

UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST  
FACULTY SENATE RULES COMMITTEE  
Minutes of the meeting on January 13, 2020

**Present:** Richard Bogartz, Lisa Greene, David Hoagland, Sarah Hutton, Jennifer Normanly, MJ Petersen and Wilmore Webley (in charge of minutes).

**1. Minutes**

Minutes of the December 13, 2019 meeting submitted by Jennifer Normanly were approved as corrected.

**2. Proposed Bylaw amendment**

**a. Voting Rules:** The purpose of his amendment is to put the Rules regarding Council meetings in the general section on Councils, because that seems to be where people look for them. This is not a substantial change just a relocation. Electronic voting is not allowed in the senate while it is allowed in the Councils. It was also suggested that the table for contents be modified to help with finding materials.

**b. New Section 4-3 Conduct of Council and Committee Meetings**

- This has been shifted to where people actually look for this information. It will now be 4-3-1

**c. Charge of the Academic Priorities Council (APC), 5-3-1:** There are three proposals here:

1) Although APC have not done a) *Provide advice to the Administration on all matters of academic planning and priority*; or (b) *Provide advice to the Administration relating to the growth, stabilization, reduction, merger or closure of academic programs*; over the recent past on the Council, it was proposed to leave them as they are, just in case we encounter difficult situations like the 1990 budget and program review, which lead to closing some small programs and departments. It was also suggested that c) be left in, even with the understanding that most of that is now covered by CPARC. The thinking is that some future Chancellor might want to eliminate CPARC and we would want this here as backup.

2) To add a provision making explicit that the Faculty Senate can ask PBC for advice.

3) Shift the attention from individual AQAD reports to the AQAD process. Two years ago, PBC had a discussion about process, which may have fed into Provost McCarthy's decisions to drop some of the elements his predecessor had added but were not working well.

**Proposed 5-3-1 - APC**

(e) Upon request of the Senate, provide advice regarding academic planning or the condition of academic programs.

(f) ~~(e)~~ Review and make recommendations regarding the AQAD Reports process.

- d. **Proposed 5-13-1 – Programs and Budget Council (PBC):** A main goal here was to add an explicit provision for the Senate to seek the advice of PBC.

**The following revisions were proposed:**

(d) Undertake, at the request of the Senate or the Chancellor, surveys of the costs of existing programs and policies; and

(e) Review the administration of funds on the Amherst campus

- *Discussions centered on (E) in terms of frequency of reporting and how those reports would look (spread sheets).* In addition, what exactly is being reviewed when the administration is being ‘reviewed’? Is this ever done?
- Since this is a three meeting sequence in order to get approval, these concerns may be brought up and PBC might want their own changes and clarifying provisions.

Under section (b) - Participate in an advisory capacity in the campus capital budget process, including the current fiscal year and plans which are developed for future years;

-What does this charge really mean? What is the level of participation?

(c) Undertake, at the request of the Senate or the Chancellor, surveys of the costs of proposed programs and policies;

- RC members felt that the word ‘surveys’ should be replaced with ‘review’

This type of request for clarifying statements set in motion discussions that maybe this should be a larger process of revising the charge/bylaws for all councils so that the language and intent can be clear. The logistics and timeline of how this would move forward was also debated.

**a. Research Council**

- The Research Council is proposing to create a standing subcommittee on Research Computing to provide better coordination on this topic between it, ICTC, and IT. This appears to be an independent committee that is under the guidance of the Research Council and not really a subcommittee as their language suggests. It was suggested by RC members that “subcommittee” be replaced with “committee”
- The RC further recommended that the language be changed in this description since the number of members suggested do not add up to the total recommended membership. Also, the narrative for membership composition is not very clear. This will be sent back to the Research Council with the request that bulleted points be used to convey the charge and guidelines.

- b. **Names of Councils:** It was proposed to remove an anomaly in the naming of Councils.

*Current:* Council on Public Engagement and Outreach

*Proposed: Public Engagement and Outreach Council*

- This will be a major search and replace in the council and bylaws.

A member of the RC suggested that at the time when the annual reports come in, we should, as the RC, examine them to ensure that they are aligned with their specific charge. In fact, the charge should be on the front page of each report. At this time, it is not clear if each council is working in alignment with their charge.

After much deliberation, the recommendation was made that the relevant councils take time to review their charges and see where they would make changes.

**These changes are on hold at this time with the following responsibilities:**

- Secretary Peterson will email the chairs of each council to take a look at their charge and if they have revised wording they should send them asap
- Secretary Peterson will also contact Research Council to revise their proposal.

**3. Agenda for the 792<sup>nd</sup> regular Meeting, 30<sup>th</sup> January, 2020**

**C. Annual Reports** – who will present this and does the person know that they will be presenting it?

- We will remove item D – Bylaw Changes from the agenda since we are still working on this.
- If we have a presentation on Sustainability or Graduate student funding, we would have that prior to the annual report (C).

**E. New Business**

- SCH-MGMT 651 Taxation of Partnerships And Limited Liability Company, (LLC) – An RC member asked if we could have the comma and LLC removed. This will need a follow up.

**F.** We clarified the concentrations for the music department motions, which will be filled in prior to the printing of the final agenda.

**4. Other Matters**

- A. Allocation of proposal 6526 – revision to the REMP concentration in the Education PhD, which involves adding 2 courses to the required list. This would change the total course credits from 42 to 48. These courses already exist and are currently taught, so there would be no budget implications.
- The secretary of the FC recommends that this be reviewed by Grad Council only and the RC membership agreed.

- B. Allocation of proposal 6439 – revision to the Higher Education concentration in the Master’s of Education. This involves removing one course from the required list and specifying an additional course in a student’s area of specialization. The proposers also claim that there are no budgetary implications here.
- The Secretary of the FC recommended that this be reviewed by Grad Council only and the RC membership agreed.