Presiding Officer Richard Bogartz brought the 755th Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate to order on February 18, 2016 at 3:30 p.m. in Herter Hall, Room 227, and began by reading “A Poem by a Taoist Priest” by Bruce Lee:

Into a soul absolutely free
From thoughts and emotion,
Even the tiger finds no room
To insert its fierce claws.

One and the same breeze passes
Over the pines on the mountains
And the oak trees in the valleys;
And why do they give different notes!

No thinking, no reflecting,
Perfect emptiness;
Yet therein, something moves,
Following its own course.

The eye sees it,
But no hands can take hold of it –
The moon in the stream.

Clouds and mists,
They are midair transformations,
Above them eternally shine the sun and the moon.

Victory is for the one,
Even before the combat,
Who has no thought of himself,
Abiding in the no-mind-ness of Great Origins.

A. PRESENTATION BY CHANCELLOR KUMBLE R. SUBBASWAMY

“BUDGET SITUATION”
(QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION TO FOLLOW)

Kumble R. Subbaswamy, Chancellor: The first two years I was here, I was under the mistaken impression that the legislature regularly handed out 8-10% increases. You remember me saying that I could get used to this. Unfortunately, last year, that didn’t come to pass. In fact, we’re still trying to collect that $10.9 million for the system, $5 million of which is for this campus.

The budget process for FY17 is just beginning. I have been sharing general information about the backdrop and long-term changes in our revenues and expenses in broader strokes with various bodies around campus, including the Rules Committee, the deans, and department chairs. I felt it would be useful for this body to know the general backdrop against which these budget discussions take place. That is my goal for today. I won’t go into too many details. Based on that general backdrop information, I thought that I would show you, based on what we know about the budget at this point in the process, what that budget for FY17 might look like. A lot of planning happens between now and April to construct this
budget—all of the departments, colleges, and administrative and support units are going to be busy working on their budgets, which will ultimately get rolled up into the University budget.

So, here’s the context. We can track our three biggest expenditures—the three things that drive costs the most—over approximately an eleven-year period, from 2005 to 2016. The first one is financial aid. This is the so-called gift aid, which I will come back to in a moment. Basically, this is money that students don’t have to pay back, usually in the form of grants and scholarships. That’s one element of what we have added, because there is our general commitment to social justice as well as our attempts to improve the quality of the students that we admit. Both of those commitments call for need-based and merit-based aid to be given from institutional dollars. The next driver is the debt service: all of the renovations and new buildings that have been paid for by borrowing money. Obviously, that calls for paying that money back with interest, and for paying for those buildings’ operating costs and maintenance. That has definitely been a growing element, but there are no surprises here. This has all been done with the approval of the Board of Trustees; in fact, the Board of Trustees controls the limits on the debt service. They also give us guidance on how to handle financial aid and what percentage of the need should be met. The third cost driver is the salary increases for continuing faculty and staff members and graduate students. These are basically collective bargaining results. As you know, the collective bargaining parameters are set between the unions and the Governor’s Office by the Department of Labor Relations. The University isn’t in the middle at all. I’m very pleased that the unions were able to work with the administration to bring salaries to a reasonable level. We weren’t competitive, but now we’re a little more competitive. I am extremely pleased that that has happened. The way it is supposed to work is that the state negotiates these raises and the state is supposed to pay for them. As you’ll see in a minute, that is not necessarily the case.

Those three are the major cost drivers. The total increase is about $200 million over the last ten years. The revenue has also increased by about $300 million, but about two-thirds of the total revenue increase has gone into these three drivers. If you look at that revenue increase for how much of it is state revenue or non-state—tuition increases—you’ll see the effects of the recession that took place during this period: State aid increased gradually, then declined, and then gradually built back up. I think the net increase is about $50 million over this entire period, but we are barely coming back to the pre-recession levels. No wonder that, with these cost drivers and the state not giving a lot of money, tuition has increased. Tuition revenue is really what has kept us with balanced books.

I want to give you a little more detail on the scholarship, or gift, aid. Remember, this is the money that the students don’t have to pay back. Of the total expenditure for aid, the largest portion comes from the institution—that’s what we give out of our own dollars. The next largest amount comes from the federal government, primarily in the form of Pell grants. The smallest portion is that from the state—how much the state gives in gift aid. Mass Grant and Cash Grant are the two programs that are primarily responsible for that. That amount has really not changed over the course of the last decade. The federal Pell grants are adjusted upward every once in a while, but it still represents a smaller portion than it did ten years ago. It’s barely grown by $10 million over this time. What has grown most is institutional aid. About two-thirds of our institutional aid is need-based aid, and the other third is merit-based, primarily to get qualified out-of-state students to attend. Those students still bring in a net revenue increase. We pay a little to get a lot—that’s part of what you do to when you play this game of bringing in out-of-state revenue to make up for the loss of state revenue. This is where a lot of our institutional dollars go.

I also wanted to report to you the changes in full-time employees for this same time frame in the categories reported to the federal government. These categories (executive/administrative/managerial, faculty, professional, secretarial/clerical, service/maintenance, skilled crafts, and technical/paraprofessional) have specific meanings, which are not always the same as those that you and I would have. Nonetheless, this is how it is reported. To make sense of these increases, you need to know what else has changed. The total number of employees has grown by about 8.8%, the enrollment has grown by about 14%, the sponsored
activity, such as research and grants, has increased by 40%, and the square footage that we had added to campus has gone up by about 24%. Seen in context, the growth in faculty and the growth in professional staff is not very surprising. Those are the two largest components. The secretarial/clerical group has decreased, and that is partly reflecting change in professional development and how work is distributed on university campuses.

Typically, there are questions about administrative bloat and how much money people are being paid. I thought that I would try to show you some of the facts behind this, and you can draw your own conclusions. Among the 200 highest paid employees on the University of Massachusetts campus, the largest component—about 75% or 76%—is tenure-system faculty. Department heads and chairs are included, but their summer stipends are not counted in calculating the highest paid. In other words, these are really some of our best faculty members who are being paid really well, both for longevity and in terms of performance. There were about sixteen or seventeen people, including myself, who fall into the category of executive/administrative/managerial with faculty rank. The other section, executive/administrative/managerial employees without faculty rank, includes vice chancellors, associate vice chancellors, and others who do not hold faculty rank. The other pieces include physicians and psychiatrists who work in our counseling and health services and three coaches out of the top 200 highest paid employees.

Here are some questions that you might ask about these graphs; I will try to answer them. This is the total non-faculty employees per 1,000 students, as reported by IPEDS in 2014. This shows UMass Amherst and our peer or benchmark institutions: Stony Brook, Iowa State, Oregon, UC Santa Barbara. UMass Amherst is comparable with these. The outliers, Rutgers and UConn, have medical schools merged into this data at that point, so that accounts for some of the oddity there. We’re basically in the median of our comparison group. Among the subdivisions of employees, UMass Amherst is close to the median for the number of business and financial employees, instructional and administrative support employees, and service occupation employees per 1,000 students. We are the second lowest, however, with regard to the management employees per 1,000 students. This data is available to you from public records; if you don’t trust my data, I encourage you to go look at the data yourself.

This long explanation is all a way of explaining, as I do to legislators, and business groups and others, what happens to all the money. Understanding the three cost drivers is the most critical part. There is nothing unusual or unseemly about it. The growth in cost drivers are, again, things for which the state hasn’t stepped in in the way that you would expect states to do for public research universities. The debt service has paid for a lot of academic buildings, which is not something that a public university should ask its students to pay off. In the last four decades, there has been very little construction or renovation, and you can still see how many of our buildings are in need of repair. Similarly, you could argue that financial aid is something that the state should pay for. The amount that the state has paid has not really changed in the last decade, and that amount does not cover the need. Then there are the salary increases. It begs the question of “if the state were unwilling to pay, then why did they agree to the increases?” I’m very happy that we are able to keep up competitive salaries, don’t get me wrong. All I’m saying is that there is a mismatch here on how the state operates.

With this background in mind, this all came to a head last year in the context that the state did not come through on its obligation to fund the first year of collective bargaining for UMass alone—all others got what they needed, but we didn’t. There was a very contentious, very public debate, as you know, with claims that if that money were given to us—that money that was actually the state’s minimum obligation—we would have to refund the money to the students and various other things. The House actually came through, the Senate put some conditions on it that were not approved, and ultimately, it all got defeated. Before all that happens this year, I want to present some projections of what the budget might look like.
This projection, in very simple terms and broad categories, is what the FY17 budget might look like, because we know a lot of our fixed expenditures. For example, the salary increases for next year are already set at 3.5%. We already know how much we need to put away for the debt service because of all the buildings that are coming online, and we know, so we can make good on commitments made to students, how much in financial aid we will need. In a sense, the three cost drivers are all pretty well known, so it is easy to predict our expenditures. The revenue side is uncertain.

What do we know today? The Governor proposed a one percent increase in his budget. We still need to get the House budget, the Senate budget, the conference committee, and there will be vetoes, veto overrides, and supplemental budgets before we get the final budget. But, at this moment, this is what we know. The Governor’s budget represents an increase of $2.5 million for us—in round numbers. Accountants will be driven crazy by the round numbers, but this is a physicist speaking, and I’m rounding up. The tuition and fee revenue is estimated, assuming no tuition increases for in-state students, which is what everyone, especially in the legislature, would like, and assuming that out-of-state tuition, which the legislature doesn’t care about, increases by three percent. That gives us a $7.6 million increase. When the state gives an increase, there is an automatic fringe increase associated with it, and that will be about $1 million on the $2.5 million. Anything that is not covered by the salary increases, the fringe has to be covered by the University. That’s another component in the expenses that people don’t usually realize. If you add the revenues in this projection, you get about $12.5 million increase from this year to next year.

On the expense side, we already know what negotiated salary increases will cost, which is about $10 million. The next question is usually “is that all because of administrative salaries?” 85% of the money on our campus goes to employees in collective bargaining units, and 15% goes to non-unit employees. Our policy has been to give the same increase to non-unit employees as unit employees get, and we do thank you for your collective bargaining skills in getting reasonable salary increases. Faculty promotions and step increases from assistant to associate account for about $1 million. The GEO contract is also about $1 million. These are known expenses. The calculated fringe that is not accounted for by the state appropriation is about $3.8 million. That’s an additional expense that we have to pick up. When the state doesn’t fund the full salary increases that it has negotiated with the unions, we not only have to come up with the salary, we also have to come up with the fringe increases.

I can’t take credit for some of these numbers. Our Administration & Finance unit has done a really great job putting away a certain amount of money with great discipline towards the debt service each year, even when it’s not coming due. If you’re very smart and a good money manager, you know the total amount of money that will be owed some day, and you can try to spread it out, instead of trying to pay it all in one year. I have been so fortunate to come into a financial system with such discipline that has been saving that money. Typically, we put away about $5 million, but this year, we will save only about $4 million. The academic revenue share is the various arrangements that exist for sharing the revenue from out-of-state master’s degrees that produce revenue—that revenue gets shared among the colleges. That money goes right back to the colleges; it is not available for paying down the debt service or financial aid or anything like that. The increase in financial aid, both need-based and merit-based, would be about $4.9 million according to our usual formula. Out of the $7.6 million in increases we get from tuition, we give about $5 million of it back. Then there are other fees, such as half a million for library increases and other small pieces, which total about $1.9 million. If you add all of that up, the total is about $26.5 million. There’s no strategic investment here, no now-forgotten Amherst 50-50 Plan—this is just the institution trying to break even, and it can’t break even. The net deficit starting point—if nothing else happened—would be about $14 million. Last year, it was $18 million. We cut a lot of things to get it down to a balanced budget, including a tuition increase. But this is a second year with such a starting point, not the first year.

This is what I want you to be aware of. Obviously, we’re all going to be working with the legislature and the Board of Trustees to not let this happen. Hopefully, the House will come up with a higher number for
us; hopefully, the Senate will come up with an even higher number. Hopefully, the Senate number will prevail and the Governor’s veto will be overrode. There will probably still need to be a small tuition increase put in place, because the 50-50 Plan died a long time ago. In fact, it kind of never existed, if you look at how things panned out. I never expect the worst-case scenario to play out, but you need to be aware of what that scenario might be. We’re going to be working very hard to make reductions in intelligent ways to minimize the impact on academic units. We’re already working on how to get that done. We’re going to be fine. Every time this happens, you lose momentum. We have our strategic plan, a rather well laid out plan for how we’re going to serve our students better, improve our research profile, and increase our impact on the region and the state—that plan is obviously effected by the budget. This was my attempt to put some facts before you about what happens. This also, of course, happens on the system level, but I’m just trying to give a sense of how things might play out for our campus. In terms of arguing with the legislature for more dollars, just remember that for every dollar that comes to the System office, about $.50 comes to us.

Thank you for giving me this time to talk to you, and I believe that we have some time for questions. We have some of my budget and planning experts here to help me out as needed.

**Randall Phillis, President of the Massachusetts Society of Professors:** I have a few clarifying questions. I was pleased to see that you count 183 new faculty over the last ten years. What is the tenure-track vs. non-tenure-track breakdown?

**Chancellor Subbaswamy:** 101 of them are tenure-track, and the remaining are lecturers.

**President Phillis:** Thank you. The other question I have is about fringe. In the tuition retention legislation, there was a statement that people who previously had salary paid on fees would now move to tuition, and their fringe would be paid by the state. Do I misinterpret that legislation?

**Chancellor Subbaswamy:** Yes, you did. The understanding was that, as of the day of the transfer, it will be revenue-neutral to the University and to the state. In other words, whatever they were covering up to that point, no less and no more, will transfer to us. That will happen as of July 1. The new increases are not covered by that.

**President Phillis:** My very last question is that you have a 0% in-state tuition increase, which would be wonderful if it could be provided to the students. How much value is there in a 1% increase? I’m just trying to gauge how much, in terms of percent, we would need.

**Chancellor Subbaswamy:** In terms of gross, a 1% increase would be about $2 million. There would be a corresponding financial aid increase as well. So, if you want to think about net increase, it would be about $1.5 million. If you wanted to cover the entire gap, without additional state money, it would be in the ballpark of 7% increase. If I had my druthers, I’d like to see the state go up to a 3% increase, if not more, and I’d like to see the tuition increase at no more than 4%. I think we can make things happen within those parameters. They are not entirely unreasonable in the larger scheme of things, from the perspective of what we want to do and what the state deserves. Really, for the ‘Education State’ to be treating public higher education and the flagship campus in this way, we need to educate our leadership a lot more.

**Senator Marinos Vouvakis:** Chancellor, thank you very much for this presentation. I think it is really good to put things into perspective for all of us. I have two questions. You mentioned that last year we had a deficit of $18 million and we closed it primarily by finding new revenue.

**Chancellor Subbaswamy:** I did not say that. We did it with lots of cost-cutting and we postponed saving money in strategic ways to make up the deficit.
Senator Vouvakis: I see. Can you tell us a little bit about how you see being able to close that projected $14 million gap for this year?

Chancellor Subbaswamy: I’m going to start by putting things into perspective again. This $14 million would be from the Education in General budget; it doesn’t include research dollars or other various revenues that we generate. We control a little over 2% of the Education in General budget. So the question is “can we shrink or increase revenue to cover what is about 2% of our total budget?” The answer is by not doing a lot of things that we should be doing. Last year, we gave up a lot of reserves. For example, I had created a pool for new faculty renovations, for when we hire a new faculty member and they need a new lab. We can’t afford that. So that became something that you give up. We gave up a lot of those reserves last year. I didn’t make a big deal about it, because I didn’t want the legislature to feel like we were in some way publically trashing them, but we cut $4.2 million just from administrative costs. These were true cuts, with twenty positions eliminated. The last portion of the cuts had to go back to the academic units and colleges, but mostly academic units and colleges were spared. This year, I don’t think we can do that because, as I said, we gave up pretty much everything we could. The budget still needs to be worked out; this is the worst-case scenario. I hope it doesn’t come to pass, but the planning occurring between now and when we know the final budget will assume that we have to trim back by about 1.5%. That’s what we’re asking units to plan around moving forward. The Provost is working with the academic units. The possible reductions will not be across the board. In fact, I have insisted that they not be across the board, and, instead, take into account various productivity issues and changes in enrollment so we can continue to serve our students well, maintain quality, and maintain research integrity. It’s a mature institution. We have mature processes. The sky is not falling. I just think that if we are not wise, if we don’t talk to legislators in terms of the true consequences, some day, the sky will fall.

Senator Vouvakis: Thank you. On your third chart, you presented the absolute increase or decrease in employee numbers. Do you have an estimate of the percentage?

Chancellor Subbaswamy: I have the percentage of the total. There was an eight or nine percent of the total employee base. I don’t have the percentages for each category.

Bryan Harvey, Associate Chancellor and Chief Planning Officer: The faculty increase was about 16%. The executive, administrative, and management category, even though it had a small base, increased by about 15%, and professional increased by about 10%. I’m sorry, I can’t remember the number for clerical. Overall, there was an 8% increase.

President Phillis: I just had a clarifying question: there’s also been a growth in the undergraduate student body?

Chancellor Subbaswamy: The student body has increased by about 14%. Thank you all very much.

B. UPDATE ON WORK OF THE JOINT TASK FORCE ON RESOURCE ALLOCATION (JTFRA)
PRESENTER - JENNIFER NORMANLY, CO-CHAIR
(QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION TO FOLLOW)

Jennifer Normanly, Co-Chair of the Joint Task Force on Resource Allocation: I’m going to give you a very brief update about where JTFRA currently is. This first slide shows where we’ve been and where we are now and what JTFRA is observing, taking input on, and will report on at the final Faculty Senate meeting.

Incremental budgeting is what we’ve been doing forever, or at least as long as I can remember. We have allocations and costs, and allocation of unit budgets is predictable and incremental. It is usually what you
got last year, plus or minus a small amount, depending on state allocations. There is really no correlation with changes in activities. By that, I mean student credit hours going up, majors increasing, or things like that. Investment is perceived as sporadic. I want to qualify that. I tried to choose my words carefully. We’ve obviously had lots of investment in this campus and we’re doing amazing things. But there isn’t really a process where the whole campus sees the big picture, understands what the priorities were, and how they were selected. From a faculty or departmental perspective, investment seems sporadic.

At the Chancellor’s urging that we think about a new model and a process, but at some point, we just needed to start working out next year’s budget. We are still using what is essentially an incremental allocation method, but the process now includes iterative discussions for the intentional shaping of spending plans for both academic units and administrative and support units that serve campus goals. We have our strategic plans and the iterative discussions between departments, deans, the Provost, the Chancellor, and the administrative and support units are meant to align our spending plans with our strategic plans. The features of this process are unfolding now. Departments have uploaded their strategic priorities for FY17 to the electronic workflow. The deans have seen them, and we’ve had some discussions. The Provost is looking at them now, and then there will be some more back-and-forth with the deans. At some point, we’ll start talking about actual dollars. The intended features are transparency, the college consultative mechanisms, a meshing of academic unit and administrative and support unit planning, and reflection on quality by all units. JTFRA recommended the college consultative mechanisms last spring, and there’s been input from other Faculty Senate councils that there should be some consultative mechanisms. There is a JTFRA subcommittee, the Joint Subcommittee on Administrative Costs and Services (JSACS), which is looking at the administrative and support unit planning. Like the academic units, they did the strategic planning on where they want to go, what their priorities are, how they can assess their progress, and what is really important is that the academic planning and the administrative and support planning meshes, so we’re not working at cross purposes. If any one unit on campus proposes something that requires an investment, there needs to be a conversation across campus about whether that’s the best thing to do and whether we can achieve synergies. JSACS is looking at this brand new process. Of course, at all times, we’re intending to reflect on quality: What are the things that we value as a campus? Do the spending plans align with our strategic goals? Are we looking at quality?

The outcome is, hopefully, a strategic allocation of unit budgets. The other thing that JTFRA has been looking at for the past two years is a model, which is a mathematical output. It is basically a way of looking at costs and activities so we can see trends in student credit hours, revenues, and costs. The intention of this budget model has always been to be informational or a starting point for these discussions in this process. It has never been meant to be determinant. That is, it does not spit out a number that we all somehow have to live with. The model hasn’t changed at all from what we presented in our spring 2015 report to the Faculty Senate. We presented some output that was illustrative from FY14. We now have FY15 and FY16 data. What is interesting about this data is that the output changes significantly depending on the amount of the state allocation. For example, FY15 was the 50-50-like year and FY16 was the big disappointment in the budget shortfall. What needs to happen is that this output has to be useful. Otherwise, if it sets up unrealistic expectations for how we should plan, it isn’t really useful for this whole process. We’re always looking at what our goals and values are, and if the number that comes out is very dependent on one fluctuation versus another, it won’t be very useful. JTFRA is looking at this to see if there is a way that we can make this robust or independent of various fluctuations. That’s something that we’ll evaluate.

As far as evaluating, getting input, and making recommendations, this is what we’re planning on doing. It’s similar to what we did last year. JSACS is meeting now and they are going to report on how the administrative and support unit plannings and the academic unit plannings are meshing in mid-March. We’re going to collect feedback on the budget process that is rolling out from deans and departments and we’re also collecting feedback on the college consultative mechanisms. These mechanisms are very nascent, and some of them are further along than others. We’re interested in what the deans think about the
process, since it is new, and what they would do differently going forward. We’re doing all of this in March. We also want broader campus feedback, so we are inviting ourselves or seeking invitations to meetings and forums with the Student Government Association, the Graduate Student Senate, the Massachusetts Society of Professors, Faculty Senate councils and interested senators, heads and chairs, and all campus. Again, there will be opportunities for people to look at the model output, reflect on the budget process, and give us feedback on the college consultative mechanisms. We will prepare the draft report by April 1 or 2, and then we’ll repeat this input process in April. We can look at the budget model and see how it’s changed, if it got better, and how the process is going. Would we do anything different going forward? Our goal is to submit the final report to the Chancellor and to the Faculty Senate by May 5th.

Richard Bogartz, Presiding Officer: I have less of a question, and more of a remark. I was recently given access to the model and have translated it into an R program. In the process, I had the feeling that I actually understood what was going on. It seems to me that this would be beneficial at the college levels, where you did the disposition and transparency notions about what’s going on with respect to departments, given what the college has available to it. It would have the same thinking behind it, namely that it would not be a determinant. But it would be informative and allow departments to understand their relationship to other departments in the college. I would like to suggest that that is something for JTFRA to take up.

Co-Chair Normandy: Do you mean the specific R program or just the model output?

Presiding Officer Bogartz: No, I mean the model output. If people want to use spreadsheets, let them.

Co-Chair Normandy: Certainly, I think having the more granular department look is something that we’ve been wanting to do. We could consider opening that up to any of these meetings that we have planned.

Senator Marinos Vouvakis: Would it be possible for somebody to outline a concrete example of what took place this year on the budget allocation process? To me, your presentation was very abstract. I have never been involved in a process like that, and I want a concrete example to understand it. I am an engineer, I am not an abstract thinker.

Co-Chair Normandy: So, I am a department head and I can tell you exactly what the process has been this year. Previously, the process was that we got a GOF allocation and an instructional support allocation. That’s our budget. Previously, my department manager, who I am very lucky to have, received an email from the Dean’s business manager telling us what our GOF allocation and our instructional support allocation was, and we just made it work.

This year, we have an electronic workflow system that is very similar to the Course and Curriculum Management system. We got an email and accessed it. We pasted in our strategic goals for undergraduate and graduate education, research, and scholarship activity from our strategic plan. In CNS, we were asked to add some detail about which of these strategic objectives would be revenue-neutral—that is, we could just do it—which would require maybe some reallocation in our own department or do something differently or not at all in order to do this other thing that was part of our strategic plan, and which would require investment. Then we had our action plan—what we could hope to do. I submitted that, it went to the Dean, and subsequently, the Dean has been having meetings with the department heads. We’ve talked about subjects like what do you do with your GOF and how much we have and how much we think we need. Then the Dean pushed it through, and it is getting looked at in Whitmore by Provost’s Office. I think we’ll get some feedback at some point, about can we do these strategic initiatives that we are proposing we do. At some point, we’ll be able to see what all the colleges and all the administrative and support units are proposing to do, because, for example, IT needs a budget because they may want to strategically plan upgrades in certain buildings. We’ll be able to see all these things. In the end, the Chancellor, the Provost, and the deans will decide on how much money will come to my department.
**Senator Vouvakis:** I’d like to hear a little bit more about that. It is my understanding that the process is basically a pyramid: everything goes up and eventually trickles back down. I know trickle-down is not the best phrase. I would like to hear more about JSACS, the college consultative mechanisms, and what their roles are. Traditionally, I understand that the Chancellor and the Provost eventually make some decisions. I want to know how the new committees are concretely involved. Are they meeting all together with the Chancellor and the Provost and they all decide? Or do the Chancellor and Provost decide, communicate their thoughts to the committees, and let them take it to their constituencies?

**Co-Chair Normanly:** In terms of the college consultative mechanisms, every college has their own committee or structure, and we are literally waiting to see if any of those meetings have been held. We’d like to get input from the deans whether they’ve met and what they’ve discussed. We’ll get input from faculty about whether they were invited to be on the committee and how that went. We’re basically waiting on data on how things have proceeded.

**Kumble Subbaswamy, Chancellor:** A more concrete response is really that we are making it up as we go along. None of this next phase has actually happened yet. Ask us at the next meeting or at the meeting after that, and we will have a concrete example. It’s still in the abstract world, but we will be bringing it to the engineering world soon.

**Co-Chair Normanly:** We are proposing to do two rounds of feedback, where we have the model output, we’ll share it, we’ll get feedback. We’ll ask, “Have you been invited to the college consultative mechanism? Have you been involved in the planning?” That’s why we have to do it twice.

**Senator Marta Calas:** I am an organizational scholar. Therefore, I guess I see things differently. I know two things. One, that I know from scholarship, is that complex systems tend to fail very often. I also know that the more complicated the world gets, organizational scholars try to devise modes of organizing that in some way captures what the world is—meaning that, because the world is complicated, the functional administrative systems need to be flexible, decision-making oriented, more participative, to be flatter and less bureaucratic. Therefore, they seem messy from the outside, but on the inside, what they accomplish is that they actually work. They are very able to be adaptive to different positions. What I have noticed is that, as a university, we have become more complex. We have gotten new technologies, which have many people behind them and involved with them. Just to give you a quick and probably irrelevant example, although it is relevant to me, SPIRE gave me a classroom and a number of students for a particular day. When I got there, there were students from another class coming in, saying they had received an email from someone else and they were using my classroom. I, of course, denied that profusely because I knew that was my classroom. It ended up there are two systems that are now parallel, and the administrator from one side was looking to one thing and the Registrar was looking to another, and we both ended up in the same classroom, and none of the systems people knew the other was there. Things like this matter tremendously. It may seem irrelevant, but it is relevant because it is one instance of very many.

I think that what we see here is complicating more things. At the end of the day, really, it is the faculty who make this system work. If we have to put so many layers of ways to consult about what we’re going to do or imagine, we may not necessarily make the system better. That is what I am worried about right now. I want it to work, but I don’t have very much confidence that the process is getting anywhere.

**Co-Chair Normanly:** I would just compare it to what we had, which is the email I get from the business manager, where I have had absolutely no input into the process. It is challenging to have a complex structure like ours, where you have good communication, but I’d like to point out that a lot of what we’re doing is new. The idea that you would have a group of faculty and administrators who look at administrative and support units and academic units and ask, “Have you talked to each other? Do you
know that four colleges want to do IT upgrades and shouldn't Vice Chancellor Buehler know about this?"

We have never really had that before, in a way that, as a department head, has been obvious to me. It is
demanding to coordinate on a campus like ours, and I find that communication about change has been
enormously challenging. There's been a lot of confusion about what we're doing and who’s in charge and
who’s making the decisions. I do think that having a process where people can participate if they want to,
like in the college consultative mechanisms, is, to me, a better process than what we currently have, where
we just get what we got last year, or we get less.

*Senator James Rinderle:* I am looking for your comments on where JTFRA is going on two fronts. The first
is about the college consultative committees. Do you expect to get to the point where you recommend how
they should be formed, who should be on them, and what they discuss? Right now, there seems to be a wide
set of practices among the colleges, ranging from a meeting with all faculty members where the dean
discusses a few numbers to other meetings in more detail. Jumping to the second question, there seems to
be change in emphasis in the budget model, responsibility-centered and so forth. That word was there, of
course, to reflect the idea that individual units could choose to do things, like produce revenue and share in
the revenue that comes from it. I think that even now departments and colleges are considering plans like
whether to have a course-only master’s program with some expectation that a certain amount of the dollars
generated from those programs will come back. If we have a model on the side but no real commitment to
it, where does the balance point lie? I’m curious about where you think the committee is going. No one
wanted to be tied to a model that could chain us down and limit what we could do, but on the other hand,
there is this notion of understanding how what you do will affect the budget and the revenue for the college
and the campus as well as for your department. I’m curious to hear where you think JTFRA will come
down on that.

*Co-Chair Normandy:* Your first question was about what JTFRA will be looking for in the college
consultative mechanisms in our comments. Last spring, we articulated some principles that we thought
these college consultative mechanisms should carry out. As the various colleges roll out their process for
consultation throughout the college, we will be looking at whether or not those processes adhere to those
principles. The Academic Priorities Council and the Program and Budget Council also articulated, to
varying degrees, what they thought these bodies should look like, so this will be an opportunity to comment
on that. We don’t want to direct anyone to do anything, but we want to comment on how those processes
rolled out.

As far as the entrepreneurial aspect and how units can plan, plus or minus the model, I think that what
we’re seeing from the model is that it is really designed for a situation where there are lots of state
allocations. When there just isn’t a lot of money, when you’re cutting budgets, it is hard to plan and
forecast what you could be doing when you have to think about how to manage the situation when the state
doesn’t give you enough. The idea of a budget model spitting out allocations based on student credit hours,
you always have to look at the larger campus good. Because of the cost drivers, the financial aid, the debt
service, and faculty salaries, you can’t just, within the space of one semester, say, “we need to increase the
size of this unit, decrease the size of that unit, drop Ph.D. programs because they are costing too much.”
You can’t do that, in any situation. You have to adjust to the values. What is it that we want to accomplish?
What are the things that need to be invested in? What do we have available to do that? In the absence of a
50-50 investment from the state, where do we get the money to make these adjustments and let people make
plans that generate revenues? Some of the aspects of units being kept independent is that they might try to
raise revenues in a way that doesn’t align with the values, like having really huge classes. That’s not really
something that the University wants to do. So there has to be some tempering of these plans for units to
make money, basically. They need to align with the strategic plans. I don’t think that we’re really in a
situation here where we could just go off on our own as units and say here’s our plan to bring in revenues
and we have this many students and therefore we can expect this much money. This is all tempered by the
fact that we are in a very tight budget period.
**Chancellor Subbaswamy:** We are trying to go from a system that was generally opaque to a more transparent system, and we’ll learn a lot of things as we go along. These things aren’t set in concrete yet. We also always want to respect the fact that different colleges have different needs, different structures, and different cultures. Therefore, we’re reluctant to take a “one size fits all” approach with anything that involves the colleges. That’s consistent with how we generally operate. That is the reason there is not a single prescription for how the colleges should go through this process. That’s why we’re having the first iteration and the second iteration, with opportunities to come back and point out best practices. I’ll also be frank and say that much as it is new for the faculty and the department chairs, it’s also new for the deans. They’re not exactly sure what everything means and how complicated decision-making might be. There is a lot of trust-building that still needs to go on when you start opening up your books. I ask for your indulgence as we do one round and learn from it, come back and report, and then we’ll be able to do a better round next year. I think we’re going to get to a much better situation.

The second part about doing incentive-based budgeting is that we’ve been doing a lot with incentives on this campus for some time, even before I got here. Continuing and Professional Education (CPE) is one thing. Some colleges have done a tremendous job of being able to generate revenue out of that while maintaining complete academic integrity in terms of what they do. That money has helped a great deal in terms of doing different things within the college as well as for the system. As Co-Chair Normanly was saying, right now we’re in a situation where you can either regard the cost drivers as common good or you can have a very divisive approach where you say, “Well, CNS had most of the buildings, so let them pay for it.” The people who are really going to get caught in the middle are students and faculty and that’s not fair. They didn’t ask for our buildings to be as bad as they are. There’s a lot that has to go on. There’s a large hole of all these expenses that the state didn’t take care of, so we keep on shoveling in to meet those costs. I think this is a collective enterprise; it is not every boat on its own. In a public university setting, we would never go that route. Yes, incentives will always be there. And yes, please understand that some portion of the money you make goes to pay for the debt service, salary increases covered by the state, and for financial aid. More and more revenue-generation is going to help with this situation when the state doesn’t come in, so we don’t have to pass all the costs off to the students who are currently here. I think the out-of-state revenue, the new master’s degree revenue-sharing, and CPE are examples of that.

**Katherine Newman, Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Provost:** I just wanted to add to the Chancellor’s remarks and reinforce something that Co-Chair Normanly said which is that when we make these allocation decisions, there are a lot of principles involved. One of those principles is about our research priorities that we have agreed are important for the campus to develop and respect our role in the region as an economic development engine. Another set of principles has to do with the quality of what we provide. We’re not going to balloon our classes and ruin the quality of what we provide our students. On the contrary, as you know because you’ve been involved in the strategic planning, we’re asking you to figure out a way to deliver smaller classes to students as they get into their junior and senior year. We’re going to be looking very carefully at advising and how we invest in advising and career planning for our students. So there is a set of priorities against which we are measuring the allocation decisions. Are they true to the values that we have? There is no way that this is going to be an incentive system that is somehow liberated from the values that drive a good university. Within that, though, we have been trying to emphasize a degree of entrepreneurship for the colleges and responsibility for the deans consistent with these values. I have an engineering example. We decided that we would now allocate master’s degree revenue much more heavily to the colleges—much more of that money is going out to the colleges, about 75%, both to incentivize the colleges to work on and to give your deans resources to speak to priorities that are within your colleges. We read everything we see coming from departments very, very carefully, return comments to the deans, and expect that they will be making allocation decisions consistent with these principles. The main thing I wanted to emphasize was just Co-Chair Normanly’s point. These decisions are
not going to be made with respect to just revenue generation for its own sake. It’s a pool of investment consistent with the priorities that have been established and the quality that we want to deliver.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Principal Administrative Officers

**Kumble R. Subbaswamy, Chancellor:** For this announcement, I speak with a very heavy heart. Within the last three weeks, we’ve had three different instances of anti-Semitic hate symbols written on different parts of the campus, including one just today in Hasbrouck. I am appalled, saddened, and angry beyond words. But what can we do about it? I met with student government leaders as well as leaders of our Jewish student group. Under their leadership, we’re going to have a gathering tomorrow outside of the Fine Arts Center, starting at 4:30 pm, for a community show of solidarity and an expression of our continuing efforts to become a very inclusive community absent of this kind of hatred and bigotry, at least what is absolutely unacceptable as members of this community. I think this needs to be a community expression. The Chancellor writing letters and holding forth is an absolute minimum expression of that. I really think this needs to be community expression. Certainly I hope that the faculty body joins in this general effort, not just in terms of anti-Semitism. In the past two years, every marginalized group has had all kinds of continuing expressions of hatred, exclusion, and biased expressed against them. I certainly hope that we can turn that around. It starts with the community coming together. There will be candle-lighting followed by a trip over to the Hillel House for Shabbat services and dinner. I will be there.

**Julie Buehler, Vice Chancellor for Information Services and Strategy & Chief Information Officer:** I have just a quick announcement. Between the last meeting and this meeting, we released the IT strategic plan draft to you all. I hope you have received that by email. If you have not, you can go to [www.umass.edu/itstrategicplan](http://www.umass.edu/itstrategicplan). It will be open between now and the end of the semester. You can send feedback to [itstrategicplanfeedback@umass.edu](mailto:itstrategicplanfeedback@umass.edu). We will also be having open forums. Finally, I just wanted to thank the over 160 people across campus who helped pull this draft together. Many are in this room; I’d like them to raise their hand for just a minute, so you can see the involvement in the IT strategic plan. If you have a question, you don’t always have to ask me; you can ask one of these individuals. Thank you very much for the group involvement.

**Andrew Mangels, Interim Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance:** President Phillis mentioned that the tuition retention changes are going into effect for next academic year, so we are working very hard to look at our communications with our prospective students as well as our current students, so that everyone understands what that means. I just wanted to reemphasize that it is a revenue-neutral situation. It does not add anything to the campus in doing this, but it does allow the campus to show tuition in a much more traditional fashion. It includes what we used to call the curriculum fee and other various fees that have been combined. It should show a much more simplified bill for the students and parents. We’re working carefully with all of the deans and the other executive units to make sure we have all of our communications, websites, and terminologies up to date for next year.

The second thing, as we’ve talked about a lot today, we’ve had salary raises that came into effect on January 1. Of course, we complicate things by doing half of the raises on July 1 and the other half on January 1. That means a lot of processing for a lot of people. I’m happy to announce that, during the month of January, we’ve processed virtually all of the raises. There are still a few to go; we still need to do non-unit and a portion of the MSP. I just wanted to thank all of you and your administrators who worked closely with HR to make sure we got all those raises processed.

**Marie Bowen, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Human Resources:** Dean McCarthy and I just wanted to quickly fill everybody in on a problem you may know about and we think you may not know that there has
been something of a solution. There had been a chronic, year-after-year history of late pay for the graduate students that had become relatively high-profile in the past couple of years. Having decided that was not to be tolerated, and I think graduate students were right to be as upset as they were, we have spent some time reengineering the appointment process for the graduate students. We got help from a lot of people in the International Programs Office, the Graduate School, Susan Chinman in particular, Tim Cendrowski in HR, and, I have to say, all of you in the colleges have been tremendous. A big part of the solution is finding out earlier about the appointments, or at least as early as possible. That way, we can begin to communicate with the prospective employees, especially if they are international and they can start to get their visa applications going and their other appointment issues worked out. I also want to make a pitch for continued help in that regard and anything you can do to spread the word about the imperatively important nature of communicating with us early in the process, even if you’re not sure the grant is going to come through or you’re not sure if the class is going to be cancelled. Just letting us know that there is a “maybe” about appointing a particular grad student employee is really worth its weight in gold in helping us make sure that we continue this progress. Having talked about it so much, I’m afraid that we can’t ever pay anyone later again in that community.

John McCarthy, Senior Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School: One element of the solution that will be increasingly important in the future is the electronic appointment form for graduate students employees. This was a joint project that involved significant contributions from IT, particularly Cheryl Ferriter, and by Kate Woodmansee and Susan Chinman in the Graduate School. Assistant Vice Chancellor Bowen came along and figured out how to get the data directly into HR, rather than having to print out all the forms. This means that graduate student employee funding data is already in SPIRE and, in the future, we ought to be able to supply departments with reports of their graduate student funding as well as academic performance. That is a long wished-for thing that I think will now be possible.

2. The Secretary of the Faculty Senate

MJ Peterson, Secretary of the Faculty Senate: I want to let senators know that, owing to the formation of a new college and owing to the increase in size of a few departments, we need to redistrict the Senate. The redistricting commission does have a proposal, which the Rules Committee has looked at. I am going to distribute it to senators either tomorrow or Monday, so that senators can look at it. My hope is, if it proves acceptable, we can adopt it on March 10, so this spring’s Senate elections will take place under the new districting rather than the old.

3. The Chair of the Rules Committee

A Yemisi Jimoh, Chair of the Rules Committee: To quickly reiterate what was said about JTFRA earlier, as you may be aware, JTFRA will be sunsetting this spring. JTFRA’s last report will be at our May 5 meeting. At that time, we will hear the report and have an opportunity to discuss it. There will be time for discussion at that last meeting, which is an additional meeting, so it might not be on your original calendars.

4. The Representative of the Massachusetts Society of Professors

Randall Phillis, President of the Massachusetts Society of Professors: I have a couple of announcements. One, it’s miserable that the state doesn’t pay what they are obliged to pay for. One of the ways that we can try to persuade the state is to go to Higher Ed Lobby Day. It’s coming up in early March. Ideally, faculty, staff, and students join together and visit legislators to make their case. The best-case scenario is that the faculty argue that students need more financial aid and the students argue that faculty need more support. It works really well that way. Stay tuned and please participate. We need people to show up and make persuasive cases. There will be information going out about that shortly. The other point is that we’ve been working with the faculty in the College of Education. They came to the MSP with some concerns, and we
helped them organize and develop a common understanding of what the issues were. We communicated those issues to the administration; the administration took those issues very seriously. There has been a change of leadership; graciously, Bob Feldman has stepped in and taken an interim leadership role in the College. The MSP is happy to have worked with the administration to achieve some goals that the faculty in the College of Education desired. It’s an ongoing transition, and we’re hoping that everything continues to go positively.

D. QUESTION PERIOD

*Senator Steven D. Brewer:* All I want to do was to make a pitch for Higher Ed Lobby Day. If you’ve never gone to Lobby Day, gone to the State House, or gotten to walk around with students as they talk to legislators, I would strongly encourage you to go and encourage your colleagues to go as well. I’ve gone three times now. If you haven’t spent that much time in the State House, it’s a fascinating experience to go see the house of governance in our state. It’s always interesting to meet the various legislators, talk to them, show them what you’re doing, and to cheer for our students and our institution. It’s a valuable enterprise and very educational for you as well. I whole-heartedly encourage you to participate. It takes place on March 7th.

E. ANNUAL REPORTS


*MJ Peterson, Secretary of the Faculty Senate:* The Research Council notes in its report efforts it is making to promote resources to help new faculty get their research feet, help faculty transition into a different field, and help those faculty who find themselves in a gap between grants. In light of the budget challenges, do you think that you’ll be able to keep those efforts moving at a reasonable pace? That may not be the fairest question for you, but I figured you would have a better read on it than other people.

*J. Eliot Moss, Chair of the Research Council:* It is an issue that we looked at in the last academic year, particularly considering the possibility of outside funding from foundations and such. We have some continuing discussion with the Development officers around that. But you’re right, it’s challenging. A key outcome for us was realizing that a single, central pool for outside donations probably would not receive a lot of interest. Most outside donors want to give to a particular cause, topic, or area. These may end up being more college-based or over a whole research area, like the biological sciences, for example.

The report was received.


*Maria Tymoczko, Co-Chair of the University Press Committee:* We had a very exciting year last year with Mary Dougherty coming on as Director of the Press. This year, we’ve started out with a new executive editor. What can we say? It’s been good. We’re already halfway through the year and we’re finally getting on schedule with the annual reports. Already, many exciting things are happening. We’re beginning to think about putting trade books into the list and how we’ll do that in terms of faculty governance and the structure of the governance of the Press. We have moved to a co-chair system, with Co-Chair Smethurst and myself as co-chairs at the request of the Secretary of the Faculty Senate.

*Secretary Peterson:* I was delighted to read in this report that any of the concerns that I had in December about financial viability are not there. Things do appear to be very solid, and beyond that, the
administration is doing exactly what Chancellor Subbaswamy said. If you recall, he said that he realized that one should not touch the Press because that’s how the president of the University of Missouri started getting into trouble. I’m very pleased to see that the Press is attentive to change and making the transition into a part-print, part-electronic, very interesting world. Good luck to you with that.

Michael Malone, Vice Chancellor for Research and Engagement: I’d just like to thank the members of the Press Committee and Co-Chair Tymoczko for a terrific job. I should also say the same to Chair Moss and the Research Council. Thank you, all.

The report was received.

F. NEW COURSES

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].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>CREDITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANTHRO 258</td>
<td>“Food and Culture”</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTHRO 221</td>
<td>“Approaching Death: Culture, Health and Science”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH 217</td>
<td>“(Dis)ability and Literature”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GERMAN 371</td>
<td>“Crime and Criminals in Modern German Culture”</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOURNAL 433</td>
<td>“Photojournalism”</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUDAIC 320</td>
<td>“Jewish Humor”</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIOL 252</td>
<td>“Introduction to Human Rights”</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOLOGY 582</td>
<td>“DNA to Diversity”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATH 571</td>
<td>“Introduction to Mathematical Cryptography”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECO 605</td>
<td>“Urban Forests: Structure, Function &amp; Value”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCH-MGMT 697-BA</td>
<td>“Business-Intelligence and Analytics”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCH-MGMT 797-AB</td>
<td>“Data Management for Business Leaders”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THEATER 734</td>
<td>“World Repertory I”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MOTION: That the Faculty Senate approve the courses ANTHRO 258 and 221, ENGLISH 217, GERMAN 371, JOURNAL 433, JUDAIC 320, SOCIOL 252, BIOLOGY 582, MATH 571, ECO 605, SCH-MGMT 697-BA and 797-AB and THEATER 734, as recommended by the Academic Matters and Graduate Councils.

The motion was adopted.

G. NEW BUSINESS


MOTION: That the Faculty Senate approve the Revision of the Master of Architecture Program, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 16-036.
The motion was adopted.


MOTION: That the Faculty Senate adopt the 2018-2019 Academic Calendar, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 16-037.

Senator Farshid Hajir: I don’t want to speak against the motion, but I would like to make a statement. I think our having moved to a thirteen-week semester some years ago is the single most detrimental thing to our student’s education. A lot of faculty members will disagree with me, and I understand that, and I understand the reasons for the move. But I do think it is something that we should put back on the table for discussion.

Presiding Officer Richard Bogartz: I think I can speak for the Rules Committee in indicating that we’ll take that under advisement.

The motion was adopted.

The 755th Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate adjourned at 5:04 pm.