Presiding Officer Richard Bogartz called the 746th Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate to order on March 12, 2015 at 3:30 p.m. in Herter Hall, Room 227, and began by reading Sonnet XVII by Pablo Neruda:

I do not love you as if you were salt-rose, or topaz,  
or the arrow of carnations the fire shoots off.  
I love you as certain dark things are to be loved,  
in secret, between the shadow and the soul.

I love you as the plant that never blooms  
but carries in itself the light of hidden flowers;  
thanks to your love a certain solid fragrance,  
risen from the earth, lives darkly in my body.

I love you without knowing how, or when, or from where.  
I love you straightforwardly, without complexities or pride;  
so I love you because I know no other way  
than this: where I does not exist, nor you,  
so close that your hand on my chest is my hand,  
so close that your eyes close as I fall asleep.

A. PRESENTATION FROM THE JOINT TASK FORCE ON RESOURCE ALLOCATION (JTFRA)  
ELIZABETH CHILTON AND TIMOTHY ANDERSON, CO-CHAIRS  
(QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION TO FOLLOW)

The Joint Task Force on Resource Allocation (JTFRA) presented the following PowerPoint slideshow:  

[Please refer to the 746th Faculty Senate Meeting ECHO for further details on the JTFRA presentation.]

Senator Marinos Vouvakis: The main change in the report is that we create this central pool; this strategic pool. Somewhere in the report, it says, “We recommend that the majority of state appropriations be held centrally.” So my question is, is that a specific percentage of the state appropriation? It was not clear in the report from my reading. Also, would that percentage stay the same year after year?

Elizabeth Chilton, Co-Chair of the Joint Task Force on Resource Allocation: First of all, in terms of the proportion, I believe it is about 85%. So 15% will be used to provide that sponsored research subsidy, and then the raise increases and the 3%, so maybe it is a little less than 85% – say 80%. It won’t necessarily be the exact dollar amount because there may be state-negotiated raises that go up and down. But it will be approximately 80%. It isn’t exactly all strategic pool because, if you remember our model from last year, when you got to the bottom lines, some of the unit margins were positive and some were negative. We needed to have this leveling of unit margins. So what this does is it actually takes that part of the state appropriation out of it. You will notice that, now, all of the colleges have negative unit margins, and then that is where that funding goes back in. So a large proportion – almost all of the state appropriation that is held centrally – is used to level the unit margins in the version that we are working on.

Senator Vouvakis: You are telling me that a central funding allocation – that is the bold line towards the end – would be 85% of the state appropriations, roughly speaking. Is that correct?

Co-Chair Chilton: I believe so.

Senator Vouvakis: The report, especially when it comes to A&S expenditures, says expenditures in academic units; I am not sure what that is. I am sure for that different A&S items, it should be something different – certain cases should be students, research dollars, and allocations for certain other things. If we can put the report up there, it will be very clear.

Co-Chair Chilton: I think you are talking about the A&S allocation and expenses in academic units. I believe that refers to academic departments.
Andrew Mangels, Associate Vice Chancellor for Finance and Budget Director: I think what you are referring to is administration and support allocations. The first line is academic affairs?

Senator Vouvakis: For every single A&S unit – on one side of Table 1, you have the actual A&S unit; on the other side of the table, you have how the budget item – the budget line was calculated.

Co-Chair Chilton: It's expenditures in academic units. That is what he is asking about; that is expenditures in academic departments.

Associate Vice Chancellor Mangels: So what expenditures in academic areas are, pretty much, the existing expenditures that all of the colleges have for their own faculty and for their own budgets that they manage today. That is, the expenditures that are attributed to the academic units. The A&S costs are the costs that would be in administration and finance for accounting, human resources, facilities, and so on, that are allocated to the academic units.

Senator Vouvakis: But my question is, for those A&S expenditures, is this like a fee for service? Or is it that we find out all the expenditures that – for example – accounting has, and then we find what proportion? So the proportionality between colleges comes from their expenditures. Is that the case?

Associate Vice Chancellor Mangels: Yes.

Senator Vouvakis: That doesn’t make sense to me; absolutely doesn’t make sense. It should be a fee for service. We should know how much we pay because, the way it is right now, it doesn’t depend on what I do, as the College of Engineering. It depends on what everybody else does.

Julie Buehler, Vice Chancellor for Information Services and Strategy and Chief Information Officer: I just want to comment for IT because, what you are seeing right here is the allocation portion of the budget. So there is a portion of the budget that comes in to pay for, what we call the core services that everyone gets. Then, there is also an opportunity to do fee for services for things like people who want special programming done just for their particular school. So it is not as cut and dry as what I think you are thinking.

I am looking forward to getting to a new place where we can better describe, as an administrative unit, what you are getting for the allocation. So there should be write-ups of the services that you are getting, and we should be able to talk about how much these things cost. We are working to do that now across some of the units. It takes time, and it takes cost accounting resources to be able to make that happen. So, in the FAQ, you will actually see that.

But I did want to point out that what you see here is a piece of it; there is an allocation piece. But for some of the units, there is a direct bill piece. So, hopefully, you feel a little better.

Senator Vouvakis: The main A&S unit I am concerned about is the one that costs the most, and that is the campus-wide Amherst. That is, if I am reading this correctly, bonds and things of that sort. Right there, it seems to me that we are doing just square footage, for example. But certain buildings are much newer than certain other units. So we treat all buildings in exactly the same way even though, for example, Goessmann Lab might cost us nothing, while the Life Sciences Building costs us considerably more. So why do I have to stay in Goessmann if I pay the same per square foot as the…

Co-Chair Chilton: So I will answer that particular one because we spent a lot of time talking about that exact thing. We flagged that, you will notice, in the report. Space is something, in particular, that we think needs to be examined in more detail. We also have to think about, what is it that we would be trying to accomplish by differentiating space. For example, if we say college A has nice, beautiful, new, expensive space, and college B has not very new and not very nice and not very expensive space, then if we charge college A more, their unit will be more negative and they will need more of a unit leveling if we are going to hold everyone whole on day one. So, what is it that we are actually accomplishing by doing that?

So right now, what we are saying is that, as a starting point, we are using square footage. But we understand that we need to take a closer look at how we make decisions about space allocations, how we make decisions about investing in space. We didn’t have good data right now, in order to do that. We also felt that we weren’t, as a Task Force, quite sure what we would do with that. But we acknowledge that.

Senator Vouvakis: By the way, Physical Plant has data about that. Right now, they have levels – every building – they have building categories, so we can find out precisely where each building is, and use the same categories.
Co-Chair Chilton: Yes. So we did flag that as something that we absolutely want to follow up on.

Bryan Harvey, Associate Chancellor and Chief Planning Officer: I will give you a brief example... Currently, the English Department, the Art History Department, and Women, Gender, Sexuality Studies are in Bartlett. Bartlett is on the lower end of our quality of space. They are about to move into a brand new building because Bartlett has to close. Those departments aren’t doing anything differently, and yet if we tried to look at the actual costs of their space, we would quadruple or quintuple the charge to them as a part of that transition.

So I think, in general, this is the core part of the discussion. These drivers are intended to be approximations of reality. Some of them – that Library thing – you could do that with swipes of students’ cards. If certain students only use the Library a certain amount, we could charge that department less, and so forth. But for the purpose of looking at this, tests especially, this is an attempt to get to an approximation of certain kinds of distributions of the costs. This wasn’t intended to be a perfect representation of reality, but a reasonable way of representing the differences in the kinds of charges that accrue to different units.

Senator Max Page: I just want to say something very briefly and then focus on a couple of issues I would like to get your reactions about. So we had a really intense Faculty Senate meeting a few weeks ago, in which people were quite angry. In fact, I was the Clintonian middle of this, which is not usually where I find myself. Good people came up with a policy that turned out to be awful. We admitted it and revoked it, and that is good. Similarly, people on this Task Force are great – they’re all good people who have been working incredibly hard. That doesn’t mean that we can’t still find fundamental real problems with it. I feel like, at times, we say that, if there is a process and good effort, we can’t critique the results. There are some, so I would like to just highlight a couple that I think are really problematic about the model as it is so far.

First, I noticed in the model all of the academic units are in the black until we add in the administrative and support, which is $270 million. Suddenly, the academic units are in the red; they are in debt and need to be rescued. I wonder why the focus isn’t more on how much administration we can actually afford, given the amount of money we have at the University. Instead, the whole model is based on looking at how the colleges bring in money, whether they are doing well enough to come equal, as opposed to the focus on administration.

The formula is really misleading about administrative and support because all of the costs of administration – the Chancellor’s Office, University Relations, the whole list; you will notice a big empty box to the right that is Athletics, Dining, etc. – do not get allocated the costs of A&S, as far as I understand it, which means the colleges all have to bear the brunt – that is, the support – of paying off one third of the Chancellor’s Office if you are HFA, or one fifth if you are this other college. That doesn’t seem right because, ultimately, this is about a model of how much money we have and how much we can spend. Later on down the line, it is going to be, like, “Colleges, you need to do better at making back some of the money,” when, in fact, it’s not being allocated fully to the full range of units at the University. I mean, Athletics – I know particularly well, I spend a long time on at least one sport – there are tons of costs for Athletics that are not in the Athletic budget. They are in University Relations; they are in the Chancellor’s Office. Those are not in here at all. If we are going to start from transparent beginning, we need to have a model that really reflects the true costs and expenditures.

Co-Chair Chilton: I will respond to the first part of the question and, maybe, others can talk more about how we have put the auxiliaries and Athletics into the table. The first part, about the emphasis being on the primary units... We have people on JTFRA who represent faculty, and folks who represent Julie Buehler, for example. We have some deans – and we tried very hard to make a balance about saying that we need to have transparency in both. We need to have a starting point. You know, this is a very short, flat table, and I hope that, if we move forward and we get to the point where we look at a strategic budget process, more details would be in these categories, and more details within the colleges’ budgets will be out there for discussion. That would be the point of having that discussion – to provide a transparent way to talk about the real costs; to look at where we could bring those costs down. As Julie Buehler has even said at a couple of these meetings, are there things that we can’t do that we need to look outside for and maybe outsource if there is something that we can do that would be much more expensive than if we brought some outside expertise – to begin to have these conversations. I think we want to have more of a collaborative sense of the A&S units and the schools and colleges collaborating on looking at what our real costs are, how to keep them down, how are we making strategic priorities. We see this as a starting point. This doesn’t determine the decisions that happen; it lays on the table data in a way that, I think, can inform decision-making.

Associate Vice Chancellor Mangels: Just as a point of clarification... The auxiliaries – auxiliary fee-based accounts – already have overhead that they already are paying. They pay campus overhead currently, so they are allocated a formulaic allocation of overhead. So, for instance, Dining, Housing – what we did is we left them alone, so to speak.
We presented them, but their direct costs already include debt service, utilities – all of the things they are already paying for. So I do not want people to think they are not paying overhead; they are paying overhead.

**Senator Page:** If I may, there are many parts of University Relations, Chancellor’s Office, and so on that are some amount of time and energy and, therefore, money is spent in those units. That should not be allocated to the colleges. The point is that, if we are going to have that collaborative discussion, we need to have a true starting point that seems actually right and fair.

**Associate Vice Chancellor Mangels:** So the auxiliaries already pay an administrative overhead cost that goes to cover a lot of those costs that you just referred to.

**Associate Chancellor Harvey:** We need to be very clear that Senator Page’s point is, I believe, correct and it is, in fact, covered. The auxiliaries, just as they do today in the presentation shown here, pay for University Relations, the Police Department – all of the other things. It is all charged to them through a fairly elaborate set of chargebacks that are more precise than the allocation drivers that are in this model for other things.

**Senator Maria Tymoczko:** I think one correction before I make my main point. It is my understanding that the English department is not just about to move, but probably we are a couple of years out.

I am quite concerned about the Library expenses. If we are going to have any kind of transparency, we can’t do it simply by FTEs across the fields. We have been using a system that is not too different from that, and it’s killing Humanities’ purchases because a Humanities journal subscription, for example, might typically cost $250 while something in the STEM fields might be running $25,000. So we really need to have the breakdown by fields and then some kind of FTE or something. Otherwise, we are going to have a continued degrading of some fields, benefitting other fields, and basically supporting those other fields by unfair charges.

**Dan Clawson, Professor of Sociology:** Any budget is, among other things, an expression of a University’s values and what matters. You can talk about the values all you want, but when you get to the budget, you get reality and what actually matters. In this budgeting system, in some sorts of things, there is every attempt to capture the costs and what goes to the unit; in others, there is much less attempt to do so. Some things are put on a dollar basis, and some things are not. So that, for example, if we are going to talk about where our mission as a public university shows up in the budget, you get reality – the costs and what goes to the unit; in others, there is much less attempt to do so. Some things are put on a dollar basis, and some things are not. That’s what the budget effectively says. Every way of seeing is a way of not seeing, and a magician does wonderful things with one hand so they can pick your pocket or pull a rabbit out of a hat or whatever, and that’s what this budget system does.

So I have two questions. One is, have you thought about the ways that we, as faculty, are going to work very hard to game the system, and have we thought about the ways that the administration is going to change the rules on us repeatedly if we figure out ways to operate within their system to get more benefits than we are supposed to get because we are out of line with what’s supposed to happen? Because that happens every time – the more emphasis there is on the budget, the more effort there is to game the system. That’s Campbell’s Law, if you want to refer to economics and so on. The second thing is, what is the reason to believe that this budget system will actually stay in place long enough to make a difference? Those of us who have been here for a while have been through repeated chancellors who bring in strategic plans and new budgeting systems. It takes a couple of years to bring them in. It takes a couple of years after they are brought in to actually have any bite. By about that time, the chancellor moves on. The good news would be, if this thing didn’t last long enough, all that had happened is we wasted our time; the bad news would be is we all spent a lot of time and effort trying to figure out how to game the system. The administration then changes the formulas in various ways to keep us from benefitting from what the rules were as initially specified because they know where we really should be and they will change the rules until we get back to where we really should be.

**Co-Chair Chilton:** I guess I would say that everything that you just said certainly goes against the charge that the Task Force was given. We have all been working since last November under the understanding that we were trying to make recommendations to the campus for a way to have a more transparent budgeting process. I was chair for six years, and I could never tell you why I had the general operating budget that I did; I never knew what others had; it was never responsive to growth of faculty or classes. The Task Force was charged with coming up with recommendations. If the campus decides – if the Chancellor decides – that this is not the way forward, then so be it. Our charge is to make recommendations after a very long period of study. I also think that the notion that there could be gaming of the system also is not borne by both the work of this Task Force and our conversations with the Chancellor. The Chancellor said that, if the point of this was to simply make a spreadsheet, and then the Chancellor or Provost just makes the decisions however they want to make them, there would be no point in doing this because
that is essentially the kind of budget system we have now. What would be the point of having gone through all of this work – with the work of the Budget Office, with the work with the deans – in order to try to make this more transparent?

Professor Clawson: The only one of these that I was significantly involved in was the one that Chancellor Lombardi introduced. It seemed really good. He insisted that it was absolutely going to hold forever. It held for about two years, and then it disappeared.

Ernest May, Secretary of the Faculty Senate: A couple of these things would involve a culture change. I think that would be a more lasting result.

Senator Frank Hugus: I am a literature person. I read books; I don’t do numbers very well. I need to have some clarification of the line that says, “Tuition and Fee Allocations.” Is my understanding correct that these allocations are based on numbers of majors?

Co-Chair Chilton: So the “Tuition and Fee Allocations”...75% of that is based on student credit hours in this iteration that we are looking at, and 25% is based on majors.

Senator Hugus: So, theoretically, the more majors one has, the greater the allocation.

Co-Chair Chilton: And the more student credit hours one has, the greater the allocation. But then the expenses that go with that are also greater.

Senator Hugus: I raise this question because I was informed that, for students who are studying abroad, they are not credited as a departmental major even though they are majors. So, in essence, we, as the largest department of LLC, have a lot of students studying abroad, as does the entire college. I am not sure how well informed I am on that.

Associate Chancellor Harvey: We went back and forth on that... It is a little complicated because there are both exchange and study-abroad students. When students leave here to go on exchange, other students come here, so that averages out pretty well.

Senator Hugus: Not really, because the students who come here do not necessarily enroll in the same courses or the same college that the leaving students do. That is the problem.

Associate Chancellor Harvey: Over time, in the college, it, by definition, comes up pretty close. So, with the question of study abroad, when the student is no longer studying here, and the student is doing something else – whether they are stopping out for a semester to work or going to another institution, they are not here – in that sense, they are bringing no revenue to us. One wouldn’t want to divert revenue from some other department to go to the department where they are no longer present. In that sense, over time, if there are 50 LLC majors who are studying abroad – and that is a fairly stable number – then the budget that gets created at the beginning of this for LLC will reflect whatever that level of activity is and there will be no difference to the department.

Senator Hugus: There are a number of students who study abroad without being on exchange.

Associate Chancellor Harvey: If they are not here and they are not paying us, there is nothing to distribute.

Anthony Butterfield, Member of the Joint Task Force on Resource Allocation: Let me just say that these are all great questions and this is a wonderful discussion, which we would not even be having if the Chancellor had not said – 2½ or so years ago – “Let’s explore a different way of doing budgeting on this campus. Let’s explore a more intentional way of doing budgeting on this campus because the current system, in my opinion, is basically, ‘What did you get last year? Let’s tweak it up or down and not even think about where resources are coming from and where our costs are going’.”

JTFRA has moved away from a purely RCM system, but we are trying to make what we have a more intentional way of doing budgets on this campus. We haven’t yet decided to implement anything; there has been no vote. What we are suggesting is that we continue to test this particular model, which has all sorts of issues and problems; some can be resolved, and some probably will not be resolved. But how well is it going to work compared to what we have now, or what we have had for quite a number of years going back before Chancellor Lombardi? To me – and I’ve been a dean and I’ve been a department head – it has basically been, “Here is the budget; work with it.” Now we have an opportunity to have some influence; some thinking, some planning on how we develop and use resources. Let’s continue to test this; that is what we are recommending. We are not saying, “Goodbye, current budget system; hello
this budget system.” We are saying, “Let’s continue to test and see if some of these problems can be resolved.” If they are not, it could be the case that, when the decision moment comes, we will say, “To heck with it. It ain’t worth it. Let’s just keep doing what we are doing.”

Presiding Officer Bogartz: It has been my observation that the closer, more involved you are with this process of developing a budget allocation model that is different from what we have, the more you are around the Chancellor and people who are involved in doing this, and the more enthusiastic and trusting you are. The further you are away from it, the less you actually know what people are doing and how much the faculty is actually participating in this, the more you revert to old conceptions of what is going on, the more you think of things in terms of the way things previously happened, and the more you think in terms of gaming the system. Now it may all turn out that way anyway; I strongly doubt it though. I am an optimist.

[A motion to suspend the Rules of Order for the purpose of considering the following motion was adopted:]

WHEREAS following uploading to YouTube of racist chanting by members of the Sigma Alpha Epsilon fraternity, the University of Oklahoma virtually immediately expelled two students, severed its ties with the organization, and required the fraternity members to leave the fraternity house; and

WHEREAS the national organization of Sigma Alpha Epsilon also closed the Oklahoma chapter in response to these racist actions;

BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate of the University of Massachusetts Amherst commends the University of Oklahoma, its President, David Boren, and the national organization of Sigma Alpha Epsilon for these speedy and appropriate responses to racist activities that, as President Boren put it, “had created a hostile learning environment for others.”

Senator Susan K. Whitbourne: I think this is fine. I feel that there are some things that we obviously do not know. The only question mark I had is about the role of the President and commending the President. I feel like we do not know enough, internally, about what his role was prior to this; we know what it is afterwards. Personally, I feel that the fraternity – the national fraternity – did the right thing. The University did the right thing. I feel that we can communicate and even keep in the quote, and just leave that part out until we know more information. The story is only a few days old.

Senator A. Yemisi Jimoh: I am uncomfortable with the idea that we give the University President less consideration than we give the fraternity itself – it has been around since before the Civil War, and has had students on a variety of campuses, and should have far deeper knowledge about what’s going on in its chapters than the University President.

Presiding Officer Bogartz: For your information, the Southern Poverty Leadership Council and the Black Caucus of the State of Oklahoma have both commended the President in the same manner, so we are not way out in front here.

The motion was adopted.

B. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Principal Administrative Officers

Julie Buehler, Vice Chancellor for Information Services and Strategy and Chief Information Officer: Just a couple of things today. I want to make sure you all received the notice that we had a pretty severe info security incident this weekend. We had people working on it all weekend. I really want you to know that you need to change your passwords. I have had a lot of people come up to me and say, “Is this real, or is this phishing?” I can assure you that it’s real. A real quick way for you to know if something is phishing or not is when we direct you to go to the UMass page yourself and go through the table links; that means it is coming from us. I can’t say a lot because there is an investigation pending, and it is a very serious thing. I do want you to go back and talk with the people in your units and make sure they change their passwords, because that will protect them from this particular threat. Unfortunately, we did have to turn off some accounts, and we had to do that pretty rapidly over the weekend. We did our best to share communications with those individuals. But every so often, we have to take that step. I hope you will bear with us as we try to protect the campus and your data as well.

We are continuing UMass IT strategic planning. Again, if you want to be involved and are not yet involved, e-mail me; I cannot say that enough times. We cannot ask more for folks to be more involved, so please do that.
We are meeting with the undergraduate students to talk about networking and how we are going to address some of the concerns they are raising with us. That meeting is on Monday, March 23.

I also wanted to mention that we have a group of Isenberg students working with us to look at project management because we think they can help advise.

Elizabeth Chilton, Associate Vice Chancellor for Research and Engagement for Michael Malone, Vice Chancellor for Research and Engagement: Just building on what Vice Chancellor Buehler said, the Office of Research and Engagement is working with IT on the strategic plans, specifically focusing on the research piece of this. Vice Chancellor Malone and Prashant Shenoy are chairing the IT Strategic Planning Research Committee. I wanted to let you know that we have about 25 faculty and staff working together on three areas of supporting research through IT: (1) Information and Data Management; Jay Schafer is chairing that subcommittee; (2) High Performance Computing; Li-Jun Ma and Michael Zink are co-chairing that subcommittee; and (3) Electronic Research Administration; I am chairing that subcommittee. I wanted to let you know that this is going on. If you have any interest in being a part of working on that, we are always looking for more hands. There should be reports coming out by the end of the spring.

2. The Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Ernest May, Secretary of the Faculty Senate: The Faculty Senate meeting on April 30 will take place in the Integrative Learning Center, Room S331, because that Thursday has become a Monday in the schedule that we adopted at the last meeting. The Senate will, at that meeting, deliberate a motion relating to the JTFRA Report that was discussed today. Unless I hear otherwise from the Rules Committee, I think it is probably a good idea to allow a little more time at the April 9 meeting for further discussion of this report if people have further questions.

An additional Faculty Senate meeting is now scheduled for May 7; it will be here, in Herter Hall, Room 227. The Senate will receive a summary report about the latest progress in the world of strategic planning from JTFSO. There may also be a report on concrete diversity initiatives that will result from the diversity report.

Last Tuesday, Robert Manning, Chair of the Presidential Search Committee, met with members of the campus community. Most of the points of that meeting were outlined in my Secretary’s Notes of March 10, and the meeting was reported in local newspapers. Chair Manning seemed receptive, if unenthusiastically receptive, to the notion that the rest of the system needs the flagship to lead the way. Chair Manning also noted that he had given $10 million to UMass Lowell and that, from his personal point of view, he would be delighted to have Marty Meehan stay there to protect his investment. Chair Manning also mentioned that he is now the Executive Chairman of MFS, a large mutual fund company, but no longer the CEO, so he will have more time to devote to charitable causes, such as UMass.

The Trustees are aiming to identify a new President by June 1, which is a very aggressive timetable.

Our councils are being very efficient. In fact, they have been getting the curricular administrative business of the Senate accomplished in a timely manner. Most recently, a proposal to create a School of Public Policy has been sent out for review by five councils. Many people are hoping that can come in by the last meeting of the year, which will be May 7, but five councils have to vet it.

3. The Chair of the Rules Committee

MJ Peterson, Chair of the Rules Committee: I will take this opportunity to say that I rather doubt that the Rules Committee is going to have difficulty about allocating time on April 9 to additional discussion of the JTFRA report.

4. The Representative of the Massachusetts Society of Professors

Randall Phillis, Representative of the Massachusetts Society of Professors: For those of you who look at your paycheck, you should know that you have not received a raise yet this year. The contracts ended on June 30, 2014. We negotiated a new contract that we agreed with the administration on, but they refuse to pay, disputing that the increased allocation from the state of $38 million was insufficient to pay the collective bargaining costs. We are disputing back, and we are still not being paid.

Yesterday, the House of Representatives approved legislation submitted by Governor Baker, stating that sufficient funds have been allocated to pay the collective bargaining costs. They should be in full force and effect, including all financial parameters. It is now moving to the Senate, so I encourage you to contact your senator, who happens to be
in a position of power in the Senate (most likely), and to strongly advocate that this legislation be passed. Then we have to work on the President’s Office because almost identical legislation was passed for UMass Lowell’s faculty contract back in October, and they haven’t been paid yet. So the President’s Office actually has to pay, and we are filing suit.

C. QUESTION PERIOD

Senator Max Page: Just a procedural question… Presiding Officer Bogartz, I love the music, I love the poetry, but I do not think, as a Presiding Officer, you are supposed to give opinions. Part of the reason is that you are in control of the stance. You just said some things that I would have disagreed with, but there was no place to have a conversation. I am just wondering what the rules are. Maybe I don’t know the rules or traditions of the Senate. This has happened a few times.

Presiding Officer Bogartz: It would be appropriate for you to raise a Point of Order. I think – I could be wrong – that if there is a motion on the floor, it is inappropriate for me to take a position; I am supposed to appear neutral. However, whatever may be going on in my heart of hearts, I am supposed to embody neutrality. But if there isn’t such, I don’t think there is any rule that prevents me from talking as I am right now.

Senator Max Page: In other organizations I have been involved with, the person who is running does not offer their opinions on a particular issue. I will ask the Rules Committee to examine the rules.

Presiding Officer Bogartz: If you will point it out to me, I will be happy to abide by it.

Senator Bruce Baird: This is for the IT people. I get e-mails from time to time, and they are from john@oit or jim@oit. I always get very concerned because I am positive that I am getting a spam e-mail. I want to know if it is possible for official e-mails from OIT to look like official e-mails from OIT.

Julie Buehler, Vice Chancellor for Information Services and Strategy and Chief Information Officer: The quick answer is, “Absolutely.” We are working on that right now. We are trying to go to a first.last@umass.edu. We are redoing our whole way of interacting, based on feedback we have been hearing. You will see new phone numbers, new ways our signatures are signed…trying to make it clearer when we are reaching out to you.

Senator Steven D. Brewer: This is an issue that I have raised a number of times with the campus. E-mails that look a particular way will not necessarily tell you whether or not they are official. If you have an e-mail that looks a particular way, it means it is styled with html. If you are looking at the html styling, you often cannot see what the actual underlying characteristics are that will allow you to determine whether the e-mail is valid or not. Really, the e-mail provides enough information that you can go in and inspect which servers it actually came from and progressed through, if you inspect the full headers. If you want to know whether or not an e-mail is valid, you need to take that step of actually looking at the servers that it passed through. If they were all oit.umass.edu, that is a pretty good indication. If they are coming from some host in .ru or .cz or .mx or from some other country or from Ohio State University, then you might want to have more questions about it.

The other thing you should always do is check to see what link is in there, and where it is actually going. If you are looking at an html-styled e-mail, it may look like the link says it is going to umass.edu. But if you mouse over the link and see where it is actually going to take you, it may actually take you to someplace that is not safe – again to someplace in Russia or China or the Philippines – and you don’t want to click on those links.

My suggestion has been that we need to not try to have e-mails that look like official e-mails. Rather, we need to make sure that people are trained to recognize the characteristics of what an official e-mail is supposed to look like. Or to potentially have it cryptographically signed, and then we would know whether or not it actually came from the institution that we think it is coming from.

You need to disclose full headers. It depends on the particular e-mail client you are using. In Firefox, I think you can hit Command-U and look at that. Or you can navigate through the menus for messages and see what the headers are.

Vice Chancellor Buehler: We are trying to get a video together to help show people how to figure out the true e-mail. I think there are two points: (1) Is this a legitimate e-mail, or is it phishing?; and (2) The level of professionalism from the IT staff that you should expect. I want to make sure that we are hitting both topics.

Senator Monika Schmitter: I just want to make sure that we follow Elizabeth’s suggestion that we continue the discussion about the report next time, and that that is actually going to happen.
Presiding Officer Bogartz: It is going to happen.

Senator W. Curt Conner: My question is for the MSP. Do you have a copy of the signed thing, with all of the words in there yet? Everybody voted on this thing back in October. When I called up and asked, “Could you give me a copy of the contract that was signed?” you did not have it. Do you have it yet? They said they were still working on the wording in some of the document. Is it now posted? The memorandum does not include the whole document that was the signed contract.

D. BYLAW CHANGES


MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Bylaw Changes, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 15-031.

(Inasmuch as these are changes to the Senate’s Bylaws, this is the first of three readings of this motion. It will be read again at the 747th and 748th regular meetings of the Faculty Senate and voted on at the 748th meeting. The motion may be debated and amended at all three meetings.)

E. NEW COURSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>CREDITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MANAGMNT 462</td>
<td>“Social Entrepreneurship”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIOL 248</td>
<td>“Conformity and Deviance”</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STOCKSCH 260</td>
<td>“Introduction to Agricultural Education”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STOCKSCH 281</td>
<td>“Topics in Herbalism I”</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STOCKSCH 282</td>
<td>“Topics in Herbalism II”</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STOCKSCH 356</td>
<td>“Food Justice and Policy”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STOCKSCH 378</td>
<td>“Agroecology”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the courses MANAGMNT 462, SOCIOL 248, STOCKSCH 260, 281, 282, 24-15 356 and 378, as recommended by the Academic Matters Council.

The motion was adopted.

F. NEW BUSINESS

1. Special Report from the Chancellor’s Nominating Committee for Secretary of the Faculty Senate, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 15-032.

(As stipulated in the Bylaws, this report will be received at this meeting, and a vote will take place at the 747th regular meeting on April 9, 2015.)

Elena Suet-Ying Chiu, Chair, Chancellor’s Nominating Committee for Secretary of the Faculty Senate read the Report of the Chancellor’s Nominating Committee to the Faculty Senate. The nominees are Professor Richard Bogartz, Department of Psychological and Brain Sciences; Professor MJ Peterson, Department of Political Science; and Professor Susan K. Whitbourne, Department of Psychological and Brain Sciences.

CONSENT AGENDA (ITEMS 2-4)

[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.]


[A motion to separate Item 4 from the Consent Agenda was adopted.]
Items 2 (Sen. Doc. No. 15-033) and 3 (Sen. Doc. No. 15-034) of the Consent Agenda were adopted.


MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Accelerated Master’s Program: Civil and Environmental Engineering, the Accelerated Master’s Degree in Biostatistics and the Process for Periodic Review of Undergraduate Certificates, as presented in Sen. Doc. Nos. 15-033, 15-034 and 15-035.

Item 4 (Sen. Doc. No. 15-035) of the Consent Agenda was adopted as amended.


MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Nominations to the Academic Honesty Board, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 15-036.

Senator Arthur Kinney moved to amend the report to add Jason Morales from History to the membership of the Academic Honesty Board.

The motion was adopted as amended.

The 746th Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate stood adjourned at 5:06 p.m. on March 12, 2015.