Presiding Officer Richard Bogartz called the 747th Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate to order on April 9, 2015 at 3:30 p.m. in Herter Hall, Room 227, and began by reading “As I Grew Older” by Langston Hughes:

It was a long time ago.
I have almost forgotten my dream.
But it was there then,
In front of me,
Bright like a sun—
My dream.
And then the wall rose,
Rose slowly,
Slowly,
Between me and my dream.
Rose until it touched
the sky—
The wall.
Shadow.
I am black.
I lie down in the shadow.
No longer the light of my dream before me,
Above me.
Only the thick wall.
Only the shadow.
My hands!
My dark hands!
Break through the wall!
Find my dream!
Help me to shatter this darkness,
To smash this night,
To break this shadow
Into a thousand lights of sun,
Into a thousand whirling dreams
Of sun!

A. ELECTION

SECRETARY OF THE FACULTY SENATE

Nominees: Richard Bogartz, Psychological and Brain Sciences
MJ Peterson, Political Science
Susan Krauss Whitbourne, Psychological and Brain Sciences

Senator MJ Peterson was elected Secretary of the Faculty Senate for a three-year term, beginning July 1, 2015.

NOTE: Because of technical difficulties, many segments throughout the recording of this meeting were inaudible.

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

“AMAZON TEXTBOOK ONLINE BOOKSTORE”
(QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION TO FOLLOW)

James Sheehan, Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance, presented the following PowerPoint slideshow:

Senator Frank Hugus: I understand that there was an orientation session which was held during the week of spring break. Was this the one you were talking about?

Vice Chancellor Sheehan: Yes.
Senator Hugus: I, for one, was not here during spring break. I wonder whether there will be other sessions because I think there is a lot that I need to learn about this. Will there be other sessions for those of us who want to understand more fully what is going on?

Ruth Yanka, Executive Director, Administration and Finance Operations: We will be paying attention to the questions we get, in terms of having Amazon come back and do more sessions for us; they will come back and do that as needed. There is also the SPIRE page, which has a very good video that walks you through, and is a pretty easy tool. The Amazon customer service line also has real people to call. Those are the ways you can get help. Any questions or problems? Send them my way: ryanka@admin.umass.edu.

Senator Arthur Kinney: Have you looked into the impact on local bookstores and our community relations?

Vice Chancellor Sheehan: No, I have not. We did think about that when we were initially looking into this whole idea. To be perfectly honest, our objective is to try to minimize the cost of textbooks for students. If students prefer to purchase their books elsewhere, they are free to do so. To answer your question very directly: no.

Senator Max Page: In your decision-making, you said you had six choices. Did you look at, for instance, the labor policies and whether those organizations were unionized? Of course we want to save money, but we also have other values that we care about.

Second, I saw you had something about electronic free reserves. It seems that we have a potential conflict with being tied to Amazon, and then also the good efforts of our librarians and OIT people to help us put lots of things on for free, under Moodle, e-reserves, and the like.

Vice Chancellor Sheehan: We have worked with Amazon, and they are open to – and part of the agreement was that – texts and items from the Library being put on and made accessible on their website. We are also concerned about the University Press, and it worked out well because we learned that the University Press publishes a lot of things, and Amazon has a contract with Johns Hopkins Press.

As far as your first question... We did hear about things and keep ourselves on top of what was happening in terms of the labor issues that some of the companies were facing, Amazon in particular. It was something that concerned us but, by the same token, one wasn't much different from another. They all ran their shops a little differently. We did not consider three of the companies because they were not large enough to handle the volume of a place like our campus. The other companies were big; they were providers that could, indeed, handle the volume of our campus. We looked at the costs, and considered, and had a lot of debate about the issues.

Senator Marta Calay: I am trying to look at your perspective about this, and am concerned about looking more broadly than the labor issue; looking at the broader concern of Amazon itself. We are supposed to live in a competitive free market environment, but we are creating opportunities for basically no competition. Amazon is definitely taking over practically everything... You call them, and they tell you, “Oh! Good idea! We are going to now do other universities.” I wonder, at what point – not just you but the administration of the University – are you really paying attention to how we are trying to educate the next citizens in maintaining the free market environment we should have. Also, pay attention to decisions – not just the decision aspect of being cheaper for the student, we all want that – but what is the impact of our decisions that actually creates or opens the opportunity for other universities to do what we do?

Vice Chancellor Sheehan: I was hoping that we might be the first to go with Amazon and get the ball rolling. It turns out that we are behind the times because the University of California-Davis and Purdue University are ahead of us. One thing about the point of competition, the free market, and so on... One of the things we learned in this process is that Amazon, for the dollar value and looking at the sales for the University and geographic area that surrounds the University, was selling more products than our bookstore was. Our students wanted it... Our bookstore sales have dropped off by about $2 million over a two-year period. Amazon is selling over $4 million worth of products and textbooks in this area.

Senator Cynthia Suopis: I attended one of the sessions over spring break, and I just want to get clarification. I asked the Amazon representative, “What, exactly, is the savings to the student?” Students can actually purchase their textbooks from Amazon on their own for the exact same prices. So the advantage to the student, he told me, is the free shipping, and that is the only cost advantage. Can you verify that?

[Inaudible segment]
Senator Suopis: So the price would be the same. If the student already has Prime, there is no value added. The other question is... We are a 100% online program. Can online students from all over the world take advantage of this opportunity with the free shipping?

[Inaudible segment]

Senator Suopis: So those specific zip code only?

[Inaudible segment]

Senator Lisa Saunders: You said it is a competitive market. Reasonably, it sounds like it is going to become a whole lot less competitive. My question is, I have a class in which students already rent one text from Amazon for $5 for the semester. Will that price go up? Will they now have to buy that book? Will it stay the same?

[Inaudible segment]

Senator Saunders: So same price for the rentals? The other text is available for free online at the Library. Will that still be available for free through the Library?

[Inaudible segment]

Senator Saunders: Okay. That wasn’t clear.

Senator Marilyn Billings: I just want to add a comment. I was on that RP committee. The value add that we could suggest to the students is that, in fact, if they purchase their books – which would be the same price whether it is through their UMass account or through a separate one – there will be a kickback to the University that will give additional revenue to the University for programs for the students. That would be the value add I would offer.

C. ELIZABETH CHILTON AND TIMOTHY ANDERSON, CO-CHAIRS, AND MEMBERS OF THE JOINT TASK FORCE ON RESOURCE ALLOCATION (JTFRA) (CONTINUED QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION, FROM MEETING OF MARCH 12, 2015)

Elizabeth Chilton, Co-Chair of the Joint Task Force on Resource Allocation: We have 23 members of JTFRA, and many of them are here today. Our discussion last time had just me up here. I thought it would be a good opportunity to have a variety of JTFRA members up here, because you may have questions during this discussion that other people are better able to respond to.

The purpose of this today is continued discussion. I just wanted to remind you that the first draft of the spring report came out the first week of May. We sent an e-mail to the entire campus, requesting feedback on the draft. On March 12, we presented a summary of that to the Faculty Senate. Our discussion went overtime, and that is why we are meeting today.

Since March 12, we have made presentations to the Student Government Association, the Massachusetts Society of Professors leadership, the Program and Budget Council (both the full Council and the Policy Subcommittee), and the Academic Priorities Council. The Graduate Student Senate presentation is coming up. As a result of these conversations, we met again and have done two things: (1) We have continued to add to the Frequently Asked Questions – as we get questions, we try to address them the best that we can; and (2) We received feedback from the Academic Priorities Council and Program and Budget Council. We had received reports from them earlier in the semester, but then MJ Peterson made contact with the chairs of those two committees – Anurag Sharma and Dick Bogartz – to draft some suggested text. We had indicated that there should be a strategic budget process that should evolve next year. We did not provide a lot of detail on that, so JTFRA got together, looked at those reports, and, in the draft that I have in the back, highlighted in bold on pages 9 and 10 the text that has been revised, which fleshes out more of this budget process that we referred to in our report.

Senator Marinos Vouvakis: I did see quite a few changes, and I think they are definitely in the right direction. It is clear to me that what you are trying to put together is better than what we already have. There are still several points that I would like to flesh out.

The main issue I see here is that we have two units – the academic units and the administrative and service units. Currently, I see that they are unbalanced. If you are in a free market, balances are the main thing. Currently, we do not have any balance. Basically, the administrative and service units are paid by academic units. There is no way,
other than some committees – they can only make recommendations, but they do not have teeth – to cause and make certain costs in the academic units lower. That is my biggest concern.

I am wondering why we are not trying to do what the U.S. government does, where we have the Executive power controlled by the Legislative power. What I see here is the Executive Power – the Chancellor – coming up with his budget, and it goes through the Senate Budget Committee – it goes through a vote there – it goes through the Senate – it goes through a vote there – and either gets approved or modified. That is how I see how those administrative and service units’ costs being curbed. Right now, I see administration and service units trying to control their own costs. It has to be somebody else that will control their costs. I see this body as, probably, the perfect place to do that because we are all elected from academic units.

So that is my take. But I acknowledge that there have been improvements in this document from the last one that I saw.

**Co-Chair Chilton:** Thank you for that comment. You are, essentially, describing the issues that we set out to tackle for ourselves next year. We are a Task Force that has been charged for three years. In our report from March, and in the current draft, we say that, in the next academic year, the top priority will be for JTFRA to tackle strategic budget planning. The Cost of Service Committee will deal specifically with the A&S units and auxiliaries and, probably most importantly, the institutional mechanisms for how those will constitute the strategic budget process. That is exactly what we are proposing – to put more detail. We spent a lot of time this year looking at the model and making adjustments to the model, and thinking about whether this will fit the campus. What we are proposing is that, next year, we will develop the kinds of institutional mechanisms we are talking about.

**Senator Steven D. Brewer:** Very early on in the process, when there was a call for a commentary, I sent in a comment because some of the early things I had heard about – what JTFRA was talking about – was, essentially, talking about incentives driving the process. This seems to me to be very problematic. It seems to me that, at a University, we want to try to decide to do what is right, and then use the means that we have to do the best job that we can and balance priorities. When you start being driven by incentives, it seems to me that you tend not to make the best decisions, or decisions that do not necessarily reflect your values. It seemed to me that that was influential, and I heard comments that a number of steps had been taken to try to address those issues, and try to have a system that would let us reflect our values more successfully. Recently, when I have heard some administrators describing the new system as an incentive system, I had some concerns. I wanted to give you an opportunity to talk about whether you see the model that is being presented as an incentive system, and why or why not.

**Jennifer Normanly, JTFRA Member:** I think, early on, there was confusion on the part of folks on JTFRA. I am in Biochemistry and a department head, and there was a sense that we had to somehow tighten our belts and come up with schemes where we could generate revenues. The conversation basically evolved into… The focus is not on the spreadsheet, and we are not trying to achieve some sort of zero margin or a positive margin. The decisions being made about how to invest in the activities of the units are going to be driven by the strategic plan, which is where our values are articulated. There needs to be conversations with departments and deans, and among deans and the Provost and Chancellor, about what we should be investing in. I interpret this as not a threat to, for example, my department, where we have to all of a sudden figure out how we are going to pay for our graduate programs, based on grants and income from CPE or student credit hours. Rather, we have to define where we are going, what our strategic plan is, and then make a case for that with our deans, Provost, and Chancellor. I do not see this as an incentive-based model.

**Timothy Anderson, Co-Chair of the Joint Task Force on Resource Allocation:** The key point is, the budget model we are heading towards is not an incentive-based model. We specifically have stayed away from that. What we have so far in the spreadsheet, if you will, is a mechanism to account for the revenues that we have and attribute the costs that we have to those revenues. It is really an accounting system. Most of the work was really gathering the data and understanding what the costs are, as well as where the revenue is generated.

The next step is to go and put our strategic plan in place. We are in the process of doing that. Now that we have this transparency regarding where our revenues are and what our costs are, we will see opportunities to minimize our costs or generate other revenues. Then, strategically, the budget process will decide where we invest. So the real key is our strategic plan being implemented; being the guiding force with the strategic funds that we have available to us.

I think what you would like is what JTFRA wants – we want to be strategic, but we want to have funds to be able to be strategic. That means we have to have revenue sources in place that make sense and we have to have costs under control that allow us to deliver quality education. We are on the same page there...
**Senator Monika Schmitter:** This is related to the incentives issue, because I think it is a really key thing, where the perceptions among some of the faculty and deans, in general, is that this is about incentives. You must get higher enrollments; you must have more majors. That is the message that comes across.

The proposed budget system raises a lot of red flags for me and many of my colleagues. As Senator Page has noted, the budget represents the University as an entity, where academic units are permanently in debt to the administration; as takers of money from a controlling administration rather than as givers and sustainers of our University and its mission. Further, the proposed system represents the University, not as a common enterprise, but as a series of entities that must, in effect, pay back the administration for any of the services we are permitted to receive. Since we do not have a lot of time, I am not going to dwell on the symbolism and representation. But I think that is what it symbolizes and represents. I find that problematic.

There are practical problems as well. Through all of my reading of documents and looking at the PowerPoint presentations, there are some things I cannot figure out.

I am the graduate program director of my department. I have just been asked by my chair to plan for a future in which we will have half as many tuition waivers for graduate students as we have today. In trying to plan forward for this, what would this mean? What this means is that our undergraduate enrollments would decrease immediately by one third. What it probably means in the not-too-distant future is that our MA program would fold. We have an MA-only graduate program. This is, obviously, a very upsetting thing for us. But there is nothing we can do if the message that comes down is that we must cut these TAs. How are we supposed to maintain our enrollments?

So, on the one hand, we are told, “You have to have high enrollments.” On the other hand, we are told, “You can’t have any TAs” or “You have to drastically cut your TAs.” These things seem very contradictory, and difficult for us to know how to respond. What is really wanted? In this scenario, 75% of our budget allocation would depend on undergraduate enrollments. The snowball effect would be devastating. So a decision to drastically reduce tuition waivers for campus MA programs without evaluating the academic success of these programs could potentially eviscerate our department or any department in a similar situation.

I would add that the history of art as a discipline teaches how to analyze and interpret visual and cultural data, involves highly complex reasoning, and, very importantly, teaches how to communicate that analysis and reasoning in clear, cogent writing. These are not skills that can be taught by Scantron Tests.

Can you give me an idea of what will happen to my department in the new budget system if we follow this scenario of cutting in half our tuition waivers? The larger question is, how are we supposed to attract majors and students when we are being undercut by taking away TAships?

**Co-Chair Chilton:** First of all, the idea or whoever sent you the message that the idea behind this resource allocation system is to put pressure to teach as many students as possible is not coming from JTFRA.

**Senator Schmitter:** It is all over the campus. Everyone is talking about this...

**Co-Chair Chilton:** Then they should read our reports more carefully because this 23-person Task Force has not been saying that that is the goal; that has not been a part of our discussions. In fact, what we are trying to do is look at a model that would make more transparent the impact of strategic planning decisions going forward. Take your example... If we were to cut tuition waivers or cut enrollments in a particular area, what impact would it have on the whole system? We would be able to use that as a planning tool. It doesn’t produce budgets. It allows us to use it as a tool for planning. So it is not a formula-based budget model. It provides information and data that decision makers can use to make decisions. But it doesn’t determine what those decisions are. That is how we distinguish it from a formula-based budget.

**Senator Schmitter:** So it’s kind of like an imaginary budget? You imagine that you cut it like this, and then you don’t actually cut it?

**Co-Chair Chilton:** It’s like looking at your checkbook ledger. You can look at your checkbook ledger and bank statement, see what you spent money on, and know what your balance is at the end of the year. That, in and of itself, does not tell you what decisions you should make the next year. You take that information and analyze it, and use it as a planning tool to reach your goals.

That spreadsheet that we have at the back of our report for March is FY2014. It has already passed, but is depicted as if we had already used a budget allocation model like this. What does that look like? What can we learn from that data that can help us make planning decisions going forward? It would still have to be used by the Chancellor,
Provost, deans, and department heads to have discussions about the meaning of the data. Is this good? Are these enrollments where we want to be? Why or why not? Each department is going to look different because we all do different kinds of things, there are different costs of instruction, and enrollment possibilities. We do not want a one-size-fits-all way of budgeting at the department level. I am going to put Mark Fuller on the spot because I am hoping he will say something about how we currently budget from the college down to the department level, and how he envisions this.

Mark Fuller, JTFRA Member: What we have done – and obviously all schools and colleges are different and have different configurations – as a professional school, which tends to be more unified and not as strongly departmental, is we implemented, probably three years ago, a process that we shared with the department chairs. We looked at enrollments as we are allocating faculty lines. So this idea of accounting for growth is not new to us. Our accounting program is at 580 students and our finance went from 380 to 620 over three years. As we look at hires and how we are going to allocate, we look at undergraduate students served, graduate students served, etc., and we are making decisions on where to put those lines or those resources – whether they are TAs or GAs, etc. – to account for that growth, because that growth responds to student demand in our case.

Again, all schools and colleges are slightly different. It was an interesting way to characterize this budget model early on, because the reality is that only a portion of the money is flowing based on undergraduate enrollments – around $250 million. Another $250 million comes from the state. So the enrollment drivers at 75%/25% majors is only used to push out half of the budget. The rest of the budget is pushed out to, as we like to say, the common good, to keep units whole, etc. Over time, there may, indeed, be decisions at the deans’ level, the Chancellor’s level, or the Provost’s level to look at where strategic growth areas are and what those investments are. But that has always been the case.

The budget model we went from, as Elizabeth articulated, was totally non-transparent, at least for me as a businessperson. I knew I received an allowance, and that allowance has not changed in the last 15 years, despite the fact that our enrollments went from 2,200 to 3,500 undergraduates. There are other units that have been in this same situation. So what we are trying to do is create, first and foremost, a transparent mechanism to look at how the funds are flowing, whether it is supporting faculty lines, research assistants, etc., so that we know what we are doing. I feel like, as a dean in the midst of these conversations, there was no transparency in the system.

So, the transparency is being added. Then the question is, “How do we do the allocation?” This is why we have a strategic prioritization pool that is being pulled out, which is quite sizable, and which the Provost will be making decisions on in terms of programs – some of the programs may have low enrollments, some of the programs may have high enrollments. We just don’t know; that is part of the strategic planning process that is going to be part of the cases that department chairs and faculty are going to be making regarding their growth and need areas.

I know it seems like this model is just going to churn out a result; it’s not. All we have done, at this stage, is add transparency to the system so we can see where tuition and fee money is flowing, based on enrollments. That is all we have done. There is still a lot of decision-making that will be done, based on the strategic planning that is going to drive these investments.

Co-Chair Anderson: Just to speak directly to your question… So you had a new budget for the department on July 1. That budget included salaries, MFA program funding, waivers, TAs, etc. What would have happened if, instead, we had our new allocation system in place? Essentially the same thing. I would guess all departments would have come up short, based on the accounting. Strategically, we would sit down and have a discussion. Do we want an excellent MFA program? And the answer would probably be, “Yes.” So we are going to allocate resources based on that. The sum of the resources would not change. So what has been added is this discussion opportunity.

Senator Schmitter: Are we going to be involved in that discussion?

Co-Chair Anderson: We hope so. Yes.

Senator Schmitter: I’m trying to say that I’m being told I may have to cut half of the tuition waivers, and this is what the result will be. Now, hopefully, someone will listen to that and say, “No. Maybe we shouldn’t cut the tuition waivers.” Is that what you are saying?

Co-Chair Anderson: What we are saying is we are trying to get those mechanisms to have these discussions at the Provost, college, and department levels to have the budget process put in place.

Senator Schmitter: I hope so, because the impression I get from my chair is that it is all about increasing enrollment and cutting our costs.
John McCarthy, Vice Provost for Graduate Education and Dean of the Graduate School: The question of waivers has nothing to do with the new budget model. Waivers became an issue about 10 years ago, when they became an actual cost. Prior to that, waivers were not an actual cost because there was no Curriculum Fee and all tuition went to the state. The two things that changed: (1) we instituted a Curriculum Fee, which grew very rapidly; and (2) we started retaining out-of-state tuition. (We may, at some point, start retaining in-state tuition as well.) At that point, waivers became a cost of the campus. Before, they weren’t any kind of cost at all. The University has been very slow in saying, “What is this cost?” So that is what’s going on now.

Senator Richard Bogart: I am not speaking as the Presiding Officer right now. I am speaking as a member of the Faculty Senate. We start with where things are, and principles, priorities, and goals. We take a look to determine if we are where we would like to be, based on those priorities, priorities, and goals. If we are where we want to be, everything is fine. If we are not where we want to be, we need to change. One of the ways we change is to get people to change. We get individuals to change, departments to change, colleges to change… It is not going to a violent, immediate, instant sort of thing. But, gradually, we would like to move to somewhere better than we are. One way we get people to move – to change – is to incentivize movement in the directions we want to change in. Incentives are not some kind of inherent evil. They are just one of the ways we go about getting people to change. We also try to persuade – we talk. But incentives are not inherently one thing or another; it is how they are used.

Senator Max Page: First, I disagree with John on this. What Monika Schmitter was referring to was that one of the parts of the model is, how do we measure how many bodies are in seats, how many majors, and the like. But then big decisions, such as ending support for MA programs, will have a dramatic effect on those numbers. So that is one of the things that happens when you start to go with a formula or partial formula model. Will we have a say over admissions, if admissions is pushing people into CNS or the Business School? Shouldn’t we have a say, since part of this model is about measuring how many bodies we are bringing into our classrooms?

Second, I appreciate the efforts to continually update the Q&A. I may have not been able to whack my way through the dense thickets of the bureaucratic writing, but I think there is a total false statement here about athletics. It says that auxiliary services are responsible for funding all operating costs. Obviously, our Athletic Department is one of the most subsidized, meaning it’s the most in the red, percentage-wise, of almost any athletic department in the country. So that simply seems like a false statement. Again, maybe I misread it.

Third, declining public higher education funding from the state leads to higher tuition and fees leads to fewer faculty or reliance on underpaid, under-benefitted faculty and staff. The only growth industry in the University is administration. Yet you have a model that you are saying is transparent. It’s not transparent if you apply a model to understanding the numbers of students who are in this college or that college, but you have no model for looking at why this amount of administration is necessary. You accept the amount that is there, and then allocate by this formula to charge us, essentially. I do not think this should go forward unless we have developed a real model for understanding the growth in the costs of administration. As I say, it is the only real growth area in the different units. I keep hearing the word transparent; it is not transparent. If it were transparent, you would just give all of the budget numbers; you would just lay it all out: this is how much money we have spent. There are already values being applied; judgments being made. We are going to measure it by square footage, graduate students or undergraduate students...

I would suggest that, before moving any further, there should be a real look at a model that measures administration. This should not be delayed well into the future, or suggested as something we are going to continue to look at. This is a major thing; if I remember correctly from the spreadsheets, administration almost equals the total amount we spend on the academic units, which is remarkable. So that is what I suggest if we want to have a better model that we can all get behind.

Co-Chair Chilton: I would say that JTFRA would probably agree with part of what you are saying, Max. We need to consider the process at the same time that we are considering adopting any new resource allocation model. By process, we mean looking at how the whole system fits together. So not just the primary units – as we are calling them – or the schools and colleges, but the administrative and support units – all of them – and how those costs will be made transparent and how decisions will be made on those. And then also the auxiliaries, and providing people with the opportunity to have a campus-wide process, where we look at this as a total package so that people can make decisions. I think that’s exactly what we are saying in our recommendations. We say that we propose that the goal would be to have a new resource allocation process designed by May, 2016 so it could go into operation simultaneously with any new resource allocation model that is adopted. We are saying that the process by which – you know, who will have what access to what kinds of data, how will decisions be made, will there be specific committees set up, will there be a strategic and open budget hearing process – all of those are what we are saying need to go hand in hand with deciding whether or not any particular model is going to serve a purpose or as a tool.
The other thing I will say is that, in response to both of the questions about the waivers, I think my fellow JTFRA members would agree that, if department chairs aren’t able to have access to as much information as they need to make critical decisions and strategic decisions in their departments, and to provide input on decisions like growth of graduate programs, or shrinking, or growth of undergraduate, then this whole process would not be very useful. Because what we are looking for is a way to decentralize decision-making so that the units that are the most affected – maybe because I am a previous department chair I think of the departments as being the most affected by this – that to put that information into the hands of chairs so they can have conversations with their faculty – are we going to start up a new program, are we going to shrink or grow our graduate program – to be able to have those conversations is going to be key. That is what we are saying – we need to develop a process for how that is going to work. How will we get that information? How will those conversations happen?

Bryan Harvey, Associate Chancellor and Chief Planning Officer: One observation I would make, from the vantage point of institutional research… Although it is pretty difficult to have sorted out the ebbs and flows of instruction and looking at what scholarly research and activity looks like, that is actually comparatively easy versus trying to sort out what administrative activity is. There is a common unit of instruction; it’s not perfect, but it’s the credit hour. It is fairly easy to see where it comes and goes across campus.

There is no such thing as a unit of administration. So one of the challenges we face in this process, which Elizabeth has described as JTFRA’s task as we go forward in sorting this out, is trying to understand how to capture the widely different kinds of administrative and support activities that we do pay (a lot of) money for. How do we figure out what we are doing and how much that costs? It is not as straightforward a task as being able to understand where students pass and go, and where instruction passes and goes. I don’t think the fact that it is innately complicated makes it something we don’t want to do. It is actually something we are very eager to do. But it is going to require a different approach. I think that the steps laid out in the report point to how to start that inquiry. It is going to take work on all of our parts.

We are not saying that the system should start tomorrow. We are saying that the system to figure this out should start tomorrow. If we are unable to satisfy ourselves and the community – that we got a handle on these administrative costs – then this test we are talking about will have failed.

Senator W. Curt Conner: There is an article in the New York Times this week that says the biggest increase, by far and away, in university education is administration. You have to look at the history of it. It has more than quadrupled in the past 10 years at this University, and this has to be accounted for. So, not only, “What is it today?” but “What was it 10 years ago?” and “What was it 20 years ago?” and “Why is it increasing exponentially at the administrative level?” We are fewer than we were 20 years ago in terms of the number of faculty. Yet we are educating 50% more students. Those numbers have to be put into perspective over our history. Administrators are now making $150,000, $200,000, $325,000 a year today, and the faculty aren’t anywhere near that.

Co-Chair Chilton: All I can say is that having more transparency in our budget process will allow us to have these kinds of conversations, which we cannot have now. I will also say that there was a response to the New York Times article, which talked more of the complexities.

D. ANNOUNCEMENTS

2. The Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Ernest May, Secretary of the Faculty Senate: Just a few announcements... The JTFRA and JTFSO report drafts will be discussed on May 7.

Provost Newman has set up a steering committee to consider the possibility of an Academy at UMass Amherst – like she had at Hopkins – chaired by Betsy Dumont and Barbara Partee. They will explore the potential of providing a home on campus for retired faculty to continue their research, teaching, mentoring, and outreach.

3. The Chair of the Rules Committee

MJ Peterson, Chair of the Rules Committee: You will have noticed that our next meeting is in a different location than usual. It will be an enjoyable trip, but don’t get any big ideas that we get to keep that nice meeting hall.

The Presiding Officer put me off earlier by asking me if I wanted to make a victory speech. What I do want to say – I’ll sneak it in here – is thank you for your expression of confidence. I will do my utmost to continuously earn it.
4. The Faculty Delegates to the Board of Trustees

*Marilyn Billings, Associate Delegate to the Board of Trustees:* The Board of Trustees had a Committee of the Whole meeting last Tuesday afternoon, and talked about such topics as funding and divestment of fossil fuels. On Wednesday, we had the full Board of Trustees meeting. This was Susan K. Whitbourne’s first attendance at the meetings. She wished she could have stayed; she had an honor society induction she had to attend.

The Board voted for the establishment of a School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences at the University of Massachusetts Lowell. Here, at our campus, the Board voted for a College of Information and Computer Sciences.

5. The Representative of the Massachusetts Society of Professors

*Randall Phillis, Representative of the Massachusetts Society of Professors:* An hour ago, we learned that President Caret has sent a letter directing each of the campuses to take the $2.2 million allocation and initiate the payment of the faculty and staff raises starting on May 3, for the current contract that we are now about three quarters of the year into. So, on May 3, your paycheck will go up the amount it should have, we presume – we haven’t heard the details yet. It will also go up on July 1, and again on January 1 for the faculty. So the pay raises have been implemented, except, of course, for the money we are owed from July 1, 2014 to May 3, 2015.

So, there is “goodish” news that there is actually movement about paying our raises; it will start in May. But we are still going to have to fight for our retroactive pay. I just want to, sort of, declare victory. We worked pretty hard to push against this – to say that the money should be there. Only through a little residual allocation by the legislature on this $2.2 million did the administration move. But there is also a declaration in that law that they had to pay. So we have moved forward, and that’s reassuring. There is still a fight left to get our retro pay, so we have to work on that.

E. QUESTION PERIOD

*Senator Tom Lindeman:* One of the fields in which I have been trained is organization development consulting. I have done a great deal of that over the decades, primarily in church systems, but, to some extent, in university systems as well. I am mindful that, on an earlier occasion regarding the discussion about the Joint Task Force, Richard Bogartz said that those who were closest to the process – most involved in the conversations – were the most enthused about the proposal. I take that observation seriously, and would like to encourage the Rules Committee to keep a very open ear, to further time allotments for conversations about this new budget proposal, as the whole thing evolves. There have been many group conversations around the Joint Task Force proposal. I think this is one of the largest groups to be involved. If the people in the Faculty Senate do not fully understand it, are not aware of all of the complexities and possible advantages, then your colleagues out across the campus are going to be persistently dubious that anything that can be done will be of any great use. So I suggest that a great deal of further conversation in this forum will be a great asset for the entire University.

F. BYLAW CHANGES


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

23-15

(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 748th regular meeting of the Faculty Senate. The motion may be debated and amended at all three meetings.)

G. NEW BUSINESS – FROM THE ACADEMIC MATTERS COUNCIL


MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Revision of the Certificate in American English Linguistics, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 15-037.

27-15

The motion was adopted.
NEW BUSINESS – FROM THE ACADEMIC MATTERS AND PROGRAM AND BUDGET COUNCILS

CONSEN agenda (ITEMS 1-3)


The motion was adopted.

I. NEW BUSINESS – FROM THE ACADEMIC PRIORITIES, GRADUATE AND PROGRAM AND BUDGET COUNCILS

CONSEN agenda (ITEMS 1-3)


3. Special Report of the Academic Priorities, Graduate and Program and Budget Councils concerning a Master of Business Administration (MBA) with a Focus in Sport Management, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 15-043 with Motion No. 29-15.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Master of Science in Nursing Studies (MSNS), the Graduate Certificate in Climate Change, Hazards and Green Infrastructure, and the Master of Business Administration (MBA) with a Focus in Sport Management, as presented in Sen. Doc. Nos. 15-041, 15-042 and 15-043.

The motion was adopted.

J. OLD BUSINESS

Special Report of the Nominating Committee concerning Nominations to the Academic Honesty Board, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 15-036B with Motion No. 26-15.

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

The motion was adopted, as amended.

The 747th Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate stood adjourned at 5:16 p.m. on April 9, 2015.