process. We are working with campus partners, but, very specifically, Academic Affairs, to look at how students are living their lives on campus and the use of space on campus. We are going through a pretty rigorous process of sitting with students, sitting with staff, sitting with faculty, and getting feedback and ongoing input about what we can do better in that area. There is a web page dedicated to it. We are doing many presentations across campus and inviting people to the Campus Center for a discussion. I welcome you to participate in the process as well.

Along the line of planning and looking at our existing programs, we are also, this semester, going through a very extensive review of Residence Education/Residential Life. I think you call it AQADs; we call it program reviews in Student Affairs. We are having Student Affairs professionals who do similarly-scaled Resident Life work on other campuses, including Michigan State, come in and really look at our system – everything from how we train our RAs to how we hire to some of the academic relationships, including our Faculty and Residence Program. It will be an extensive report that includes a very extensive internal self-review. When that is done, I am happy to share it. It will be the foundation of looking forward and developing newer programs in our area.

I also want to acknowledge the death of a student over the weekend. Matthew Schiek, who was going to be graduating in the spring in Engineering, had a very sad and tragic accident in Belchertown. I hope you will join me in extending condolences to his friends. He was very deeply connected with this community and his family.

John McCarthy, Vice Provost of Graduate Education and Dean of the Graduate School: NRT is the NSF training grant program that replaced IGERT. There is a limited submission deadline of Monday for the NRT proposals the campus can make. I put in three. One of them is training and applications in Data Science, one of them is any theme, and one of them is specifically about Innovations in Graduate Education. All three of them place a lot of focus on professional development for graduate students, and preparation for the full range of careers that STEM graduate students might be eligible for. If any of you or your faculty are thinking about a proposal, you should get in touch with us, or the Office of Professional Development can help them with the requirements.

2. The Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Ernest May, Secretary of the Faculty Senate: I would like to remind everybody that there is a Presidential search underway. A search committee has been set up. Two Senators are on the search committee – Professor A Yemisi Jimoh is on the committee – as well as Dean Mark Fuller, plus our Student Trustee, Sarah Freudson, alumni David Fubini and Philip Johnston, and former Chancellor Marcellete Williams. Western Massachusetts is also represented by Mark Keroack, CEO of Bay State Health, Roger Crandall, CEO of Massachusetts Mutual, and Ed Collins, a Trustee who represents the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.
Another item... This is a brief follow-up to the presentation by Juanita Holler at the January 29 meeting. She made a very detailed presentation of the many building projects that are or are about to begin rising out of the ground. This same presentation was discussed at the Program and Budget Council meeting yesterday. Following are some interesting additional points. After the completion of these projects, we will have reduced our deferred maintenance down to about $1.3 billion; that is good news, but it is also a challenge. That is the investment it would take to bring everyone on campus into good to excellent space and facilities.

Another piece that is a little more disturbing is that, for every new project completed out of the Capital Budget, there is a mandatory set-aside of 5% to address O&M and long-term depreciation, plus debt service that adds another 5% (approximately), unless the project is state-funded. Roughly 8% to 10% of the building cost must be squeezed out of the Campus Operating Budget in order to keep the building going. So every new $100 million building that is built represents a draw in the range of $8 to $12 million on the Operating Budget. This is certainly a long-term problem, but we have no alternative if we want to stay in business, let alone lead. Witness the predicament of the MBTA. The best solution, of course, would be for more and more of the State Capital Budget, including deferred maintenance, to be state funded. In the past decades, we have competed with “The Big Dig.” In the future, I suspect that we will be competing with the MBTA. At present, however, it is gratifying to know with the current building boom, the state has increased its level of support substantially, reducing somewhat the burden that would otherwise translate directly into increased student debt.

5. The Representative of the Massachusetts Society of Professors

David Gross, Representative of the Massachusetts Society of Professors: We had an MSP Board meeting on Wednesday. There are two items that are worth mentioning. One has to do with the Iranian student policy. The Board voted unanimously – 14 to 0 – to strongly encourage the administration to reverse the policy. The MSP applauds the administration for reversing the policy.

The second item has to do with our contract. For those of you who are subject to the MSP contract, you might know that, about three months ago, we had a signed and ratified contract. All of that contract is in force except for the financial parameters; there are raises that are involved. The President’s Office claims that there has not yet been money appropriated by the legislature to fund those raises. The UMass unions disagree with that; there is a letter from the Governor to the legislature saying that the House I budget, which included money for the University, included money for those contract bargain raises. So we are in disagreement with the President’s Office; we think we should be paid. The President's Office says that there is not yet money in the budget. You should look in your e-mail Inbox in the next few days. There will be an all-union meeting called to discuss this. Further, at a later date, probably not too far in the future, there will probably be some actions we suggest might be useful to help loosen the budget.

6. The President of the Graduate Student Senate

Dani O’Brien, Vice President of the Graduate Student Senate: The GSS would like to thank all of the faculty members who worked to speak against the policy banning Iranian nationals. We think that the reversal speaks to the impact it has when faculty, graduate students, and undergraduate students organize collectively. We are also thankful to the administration that the policy was reversed. But we do feel that there is still more work to be done and look forward to working with the Faculty Senate on this work. Questions exist about the ways that urgency is used to undercut or undermine the value of shared governance. The impact and consequences this policy has had on the emotional well-being and feelings of safety for Iranian nationals already here is huge, and not just for Iranian nationals, but also for Iranian American students who are here – they are hurting despite the reversal of the policy. There are questions regarding how the new policy – the updated version – what that will mean in action. Given these issues, we have recommended to the Chancellor, in the form of a letter, that there be an advisory task force comprised of graduate students, undergraduate students, faculty, staff, and University counsel, whose charge it is to evaluate the updated policy and offer recommendations.

[An extra announcement was made by the Nominating Committee for the Secretary of the Faculty Senate: Elena Suet-Ying Chiu, Marilyn Billings, David Gross]
D. **QUESTION PERIOD**

The following people posed and answered questions regarding the University of Massachusetts Amherst’s policy regarding Iranian students:

Paul Siqueira, Professor of Electrical and Computer Engineering  
Senator Marinos Vouvakis  
Mohsen Jalali, Graduate Student  
Emery Berger, Professor of Computer Science  
Amir Mikhchi, Alumnus  
Senator Max Page  
Richard Bogartz, Presiding Officer of the Faculty Senate  
Senator MJ Peterson  
Senator Amilcar Shabazz, Faculty Advisor for Diversity and Excellence  
Senator Marinos Vouvakis  
Michael Malone, Vice Chancellor for Research and Engagement  
Kumble Subbaswamy, Chancellor  
Ernest May, Secretary of the Faculty Senate  
Emery Berger, Professor of Computer Science  
Soroush Farzinmoghadam, Graduate Student  
Michael Havlin, Graduate Student  
Joseph Bardin, Assistant Professor of Electrical and Computer Engineering  
Nariman Mostafavi, Graduate Student  
Kumble Subbaswamy, Chancellor  
T.J. Lakis Mountziaris, Professor of Chemical Engineering  
John McCarthy, Vice Provost for Graduate Education and Dean of the Graduate School

[Please refer to the 745th Faculty Senate Meeting ECHO recording for details regarding these conversations.]

E. **NEW COURSES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>CREDITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANIMLSCI 232</td>
<td>“Belted Galloway Management I”</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANIMLSCI 234</td>
<td>“Poultry Management I”</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANIMLSCI 252</td>
<td>“Belted Galloway Management II”</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANIMLSCI 254</td>
<td>“Poultry Management II”</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 385</td>
<td>“Media &amp; Motion Graphics”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENVIRDES 125</td>
<td>“Global Cities and Global Issues”</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICROBIO 265</td>
<td>“Introduction to Microbiology Laboratory”</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIOL 288</td>
<td>“Introduction to Latin American Societies”</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIOL 381</td>
<td>“Race, Gender and Work”</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPANISH 474</td>
<td>“Syntactic Structure of Spanish”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the courses ANIMLSCI 232, 234, 252 and 254, ART 385, ENVIRDES 125, MICROBIO 265, SOCIOL 288 and 381 and SPANISH 474, as recommended by the Academic Matters Council.

The motion was adopted.

F. **NEW BUSINESS**


MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Establishment of a College of Information and Computer Sciences, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 15-025.

The motion was adopted.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate adopt the amended 2014-2015 Academic Calendar, as presented in Sen. Doc. 21-15 No. 15-026.

The motion was adopted as amended.

CONSENT AGENDA (ITEMS 3-6)

[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 Revision of the Requirements for the Minor in Hebrew, the Revision to the Major in Nutrition, the Revision to add Biology 151 to the Requirements of the Chemistry Major, and the Application of Courses towards Multiple Credentials, as presented in Sen. Doc. Nos. 15-027, 15-028, 15-029 and 15-030.

The motion was adopted.

G. OLD BUSINESS

Amendment to the Special Report of the Nominating Committee concerning Nominations to Faculty Senate Councils and Committees, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 15-021B with Motion No. 15-15.

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

The motion was adopted as amended.

The 745th Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate stood adjourned at 5:18 p.m. on February 19, 2015.