

UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST RULES COMMITTEE

Minutes of the Meeting on Friday, June 12, 2015

Present: Richard Bogartz, Steven D. Brewer, Nancy Cohen, A Yemisi Jimoh, Ernest May, MJ Peterson, James Rinderle, Susan Krauss Whitbourne

1. GUEST

Elizabeth Chilton, Associate Vice Chancellor for Research and Engagement – “Revision of Sen. Doc. No. 14-032 – Centers and Institutes: Comprehensive Policy on Approval and Review”

Elizabeth presented update on this document, which had been circulated among the Rules Committee prior to this meeting, and several comments were made regarding the proposal. One issue regards the proposal of a 3-year interim period (p. 4). Several alternative proposals were discussed regarding this time frame and the approval process and revisions were incorporated into the document. Continued revisions will be circulated by email. There was a brief discussion regarding the filing of documents on the Faculty Senate website when a Center is closed, and clarification of the fact that this policy applies to research, not teaching, centers.

2. MINUTES

Minutes of the May 13, 2015 Rules Committee meeting were approved.

3. ACTION ITEM

Approval of Sen. Doc. No. 14-032A “Centers and Institutes: Comprehensive Policy on Approval and Review.” This item was deferred pending further revision of the document.

4. DISCUSSION ITEMS

MJ presented a brief summary of her May 18 meeting with Provost Newman.

5. GUEST

9:30 a.m. - Max Page, Professor of Architecture and longtime Senator – “Current State of Shared Governance”

Max was invited to present his views about how faculty can have a larger role in governance. In his view on this campus (and others), the “shared” has shifted toward administration. The lead is taken by administration, and then the Faculty Senate responds. In particular, Max questioned the notion that any kind of critique of the administration is bad for the campus image. We discussed our current model of shared governance and how we can best work together to advance faculty concerns. Much of this discussion recently has revolved around Division IA football and how we debate this issue but there are larger issues as well. We might consider using Faculty Senate meetings as opportunities for discussion rather than votes that can be dealt with on a consent agenda, which we have started doing but could continue to expand. Max also suggested that the Faculty Senate could expand their advocacy beyond the University hierarchy and make a case directly to the legislature, minimally commenting on and supporting relevant legislation. Max recommends dedicating each Faculty Senate meeting to a broader topic related to the University to create discussion and develop a vision for the campus. There was a recognition that a challenge was the culture on campus that does not consistently value service.

4-continued. DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. Emeritus Academy at UMass Amherst

There was a general discussion about the implications of the proposal and perspectives on campus.

B. Topics from BOT

There was a brief discussion concerning the upcoming BoT meetings at the Mullins Center and following Intercampus Faculty Council meeting at the Campus Center.

C. Status of Diversity on Campus

Tabled for future discussion.

Respectfully submitted,
Susan Krauss Whitbourne & Steven D. Brewer