A. PRESENTATION BY DAN GERBER, CHAIR, COUNCIL ON PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT AND OUTREACH

“UPDATE FROM THE FACULTY SENATE’S COUNCIL ON PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT AND OUTREACH”
(QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION TO FOLLOW)

The Council on Public Engagement and Outreach presented the following PowerPoint slideshow:
https://www.umass.edu/senate/sites/default/files/Faculty%2020Senate%20Outreach-Engagement%20Council%20-%202015.pdf

Professor Dan Gerber, Chair, Council on Public Engagement and Outreach: Good afternoon. It has been a few years since I have had the chance to update the Faculty Senate on the activities of the Council on Public Engagement and Outreach. In this presentation, I want to highlight where we’ve been and where we’re going. We feel pretty good, especially when you look at where we were. As for where we’re going, it’s like everything at UMass: two steps forward, one step back, two steps forward.

The most significant thing that the Faculty Senate’s Council on Public Engagement and Outreach has done is that we changed our name. When I arrived here on campus about 25 years ago, we were supporting ‘outreach’ on campus. About 15 years ago, we started hearing the word ‘engagement.’ In 2006, we decided to come up with our own definition, following the literature, of what engagement is: “Scholarly engagement is the creation, integration, application, and transmission of knowledge for the benefit of external audiences and the University and occurs in all areas of the University Mission: research, teaching, and service. The quality and value of Scholarly Engagement is determined by academic peers and community partners.” The most interesting thing—and the reason that I’m here—is that we have always been an engaged campus. I came to UMass because I met a faculty member in Indonesia, where I was working, who was an
engaged faculty member. She taught me how to frame the work I was already doing as scholarly engagement. That’s the first time I heard about UMass as engaged, and then, three years later, I was here.

We changed our name from ‘Public Service and Outreach’ to ‘Public Engagement and Outreach’ because engagement has come into its own across America. Engagement is a nationwide movement in universities that talks about how our work off campus can be about outreach, which is one-way, but is also very much about engagement, which is reciprocal. In the Council, we talk about what engagement is and why we do engagement. One of the three biggest reasons that we identified is that engagement allows UMass to fulfill its land-grant mission of research, in the context of the well-being of the Commonwealth, nation, and world. But for engagement to be done really well, our understanding of the community is not as the Other; community is not over there. Community is us, and everyone else, working to create new knowledge. Engagement also helps us to educate our students to be better civic citizens when they graduate.

Our accomplishments included facilitating the inclusion of the word ‘outreach’ into the Annual Faculty Review (AFR) a few years ago. In its original form, outreach was only included under the ‘service’ category. But, as you all know, outreach takes place in teaching, research, and service. We were able, with the help of the Massachusetts Society of Professors and the administration, to negotiate its inclusion to mirror this reality in the AFR. Our next step is to figure out how to get the information about engagement from the AFRs. As you all know, this year is the first time that the AFR is being done electronically, and we want to find out a way to mine that data and see what our faculty members are doing.

We were also part of the renewal process for the Carnegie Foundation classification for engaged institutions. All five campuses in the System have this classification, and we were the first to get it. I’ve heard from the other campuses, and, basically, they followed in our footsteps. Many of our students, who worked with individuals like John Reif, have graduated and gone on to practice outreach and engagement at the other campuses. It was really important for us to get the classification renewal. Thanks are owed to the Provost and the Provost’s Committee on Service Learning and to the Council.

Another thing we did was to create a website in collaboration with University Relations to share the outreach and engagement activities on- and off-campus (http://www.umass.edu/worldwide). Does anyone remember the Mullin map? The Mullin map came about when John Mullin, the first Provost for Outreach, was trying to get a handle on all the activities people were engaged in—he had a map that covered a whole wall that he would put pins in to indicate outreach and engagement. Well, we now have a website.

We also contributed to the development of the UMass Strategic Plan, and organized a day-long symposium on what engagement means to our faculty in 2013. We actually organized a day-long symposium on engagement a decade before, so now when people hear about the Council on Public Engagement and Outreach, they say, “Oh! You’re the people who organized the symposia!” We also coordinate the UMass Engagement Awards every year. We also nominate faculty members for the national Lynton Award, and in the past three years, two of our nominees have made it into the top ten—one of these days, we’re going to win it.

As for our future agenda, we will continue to support the campus in becoming more engaged. We also plan to collaborate with the Chancellor’s Diversity Advisory Committee to help put the Diversity Strategic Plan into action. We want to seek new ways to develop stronger connections across different public engagement projects. We also want to continue working with the Massachusetts Society of Professors. As I said, we want to find a way to pull the data out of the AFR so we can show how engaged our faculty and our campus are. We will also continue to look for ways to connect and support faculty, staff, community members, and students. Thank you.

Honorary Senator Tom Lindeman: I am also a member of the Council on Public Outreach and Engagement. Outreach is a word that, I believe, goes all the way back to the Morrill Land-Grant Act, which founded public universities in the 1860s. The new buzzword is engagement. I think the definition that Chair Gerber shared with us doesn’t do full justice to the change. It sounds like simply another label for the same old outreach. My understanding of engagement is that it stresses mutuality. Whenever we, as university people,
are involved with any stakeholder, we are engaged with them. First of all, we are engaged with them in research about the nature of the issue with which we're working, and then we're mutually engaged in determining ways of approaching those issues that will help things move forward. The old outreach program did a lot of good; it also earned some resentment because it tended to say that the UMass experts would come and tell you how you should be doing it. The new approach says that, together, mutually, we will define the issue and find a way forward.

Professor Gerber: You won’t get any argument from me, Senator Lindeman. Many of the members of the Council recognize that there are those on campus who do outreach and do it very well, and we wanted to be inclusive. The whole point of engagement is to be inclusive. So we kept outreach and paired it with engagement.

Senator Marta Calas: At the end of your slides, you had something about how engagement connects with all the areas of the AFR. As far as I know, other universities that have incorporated engagement as part of their Research-1 missions have actually had trouble with the area of research. They have had trouble getting the idea of ‘engaged research’ to be recognized as being as rigorous as the other kind of research. Rutgers University is having a lot of trouble with this; they got the engaged Carnegie classification at about the same time that we did. Colleagues from Rutgers have indicated that they are having tremendous difficulties getting recognition for faculty who do research with an engagement orientation. Do you have anything to say on this subject?

Professor Gerber: It definitely is an issue, no argument. It is a lot easier in my department of Public Health to get tenured using an engaged process, because we understand the process and we honor it. We also have to go through several committees in the tenure process, and justify ourselves at every step. In many cases, it starts with the Department Personnel Committee; if that Committee gets it, then we move forward, but if they don’t, then it is really an education process to reach those who don’t really understand engagement.

Senator Calas: That’s really my question. Is this a wish or is there some attempt happening to engage with those who do not engage, who don’t recognize that we are making a claim to be an engaged campus and don’t incorporate it into the overall university orientation? I guess my question is: how does one get beyond the wish to be recognized?

Professor Gerber: If you have the magic wand, I’m looking for it! When I arrived here twenty-five years ago, qualitative research was not nearly as well respected as it is today. It’s an on-going process.

Presiding Officer Richard Bogartz: May I make a suggestion that the Council bring forth a statement on what you’d like to have happen, bring it to the Rules Committee, let it go out to the councils, let it come back to the Faculty Senate, and let the Faculty Senate take a position, and, hopefully, that will have some persuasive value.

B. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Principal Administrative Officers

Elizabeth Chilton, Associate Vice Chancellor for Research and Engagement: I’m hoping that you all got an email announcing that we have a brand new website for Research and Engagement (https://www.umass.edu/research/). We tried to organize the site in ways that would better communicate our major functions, so you’ll find Research Administration & Compliance in one place, Research Development in another, Centers & Institutes, and then our specialized research facilities. We’re looking for feedback. This is a collaboration with University Relations; they did a great job helping us transition from the old website to the new. Like a lot of our websites, the old one kind of grew organically. They helped us rein it in and better communicate the services and functions that we provide to the campus. If you have suggestions, or you are like me and we suddenly find that you can’t find something, please let me know. There may still be some glitches, so let me know directly, and I will refer it to the people who are working behind the scenes.
2. The Secretary of the Faculty Senate

*MJ Peterson, Secretary of the Faculty Senate*: At the December meeting, the Rules Committee anticipates bringing a proposal to create a Joint Task Force on Student Learning Outcomes. That’s not its full name; we’re still working on the name. The reason for this is that this is an action that is consistent with the strategic plan. It calls for further defining the learning objectives for our general education curriculum. These objectives complement and, in many cases, echo the learning objectives associated with specific programs of study. The strategic plan also reminds us that the next generation of higher education leaders will demonstrate how they establish learning objectives, communicate them to students, express them in the curriculum, gather evidence of their success, and, most importantly, use that evidence to improve curricula and pedagogy.

So this is an issue with which the campus is engaged. Why a Joint Task Force at this time? It will work on a particular piece of developing the learning outcomes assessment. That piece relates to the general education curriculum. As you know, the general education curriculum is about one-third of the average undergraduate’s course experience. Why do we want to do this? The immediate impetus is that when the Northeast Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC) did the interim review of our accreditation in 2013, they asked us how we were doing in developing these assessments. We had made a start, and they asked us to let them know well before our reaccreditation review, which is coming up in 2018, how we were doing with the rest of it. So the immediate impetus is that we need to respond to NEASC, and NEASC actually reads responses. You can’t just give them a bunch of nice abstract stuff and they’ll go away; you do have to have something substantive.

But the wider reason for doing this is the demand that is emerging in society as a whole for a better explanation and a better demonstration that students actually benefit from going to college. This is linked very closely to all the discussion of student debt. It’s linked very closely to schools getting people ready for jobs—although this should go beyond that. We can see this societal demand at the federal level; we can see it in the campaigning for president; *The Chronicle of Higher Education* reported last week on Obama administration initiatives in this area. They are limited right now, but, if they could get a change in the law, they could be more extensive. We can see it in several states. A lot of what is going on in public higher education in places like Wisconsin, North Carolina, and Indiana is a demand by the state, usually impelled by voters, for greater accountability by the public higher education system for the attainment of learning outcomes. It is being expressed here in Massachusetts. Secretary Peyser, who is getting more active in the direct management of higher education, says on his website about education in Massachusetts, that “we are committed to realizing a more rigorous, comprehensive and successful 21st Century education system that expands on our achievements….by investing in research-based strategies, raising standards and accountability, improving assessments, increasing the quality of teaching, promoting innovation, enhancing student supports and rewarding excellence…” So, right here at home, at the other end of the Mass Pike, this same demand for how you know that your students are actually getting what you say they’re getting is being expressed.

This is the discussion that is going on. We can’t ignore it. The Joint Task Force is a way for us as faculty to get our viewpoints, our understanding, our expertise, our lifelong engagement in teaching students into these discussions.

There will be a more carefully-crafted proposal brought forward at the December meeting. Thank you.

3. The Faculty Delegates to the Board of Trustees

*Susan K. Whitbourne, Faculty Delegate to the Board of Trustees*: Today, I ran an all-day scholarship workshop for Massachusetts public higher education colleges and universities. We had people come learn about scholarship opportunities. President Meehan was supposed to come open the workshop, but it turned out he had a busy schedule today. Chancellor Subbaswamy came in his place. This workshop doesn’t really have much to do with my role as Faculty Delegate to the Board of Trustees, except indirectly,
because we’re trying to raise the visibility of these national scholarships like the Fulbright and the Rhodes. The UMass Dartmouth Trustee won the Truman last spring, and it has brought everyone’s attention to the fact that we could be doing more for this. A side benefit of this is that President Meehan has made scholarships a big part of his inauguration today, as he is raising money for scholarships. These scholarships are things that ultimately benefit us all because we can show good students to people who say, “Show me good students.”

We haven’t seen the agenda for the December Board of Trustees meeting yet. CASA, the Committee on Academic and Student Affairs, has sent its agenda around for its meeting next week; PMYRs and performance reviews are being discussed as a carryover from a previous meeting. I don’t have a lot to report substantively, but if you have questions or issues that you’d like us to bring up, please let me know. I think the Intercampus Faculty Council is trying to get more substantive discussions going and come up with ideas that we would like to see rise to the surface. So, if there are any issues that you’d like us to discuss as a council or more generally, we’d be happy to do that.

C. QUESTION PERIOD

Senator Frank Hugus: I have two requests, rather than questions, for the administration and the Rules Committee; I am sure that the Rules Committee will take note and convey them to the administration. I am a member of the Ad Hoc Committee on FBS Football, and, over the last several years, we have been looking into the financial aspects of football. The amount of money that we are putting into football has continued to increase. We are ending another embarrassing season for the UMass players. As far as I understand, there has not been good attendance at the games. The off-the-field behavior of some of the players has been less than edifying. So I think that it is time that we take a very serious look at this affiliation in the Football Bowl Subdivision, and determine whether or not we should be doing this, or whether we should revert to what we had before—which seemed to do quite well, in my opinion. So I leave this with the Rules Committee to convey this to the administration and urge that we have a serious discussion of this issue. There are many, many implications, some of them financial, as I said, but many of them also academic.

My second request is about Amazon. I am here to urge the Rules Committee and the administration to look into the ways in which Amazon is intruding into the academic mission of the faculty. As I’ve said before, it is very difficult to order one’s textbooks independent of Amazon. I never ordered my textbooks from the old Textbook Annex anyway. Now – once the orders go in, they seem to either be gobbled up by Amazon and they decide that you need a different edition of the text or a different text, or occurrences like what happened in the case of one of my students, who paid $120 for a used copy of the book for which there was a reader that cost $23. This sort of thing is very poorly planned, it’s not thought out, and I think we need to have a thorough discussion of how Amazon can help us, not how it can hinder us.

Senator Marta Calas: I was listening to the explanation of the student learning outcomes assessment, and how we need to assess our teaching and contribution to the Commonwealth in our activities and how this is a very important pursuit that seems to come up every so often. The more the students pay, the more the story goes. I am having a real difficulty trying to understand if we really know what we are getting ourselves into. I think that assessment occurs when we are actually educating the public, and we should certainly assess ourselves and assess the job that we are doing. But the cries that we hear from outside of the University, both nationally and even internationally, tells me that somewhere there is something fundamentally happening in which the public seems to have a different understanding of what the role of the university as an educational institution is. I feel that, sometimes, we are pandering to that misunderstanding, because just looking outside of the classroom, the public discourse, including the political discourse at the moment, somehow lost the idea that the university is educating students for citizenship, to be the citizenry of the nation. I don’t know where the idea of education for citizenship went, or if the definition of what citizenship is had changed so fundamentally from what I thought it was. I say this as an educator; I educate both graduate students and undergraduate students. It seems to me that my students, after these many years, are demanding less of an education from me than more of a feeling good situation, in which that feeling good is more of a detriment of their educational process, not an engagement
nor an enhancement of it. I think that if we are going to engage in an assessment process, we need to look at what we want the role of the University to be and what it should be assessed on, not the other way around. I think that is a conversation that needs to happen. We do a lot of things in the University today, but we don’t talk much about what education truly means. We talk budgets and strategic plans and other managerial things, but we don’t talk about what it means to be an educated citizen of the state, country, or the world. What does that mean? We are not having that conversation, and it really bothers me.

**Senator Frank Sleegers:** I am very pleased that Senator Hugus is putting forward these thoughts on Amazon, and I would like to say some words in support of that. I was very surprised when Amazon got onto this campus. Another reason, in addition to Senator Hugus’ points, is that Amazon is a firm that is really undermining workers’ rights. If you look it up, you find that Amazon is undermining workers’ rights in every country, including the United States and Germany, where I’m from. We, as a land-grant university, have a responsibility to send the message out and also to support local businesses. Everyone talks about local food, right? But I think other local resources should be used, too. I think there are a lot of reasons to really think about these things, and these are some other arguments to support those of Senator Hugus.

(Presiding Officer Bogartz handed the gavel to Secretary MJ Peterson.)

**Senator Curt Conner:** My comments today refer to Secretary Peterson’s statements as well as some of what Senator Whitbourne said. I think we need to discuss the cost of education. I think we need to justify it a little bit more. We keep on increasing the fees and lots of things around here for students to come here and work, whatever education they are going to get. We were going to do some sort of evaluation of where the money was going, but we kind of stopped doing that. We stopped figuring out where the money is going, and where is it coming from. Ten years ago, there were no fees for graduate students, and now they are up to $10,000 a year sometimes, and no one can account for where that money goes. No one in this University can tell you where that money goes. It disappears! I certainly can’t tell what it does now that it didn’t do ten years ago. I know where it went—we all do: We’ve quadrupled the size and the amount of money of the administration. I did an evaluation about two weeks ago and found that over 25% of the money that comes in and that is paid out in salaries goes to a vice chancellor, dean, or provost—and they don’t teach any courses. So I think the Faculty Senate needs to deal with that in a very solid way by not putting any administrators on that committee at all. Because I know what they will count and not count. They’ve been doing it for years, and they certainly won’t tell you how much it’s increased. I’ve tried asking that question many times here. This is something that we have got to handle soon, because the public wants to know and certainly parents, who pay the tuition for their children to go here, want to know where the money is going. Thank you very much.

**Senator Richard Bogartz:** I have two comments. At a recent meeting of the Faculty Senate, the Chancellor asked that if people were going to make remarks like Senator Conner just made, they come equipped with facts. I just wanted to remind people of that.

My more important remarks have to do with the issue that Senator Calas discussed and with the proposed Joint Task Force that deals with concerns and the need for the University to justify its existence, to justify what it does with students. One of the phrases that Senator Calas used that triggered this was “what we’re getting into.” From my perspective, we are already in it. We are in a war. This war has a character of this sort: there are forces arrayed in this country that have as their goal the privatization of every public thing that they can get their hands on. There are attacks on every public institution, on common areas, on roads and bridges, on schools, and on universities. What they want to do is to somehow invalidate what the public does so they can make it privatized and therefore profitized. We are in the midst of it right now. Nothing I’m saying right now is an argument against the Joint Task Force. We may want to play that game. But while we’re playing that game, we ought to know what we’re up against and who is doing what.

(Senator Bogartz resumed presiding.)
D. **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. 02-16

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

Senator James Rinderle moved to amend the motion to include a new change to the membership of the Athletic Council. This amendment proposes that a faculty member, to be appointed by the Rules Committee, serve as the Faculty Senate’s representative to the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA) and be included as a member of the Athletic Council.

**Senator Marinos Vouvakis:** Why is the new member proposed in the amendment being appointed by the Rules Committee rather than the Nominating Committee?

**Senator Rinderle:** The reason for this change is that the current representative to COIA is also serving on the Athletic Council—they are serving the Athletic Council in two guises. Together with the Athletic Council, the Rules Committee thought that separating these two roles would be beneficial, and would increase faculty presence on the Athletic Council.

**Senator Vouvakis:** I understand that this will resolve the issues, but it could be resolved in a different way by requiring the Nominating Committee to choose two different faculty members. If the Rules Committee did not consider this option, I am wondering if I could interject it into your discussion? My only problem is that I get nervous when a committee chooses itself to appoint people. Additionally, nominating people to councils and committees falls closer to the purview of the Nominating Committee. I will speak to Senator Rinderle and the members of the Rules Committee about bringing an amendment to this amendment to the next Faculty Senate meeting.

E. **ANNUAL REPORT**


The report was received.

F. **CONSENT AGENDA**

[A consent agenda may be presented by the Presiding Officer at the beginning of a meeting. Items may be removed from the consent agenda on the request of any one member. Items not removed may be adopted by general consent without debate. Removed items may be taken up either immediately after the consent agenda or placed later on the agenda.]

**NEW COURSES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>CREDITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANIMLSCI 231</td>
<td>“Dorset Sheep Management I”</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANIMLSCI 233</td>
<td>“Boer Goat Management I”</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANIMLSCI 251</td>
<td>“Dorset Sheep Management II”</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANIMLSCI 253</td>
<td>“Boer Goat Management II”</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTHRO 384</td>
<td>“African American Anthropology”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAPANESE 142</td>
<td>“Survey of Pre-Modern Japanese Literature in Translation to 1600”</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MATH 461 "Geometry I" 3
MATH 471 "Theory of Numbers" 3
PHIL 105 "Practical Reasoning" 4
UWW 350 "Experiential Reflections on Health" 4
KIN 577 "Cardiovascular Physiology" 3
EDUC 674B "Higher Education Policy" 3
EDUC 676 "Secondary Data Analysis in Education Research" 3
EDUC 680 "How Children in Developing Countries Learn to Read" 3
EDUC 680B "Systems to Support Early Grade Reading in Developing Countries" 3
EDUC 745 "Educator Evaluation and Development" 3
EDUC 847 "Advanced Qualitative Thinking and Writing" 3
NURSING 612 "Advanced Practice Psychiatric Mental Health Nursing with Children & Adolescents" 3
NURSING 698AD "Practicum: Advanced Practice Psychiatric Mental Health Nursing with Adults & Older Adults" 3
NURSING 698CA "Advanced Practice Psychiatric – Mental Health Nursing with Children and Adolescents" 3
NURSING 722 "Psychiatric Mental Health-Complex Health Problems" 2
NURSING 798CH "Practicum: Psychiatric Mental Health Complex Health Problems" 2
NURSING 798GF "Practicum: Advanced Psychotherapy Modalities with Individuals, Groups & Families" 2

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the courses ANIMLSCI 231, 233, 251 and 253, ANTHRO 384, 03-16 JAPANESE 142, MATH 461 and 471, PHIL 105, UWW 350, KIN 577, EDUC 674B, 676, 680, 680B, 745 and 847, NURSING 612, 698AD, 698CA, 722, 798CH and 798GF, as recommended by the Academic Matters and Graduate Councils.

The motion was adopted.

G. CONSENT AGENDA (ITEMS 1-9 )
[A consent agenda may be presented by the Presiding Officer at the beginning of a meeting. Items may be removed from the consent agenda on the request of any one member. Items not removed may be adopted by general consent without debate. Removed items may be taken up either immediately after the consent agenda or placed later on the agenda.]

NEW BUSINESS

5. Special Report of the Graduate Council concerning a Revision of the M.Ed. in Educational Leadership, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 16-012 with Motion No. 04-16.
7. Special Report of the Graduate Council concerning a Revision of the M.A. Degree Program in English, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 16-014 with Motion No. 04-16.

8. Special Report of the Graduate and Program and Budget Councils concerning a Revision of the Requirements for the Concentration in Public Health, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 16-015 with Motion No. 04-16.


MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve 1) the Revision of the Requirements of the Online Certificate Program in Journalism, 2) the Accelerated MS in Labor Studies, 3) the Revisions to the B.F.A. Program in Studio Arts, 4) the Minor in Classical Archaeology, 5) the Revision of the M.Ed. in Educational Leadership, 6) the Revision of the Requirements for the M.S. Degree in Labor Studies, 7) the Revision of the M.A. Degree Program in English, 8) the Revision of the Requirements for the Concentration in Public Health and 9) the Five College Program and Certificate in Reproductive Health, Rights and Justice, as presented in Sen. Doc. Nos. 16-008, 16-009, 16-010, 16-011, 16-012, 16-013, 16-014, 16-015 and 16-016.

The motion was adopted.

{A corrected version of the Special Report of the Academic Matters and Program and Budget Councils concerning Revisions to the Bachelor of Fine Arts Program in Studio Arts, was adopted as Sen. Doc. No. 16-010A at the 753rd Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate on December 10, 2015.}

The 752nd Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate adjourned at 4:26 pm.