Empty your mind of all thoughts.
Let your heart be at peace.
Watch the turmoil of beings,
but contemplate their return.

Each separate being in the universe
returns to the common source.
Returning to the source is serenity.

If you don’t realize the source,
you stumble in confusion and sorrow.
When you realize where you come from,
You naturally become tolerant,
disinterested, amused,
kindhearted as a grandmother,
dignified as a king.
Immersed in the wonder of the Tao,
you can deal with whatever life brings you,
and when death comes, you are ready.

A. UPDATE AND PLANS FROM THE JOINT TASK FORCE ON STRATEGIC OVERSIGHT (JTFSO) (QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION TO FOLLOW)

The Joint Task Force on Strategic Oversight (JTFSO) presented the following PowerPoint slideshow:

Nancy Cohen, Co-Chair of the Joint Task Force on Strategic Oversight: Good afternoon. I’m Nancy Cohen, and this is Bryan Harvey. We’re here to give you an update on strategic planning, and to kick off the year in that matter. We thought that we would start off with where we started three years ago, in terms of the question, “Why are we doing what we are doing?” because it is a useful thing to ask yourself every now and then why you’re doing what you’re doing. That question is even more urgent and relevant today. Just like three years ago, our environment is changing rapidly and we want to create public impact through innovation.

We really have a tripartite mission at this University. We are a research university, which is an expensive model; it is resource-intensive, there’s competition for talent, we really only recover part of the costs, and we need specialized facilities. We are also an immersive, residential institution. That is also resource-intensive in terms of faculty time and facilities. Finally, we are a land-grant institution. We have a commitment and a passion for outreach and community service. Those things are all weighing on us, and, three years ago, we noted that that model was fraying. Now, considering that state and federal support are bending, we are probably a few inches lower than we were three years ago. We are being upheld by our students and our campus, and by the innovation that our students, faculty, and staff bring.

So, where we started and where we want to go: we want to be the investment of choice for our partners, so we can develop a more competitive research profile to have a bigger impact and a broader investment pool. At the same time, we want to become the destination of choice for students of the Commonwealth, so that we have greater student demand, better outcomes, and a more sustainable enrollment strategy. So that’s where we’re going. Additionally, we want to be recognized as the flagship institution, the leader in the state,
the system, and the nation. That’s really the basis for our strategic planning and impact through innovation. That’s where we started, and we’re looking for that support through the federal and state governments as well as industry, a balance between state and student support, and by bringing our campus creativity and focus to the table.

That effort kicked off around three years ago, and, for three years, we’ve been putting this framework for systematic improvement into place. Thanks to everyone in this room and hundreds of people outside of this room, we now have a clearer focus on what it will take to be the flagship University that our Commonwealth needs and deserves. This was reinforced just last week by our Chancellor in his Convocation address, in which he said “Massachusetts rises or falls on the strength of its education enterprise...There are many universities in Massachusetts, but only one university for Massachusetts. Our special obligation is to bring the enormous benefits of world-class undergraduate and graduate education to the people from all segments of the state. And until we achieve the highest standard in that quest, our work will not be done.” So our work is not done.

As we had left it in the Spring, we had gone through some initial rounds of planning. Our academic departments had done some rounds of unit planning. JTFSO conducted and presented our initial analysis of the “Part One” plans that had to do with the undergraduate experience, and the “Part Two” planning concerning research and graduate education is continuing. JTFRA presented an approach to trying out a “parallel process” for exploring a new budget system.

**Bryan Harvey, Co-Chair of the Joint Task Force on Strategic Oversight:** Over the summer, quite a lot happened. The Vice Chancellors and Deans had a couple of retreats, and put in quite a lot of work trying to share the results of this planning and having discussions about what ideas had come up and trying to get used to talking about some of these issues. This included Administrative & Support units sharing an overview of their programs, costs, and services. Work continued on the “parallel process” over the summer.

Some status updates for ongoing efforts: There was considerable follow-up on the Diversity Strategic Plan. If you haven’t seen the Diversity Matters website (http://www.umass.edu/diversity/), you should. A lot of the work is there and there is other work going on now. The ACE Internationalization Group, who we’ll hear from a little later on, has a draft report going around and is seeking input on that. Remember the intersectional research priorities that were a partial representation of our research goals representing the state, regional, and national priorities and our strengths? They have been very useful in talking about a lot of these projects. Provost Newman has launched follow-up curricular planning focused on curricular gaps and class size. In terms of outreach and engagement work, not a lot has happened to report, but the Council on Public Engagement and Outreach has picked up the torch on that.

Major upcoming efforts include thinking about how to link planning and resources questions through the first pass at a budget development process. JSACS, the Joint Subcommittee on Administrative Costs and Services, a collaboration between JTFSO and JTFRA, will be launching to start looking at that bunch of issues. We’re also intensifying campus-level planning in two areas. The first is a campus-wide enrollment strategy. Given all the pressures that we’ve seen and the heightened competition, how do we best balance our diversity, quality, and selectivity goals in the enrollment planning realm? The other is capital planning. You may not hear about it a lot, but this is a key area. We now have a good sense on what is going on, in terms of our debt profile, and we have some tough decisions to make. So, we’re going to get the full JTFSO schedule underway to tackle these questions, and there’s going to be a governance retreat for the members of the Rules Committee, JTFSO, JTFRA, members of the councils and so forth coming up on 10/15/15 to try to bring everyone up to speed. So that is where we are headed.

**Nancy Cohen, Co-Chair of the Joint Task Force on Strategic Oversight:** We thought that we would end with this quote from the Chancellor, again from his Convocation address: “All of the reflection and the planning over the past few years have led us to this point. Every department has explored how it can be more committed to its students’ success and how it can increase its research profile and impact. Every administrative and support unit has explored avenues for greater efficiency and effectiveness. Now we face
the challenge of bringing those plans to life through the endeavors that have the most profound impact on society and our students.” So I think that, this year, things will really be coming together. We look forward to everyone’s participation and, in fact, count on it. Thank you.

*MJ Peterson, Secretary of the Faculty Senate:* If you had to identify the issues that you thought posed the most challenges for us going forward, what would they be?

*Nancy Cohen, Co-Chair of the Joint Task Force on Strategic Oversight:* I think pulling it together is a challenge. To combine the planning with the resource allocation is big challenge. It’s a very different mindset for us, so that’s a challenge. Another challenge is using data to inform decisions. I think many of us have done that in many different ways, but not in the systematic way that we are trying now. I think it is a shift, and that’s always a challenge to change to something new.

*Bryan Harvey, Co-Chair of the Joint Task Force on Strategic Oversight:* I would just add the obvious. We’ve had some recent very good budget years, some years that have looked less good. Nonetheless, how do we maintain core ideas and maintain an even keel? Times are always going to be better and times are always going to be worse, and we’re always going to do better in any circumstances as long as we have a clear focus on what we want to accomplish.

B. UPDATE AND PLANS FROM THE JOINT TASK FORCE ON RESOURCE ALLOCATION (JTFRA) (QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION TO FOLLOW)

*The Joint Task Force on Resource Allocation presented the following PowerPoint slideshow: https://www.umass.edu/senate/sites/default/files/JTFRA%20Update%20to%20FS%20October%202015.pdf*

*Elizabeth Chilton, Co-Chair of the Joint Task Force on Resource Allocation:* First of all, I have a new co-chair here with me. This is Jennifer Normanly, a member of the Research Council and head of the department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology. She has served on JFTRA for the past two years, so she is well-versed in this. I am happy to have her with me in leading this Task Force. I also wanted to acknowledge all the members of JTFRA. What is really exciting is the people who will be joining us this year: Richard Bogartz, who is now the designee of the Academic Priorities Council, and two new student members from the Graduate Student Senate and the Student Government Association. But everyone else is going into their third year on this Joint Task Force, and have all been there all three years, so I really want to thank them for their hard work and dedication.

To remind you a little bit about our charge: We came directly out of Phase I of the Strategic Plan, which really sought to connect our strategic goals with how we make decisions about allocating resources. We sought to find a way to make this process more transparent, linking the evidence to the decision-making and making that transparent to all. Our charge was to educate ourselves and the campus community both about how we are making budget decisions and how we might do it better. That is what we have been engaged in for the past two years, and will continue to engage with as we move into what is supposed to be the third and final year of our charge, unless we are recharged after that.

I want to remind you of where we left off in May, because this body voted to endorse and support our recommendations in that report. That report and our other reports are up on the web (https://www.umass.edu/chancellor/strategic-planning/joint-taskforce-resource-allocation), where they are available for all to see. Our specific recommendations in May were to continue to explore and develop a more decentralized and transparent resource allocation system and to further test the strategic budget allocation model developed by JTFRA with input from the community and the development of a strategic budget development process. Basically, regardless of the data that we use, we identified a very serious need for a process by which the campus can engage in transparent decision-making using whatever data we have, whether we stay with the current incremental budgeting or whether we move to a variety of other budget models. We identified that the most important part of this is a process by which we use that data to
inform decisions. That is what we charged ourselves with continuing this year, and this body charged us
and the Chancellor did as well.

There was some activity this summer, although JFTRA as a group did not meet. Associate Chancellor
Harvey mentioned that there was some activity, both with the Administration & Finance Office and also
the Budget Office. They loaded the FY15 data into the model and made some comparisons. They had a
series of informational meetings with Deans and their budget officers, trying to understand how this data
could be used in making decisions, and also where the problematic or missing pieces of data were. So there
was some work going on, and maybe Interim Vice Chancellor Mangels or Chief of Academic Finance and
Administration Gould could answer any questions about those activities. There was an initial analysis of
the revised model that we were looking at, and we found some over-sensitivity to things like student credit
hour shifts. JTFRA is going to have to explore that further, because if we have any kind of allocation model
that is too variable, that model will not be very useful in planning at the College or departmental level.

On the budget process, as Associate Chancellor Harvey mentioned, the Administrative & Support units
were engaged in a process that was a smaller scale version of the Strategic Plan. In fact, now that I am a
member of one of these Administrative & Support units, I brought with me the assignment that the
Chancellor gave us. Starting in June, there were three phases. I was both really impressed with the
homework he gave us and I thought that it was important to share this with all of you. Each of our units (in
my case, Research and Engagement) were asked: what are your major functions, what are the functions
that your unit performs in support of the University’s mission, how do you know how well you are
performing these functions, are you collecting data that tell you whether or not you are doing a good job,
how well is your unit performing currently and how do this compare nationally with our peers, and what
improvements are needed? The second step asked us to tie this to the costs to our units and subunits in
meeting these functions. I can tell you that this was a very, very useful exercise for us, because, as you
know, with the budget reductions, Administrative & Support units were asked to cut 3% of our budgets
and it was very helpful to have gone through this engagement.

We will be doing two things in the coming year. We will continue to test the model that we developed last
year, and we will be making a first pass at a budget development process. As Associate Chancellor Harvey
mentioned, the first step will be the governance retreat with JTFSO, the Rules Committee, and the Faculty
Senate Council Chairs, so we can all be on the same page to make sure that budget decisions are tied to
strategic planning.

Senator Curt Conner asked about the appointment process for members of JTFRA, and whether
administrative costs will be included for consideration during the model testing/development period.

Elizabeth Chilton, Co-Chair of the Joint Task Force on Resource Allocation: In fact, this committee is not
almost all Deans; half of the members were nominated by the Faculty Senate. You can look at their titles;
membership includes faculty, staff, graduate students, and undergraduate student representatives. On the
second, I will say, yes, the plan is to include both the Administrative & Support costs which includes all the
University staff and administration, as well as all the academic areas. This summer, we actually looked at a
seven-year trend in the changes in the costs of different services that we provide, so that is very much part
of it. One thing that I didn’t get a chance to say is that there is going to be a joint subcommittee on
Administrative & Support costs that will be a JTFSO/JTFRA-combined subcommittee. It will specifically
look at administrative and support costs as part of this process of budget planning. I would like the
subcommittee to begin by reading the plans created during the process we went through this summer, and
formulate a process to be used moving forward.

Chancellor Kumble Subbaswamy: We have carefully gathered a lot of data, as part of our internal processes
to ensure that administrative and support units are held accountable, and we also normed it with national
data. All of that information will be put on this website (http://www.umass.edu/chancellor/strategic-
planning/joint-taskforce-resource-allocation).
Mr. Presiding Officer, I request that senators who wish to criticize data and what the administration has been doing please do so based on the evidence. In fact, they can also challenge the evidence.

C. REPORT FROM JOSEPH BERGER AND MZAMO MANGALISO: “INTERNATIONALIZATION”
(QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION TO FOLLOW)

Joseph Berger, Co-Chair, UMass Amherst/American Council on Education (ACE) Internationalization Committee: Thank you. Good afternoon. It is a pleasure to be here. I am going to do all the speaking, even though Senator Mangaliso is more eloquent than I am; he is very jet-lagged, having just returned from South Africa. We are pleased to give this report with where we are with the internationalization plan that has been drafted. We have been working on it for over two years now. I want to give a lot of credit to both Senator Mangaliso and Vice Provost Ahern, who helped provide leadership for this. More than fifty faculty members and staff have participated on our various subcommittees in the drafting of this report.

A little bit of background and context first. We developed this plan in conjunction with colleagues representing units throughout campus. We also engaged assistance from the American Council on Education (ACE) Internationalization Laboratory. The ACE Lab allowed us to work with peer institutions that are also looking at how to engage in comprehensive internationalization planning across campus and to tap into the expertise of other folks who have done this before on their campus. ACE has worked with colleges and universities across the country that have engaged in exactly this kind of enterprise. This gave us additional resources and workshops we could attend. We also had a visiting team that came here most recently last April to look at the plan and to meet with campus leaders and folks who developed the plan and give us the benefit of their insights and feedback. Also in the course of this work, our six subcommittees met regularly throughout the last two years. These subcommittees focused on various aspects of internationalization across campus. As we developed our ideas and plans, we sought preliminary input from a number of groups across campus, including the International Studies Council, the Research Council, the Status of Diversity Council, the General Education Council, JTFSO, the Student Government Association, and the Graduate Student Senate. We also circulated various drafts of the plan, so we have really tried to get a lot of participation and feedback. Presenting this draft to all of you is another step in moving it all forward for additional commentary and feedback as the plan gets finalized this year.

We really wanted to develop a comprehensive approach to internationalization that is consistent with the strategic priorities on campus, including our campus being a destination of choice and an investment of choice, looking at a variety of high-impact educational practices that are consistent with our institutional diversity goals. There was a lot of discussion about the relationship between diversity and internationalization. We firmly believe that these are complementary priorities and goals for our campus, and we should be working together to find out how we can increase both the campus climate for diversity and internationalization on campus. This work really builds on strengths here on this campus. We have a long history and tradition of international activity and internationalization, and looking at how we could build an integrated and cohesive approach across these pillars of strength.

In the report, we would like to adopt an articulated institutional commitment to internationalization, that would read: “As a globally-engaged, research-intensive university, UMass Amherst is committed to fostering intercultural knowledge and diversity in all aspects of its mission, and strives to be a premier destination for international students and scholars. UMass Amherst promotes and supports a campus culture of diversity, global awareness, intercultural understanding and respect, global learning, research on global and international issues and research collaborations with international partners, and outreach and engagement with international constituencies. We educate and prepare responsible and globally-engaged citizens to succeed locally, nationally, and internationally in a highly connected and competitive world.”

In coming up with that statement, we really drew from some of the prompts that were part of JTFSO Phase III. We had three internationalization prompts that we asked the units to consider and that we looked at in coming up with these plans: How is education abroad supported, enabled, and encouraged in departments and programs? How are international students supported in departments and programs, and
how are they integrated with the domestic student population? How are global perspectives and knowledge incorporated with department and program learning objectives and outcomes?

This also helped us come up with some goals and recommendations, which reflect our effort to balance between providing a cohesive framework across campus with leaving a lot of room for individual units to develop their own plans and priorities, depending on the nature of their particular portion of the mission. This included education abroad, where we’re looking for a substantial increase in participation and diversity of participants, to fund education abroad scholarships, and remove curricular barriers to education abroad participation. We also looked at international students and scholars, where we would increase and diversify the international student profile, provide support services for international students, and engage and integrate international students with the UMass domestic student population. In terms of international faculty, we would like to support and retain the best international faculty and staff, and engage international faculty in the campus culture and classroom learning.

The three other areas that we focused on were international research, global curriculum, and international outreach and communication. Our goal is to increase the scale, diversity, and funding for international research, develop strategic partnerships that are selective and focused on our research strengths, including our Worldwide University partners (a strategic partnership initiative that we have embarked upon this year), and to seek industry partners who are interested in supporting international projects. In terms of global curriculum, we want to coordinate global learning with ongoing JTFSO planning, articulate desired outcomes, and to engage international faculty in the curriculum. Finally, international outreach and communication: we want to engage international communities and associated Massachusetts communities in our efforts and integrate education abroad into these opportunities.

Our next steps: We’re going to meet with the International Studies Council again—we’ve met with them previously—to lead the discussion of finalizing the Draft Plan. We’re going to meet with additional key Faculty Senate councils and committees throughout this year, coordinate the discussion with JTFSO, and then revise the plan accordingly based on that feedback by April of this academic year with the hopes of getting it approved and finalized by the Faculty Senate and by the campus.

**Senator Frank Hugus:** I have read the report and find that it does cover a lot of very desirable goals and outcomes. Since I do come from the Department of Languages, Literatures, and Cultures, one thing that did surprise me was that there was no reference in the report or in your remarks to indicate that our department, which not only talks the talk but walks the walk of internationalism, was consulted. Or did I miss something here?

**Co-Chair Berger:** The department was not consulted explicitly; on the other hand, there were folks who were invited to participate on the subcommittees and had opportunities to engage in the discussion. We would certainly be willing to go to any academic unit or department throughout this year to have further discussion, if there are any ideas or points of clarification that folks would like included in the plan.

**Senator Howard Peelle:** I just wanted to say that I liked your idea in the report for a speakers’ bureau. It made me wonder, and that leads me to the next question. Is the place for this campus or for all UMass campuses?

**Co-Chair Berger:** This plan is specifically for our campus.

**Senator Peelle:** Might it be considered extensible? It seems like there might be some good speakers at other campuses.

**Senator Marta Calas:** I read this document, and I am somewhat confused. It seems to me that a lot of the things that are presented here as desirable are already being done. I wonder whether you did an inventory of what is already being done on campus that, in some ways, can be coordinated with whatever was the intent or goals of the report. I see a lot of prospective thoughts in the report, but I don’t see anything that tells me that we are already doing a lot of these things. And I can speak for my own School, and,
specifically, for my own department, that internationalism is, in fact, very present in our everyday life. So that is one question.

On the other side, you use words here, like ‘diversity.’ Given the fact that my field is international management, and, specifically, the topic of diversity within that field, I can speak to the diversity of diversity. Even the meaning of the term diversity is very diverse. So, some of the language would defy, in fact, the idea of internationalization if we are really going to respect not just the differences in the way we think about things, but actually the meaning of the things that we say we can talk about as if there is a common language, when in fact, there is not. I just wonder at what point in your discussions did you take into consideration the incommensurability that may be present in many of the things that you are seeing here from a very specific vantage point what is maybe being seen very differently in the rest of the world?

Co-Chair Joseph Berger: Thank you for those two good questions. In response to the first question, one of the things we tried to do in the preamble was to recognize that this was built on a category of certain types of activities, many of which already exist on campus. Then we looked at what are those things that are already being done and could proceed apace, where were those areas that where pockets of activity and pockets of excellence but could be built in a more comprehensive manner across the entire campus and be recognized as such, and what were some new initiatives and places that our campus still had yet to go. As you look at how the plan was laid out, some of the things that we’re proposing that could occur earlier in the plan are those things that are really building on strengths that already exist on campus. Those things that are further down the road are new things that require additional investment and require us to put some effort into going in some new directions that this campus has not gone yet.

In terms of the second question, there was quite a bit of discussion about wrestling with some of the concepts and terms and how we presented the plan. It’s a real challenge, coming up with terms that convey a shared meaning so that everyone across campus can agree that we’re talking about some similar concepts and, at the same time, being able to wrestle with the differences about those terms. Again, we’re still open to some feedback on how to present that better, because, again, there is always that balance between how we can communicate some key ideas clearly to everybody and have that shared meaning without diluting it down to the lowest common denominator. That’s a real challenge.

Jack Ahern, Vice Provost and Director, International Programs Office: I am very gratified to hear the questions and comments. I’d like to emphasize and clarify that today is a benchmark in a long process that will continue. It is also a hand-off from the ACE Committee, led by co-chairs Berger and Mangaliso, to the Faculty Senate International Studies Council. It is very much the correct time for these comments, questions, and suggestions to be delivered through the Faculty Senate or directly to myself or to the International Studies Council. We’ll be happy to entertain a dialogue on those going forward.

Mzamo Mangaliso, Co-Chair, UMass Amherst/American Council on Education (ACE) Internationalization Committee: The other thing I would like to add is that the key here on our plan is the phrase ‘comprehensive internationalization.’ The campus does participate in a lot of international activity across the board, but, as co-chair Berger pointed out, it is all scattered and is not coordinated as such. The plan is calling for this activity to be coordinated as much as is possible, so the best practices happening in one corner of the campus can be shared with the other corners, so we march to the same drumbeat all together. Take the international faculty and staff, for example. Richard Chu, who has been coordinating the effort in the subcommittee, found that there are a lot of issues that are pertaining to that particular sub-area of internationalization, whose needs, they feel, are not being met. What they have done is gotten together, created a list of those who identify themselves as international faculty and staff, and identified what their needs are. There is a long list of these needs. So, what we’re doing with this strategic planning process for internationalization is coordinate efforts like that; you can go to teaching, as well, or to the curriculum, and find that there are similar issues. Like people who want to go abroad but find that they lose time on campus because courses that they take elsewhere are not recognized here. Part of the whole idea of being a destination of choice, of being a partner of choice, is really to be able to practice what we are preaching. So it is really a function of coordinating everything rather than saying that we do not do these things. Certainly, we do, but, because our efforts are not as coordinated, we are finding that we are actually losing...
ground in the global marketplace. We find that other campuses are all over the place in their representation there.

D. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Principal Administrative Officers

*Kumble Subbaswamy, Chancellor:* Thank you. We started this whole session, actually, with this sentence: The external environment is changing. Certainly, for some time now, there has been a lot of national discussion about the cost of higher education and the idea of higher education, with different questions of accountability, different modalities, etc. This debate has now entered our lives in a way that wasn’t even true last year, so we were anticipating this. One of the things that has happened is that we have a new Governor and a new administration in Massachusetts. This new administration is of a different party than the old one, and it comes with a different philosophy with regard to public higher education, and is trying to learn the terrain and what has been going on. We have a new Secretary of Education who is also on the Board of Trustees, as you know. He comes from a background with a strong philosophical emphasis on private education, charter schools, and so forth. He is certainly asking questions at the Board level that we haven’t had the opportunity to see in this debate. Several members of the Board of Trustees have a strong focus on the increasing debt that we are undertaking and the debt limits and so forth. There is a lot of concern about that aspect of what is going on. The last several Board committee meetings have been mostly about debt limits, financials, balance sheets, bond ratings, and so forth. I have been alarmed at several meetings about the total absence of the word quality. So, I think we have a task to try to bring quality back into the discussion. I’m sure you’ve noticed that the state government still has not paid their obligation for the FY15 collective bargaining. The House passed a supplemental budget that contained the amount that the state obligation was to pay the University of Massachusetts, but the Senate supplemental does not have that amount. So, in all of these discussions of cost, cost, cost, the quality element and who pays for the quality has been absent.

In the coming months, drawing off my Convocation speech where I spoke about quality in the ‘Education State,’ that’s going to be something we will all collectively have to do: talk about what a high quality education looks like and the spectrum of educational choices available to the citizens of the Commonwealth and beyond. Where do we fit in, and what do we bring to the table? So, I encourage everyone who cares about public higher education, accessible, high-quality higher education, about research and research universities to pay very close attention to what’s being debated in the Legislature, on our Board, and in our communities, because this really gets to the core of public education in this country and in this state, the Education State, in particular. I apologize for the polemical announcement, but I do think this is a very important issue.

*Katherine A. Newman, Provost and Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs:* I wanted to say a word about a few of the great things that are happening on campus and some of the successes that we’ve had since we began these efforts last year. I mentioned to many of you, maybe in this body, that we developed in the Admissions Office a new scholarship program called Honors to Honors. Honors to Honors links the community colleges in the Commonwealth to the Commonwealth Honors College and, for the first time, provides a special scholarship, aimed particularly at low-income and first generation college-going households. We scrambled to put this together, and the Chancellor sent out just a single letter to his colleagues, the presidents of the community colleges, in the transfer season, which is just a little bit later than our normal admissions cycle. With that single letter, we were able to recruit from thirteen of the fifteen community colleges in the Commonwealth—an extraordinary track record for a program that is just getting going.

I’ve had the chance to meet with some of the students who have now joined us in the Honors College as juniors coming out of the community colleges, and it is inspiring to see these students. I met with one yesterday whom I had first met at a Luncheon of the Western Massachusetts Legislators. He was the student body president at Springfield Technical Community College, and is now an Economics major in the Honors College. An African-American student from Springfield who grew up just a few blocks away
from the community college, he didn’t really know very much about UMass Amherst, but the Honors-to-Honors scholarship was really dispositive in his interest in coming to us. I met with him for about half an hour a couple of days ago, and he is incredibly excited about what he’s able to do here. Encouraging, especially to me, was his comment that he knew four or five other students coming behind him at Springfield Tech who he was going to encourage to follow in his footsteps. This immediately alerted me to the possibility that we could actually enlist him in that effort, and that we should contact the other students coming from the other community colleges and ask them to help us do the same. These things do tend to spread by word-of-mouth. However we get the word out, whether it’s by word-of-mouth or a more concerted advertising campaign—and we will probably do both—I think this is a truly extraordinary experiment in creating a kind of integrated higher education system. This was already underway, in terms of making it easier for students to see how their coursework transferred. This is a significant financial contribution to first-generation and low-income students, and it is really helping, especially with something that I know all of you are concerned about, which is the diversity of the Honors College. With our new Dean, Gretchen Gerzina, at the helm, thinking with all of her colleagues on the faculty and the lecturers about new curricular possibilities in the College, I think it is going to be a very exciting time.

That’s just one of the many innovations that are underway. We sometimes, under the extraordinary and understandable burdens of trying to figure out how to manage through the budgetary ups and downs that we face, lose sight of the truly remarkable achievements of our colleagues. We have a bumper crop of fantastic grants come the way of our colleagues. We have several new, massive training grants coming into Material Science and other areas. These are incredible achievements—something like 5% of grants submitted for this purpose are approved, and our campus has been successful because we have an extraordinary faculty out there hustling for every dollar that we can get to support our research needs. The fact that we’ve been successful in this incredibly complicated and competitive environment speaks very highly for the quality of this campus. So, whether we’re talking about the students who are headed our way, the faculty we are recruiting, the grants that are coming in, from my seat, it looks like a truly extraordinary trajectory for this University. I think I am going to continue to add some of those rose-colored glasses perspectives, and keep our spirits up.

Julie L Buehler, Vice Chancellor for Information Services and Strategy and Chief Information Officer: Good afternoon. Let me start by apologizing; I missed the first Faculty Senate meeting and I didn’t really want to do that, but we in IT were a little bit busy. We had some issues with the network and I don’t think that would be a surprise to any of you who use our network. Today, I just wanted to take a couple of minutes to share some facts with you during the back-to-school activity that probably impacted you. I also wanted to say that I am sorry if you had a bad experience in the first couple of weeks as we worked to address these problems.

When the students came back, we saw that the number of simultaneous devices attached to the internet and our network here on this campus tripled. We also saw that peak network activity—that’s the amount of traffic—increased by 80%. What happened is that we have some new equipment and some aged equipment, and some of it just didn’t handle the increased traffic well. We had some equipment breakages that we had to swap out. We also saw an increase in information security attacks during that period. Thankfully, we did a series of seven major fixes in the first few weeks of school, and now most people are reporting a much better experience.

That said, we still have some buildings that we know we do some updates in and, as you’ll recall from last year, we do have a multi-year project for networking. People want to know how they can track the progress. We did put up a new website (http://www.it.umass.edu/network/campusnetworkupdates) and as we start and finish buildings, you’ll see bar graphs with percentage completion, so you can actually check our progress. The good news for you is every month you will be able to see improvements, because we are done with the assessments and financial planning, and now we are actually making it better. We are going to do a lot of work on classrooms in the coming months, so hopefully you’ll see improvements in your experiences. If you have feedback on how you would like to see the progress reported, let us know. We’re on the first version, and it isn’t very pretty, so we’re interested in that feedback.
I wanted to make sure that you saw the notice about SPIRE for this extended weekend. We always try to schedule upgrades for when people aren’t here, although we’re finding that window is getting shorter and shorter. So, starting Friday at 5 pm, we’re going to do a major SPIRE maintenance upgrade and SPIRE will be down. If you didn’t see that, and that’s going to be a problem, let our User Services Desk know right away. We’ll try to get it back up as soon as we possibly can. It will definitely be back up by the time everyone gets back, but I just wanted to make you aware of that.

Lastly, I wanted to remind you of what month it is. It’s not just October; it is also Information Security Awareness Month. I have to tell you, we have really been struggling to find a way to make Information Security a fun and interesting topic in a world of busy people. We have a new Student Advisory Board, and they have told us quite frankly that all of our campaigns are boring and aged and they wouldn’t even look at them. So we asked them what we should do, and Alyson Gill helped us with some others, and we asked what would be interesting or attention-grabbing to them. They said that they wanted to see their pets, and we said, “We’ll do it!”, because at the heart of Information Security is people. What we really want people to do is reflect a little bit about their own practices and we want them to link to the Information Security page. I wanted to quickly share one of our new posters with you. It’s called “My Name is not a Good Password.” But here’s the part that we think might be exciting. The students told us that they are a ‘selfie generation’ and they do not want us creating posters for them. We actually have an app where they can put whatever they want in this picture. In our test group so far, we have dogs, cats, horses, goats, plants, a teddy bear, and some people’s faces. The important part is that we’re starting to have people get interested in this subject. You’ll be seeing this soon, and we’ve also had some interest from other schools who like the idea of involving people in helping to build the campaign. So that’s one campaign. Faculty can also use the app and give feedback on it if they like it.

The other campaign we’re running, which I hope faculty will be very active in, is trying to think about how to promote Information Security awareness during the rest of the year. We’ve just opened it up and any idea you have that is not illegal or hacking for how we can make people aware about Information Security is welcome. We’re having a contest right now, and there’s a flyer on the back table; it could be interpretive dance, it could be whatever you want it to be, including poetry, photos or videos. We want your ideas, we want your thoughts, and there are prizes. Thank you.

*Elizabeth Chilton, Associate Vice Chancellor for Research and Engagement:* I have one announcement that I wanted to make and one request for your involvement. In terms of the announcement, it is part of the international strategy discussed earlier by our wonderful internationalization team. At the level of the University, you may know that this year we joined the Worldwide Universities network. Provost Newman is serving on the partnership board of the organization. This is a network of eighteen research universities worldwide, and it is as it sounds: a network to stimulate research at those universities and beyond. The idea is to focus on four global challenges that are identified by the partnership board. The four are: global higher education research, public health and non-communicable diseases, responding to climate change, and understanding cultures. As a matter of fact, Associate Dean Berger is the new chair of the global higher education research theme. So our University is participating, and, hopefully, you have received emails inviting you to send in a submission or start a research project as part of this network. They are called Research Development Funds, and we did award matching funds from the campus to six different PIs in the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences, the College of Natural Sciences, the College of Humanities and Fine Arts, and the School of Public Health to either lead a team with at least two of these other partnership organizations or become part of a team that they are leading. Those are being submitted on October 30th, and we hope to hear more. That’s just one of the ways to be involved in the Worldwide Universities Network, and I encourage you to speak to me if you have any interest or check Research & Engagement’s website for more information (https://www.umass.edu/research/).

The Office of Management and Budget from the White House is seeking comment on regulatory burdens of federal grantees. This is part of the Obama Administration’s national dialogue to reduce reporting and compliance costs. I have heard from lots of faculty, especially now that I am in Research and Engagement, about the burdens of compliance, so here’s your opportunity to give lots of feedback. Last month, the presidents of the Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities, the AAU, and the Council on
Government Relations got together and came up with their list of what are the difficulties and costs of compliance and they put them on a website. They are asking for people to respond to the list. The website is: [https://cxo.dialogue2.cao.gov](https://cxo.dialogue2.cao.gov). You can respond to the list posted, or to more open-ended questions also posted there. They are asking for this in the next few weeks. All PIs have already gotten the email as well as the Research Council and the Research Administration group. Thank you.

Andrew Mangels, Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance: Good afternoon. As an addition to what Associate Vice Chancellor Chilton just said, we are looking at administrative processes involving post-award research grants. We had a three-day site visit by four individuals from around the country who are experts in research administration from a group called the National Council of University Research Administrators (NCURA). For three days, they interviewed administrators, deans, researchers, faculty members, and got a lot of insight from constituents about what’s working on the research accounting process, primarily in the post-award stage when the award converts over to the Comptroller’s Office. They completed their review, though they have not issued their report yet. I had an exit interview where they gave us some thoughts and complimented the University all-around on the dedication and hard work that goes into research compliance as well as the commitment to the processes and getting everything completed. Obviously there are still a lot of areas that we need to focus on, and we’re looking forward to getting that report back and working with all of you to see where we can improve the post-award process.

As I’d mentioned at the last meeting, I have continued to work with Amazon on the implementation of the new textbook delivery system. We successfully had about 35,000 textbooks delivered to campus. On the other hand, there are a number of issues that we are continuing to work with Amazon and work with you on that involved everything from delivery snafus to people not getting their textbooks on time as well as some issues that Amazon had with the publishers. We are continuing to work with Amazon to identify these issues, and, if you have issues, make sure to forward those to Ruth Yanka (ryanka@admin.umass.edu) in my office. She’s been working closely with a lot of you to make sure that, when we get to the Spring semester, we have better communication and better processes so we can mitigate many of the problems we saw this fall. Thank you.

2. The Secretary of the Faculty Senate

MJ Peterson, Secretary of the Faculty Senate: I have the distinct pleasure of introducing four newly-elected senators, one of whom has already spoken. I’ll begin with Jeffrey Beaulieu who is a Senior Lecturer in the Department of Mathematics and Statistics and teaches many of the crucial beginning mathematics courses that provide the foundation that allow our students to then go further in math and succeed in their studies. That is very important work, and we thank you for doing it.

We also have Senator Michael DiPasquale from Landscape Architecture and Regional Planning. He is an Extension Assistant Professor and practicing architect in Northampton. He founded the UMass Amherst Design Center in Springfield in 2009. He is a faculty member down there, and he works with faculty and students from here and people in the community on urban design and community projects.

Farshid Hajir, who we have all heard from, is Professor and Chair of the Department of Mathematics and Statistics. He is a specialist in algebraic number theory. To give you a sense of his research, here is a title of one of his articles: “Tamely Ramified Towers and Discriminant Bounds for Number Fields.” More mundanely, he has been his department’s Undergraduate Program Director and an Associate Chair of the department; so he cannot only deal with the intricacies of algebraic number theory, he can also deal with wide elements of the faculty and student experience.

And then we have Frank Sleegers, also from Landscape Architecture and Regional Planning. He is an Associate Professor of Landscape Architecture with a particular focus on urban landscapes. He is responsible for designs that have won awards in both Boston and Hamburg, Germany. He also works down in the UMass Design Center in Springfield with the residents of Springfield and leads community service courses at that Center. So again, we have a set of wonderful new senators. I welcome them to the Senate and urge all of them to participate actively as their colleague, Senator Hajir, has already done.
This was done very subtly, but I want to thank Professor Jennifer Normanly for stepping up and taking on the role of Co-Chair of JTFRA. At the same time, I want to thank Dean Timothy Anderson, who served as Co-Chair for the past two years, and recognize his grace in ceding the position so we could return the co-chairmanship of JTFRA to its original design of a faculty member and an administrator. Elizabeth Chilton underwent a transformation that she was not anticipating two years ago, but we have been able to return, through Professor Normanly’s willingness and Dean Anderson’s graciousness, to the design that we originally intended.

In the coming months, we will begin to get reports from the Councils, who are at work on their various tasks and they will be submitting information for our consideration in due course. Thank you.

3. The Chair of the Rules Committee

A Yemisi Jimoh, Chair of the Rules Committee: I just have a reminder that the development of the new College of Information and Computer Sciences will require redistricting of the Faculty Senate. The Rules Committee is looking to present a redistricting proposal to the Faculty Senate at the December meeting. Redistricting will not affect the terms of the senators who are already elected, which will go into effect only for future senators. Thank you.

4. The Faculty Delegates to the Board of Trustees

Susan K. Whitbourne, Faculty Delegate to the Board of Trustees: There was a Board of Trustees meeting on September 16th and the Committee of the Whole met on the same day. The meetings took place at UMass Boston. There was an extensive presentation about UMass Boston and extensive traipsing around in all the dirt, so if you think that our construction here is something to contend with, it’s pretty massive there. The Board meeting discussed a couple of consent agenda votes that might be of interest to you. One was approving the Master’s in Public Health at UMass Lowell, the second was establishing a School of Public Policy here at UMass Amherst. When these things come up, Secretary of Education Peyser tends to question things where there is more than one function being dealt with by more than one campus. We should definitely be on the lookout for that.

The Committee of the Whole meeting was really, really interesting with very animated discussion. This was the first that President Meehan chaired and it was very impressive, with a lot of freely flowing discussion. The topic was student debt. We had a lengthy presentation from the Education Advisory Board, who is a consultant, about data on student debt. The presenter did a very interesting job of breaking down the numbers and really showing where the real problems are. Basically, he said that the media presents worse cases than is actually the case, which is a debatable point. Certainly, one of the things we were talking about was that students are definitely in debt for public higher education, but not the same as for private or for-profit higher education. When you look at it that way, yes, our students are encumbered and will need to work to manage their finances, but there are some areas of higher education that are the main culprits in generating student debt. There was a great discussion after the presentation about how we can increase awareness of the good that public higher education does, how to make legislators more aware of what our students are doing. I pointed out that our students actually are out there, they are in the constituency, working for the legislators, doing internships, and all kinds of things. I liked the feel of the discussion, that we can do a lot more to engage legislators with our students and really show them what it’s all about and how and why we do what we do. It was a great meeting. The minutes are always posted on the website of the Board of Trustees (https://www.umassp.edu/bot/meetings), as are the upcoming agendas. If you have any questions or concerns, they are a resource, and I’d be happy to answer them, too. This is especially true for things you’d like to bring up, because we are trying to have a bit more of an interchange between campuses and to try to have as active a role as possible. Thank you.
Randall Phillis, President of the Massachusetts Society of Professors: The Chancellor already mentioned that the House put forward a supplemental budget that contained some additional funds for the University of Massachusetts. Remember in the spring, when the budget was put into place for the coming year, there was a request for about $40 million more than the University actually received, plus there was no supplemenatal funding for the collective bargaining agreements from the previous fiscal year. So we’ve come up quite a bit short. The only thing that was included in the House’s supplemental budget was the monies for last year’s collective bargaining agreements. When the Senate took that up, the most senior officer of the Senate insisted that there was an exchange—if they were going to provide that money to the University, then student fees must be correspondingly cut. What that did, which was extraordinarily aggravating, was to directly link faculty and staff pay increases and regular collective bargaining agreements with fee increases. There are many reasons why fees have increased at the University. They include everything; collective bargaining is but one component. There are many others, such as the growth of costs, the financial aid that is given out, the growth of the student body and attempts to grow the faculty and staff to correspond—there is a whole array of reasons for fee increases. None of those were mentioned in the supplemental budget. Faculty and staff pay raises were the only thing blamed for the fee increase. That was very alarming, it is totally unfair, and it doesn’t actually represent the reality of how university funding works. We’ve been working hard to make that clear to legislators, but legislators think in less than fully complicated ways, so we’ll see where this goes. The supplemental budget is now going to conference, because the House put money in and the Senate did not, so they have to come to some sort of compromise. We’ll see how it goes, but there may be a need to put pressure for adequate funding for the University of Massachusetts, one of the items that is included in that is money for collective bargaining.

E. QUESTION PERIOD

Senator Frank Hugus: Coming back to a question that I asked at the last Senate meeting and relating directly to comments that Vice Chancellor Mangels made about the work going on with Amazon, one of the things I’d like to express—and I have had several email exchanges with Ruth Yanka about this, though I did not directly include this in those emails—is that there are a number of faculty who feel that their academic freedom is being abridged because of the way that Amazon has put itself right up front as you put your textbook orders in. At the very least, I think that this intrusion by Amazon into the ordering process should not continue.

Senator Steven D. Brewer: This is a comment or a question directed to Provost Newman. I enjoyed hearing the comments about the Honors to Honors Program in the Commonwealth College. One of the things that you said was a statement that the faculty and the lecturers are working together. Are lecturers faculty?

Senator Marinos Vouvakis: This is a question for Chancellor Subbaswamy. Your comments earlier about the new government and the new Secretary of Education resonated with me. I want to ask your thoughts. Obviously, I agree with you that the issue of quality has to be part of the discussion, but I would like to hear your thoughts on the issue of efficiency. In the long run, the state will be funding lesser and lesser amounts to universities; that’s a national trend. So I’m wondering what are your thoughts about efficiencies; how can we survive with smaller budgets coming from the state?

Chancellor Kumble Subbaswamy: I think the entire question of “business model” of the public research university is under a lot of stress and a lot of debate. What I will say is that, without question, increasing efficiency and effectiveness and making effective use of technology wherever we can in the administrative and support functions is a critical part of the full solution. We just prepared these slides, so I have some numbers. We have saved about $20 million in base funds in efficiencies associated with energy procurement and so forth. This means that each year we are spending about $20 million less in the base fund. So, in terms of savings in the last 5 years, we have saved about $100 million or so simply from efficiencies associated with running the University. This is a continuous effort, and part of the solution, as is the use of technology in other ways, like in the classroom. For example, team-based learning gets to one aspect of teaching large classes in a different way while still being effective. So, we’re constantly trying to
address this issue from both the academic side and the business/operations side. There is also a Board of Trustees Task Force on Efficiency and Effectiveness. But that is only one part of the solution. I think there is an increasing role for the state particularly, whose economy relies so heavily on innovation and research, as well a role for families to contribute—those that can afford it—because higher education is an investment. I think that a combination of all of those will ultimately get to a place where we only have inflation-related increases only, rather than playing catch up. One other important element is that there are about forty years of deferred maintenance and lack of building to cover expansion or even capacity-building, and that is part of the problem. We have about $90 million a year in debt service that we are paying in our operating funds. As I pondered at Convocation, that’s about 900 faculty lines. These are all factors and one really has to look at the whole combination to get a handle on this.

Senator Howard Peelle: My question is for the Committee on Workplace Climate and Bullying. Last week, we all received an update from the chair of that Committee. Yet there didn’t seem to be any indication of progress in the last two years. Now, surely, it is challenging to measure something as complex, elusive, or pervasive as bullying. But it seems that it would be helpful if we had some sense of whether, on our campus, it’s increasing, decreasing, or the same. So, the question is: are we making progress on dealing with bullying?

Chancellor Subbaswamy: Indeed, as Senator Peelle said, it is a very complex issue. We’ve really had the appeals process in place for one year. Nonetheless, the best way to get a handle on this is like any other climate change. Just as it was a climate survey that got this change started, in about five years, we need another climate survey that gets at various issues of work climate, classroom climate, and that is our intent. We will keep monitoring the situation. But it is not something that you can change overnight.

F. BYLAW CHANGES

Special Report of the Rules Committee concerning Bylaw Changes, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 16-003 with Motion No. 02-16.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Bylaw Changes, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 16-003.

(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 752nd and 753rd regular meetings of the Faculty Senate and voted on at the 753rd meeting. The motion may be debated and amended at all three meetings.)

Senator Brian Ogilvie: I was wondering about the rationale in Section 5-3-1 for striking the current point D: “Develop criteria and procedures whereby programs can be assigned academic priority.” I wonder if someone could explain whether that’s there because that’s just impossible, so the Council is giving that up. If not, it seems that the Academic Priorities Council should be dealing with academic priorities.

Richard Bogartz, Chair of the Academic Priorities Council: It was pretty unanimous that when we thought about actually doing that, we had no idea how to proceed, what sorts of criteria we might use, what sorts of information we might use. What we did do was decide that maybe it would make sense to start by reading the AQAD reports, and seeing if we could do something with them that might wind up being a kind of prioritization, in terms of need or what have you. As a matter of taking all the programs and prioritizing them, we didn’t know how to begin. I’ve been on the Academic Priorities Council for about two decades, and we have never been able to do this. So we figured that we would just remove it from the Bylaws.
G. ANNUAL REPORTS


The reports were received.

H. OLD BUSINESS


The motion was adopted as amended.

2. Amendment to the Special Report of the Nominating Committee concerning Nominations to Faculty Senate Councils and Committees, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 15-050D with Motion No. 34-15.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Amendment to the Special Report of the Nominating Committee concerning Nominations to Faculty Senate Councils and Committees, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 15-050D.

Secretary MJ Peterson moved to amend the amendment to add Donna Zucker from the College of Nursing to the membership of the Nominating Committee, Stephen Schreiber from Architecture to the membership of the Program and Budget Council, and to change the listing of Deborah Picking to Deborah Henson to reflect her current name on the Academic Priorities Council.

The motion was adopted as amended.

The 751st Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate stood adjourned at 5:06 pm.