UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST
OFFICE OF THE FACULTY SENATE

Presiding Officer Richard Bogartz called the 754th Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate to order on January 28, 2016 at 3:30 p.m. in Herter Hall, Room 227, and began by reading Poem #822 by Emily Dickinson:

This Consciousness that is aware
Of Neighbors and the Sun
Will be the one aware of Death
And that itself alone

Is traversing the interval
Experience between
And most profound experiment
Appointed unto Men—

How adequate unto itself
Its properties shall be
Itself unto itself and none
Shall make discovery.

Adventure most unto itself
The Soul condemned to be—
Attended by a single Hound
Its own identity.

A. ADDRESS BY MARTIN T. MEEHAN, PRESIDENT, UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS
(QUESIONS AND DISCUSSION TO FOLLOW)

Martin T. Meehan, President, University of Massachusetts: Thank you for the invitation and the opportunity to speak to the Faculty Senate. I was telling Secretary Peterson earlier that this is my eleventh time on the Amherst campus and she said that that was more than any other president during an entire term. I think that is a good thing. I also wanted to thank each and every one of you. The faculty of this great flagship university is what this university is all about. I look at all the progress that’s been made in the last five years and it is directly attributable to the outstanding and high-quality men and women on the faculty here. The research, the teaching, the learning, the rise in the rankings and reputation—it really all comes down to the high-quality faculty. I have been around the UMass System for about nine years now; I always say that universities are really all about faculty and students and the interaction between those two groups. Everything else is really meant to encourage and to nurture that interaction. Universities are really about faculty, and I want to thank each one of you. You have led this university and this system to national and international prominence, and I congratulate you on that.

I look at the role of President as being a person who helps the Chancellor to move the agenda of this university forward. I should say that I worked with Chancellor Subbaswamy as a chancellor and colleague for three and a half years before becoming President. When I was at UMass Lowell, Chancellor Subbaswamy was the fourth Amherst chancellor that I dealt with in the matter of five and a half years. Regardless of what you think about the folks involved, that’s not good leadership. There’s too much change and too much turmoil. I really love Chancellor Subbaswamy’s leadership. I love that he is accessible, collegial, and a really good leader for this time at this institution. I am honored to be working with Chancellor Subbaswamy, and we work very well together.

From time to time, we get pieces that we wonder about in the paper of record in New England, the Boston Globe. Chancellor Subbaswamy, Vice Chancellor John Kennedy, and I had a meeting with the editors of the Globe the other day. I think we did a nice job of promoting the system and getting them to understand that there is a difference between the University of Maine and the University of Massachusetts. I don’t
know how many of you saw that editorial. But I thought we did well in promoting UMass Amherst and promoting the fundamental importance of UMass Amherst to the state. I consider that a big part of my role as President. I’ve been on this campus a lot, not to micro-manage it, but to better understand it. I want to get to know all of the campuses and hope to be able to support all the campuses in an important way.

In terms of budget updates, I can tell you that the Governor’s budget proposal came out and we got a 1% system-wide increase—that is about $5.3 million. However, the governor’s budget is only the beginning of the budgeting process. I think we have some support in the Legislature. I have been talking to the Speaker of the House and the Senate President on a pretty regular basis. I can assure you, I have met with the Speaker and the Senate President a lot. We are going to work as hard as we can to get as much of an increase in the budget as we can.

This year, we’re going to be implementing a process called tuition retention. Remember, we’ve had this system—frankly, an embarrassing system that no other university in the country has—where tuition would be $1,800 and fees would be $9,000. People would get their invoices, and we would get calls on all the campuses and at the President’s Office saying, “Wait a minute, I have a scholarship that says tuition is waived, but now I have a bill for $9,000?” It was a crazy system. Over the years, the House of Representatives had not supported changing the system, even though Senate President Rosenberg had been supporting the idea of change for years. I was on the job for three weeks and I went to meet with the Speaker of the House. I informed him that we were looking to get tuition retention, and he was vague about whether or not that would be possible. I pressed him on the issue and he finally agreed that tuition retention would be a good change for the system. I do think that having the tuition retention will help move the University forward. It is complex to figure out the details, and I do have to point out that, unfortunately, tuition retention is revenue-neutral. That means that each campus needs to make sure that enrollments are at least as high as they were, because if not, they will cut the budget. This is interesting: if we had gotten tuition retention ten years ago, it would have meant significantly more revenue for the University now because we have grown so much. We will really have to keep an eye on enrollment management and make sure that we continue to grow the enrollments at least enough to keep up with the cuts. If enrollment goes down and the budget is cut because of the enrollments last year, then we would actually lose money. It is very important to make sure that we manage our enrollment appropriately. Nevertheless, it is a positive development that I am very pleased about.

It is unclear if we are going to be able to get the state to make the kind of commitment it needs to make. It is very interesting to me, especially as a graduate of UMass Lowell where I participated in student government and lobbied the legislature. I graduated in 1978. It seems like it has been very difficult to get political leadership in Massachusetts to understand the importance of UMass. I think that the best, most effective argument is that the private institutions in Massachusetts educate very little of the state’s workforce. This is an innovation economy and they need to invest in us. GE recently moved their headquarters to Boston. Mayor Walsh asked me to give a presentation to the CEOs and administration of GE to help them make that decision. I will tell you that, fundamentally understanding the role of UMass, for example, in producing STEM graduates, I was able to compare the number of our graduates with those of the private institutions and show that we really drive the economy of Massachusetts. Those are the types of arguments that we’re going to have to make. I am having a meeting with the Pioneer Institute on Monday and, today, they sent me a report that they did on the University of Massachusetts. Chancellor Subbaswamy also received a copy of it. It is really interesting to see what we’re up against. They want to know why we have been borrowing so much money to build new buildings. Well, because the state let our buildings deteriorate! We are a research institution, and we need to build new facilities. They want to know why it has become so difficult to get into UMass Amherst—what about the people who can’t get in? UMass Amherst is an elite university; it is difficult to get into. They are wondering why people come to UMass Amherst from outside Massachusetts and outside of the United States.

Sometimes I think that there are those who believe that UMass shouldn’t be a research institution, shouldn’t strive for excellence, but should just put along. I can tell you that I took this position because I believe in UMass. When political leadership decides that UMass should be just “good enough,” then I am not going to be President here, because I don’t believe that and I reject that with very fiber in my body. We
need to continue to strive for excellence in everything that we do, and I think that the future of the Commonwealth requires us to do that. Obviously there will be challenges; there are currently budget challenges and we had budget challenges last year. One of the first things that I did when I became President was to declare my support for paying the contracts, because I don’t want to be president of a university that doesn’t pay on contracts negotiated in good faith and give the cost-of-living increases that were negotiated. The Commonwealth was supposed to pay for those but, as it turned out, they didn’t. I don’t regret the decision, but I regret the fact that we’ve had to make adjustments to our budgets to pay what the Commonwealth should have paid. We will continue to work as hard as we can.

One of the reasons that I mentioned the Pioneer Institute is that we have to figure out how we can more effectively get the pro-UMass message across, whether it’s lobbying the legislature and the Governor or responding to a report that will take tiny bits and pieces of information that will make it seem like the Commonwealth shouldn’t be supporting UMass. If you look around the world today, you’ll see that governments are being brought down by the power of social media and mass communication. One of the things I’d like to see everyone work on figuring out is how to be more effective in having all of our voices – those of students, faculty, deans, administration—heard in terms of the need to support UMass or to rebut, whether it is a piece that is unfair in the newspaper or it’s a study by a conservative think-tank funded by the Koch brothers that make it seem like UMass shouldn’t be a priority for the Commonwealth. I’m interested in ideas about this, and have been talking to people on and off the campuses about how an organization as large as UMass finds ways to be more effective in our communication.

I think this is a good place for me to stop talking and take any questions you may have.

Senator A Yemisi Jimoh, Chair of the Rules Committee: Welcome and thank you for your address to the 754th Regular Faculty Senate meeting. I know that you said that you will leave the governance of each campus alone, but I am interested in your ideas about two issues that I have in mind. First, last year, you described the UMass system as joined but simultaneously operating from five separate missions. You also mentioned that UMass Amherst needs an investment of resources. One can perceive the very taut tension with this need and its solutions. My question is two-tiered and connects to concerns for resources and concerns about academic quality. UMass Amherst is a residential university. In my view, overall, an effective classroom is the premier educational experience. Even given that some courses fare very well online and may even be on par with the classroom experience, what are your thoughts on how UMass can maintain its core excellence while responding to an increasing interest in online education, which can be very profitable to the campuses and the system as a whole? Also, while I recognize that student debt is a complex topic, it is an issue that persists for our students and their families on this campus and throughout the system. During your term as the chancellor of UMass Lowell, you investigated innovative ways to cut student debt. One proposal was a flat-rate tuition plan and another was a price cap for students transferring from community colleges. Do you think that such plans would be beneficial across the system and very particularly at UMass Amherst, if there is buy-in across the system and in the legislature and the Governor’s office? What might we anticipate in terms of financial impact on the campus, if a plan along these lines or a plan for a three-year B.A. is implemented?

President Meehan: That is a great question. Let’s start with online education and its role here. There’s been an explosion of online education across the country. What I think UMass needs to do, and what I’m going to try to figure out, is how to adopt blended and online learning. I think the answer has to be that it’s a mixture. In some instances, online learning can be more accessible to people. It’s not necessarily cheaper, by the way, something a lot of people have misconceptions about. I’m not a big fan of these for-profit, online programs that don’t lead to degrees. Frankly, we have a whole generation of men and women who served in Iraq and Afghanistan, and have come back with certain benefits, and have those benefits exhausted in programs, many of them online with institutions like University of Phoenix. It can be a negative thing. What I like about UMass online is the fact that these are nationally accredited programs with our faculty. I do think that online education is part of what UMass should be doing. Amherst and Lowell have developed the most robust online programs. I would like Dartmouth and Boston to grow their online programs a little bit more than they have to this point. That doesn’t take away from the fact that students
want to come to the university, they want to take courses, and they want to be in classrooms. I think there needs to be a combination of what you offer today. We need to offer a combination.

Being online doesn’t mean that you take away from the notion of a residential college. I have two boys, and I want them to go to college, be in class, and be engaged. I don’t necessarily want them to get a three-year degree, because I want them to be engaged and come to class. I don’t necessarily want them to do a thirty-plus degree program like we’ve been working on. But it remains that one of the ways that we can cut costs is to combine with community colleges in certain areas and programs; then, we can offer a cheaper degree. However, that would involve a lot of commuting. I don’t think that commuting is necessarily what we should encourage for everyone because the on-campus experience is important. As you say, this is a residential campus. The Chairman of the Board of Trustees talks about growing up in Springfield and then coming to UMass Amherst. If he had been commuting, it would have been a different experience. He needed to get out of the situation at home and into an academic program that changed his life. I’m a big believer that UMass should offer a mixture or a combination. There are some programs that are going to be good for certain students. Others are going to be good for other students. I think we need a combination.

I do think it is important for online education to remain within the domain of faculty governance. I love that we don’t outsource our teaching like I see some of the for-profit institutions doing. I do think that online education is part of what we should be doing. I personally think that blended learning—to the extent that you can bring students to campus two or three times a semester and have the rest online—could be a good model, too. Obviously, that wouldn’t work for an online student in California. But it’s a possibility. You mentioned the profit or revenue that would be generated. I do think that we’re in an era where we need to think about the fact that we need to generate revenue somewhere. The online education piece really helps with that.

You also mentioned three-year degrees. When Governor Baker was campaigning for governor, he talked a lot about three-year degrees. I decided to try to develop some three-year degrees on the campuses. Three-year degree programs are not appropriate for everyone. I think there are ten or eleven three-year degree programs here at Amherst, but they are not appropriate for everyone. But let’s take a good student who has done several tours in Iraq or Afghanistan and is in their late twenties as an example; they may want to get through as soon as possible. I’ve talked to several student-veterans who would love to have more opportunities for a three-year degree program. I can’t imagine recommending three-year degree programs for every student, because some students and their parents want the full four-year experience. But I think that three-year degree programs are part of the equation. I think that we’re into an era where we need to offer a wide range to all of our students. I think that’s an important thing for us to do.

**Senator Howard Peelle:** Thank you for being here. It’s tempting to ask you if we should strive for excellence in football, but I won’t. Speaking a little bit analogously, you did mention STEM as an area in which we should strive to be excellent. You also mentioned connecting with the community colleges and the three-year programs. How can the Faculty Senate help you identify these areas for excellence at UMass Amherst?

**President Meehan:** I want us to excel in everything that we do. When I got to UMass Lowell, I invested resources into the offices of the English department. I met with the faculty of the English department, and I said, “This is a great time to hire tenure-track faculty.” This was in 2008 or 2009, at the height of the recession, and private institutions were cutting back and not hiring. I told them to go find the best tenure-track faculty that they could possibly get. I offered resources to help them and told them that I wanted to see faculty searches for positions that were critically important for the future of the institution. A chancellor had never gone to the English department and told them to find the best new faculty members that they could—UMass Lowell is known for science and engineering. I told them what I just told you—we want to be excellent in everything that we do.

Given the governance structure, I look to get ideas about how to do this from the faculty. We can share ideas about what we need to do. Additionally, having great searches, getting the best people that we can, and looking at diversity and becoming a more diverse institution is also important. I think that excellence is
about looking at what the national norms are and what the best models are. When I became chancellor at UMass Lowell, I looked at university presidents around the country. I got to know Michael Crow at Arizona State University, and I like the way he runs things. I met up with him and brought my leadership team to Arizona. In this way, I looked for best practices and models. I think that we all need to do that here at UMass. We all need to think about what are best practices and how do we become better at all that we do. That’s my general philosophy about what we ought to be doing.

Another thing is that my job is to fight for state funding, and I’m going to fight as hard as I can. But we can’t let whatever happens with the state affect what we’re doing and our pursuit of excellence. That is one of the reasons that I mentioned revenue. It’s really important for us to figure out a way, when we develop an academic program, where the revenue might come from, how many students do we have, what is our full capacity, and how do we maximize our capacity so we’re creating more revenue that we can invest in more tenure-track faculty, invest in the quality of everything we’re doing. That’s different from how UMass may have thought thirty years ago, when the state would have provided a high portion of whatever the budget was. Interesting fact: the cost of a UMass education, if you factor in inflation over the last thirty years, hasn’t gone up. Actually, the cost has stayed steady or slightly gone down. What shifted is who pays for it. When I graduated from UMass Lowell, the state provided 88% of the budget there; today it is 24% and that is true across the campuses. There has been a shift from the state paying the lion’s share to the students and their families paying the lion’s share. I don’t think that we can afford to compromise on excellence in everything that we do. I believe that the University of Massachusetts Amherst is a better place to get a high-quality education than many, many other private institutions that cost two and three times as much money.

A key here is to raise more money for scholarships, and more money for the endowment. About twenty years ago, the UMass endowment was around $40 million; now, it’s at about $770 million. We are late to the game, but we need to continue our efforts in raising money. If the tuition is going to go up, we need to provide more scholarships so we are accessible to everyone. I think part of the deal here—and a big part of my job and of all the chancellors’ jobs—is to raise as much money as we can for student scholarships and continue to build on the amount of money available. When I was inaugurated, I was wondering whether I should have an inauguration. I had had an inauguration when I became chancellor and I raised a million dollars, so I figured that I would have another inauguration and raise money for student scholarships. We raised $1.7 million for student scholarships at my inauguration in the fall. It’s actually a funny story. The Boston Herald called and asked how much the presidential inauguration was going to cost. Our response was, “Under $100,000, for sure.” The paper ran a big headline the day before my inauguration reading: “Marty’s Party to cost $100,000.” But we raised $1.7 million. I went into the Boston Herald and told them that if I could have a party everyday and raise $1.7 million, I would do it. If we did that, we would raise over $500,000,000 for student scholarships. That would almost double what we have. I think that the idea of excellence in everything we do is a reason that fundraising is so important and why the Chancellor and I spend so much time on it—we need to raise money so we’re still accessible to everyone.

Craig Nicolson, Sustainable Science Program Director, Environmental Conservation: Thinking about what you just said about Michael Crow and about excellence, I’ve watched UMass Lowell, UMass Dartmouth, and our campus particularly become national leaders in the sustainability movement in higher education over the past five years. You also talked about how the university leads the innovation economy in this state. I’m curious: in the interactions you’ve been having on Beacon Hill, do you hear from legislators not just an emphasis on the innovation economy but also on the green economy? Is that something they are talking about? Is it a priority for them? I am thinking particularly about the current administration, because the Patrick administration was very much in support of this and set ambitious solar targets and things like that.

President Meehan: I agree, the Patrick administration really put this topic on the map in terms of the legislature. Once a governor has put something on the map it moves the legislature forward; legislators, even though many of them already supported it, become educated about the issue and support it. I think the Massachusetts legislature is in a better position on sustainability and green energy because of the work that was real strength, frankly, of the Patrick administration. I think that the legislature does get it, and I
think that will continue because of the real groundswell of support in Massachusetts. So, yes, those are initiatives that we will continue to see support for. Green energy and sustainability were on the front burner for the Patrick administration and, because of that, the Commonwealth is more engaged, involved, and supportive than they were before Patrick came into office.

Dr. Nicolson: In a similar vein as the previous question, are there ways that we, as the faculty at the flagship university, can help you make that case in support?

President Meehan: I think that writing Op-Ed pieces, speaking out, getting into social media, commenting on articles are all good ways. This links back to what I was saying earlier. We need to find the most effective ways to communicate. It’s not just through Op-Ed pieces in the newspapers anymore. It is amazing to me that the circulation of the major newspapers in America is just going down. We have to find a way to use social media and communicate with more and more people. I think that the extent that we can coordinate our messages as part of the UMass family would put us in a stronger position. I’ve been thinking about this for quite a while, and I plan on talking to some experts about how a university of this size can do better. If you think about it, we have 280,000 alumni in Massachusetts. We have all of these students, all of these faculty; we should be a major force in this state. If a place like the Pioneer Institute puts out a report, we should be able to kill it just with the UMass family in this state. I want to find a way to do that. If folks here have ideas about how to do that, email me or email Chancellor Subbaswamy. That’s something we have to get at because the UMass family is really a force, if you think about it.

Senator John Reiff: President Meehan, I have a split appointment this semester between here at UMass Amherst and the Massachusetts Department of Higher Education. I am sure that you are aware that the Department of Higher Education sets policy for the other two segments of public higher education in Massachusetts, and invites the University of Massachusetts to join in initiatives. In 2014, the Board of Higher Education passed a policy around civic learning and engagement, and invited the UMass system to join in the goal of ensuring that every undergraduate would participate in civic learning. To this point, I don’t think that there has been an affirmative response from the President’s Office. Wearing my UMass hat, I see UMass Amherst and the UMass campuses as leaders for public higher education, and I would love to see UMass Amherst step up and claim that leadership role as a participant or set of participants in this statewide work on civic learning and civic engagement. My question is: What do you think of that?

President Meehan: That’s a really good question, with a lot of history involved with it. UMass has independent governance from the community colleges and the state colleges. They are now called state universities, but, frankly, it is only a name change—their mission remains the same. We have an independent system of governance that was put together by something called the Saxon Commission, named after David Saxon, the President Emeritus of the University of California system. That’s when we became, 25 years ago, a five-campus system. I think that universities that have a degree of independence—even more than what we have now—is a good thing. I think universities need to be independent, and I think a problem in Massachusetts historically has been not having the universities independent enough, from the political process and everything else. The University of Massachusetts system, at last under the past two presidents before me, has had a propensity to not want to get under the umbrella of the Board of Higher Education when we don’t have to.

Now, I adopted a different tack when I was at UMass Lowell. Richard Freeland, the former president of Northeastern University, was the Commissioner of Higher Education, and he had a project that was looking at assessments and things like that, and the system rejected being part of it. But I volunteered to join in with them. In this instance, I will volunteer to join in on this issue as well. Secretary of Higher Education Peyser has meetings with all the people who report to him—no University of Massachusetts president has ever gone to those meetings because we don’t technically report to him. I have agreed to voluntarily go to those meetings. There are some folks on the academic side of the President’s Office who don’t think it is a very good idea for me to go to those meetings, but I’m trying to be collaborative.

I can tell you, from a PR perspective, I don’t necessarily want to be part of a PR campaign with the other sectors, because we’re different. We’re a research university. UMass is a public research university; it’s not
the same as a state university that doesn’t do research or have Ph.D. programs and it's not the same as a community college. Some people in authority in this state can’t tell the difference between a community college and the University of Massachusetts Amherst, the flagship university. It costs a little bit more to be a public, flagship research university. The reason why historically there has been a little bit of a sense that we'll just go our way is that we don’t want to be tied with them.

But you asked what my perspective is. My perspective is that, as long as it’s voluntary, I want to be collegial. I have met with the community college presidents three times; there’s never been a UMass president yet to meet with the community college presidents three times. I think the collaboration with the community colleges is very important. When somebody says to me, “You can’t get into UMass Amherst anymore,” I say, “We have a great system of community colleges. When a student goes to a community college and is successful, they can transfer to any of the UMass campuses, and have a higher likelihood of academic success than the students we admit with the higher SAT scores or the higher GPAs.” I’m a big believer in collaborating with the community colleges. In fact, I see us collaborating even more with the community colleges.

That’s the history. I wanted to mention it because it’s a very interesting issue. I think UMass’s independence and governance is really important. We’re not part of that system, but we can collaborate. On the issue of civic engagement, we will do that. Here’s another example: They wanted us to agree to participate in these $30,000 degree programs. It’s a good idea; I’m all in favor of a $30,000 degree program. But can we have a $30,000 degree program in engineering? No, we can’t. There are only certain subjects that work, and even those are a challenge. I don’t want the political leadership in this state to think that UMass is the same thing as a community college or the same thing as a state college. That’s where the rub is. That’s a very good question, and I’ve given you a lot of the history. But the short answer is yes, I will participate as long as I don’t jeopardize the governance model of UMass.

Senator Richard Bogartz: You suggested that one of the things we ought to be doing is mobilize to inform the state as to how we drive the economy and beneficial effects of this university. When I think about that, it’s a good thing. But I really want to see taxes go up, to see people pay more to support us. We’re taking it for granted that it’s going to go down, but it really needs to go up. When you think about the possible effects of informing them of how beneficial we are and what a good job we do, I don’t think it makes them want to pay. I think the question is: how do we get the people in the state to fall in love with the University of Massachusetts? Once they fall in love with us, they’ll want to give us their money. I don’t know how to do that. I know that there have been some abortive attempts having to do with athletics, but those don’t seem to be working. I’m not sure they will work ultimately. But, somehow, we need to present ourselves in the light of being lovable. I don’t know the trick of that, but I do know that once they love us, they will support us better than they do now.

President Meehan: I was in the Congress for a number of years, and one of my first votes in my first year was to increase taxes as part of President Clinton’s economic package. It really was good for the country. It was a tough vote. I was one of 111 new members of Congress elected that year, and half of that freshman class lost their seats in the 1994 elections, which resulted in Newt Gingrich becoming Speaker of the House. I’ve talked to some of those former members, who feel that they lost because of that vote. I’ve told them that it was the best thing we could do for the country at that time. Losing a seat because of a vote for something that our economy really needed and helped get us where we needed to go was the price. I identify with what you’re saying. When I was chancellor at Lowell, we had a number of years where state support decreased. I always wondered why they didn’t just vote for an increase in taxes. That’s a question for political leadership to answer. They have to make those judgments.

But I think you’re right. We need to get more people thinking in terms of investment in UMass. That doesn’t always lead to the average person saying, “Yes, increase taxes!” But we do have to think about that. One of the more encouraging developments is the number of UMass alumni in the legislature. Historically, the legislature has been comprised predominantly of graduates of the private institutions. Today, the number of UMass grads has never been higher in the legislature. One of the things that I’m doing now is that I’m inviting UMass grads over to the office. PHENOM and the students are going to have a day at the
Statehouse, and we’re inviting all the UMass alumni in the legislature after that day so we can have further discussions with our legislators.

We have to keep working. That’s why Chancellor Subbaswamy and I were in the Boston Globe’s offices, talking to the editorial board. We need to get people to understand how important UMass is. Too often, people are taking cheap shots at the university without looking at how fundamentally important it is. We’re into an era where institutions are always getting hit, and we need to find a way to turn that around and get people to understand the importance of the university. I think that can happen by highlighting our graduates more—we have graduates who are doing amazing things, not just around the state, but around the country and the world. I’m all for however we can get that to happen. I was disappointed—I’m not a fan of gambling, but we passed a law about gambling in Massachusetts and UMass wasn’t even in the equation. I’m all for local aid, but it seems like local aid gets more support than UMass. We have to get to that point that when someone talks about funding UMass or funding public higher education, people say, “Yes, that’s what we need to do.” I agree with you on this, we have to find ways to do that.

Senator Curt Conner: I have two questions or concerns. You discussed enrollments and how they have increased to some extent. Certainly, my department, Chemical Engineering, has four times as many students as eight years ago. But the number of faculty has not increased by even ten percent. You didn’t talk at all about increasing the number of faculty. You also didn’t talk about making academic administration more efficient. The number of vice chancellors, vice provosts, associate and assistant deans has increased much faster than the number of faculty, because the number of faculty has actually gone down. Can you talk about trying to address those two concerns—one being increasing the actual number of people who teach the students—that’s the faculty—and the other being making the administrative overhead less? If you talk to Eric Kaler, you’ll find he has a different perspective. His perspective is cutting down the cost per student for administration by twenty-five percent.

President Meehan: That is a good question. When I talked about increasing revenue at UMass Lowell, I used that revenue to invest on the academic side in more tenure-track faculty members. That is fundamentally important. I have been a big supporter of faculty. In fact, the way that UMass Amherst is going to get from #29 to #20 in the rankings is by increasing the tenure-track faculty lines here. I don’t think there is a disagreement about that at all. It’s part of the reason that we are fighting as hard as we are for more money.

We have had efficiencies put into place. We’re now talking about the possibility of having consultants come in and look at the administration and see where we can cut and where we can streamline. I’m open to any ideas about how to do that. I fundamentally understand that there is nothing at a university more important than adding tenure-track faculty members. I want to lower our faculty-to-student ratio. I did that at UMass Lowell—it is one of the reasons that Lowell got into the U.S. News & World Report rankings. We generated more revenue to hire more tenure-track faculty members to get more classes at a less than twenty student per faculty ratio. I can remember talking to people in calculus and physics, and fifty percent of the students were flunking Calculus 101. I looked into it and found that they had 110 students in a single calculus course. I went to the faculty and asked why fifty percent of the people taking it were flunking calculus. They responded that that was true, and it was a difficult course. I asked why the classes were so large, and they responded that it was cheaper that way. If you look at the trends, at what places like Harvard and MIT are doing—they’ve found that if you reduce the number of students in a calculus or physics course by quite a bit to twenty or thirty students and you have lectures available to students whenever they might be doing their homework, those are the best practices. I told the faculty that we don’t want to save money by having 110 students in a single course when all the data and evidence show they do better in smaller classes. Studies also show that when students flunk courses in the first year, student retention goes down, which also means you lose a lot of revenue. When a student leaves, they take a lot of money for the institution with them. I am a big fan of reducing student-to-faculty ratios. Chancellor Subbaswamy and I discuss ways to do this. We measure the student-to-faculty ratio and keep track of it. I hear you, and I’m glad you asked this question. We will continue to strive to increase our tenure-track faculty numbers.
B. JOINT PRESENTATION BY JULIE BUEHLER, VICE CHANCELLOR FOR INFORMATION SERVICES AND STRATEGY AND CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER, MATTHEW DALTON, CHIEF INFORMATION SECURITY OFFICER, AND PROFESSORS STEVEN D. BREWER AND RYAN WRIGHT
"THE STATE OF INFORMATION SECURITY"
(QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION TO FOLLOW)

*Julie Buehler, Vice Chancellor for Information Services and Strategy and Chief Information Officer:* Here’s the challenge. We were told that we would be on this agenda before I knew who the lead-in was going to be. So there we were, wondering how we can use the fact that we have a full house to our advantage? First, I’d like to thank the Faculty Senate for having us back again to talk about information security. Secondly, thank you for this time slot. Thank you, President Meehan, for packing the house. Considering President Meehan’s reputation as a charismatic speaker, I thought we’d better start strong. What you’re seeing is actually a vendor product, although I am not endorsing the vendor product in any way. What you are seeing are live information security attacks occurring as I speak. If the screen freezes up, it’s not because of a network issue; it’s because the volume of attacks is so great.

The last time I was here, we talked about the assessment in IT. You’ll recall that the way we work in IT is that we first assess the current state, envision where we want to be, and then start walking toward it. When I last gave you an assessment about information security, I said quite honestly that we were way behind. For example, when I first arrived here about two and a half years ago, we had people who had not changed their NetID in over a decade. That’s just one illustrative point. Since then, the good news is that we have made tremendous progress. We’ve put in new policies and processes that we vetted for a year, we’ve put in some new tools, and there’s been good progress. The bad news is, the evildoers have also made tremendous progress. One of our challenges is how do we get busy people across our campus and our system to pay attention to information security. Part of what we want to do today is to educate you on how the threats have changed recently and what we can do to prevent occurrences from happening.

I have some guests with me today. In the same way that we approached our network and data projects, information security, and even writing our strategic plan, instead of approaching it from only an administrative perspective, we’ve leveraged the experts on campus: the faculty members who study those issues. For the network plan, we went to the faculty who study networks and they helped us design it. For the Data Center, we went to the Data Center experts and they helped us with our design. Today, I have with me two faculty members who are going to present some of their expertise on information security, alongside our new Chief Information Security Officer, Matthew Dalton.

*Matthew Dalton, Chief Information Security Officer:* Good afternoon. Thank you for the opportunity to speak with you on this issue. As Vice Chancellor Buehler mentioned, the game really has changed. That website illustrates part of that. Another way the game has changed is that, as Vice Chancellor Buehler was speaking, I took a look out at the room and saw a lot of glowing Apple logos and even more cellphones. Our reliance on technology has exploded. Ten years ago, you would have seen notepads and paper. I still see some people with that, but for most people, technology isn’t just a part of their lives. In many ways, it is central to their work, to their entertainment, to the vast majority of their waking hours and, for some people, even their sleeping ones. In business and in higher education, technology has become a strategic portion of how those enterprises operate. In addition, the cost of security breaches has gone up significantly within the last ten years. It may be hard to remember a time before we had headlines reading, “Major Corporation Loses Millions of Patient Records” or customer, employee, or student data. It’s only been ten years since California introduced its first major information security legislation in 2006 and these headlines started appearing. Another major change is compliance requirements. If you are involved in health care in any way, you know about HIPAA. Every faculty member here no doubt knows FERPA. For researchers,
you’re used to seeing contracts come up more and more in grant proposals that are specific security requirements whereas before, it was “try your best.” The scariest part is that the attackers’ skill and funding are changing, too. It used to be that they were in their basements, on winter break and had nothing better to do, so they figured they would see if they could break into the government. Now, it’s not the people in their basements, it’s people who are being paid to work full-time. It’s criminal organizations, terrorist organizations, and nations attacking each other. Now I’m going to have Dr. Wright come up and talk about how the main target for that isn’t the computer, it’s the people in this room.

Ryan White, Associate Professor, Operations & Information Management: Thank you. My name is Ryan Wright, and I’m in the Isenberg School of Management. I study how organizations are affected by IT and cybersecurity threats. I want to start with a story. When I was an assistant professor at the University of San Francisco, I received a phone call from one of our trustees. The trustee was the owner of a Fortune 100 company, somebody that I clearly did not expect to get a phone call from. He called me up and said, “I understand you know something about cybersecurity?” I said, “I think so. I guess we’ll find out.” He said, “I think I’ve done something on my computer that I shouldn’t have done. What should I do?” After asking him if he was at home, I said, “Walk over to the dishwasher. Put your computer in the dishwasher and turn it on.” At that point, when you’re infected by these things, it is already too late.

Today, I am going to tell you a little bit about my research and why it is so important that we stay vigilant. The IT model is now changed from what we’ve seen before. We’ve been dealing with the indemnification model of IT. Indemnification means that I can take President Meehan’s credit card and go around town, having a good time. And how much is President Meehan on the hook for? Nothing. That’s indemnification. The problem with IT today, especially for faculty, is that we can go around with our computers and do anything we want with these computers and be indemnified by our IT departments. That model is now broken and I will show you why.

If we look at the top five cyber attacks, we can see that the internet of things is a big one here. If you ever want to know if someone is interested in or paranoid about information security, you’ll see a little sticky note or something over their webcam. That usually means, “I’m afraid of someone looking at me.” That’s internet of things. Hackers can easily attack devices that aren’t as smart. We also see the denial of services attacks, which Vice Chancellor Buehler showed you. Hackers are just bombarding things with messages. We also see social media attacks—that’s number three right now—where you get people going through your Facebook, LinkedIn, or Pinterest, or other things to find identifying information. I’ve done research on mobile attacks. I’ve found that people make bad decisions on their mobile phone. We also see third-party attacks, where someone can use other people’s information to get connected to you. An attacker knows someone’s friend, and uses that friend’s information to attack that person. What really has happened now is that we’ve moved away from technical attacks to where the top attacks are the social engineered attacks; here the target is people sitting in this room, rather than devices. We need to think about new ways of protecting ourselves.

One of the things I’ve studied is phishing attacks. We’ve all received the phishing emails. In fact, in 2013, phishing attacks went up 91%. In the past year, phishing attacks have gone up 139%. The attacks have shifted from focusing on consumers to focusing on organizations. They are now attacking organizations. We’ve seen stories like Target: Target was breached a little more than a year ago. It came to light that hackers were in their POS system over Thanksgiving and stole millions of consumer records. And guess who lost their job because of that? The CEO of Target.

So we’re changing the models in how we think about this. As Chief Information Security Officer Dalton mentioned, we see now that these attacks are collaborative, these are businesses that are attacking businesses. These are governments that are attacking governments. They know that the weakest link is folks like you, sitting in this room. We are good enough technically to protect ourselves, but not good enough socially to protect ourselves.

So we have this idea of phishing, which can take many media. We had fax-phishing at one point in time, we have phone-phishing, where people call and try to do social engineering attacks. We’re all familiar with
email-phishing, and there’s phishing on social networks. But it’s really changed: the hackers have gotten better and better, and they respond to economics. They are stealing your information because they can sell it. The average credit card goes for about $50 online, if you go to the right places, which I don’t recommend. They are making money. $50 doesn’t sound like a lot, but think about if they steal five million or fifty million—that’s a lot of money these folks are making off of us. They are becoming millionaires overnight by stealing your information, through you, and through your particular company.

How do they garner this information about you? We know that they go and look at information on your CVs, your Facebook profiles, your LinkedIn profiles. By the way, when you get challenge questions for security, what is most of the information? Personal. You forget your password, you get a challenge question, like “Who’s your best friend?” Well, I can find that out on Facebook. “What street did you grow up on?” I can find that out as well. These challenge questions are not the answer to this particular problem. We’re seeing very customized attacks. I want to show you an example. About ten years ago, I wanted to start collecting phishing emails. I wanted to use a computer that I could segment from my network, so it couldn’t touch my research or anything in my home, but I could have a fully operating production environment. So I confiscated my wife’s laptop, which is why, to this day, she still can’t print in our house. But I wanted to go through and see the evolution of these messages. These are actual messages. This message is one I received in 2006 and it is addressed “Dear Generic Bank User.” We see this and can discount it accordingly. About eight years ago, I started getting messages saying, “You have a tax return.” Well, I do have a tax return, so this message is a little bit better crafted. Last year, I received a message saying that I was invited to a wedding—I love weddings! This is something that hackers are getting better and better at. This message is one saying that someone had posted something nasty about you on Facebook; this one says you’ve received an invoice from UPS. This message was actually sent to a small import/export company in California. They clicked on the link, and a nasty piece of software was installed on their computer that made a wire transfer for $50,000 out of that company. That company had to go into bankruptcy protection because an employee clicked on an email.

My job here is not to scare you, but to get you a little informed about what’s going on. The most current attacks that we’re seeing have to do with how we’re using production environments and what I call shadow systems. Who here uses a product like Dropbox, OneDrive, or Google Drive? Who here has gotten an invitation to join a shared folder using one of those products? Hackers understand that this is how we’re doing business, how we’re clicking on links, so they are crafting messages and attacks accordingly. I want to show the number one attack from last year, the most successful attack in the history of phishing. If you get a request from Jayden Ross, I suggest that you do not accept that request. This is an actual phishing message that is designed to look like a LinkedIn request. Over 50 million people clicked on this link and it installed something nasty on their computer.

So, we know this is a big problem, we know it’s going on, and has been for quite a while. What I want to point out to you is that universities are the most exposed. In fact, we had a recent story in the news about a faculty member at the University of Virginia who clicked on an email link last week, installed something on their computer. That something used this person’s credentials to log onto 1400 different people’s W-2 forms, direct deposit information, and social security numbers. How did UVA find out about this? The FBI called them and told them that they were seeing the information being sold online.

I’m telling you this to drive home the point that we need to change our thinking about IT. As a former engineer and as someone who used to work in my basement, the model can’t be that IT guys are the weirdos in the basement anymore. It really needs to change into a co-created experience about security or we’re going to have a problem here on campus. That is a guarantee. With that said—and hopefully I’ve scared the pants off of you—what I want you to take back with you today, to your faculty, is that we really need to think about different ways of securing our information. We need to think about what we’re doing online; that’s sitting in front of Downton Abbey, answering student emails, or we’re doing grading and we’re not expecting problems. Email cannot be an afterthought. It needs to be a mindful experience, or we’re going to ruin people’s lives. Somebody is going to steal their information, and it’s going to be a big problem.
Chief Information Security Officer Dalton: Next, we want to give you a little bit of a sense of where we’ve been. I know that the last time that Vice Chancellor Buehler talked to you about information security, it was kind of a scary subject. Unfortunately for this time, it is still kind of a scary subject. But I did want to tell you a little bit about the progress that has been made so far.

There has been a tremendous effort from within UMass IT and across the university to address some of the gaps that we have experienced. We’ve come a long way. Some of those steps include doing a campus assessment and making some key hires, as well as some planning and policy work that are really laying the groundwork for being able to roll out some of the other protections as we’re experiencing these increased attacks. Some of that is still ongoing, including the IT strategic planning process.

Vice Chancellor Buehler: The draft went out to the chairs of the committees yesterday. It will go out on Friday to the 160+ participants across campus who helped us develop this draft. Next week, we will be rolling it out to the whole campus in draft form. Then we will be holding open sessions to get feedback; we’ll be accepting feedback for several months.

Chief Information Security Officer Dalton: You may have heard about the foundational security that we are rolling out across campus. We are about 62% done at this point, and our intention is to have it completed by the end of this year. We’re also visiting a variety of different organizations. One of the things I’ve been doing in my first three months has been meeting with a lot of different groups across campus to try to understand the assets that we have, the value of what’s on campus, and some of the risks that people are experiencing. We’re getting a good understanding of the maturity of the information security plans and strategies that exist across campus. I’m seeing a lot of good, but I’m also seeing a lot of need that people are expressing. It is encouraging to hear the number of people who understand that demand, which is growing. What we’re looking at in the future is finishing the foundational controls and foundational security rollout as well as information security liaisons.

We've been having some questions about the foundational security, and I want to help people understand a little bit more about what that is. It is the basics of end-point, device security. It's making sure that your system is up to date, that it has the most recent patches, that the holes where the attacks are coming aren’t there when they get to your system. It’s making sure that the firewall is on, so, again, they can’t get through. It’s making sure that, if someone does get through, we can stop a lot of the damage using an anti-malware program. It’s if someone loses their laptop or has their desktop stolen from their office, then we only need to worry about the cost of replacement of a piece of equipment and not about news headlines announcing employee information breached or student records lost. Those are some of the things we’re rolling out across campus for the protection of everybody.

In a longer time frame, we’re taking the approach that it has to start with standards and with risk. There are many people who have looked at risk across information security and looked at effective practices. Rather than inventing our own, we’re using industry standards, government standards, and a number of others, and we’re applying them to the risk that is within different parts of the university. That means that we are being context-aware. In plain English, that means that a researcher who is working on a military research project is not going to have the same level of protection as a community member who is attending a conference here. They will have much more. Toward that end, we need this to be a community-driven effort. It’s not something that one person, six people, or even sixty people can do. It’s something that everyone in the university has to be equipped to be able to deal with, and it’s something that we have to get feedback from the entire university on how to institute those protections effectively across the institution. The last part of that process is recognizing that it is a process. This isn’t something where, at the end of the year when the foundational security is all in place, it’s done. This isn’t something that will be done in five years. As we talked about, ten years ago, breaches were practically nonexistent. Now, we have nation-states and organized crime involved. In another ten years, that’s going to be even more. Our security and protections have to keep pace with threats that are happening across the world. That’s not to say that there aren’t challenges and my colleague, Steven Brewer, will discuss those.
Steven D. Brewer, Senior Lecturer, Biology: I am the director of the Biology Computer Resource Center and the co-chair of the Information and Communication Technology Council. This presentation is, to a certain extent, was my idea. The foundational security process has been moving forward, and I think that faculty members will start to see things move forward, and I wanted to make sure they were aware these things were happening and be prepared to a certain extent.

There’s a long-standing joke in IT that the most secure computer is turned off, unplugged, and buried under six feet of cement—very, very secure, but not very usable. There’s always a tension between usability and security, and we need to strike a reasonable balance. As we move forward with the foundational security controls and the other things we’re doing, you’re going to find it more difficult to do the things that you do. There will be things that you’ll need to learn to do a different way, because the way you’ve been doing them isn’t going to continue to work. That’s the main thing I want to alert people to. We’re going to have to expect that moving forward. We can’t just turn the computers off and start from scratch. Mixing metaphors, we need to fix the plane while it is flying. The process moving forward is going to require some accommodations.

Another point that I really wanted to make is that there are real opponents out there. We need to pull together and work together as a team. I think that’s something that is different for faculty. It’s not what gets you here necessarily. Many people are used to going off and focusing on their own thing and doing whatever needs to get done to make things happen. But what we need to pull together and treat information security as a key process of the university. We need to think about information security in the same way as we do about physical security—keeping stuff locked up, making sure doors are closed, making sure people don’t walk off with your stuff. We need to treat information security in the same way. We need to be alert to and recognize social engineered attempts and, as Dr. Wright pointed out, those are getting more and more complicated and difficult to recognize. We’re also seeing ones that are targeted to you specifically. That is, somebody who knows you and has tried to leverage that information to get access to what you have access to.

We also need to make sure that our business processes don’t encourage insecure behavior. I received an email about an internship that I purportedly needed to approve. The email said it came from Career Services, but it actually came from a third-party company and it wanted me to click on some link that had some complicated information. So I checked and, sure enough, it was a real email, and I could click on the link. That’s the sort of thing we need to become sensitive to—to recognize this as a moment to ask if UMass really wants me to go to simpatico.com and click on something? Maybe not. It’s something you’d probably need to check on. We also need to realize that we need to balance security and productivity. It’s not a good idea to circumvent the procedures in order to get something done. I think that is a tradition of faculty: sometimes people will cut corners as they try to get things done and meet deadlines. If you think that security impacts productivity, it’s nothing compared to a breach. If your department ends up leaking information, what you and your department will have to do to respond to that will be much, much worse.

I also want us to remember who the enemy is. I think IT staff sometimes have a tendency to treat end-users as the enemy and vice versa. Faculty feel that IT staff try to keep them from doing their work, and IT staff feel that faculty will work hard to circumvent what they see as obstacles. We need to have good communication, to build a culture of working and adapting together. We also need to make sure that we have sufficient resources. Faculty need to demand the support that they need, they have to be willing to work within the system to get it, they need to learn how data needs to be managed, and be respectful of the changes that are coming forward. The other thing that is important to recognize is that we’re going to be moving from a more diverse ecosystem of technology that we’ve had up until now to something that is a lot more of a monoculture. Our diverse ecosystem is supportable in certain ways but we don’t have enough support to make sure that it is all secure. It ends up becoming a target-rich environment. We want to try to move forward to something that, although it’s a monoculture, it’ll be more standardized and it will have fewer surfaces for attackers to target. We need to recognize that, even so, the vulnerabilities that are left then may be pervasive, like using the same anti-virus program and being vulnerable to the same virus that comes in and then can propagate everywhere.
Chief Information Security Officer Dalton: Thank you, Dr. Brewer. So, why should you all care? In the beginning, with the attackers, it was about, “Look at this cool thing that I can do. I must be really good.” It was about reputation, about the thrill of the hack. Then those teenagers—it was mostly teenagers at the time—grew up, and their parents weren’t paying the bills anymore. Then it was about money. They realized they needed a job and the only skill they had was breaking into your stuff. It was the phishes, the requests for credit card numbers. It was using crypto-locks to hold other people’s technology for ransom. But there’s another part that is now emerging. It’s not just about the thrill anymore and not just about the money anymore. It’s now about who controls the future. It’s about whether or not we are the ones who are innovative, whether or not we are ones in control of the innovation economy, whether or not we are building and being recognized as among the best in the world for developing and creating the future and preparing the leaders of tomorrow. That’s why it’s important not just for anybody or any business, but why it’s important for the flagship campus of the UMass system to care about this. This is why, if we want to stay here not just among the world’s top universities but growing as one’s the world’s best, we need to care about this threat. There are people out there who want to be where we are. They will do what it takes to disrupt our progress, to steal what we have developed—the hard work that the people in this room have done and that the people that you represent have done. That’s why this is important for us specifically.

So what do you do? We need your help to commit to protect the value that we have for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, for the nation, and for the world. President Meehan said we had 280,000 alumni just in Massachusetts. But UMass is known not just in Massachusetts; it’s known worldwide as an innovative leader. So helping to protect that leadership, that innovation, and that future is part of what we’re asking for. That’s really three things. As we’re working on the protections, help us by helping us to implement them and by giving feedback, so we know that the context is understood and that we can do our best to help you work for the future. Continue to learn how to protect yourself against the new hacks and phishes that happen. Do not click on that email even though it looks like you’ll get in trouble if you click on it. Reach out to us, like Dr. Brewer mentioned. The IT staff is not here to stop you. One of the ways that we’re making this a community-driven effort is by working with your IT staff to make sure that they are prepared, so if you have questions, you can go to them and they can guide you on a way to do safer research and help make sure you are compliant and that you aren’t falling victim to any of the attacks that we showed you today.

Senator Susan Krauss Whitbourne: I have a question about the Google Apps@UMass. They are quite difficult to coordinate with your own Gmail account, and I know other people who have experienced this. I know it can be gotten around, but I worry that, when you go through all of these steps, people get more insecure, so to speak, mostly because you have to take all of these extra steps and people might use shortcuts.

Chief Information Security Officer Dalton: Sure. Typically, that has to do with the contracts with Google. Higher education institutions have contracts with a lot of different companies like this, and I’m not sure of the particulars of our contract, and we can also talk after the meeting about this approach. Typically, however, you want to segment it off because, by contract, you’ve worked with Google to make sure that they don’t do some of the data-mining practices that they do with the normal Gmail. So that’s why there is that wall of separation between the two.

Professor Wright: People ask me all the time, “How do I know if I’m being insecure?” We know through the kens of our research that, if you just pause for a moment before clicking on something and think about what you’re doing, you’re 80% more likely to make the correct assessment on what’s going on. It really is about being mindful of these issues. We also know that, if you tell an IT person, you are 99% more likely to be secure. So, we know that talking it through with the person beside you, even if they are an officemate and not an IT person, you are more likely to be secure. If you want that 100%, go to the IT people. If you pause for a moment before making a decision, you will probably make the right decision. That’s how you act securely online.

Senator Anthony Paik: Thank you for this presentation. I personally take this to heart. I’m a PI on a multi-university study and my collaborator at another university was hacked and the server where we store our
data was hacked, and now we’re dealing with the cleanup of that. I’ve become aware of their policies over there, and one of the things they have is a server registry. So all studies, particularly externally funded studies, are required to have their servers registered as a way of keeping track of IT. I was wondering if that is part of the plans here?

**Vice Chancellor Buehler:** Absolutely. One of the opportunities with our new Data Center is for us to pause and re-look at all our policies and strengthen them considerably as we go into the new Data Center. The Data Center is a two-phase project. We’ve actually finished with the build now, and we’re going to move the machines in soon, which is when we’ll put the protocols in place. Absolutely, that is under consideration.

**Chief Information Security Officer Dalton:** We’re also looking at it from a vantage point of the research side of the house. Part of the listening tour has been to talk to various members of the research community. Vice Chancellor Buehler and I are meeting with the Research Council next month about that sort of topic. We’ve already been engaged in the research area in order to figure out what the right controls are as we’re building those out, not only on the technical foundation but also in procedures. We’re making sure both are adequately matched.

**Vice Chancellor Buehler:** One of the areas that we are working in right now, both in the UMass system and with Boston University, is having HIPAA data that we can store from the HPC environment. We’re working on the potential for that right now, and that should be exciting. Right now, people have to go outside to do that. We’ll be able to bring that in and control that a little better.

**Senator MJ Canavan:** One of the things that has been successful at other institutions is developing communities of practice to commiserate about some of these technical and security things. I also wanted to thank you for doing this presentation, but also wanted to note that IT has done some really great things with Tech Talks. They’ve kind of run the gamut of different technological topics. But security might be another one. I know that you had one about identity theft, and I think it was a very compelling and well-attended presentation. I think some of those would be very helpful. Could you speak to what you might do about that?

**Vice Chancellor Buehler:** I have a couple of thoughts about that. Communities of practice are a strong theme in the IT strategic plan. We have pockets on campus that have information, but we need to find easier ways to share across the campus community. Every section of the IT plan says that. We definitely need to do that on topics that include and go beyond information security. We do have some communities of practice already. For example, we work with the other campus CIOs on information security. If there is an incident, you can bet that we are talking. We also work with state and federal agencies. But I do think that we could do better on the campus side of that.

**Chief Information Security Officer Dalton:** You also mentioned the Tech Talks. That is something we’ve been engaged in. In December, we had agents from the FBI come in and discuss the current state of cyber risk. It was actually a very successful talk for a number of reasons. One reason was that it was right before finals week, but we still had over 100 students attend. The other thing is that we asked the agents to not just talk about risk, but also about potential employment opportunities to help our students explore cybersecurity as a career. The agents brought maybe fifty fliers about how to apply for an internship or employment at the FBI. There was a line for them and they ran out, and there were still about a dozen or so people asking where they could find more information. It was a very successful talk. What I would be interested in from this group is a listing of what are the topics of interest, what are the needs, and how to bring people’s attention to it. I can probably list several dozen topics that people don’t want to learn about and won’t come to presentations about. What I’d like to hear from this group is what has you concerned. I think inviting Dr. Wright for a Tech Talk would be incredibly valuable.

**Vice Chancellor Buehler:** The Tech Talk series has been an incredible success. We’ve opened it up to others in the UMass system and the Five Colleges. We’ve gotten a great reception for that and you can certainly expect to see it expand.
Senator Richard Bogartz: One thing that I’ve noticed is that occasionally I’ll get some kind of phishing email come my way. I don’t think I’ve ever been caught. I usually recognize them and delete them. Then, sometime in the future, I get a warning about the threat and get to congratulate myself on being so clever. But wouldn’t it be better if I could take a suspect email and send it somewhere and say, hey, look! This might be a problem?

Chief Information Security Officer Dalton: You can send them to abuse@umass.edu. Every time you see something suspicious, like a phishing email or you’re concerned that you’ve gotten a virus or your credentials have been compromised, please don’t hesitate to reach out to us. For phishing, it happens so much these days, so we may not individually respond to each and every one of them. But it helps us to find when there’s been a particularly good one or one that’s started to reach a lot of people. So please let us know. That address is abuse@umass.edu.

Senator Lisa Saunders: I have two questions. Why is there so much spam and phishing on UMail, but not on the Google account that I use? The second question is that one of you said that we should be concerned about the UDrive. We use UDrive for personnel documents, confidential documents about hiring, and student grades. What are some best practices to protect those files?

Professor Wright: The best practice for anything that goes to a shared drive or folder is to never send a link or attachment. Always refer to a place that they can get to it. Never send a link and never accept a link. That makes things simple. If you go to the NSA, for example, they don’t allow you to send attachments or links. That is the most secure.

Chief Information Security Officer Dalton: The warning is not necessarily not to use these tools, but that, if you get a Facebook or Dropbox or UDrive request, don’t click on the link in the email. Go straight to the source. It will be there if it is real. So the warning was don’t pay attention to invites in your email.

Professor Brewer: The contrast with Gmail—you may have noticed that Gmail now has three tabs. One is for email, one is for spam, and one is for social media stuff. That’s because they are being very aggressive about trying to separate those things out so your inbox doesn’t have those other things in it. That’s simply the policy of the company. You may find that emails for any mailing lists that you may belong to might get filtered off into one of the other tabs. You have to be careful in Gmail in finding that stuff, depending on what you’re using your account for.

Vice Chancellor Buehler: I would like to speak to storage for just a moment. We knew when we did our assessment that we had some people on this campus storing files in places that they shouldn’t. We are coming out with a new offering, with improved security. It’s called Box. We are strongly encouraging people to get off Dropbox, which has a lot of security holes. We will also be taking some of the old mechanisms and transferring them to the new.

Katherine Newman, Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Provost: This is just a little bit of promotion. You mentioned that there were fantastic opportunities for our students to get experience in learning about cybersecurity. Our colleagues in Computer Science, the Isenberg School, and Engineering were just awarded a $4 million grant from the National Science Foundation to train students in cybersecurity, all the way from undergraduate students to doctoral students. The most amazing part is that the undergraduates will get put on NSF-level stipends to learn this field. That’s because, in addition to having this amazing team inside IT, we have an amazing research capacity in cybersecurity. We are becoming a nationally ranked campus in this area. I wanted to mention this in case you have students, from any field, who want to pursue this area. This is a growth area in industry, in government, and all over the world. Remember that, if you have interested students, the training program starts up this fall.

Vice Chancellor Buehler: This is where we want to stay close and keep talking. I am being approached by IT vendors who are desperate for talent. They come to me, asking if I know sharp students who I could place. They have negative unemployment in this space; they have more jobs than students. I cannot be
more of an advocate for increased training in this area.

_Senator Marta Calas_: You mentioned that you’ve been leveraging resources on campus to be able to do this. I am so grateful that you are doing this because there are so many resources on campus. We don’t need consultants—they are only in it for the money, and that’s why they come to us. Consulting in higher education has become a really good business for consultants these days. Just by listening to you, the idea of the community—the idea of all being together in this—would apply to many other things we do and we want to get involved because that is what makes us better and stronger. Your example is a great example. Thank you very much.

_Vice Chancellor Buehler_: I reached out to faculty in no less than six different topic areas and I have not received one no. I want to thank everyone for their participation.

C. **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Owing to the lateness of the hour, announcements were postponed to the next meeting.

D. **QUESTION PERIOD**

Owing to the lateness of the hour, questions were postponed to the next meeting.

E. **ACTION TAKEN BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, ACTING ON BEHALF OF THE FACULTY SENATE, OVER THE JANUARY BREAK, 2016. APPROVAL OF THE FOLLOWING:**

**NEW COURSES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>CREDITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANTHRO 600</td>
<td>“Pro-Seminar in Anthropology”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURSING 622</td>
<td>“Advanced Practice Psychiatric-Mental Health Nursing with Adults and Older Adults”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURSING 721</td>
<td>“Advanced Psychotherapy Modalities with Individuals, Groups &amp; Families”</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORG&amp;EVBI 790E</td>
<td>“OEB Ecology Core Course”</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MOTION:** That the Faculty Senate confirm the action taken by the Rules Committee, on behalf of the Faculty Senate, over the January break, as listed on this agenda, Item E.

The motion was adopted.

F. **NEW BUSINESS**

**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].


2. Special Report of the Academic Matters and Academic Priorities Councils concerning a Program Name Change: Slavic and East European Studies to “Slavic, East European and Eurasian Studies”
and a Name Change of the Major in Russian and East European Studies to “Russian, East European and Eurasian Studies,” as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 16-027 with Motion No. 10-16.


4. Special Report of the Academic Matters, Academic Priorities and Program and Budget Councils concerning a Revision of the B.A. Degree Program in the Department of Psychological and Brain Sciences, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 16-029 with Motion No. 10-16.

5. Special Report of the Academic Matters, Academic Priorities and Program and Budget Councils concerning a Revision of the B.S. Degree Program in the Department of Psychological and Brain Sciences, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 16-030 with Motion No. 10-16.

6. Special Report of the Academic Matters, Academic Priorities, Graduate, Program and Budget and Research Councils concerning the Establishment of a School of Earth and Sustainability, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 16-031 with Motion No. 10-16.

7. Special Report of the Academic Priorities, Graduate and Program and Budget Councils concerning a Revision of the Masters of Science (MS) in Nutrition, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 16-032 with Motion No. 10-16.


MOTION: That the Faculty Senate approve 1) the Revisions to the Associate in Science (A.S.) Degree in Sustainable Food and Farming in the Stockbridge School of Agriculture, 2) the Program Name Change: Slavic and East European Studies to “Slavic, East European and Eurasian Studies” and a Name Change of the Major in Russian and East European Studies to “Russian, East European and Eurasian Studies,” 3) the Revision to Suspend the Minor in Nutrition, 4) the Revision of the B.A. Degree Program in the Department of Psychological and Brain Sciences, 5) the Revision of the B.S. Degree Program in the Department of Psychological and Brain Sciences, 6) the Establishment of a School of Earth and Sustainability, 7) the Revision of the Masters of Science (MS) in Nutrition and 8) the Certificate in the Teaching of Writing in the Department of English and the Division of Continuing and Professional Education, as presented in Sen. Doc. Nos. 16-026, 16-027, 16-028, 16-029, 16-030, 16-031, 16-032 and 16-033.

The motion was adopted.

G. OLD BUSINESS

1. Amendment to the Special Report of the Rules Committee concerning the Establishment of an Ad Hoc Committee to be named the Joint Task Force on Student Success Learning Outcomes (JTFSSLO), as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 16-018A with Motion No. 06-16.

MOTION: That the Faculty Senate approve the Amendment to the Special Report of the Rules Committee concerning the Establishment of an Ad Hoc Committee to be named the Joint Task Force on Student Success Learning Outcomes (JTFSSLO), as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 16-018A.

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. 16-024B with Motion No. 08-16.

MOTION: 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. 16-024B.

The motion was adopted as amended.

The 754th Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate adjourned at 5:23 pm.