Presiding Officer Richard Bogartz brought the 758th Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate to order on April 28, 2016 at 3:30 p.m. in Herter Hall, Room 227, and began by reading “Sonnet 18” by William Shakespeare:

Shall I compare thee to a summer's day?
Thou art more lovely and more temperate:
Rough winds do shake the darling buds of May,
And summer's lease hath all too short a date:
Sometime too hot the eye of heaven shines,
And often is his gold complexion dimm'd;
And every fair from fair sometime declines,
By chance, or nature's changing course, untrimm'd;
But thy eternal summer shall not fade
Nor lose possession of that fair thou ow'st;
Nor shall Death brag thou wander'st in his shade,
When in eternal lines to time thou grow'st;
So long as men can breathe or eyes can see,
So long lives this, and this gives life to thee.

A. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. The President of the Student Government Association

**Anthony Vitale, President of the Student Government Association:** I'm the newly-elected president of the Student Government Association. I've had the pleasure of meeting many of you previously, and I look forward to developing a relationship with the rest of you throughout the next year. I’m a finance and economics double major and I’m currently a sophomore here at the University. I came to this meeting today because of a motion that you have on the agenda this afternoon pertaining to the continuation of the football program here at the University. Honestly, my opinion on this matter has wavered throughout my time here. Something that has allowed me to come to a more concrete conclusion on how I view the football program and the community’s relationship with the program is the tremendous, tremendous outreach I have received in the past few hours, not only from current students but also from alumni of the University. In the last few hours, I have received hundreds of emails and hundreds of comments on my post on the SGA Facebook page urging me to support the UMass football program. I’ve read each and every one of those comments. Each one shows a clear indication that the football program extends far beyond what’s here on campus. It extends into the alumni’s relationship with the University and it extends into the community that we have here. In preparing for this, I looked into the mission statement for what the University is supposed to offer, how it is supposed to interact with the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and what students are supposed to receive. What I saw is that this University is not supposed to just provide an education; it’s supposed to foster a sense of community and togetherness here. I believe that the football program definitely allows this to happen.

I am not without criticism of the football program. There are things that have room to change and there are areas that need to be worked on. I hope that the faculty, students, including the Student Government Association, and the administration can work together in the future to develop a concrete plan with a definite timeline to help develop the football program. I looked at my initial concerns about the football program from my background as a finance major—I looked at the dollars and cents of it, how much money goes into the program versus how much we get back. To be honest, the football program doesn’t break even and that’s not news to anyone here. But what we do receive from the football program is far more beneficial than strictly financial benefits. You can’t place a number on the advertising that the University receives from football. There’s no dollar amount that you can levy on the amount of goodwill that we get through the football program. It’s important to remember that that football program isn’t just a sinkhole that we’re pour money into. It’s an investment—an investment in our students, in the communities in our
Commonwealth, in our alumni, and in ourselves. I think it is a grave mistake to take such a strong stance against the program, as the resolution is written. I, along with the Student Government Association and the hundreds of students and alumni that I have spoken with today, strongly urge that we do not take such a harsh stance against the program and instead try to foster dialogue between faculty, students, and administration to work toward a more sustainable and long-term plan for the football program here. Thank you.

2. Principal Administrative Officers

John McCarthy, Senior Vice Provost of Academic Affairs and Dean of the Graduate School: I wanted to mention some of the Graduate School programs that are being launched this summer and into the fall. One of them is the Summer Dissertation Fellowships. This is one of our diversity fellowship programs and we are very excited to have forty students participate in it this summer. Associate Dean of the Graduate School Barbara Krauthamer, working with the Office of Professional Development, has set up some workshops around writing and productivity both at the beginning of the summer and at the end of the summer. Coming in the fall, we'll have somewhere around twenty-five to thirty students in our new Research Enhancement and Leadership Fellows program, also being run by Associate Dean Krauthamer in collaboration with our Office of Professional Development and other offices on campus. We're really excited about all of this and we'll be announcing some other things as we go forward. Thank you.

3. The Secretary of the Faculty Senate

MJ Peterson, Secretary of the Faculty Senate: First, a reminder: We do have another Faculty Senate meeting next week where we will hear final reports from two Joint Task Forces plus some recommendations on some very important questions.

In light of some concern and confusion about the voting rules, I simply want to remind everyone that only elected senators have a right to vote, as do certain, but not all, ex officio senators. I'm going to read a list of the ex officio senators who do have a right to vote. Nobody who is not an elected senator and is not on the list that I will read out by title should be voting. The ex officio senators with voting rights include: the Chancellor, the Provost and Senior Vice Chancellor, the Deputy Chancellor, the Vice Chancellor for Research and Engagement, the Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Dean of the Graduate School, Dean of the College of Humanities and Fine Arts, Dean of the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences, Dean of the College of Natural Sciences, Dean of the Isenberg School of Management, the interim Dean of the College of Education (who is the same person as the Deputy Chancellor but does not get two votes), the Dean of the College of Engineering, the Dean of the College of Nursing, the Interim Dean of the College of Information and Computer Sciences, the Dean of the School of Public Health and Health Sciences, the Dean of the Commonwealth Honors College, the President of the Massachusetts Society of Professors, and the Secretary of the Faculty Senate.

4. The Faculty Delegates to the Board of Trustees

Susan K. Whitbourne, Delegate to the Board of Trustees: I'll speak first on the events of a very productive two-day meeting of the Board of Trustees at UMass Dartmouth. A lot of this has been covered in the media and you’ve already heard about the budget woes, but what I found most impressive about this meeting was the presentations by speakers, including the Peer Mentor Unit from UAW, Olivia Murphy (the Vice President of the Coalition to End Rape Culture), and Max Montille from the Divest Campaign at UMass Dartmouth. They did an outstanding job; I can’t really think of a better way to represent our students to the Board of Trustees than these wonderful speakers and, of course, our Student Trustees, Emily O’Neil, from UMass Amherst, and Jacob Miller, from UMass Dartmouth.

We also heard a great deal over the two days about deferred maintenance costs—what has been called the ‘Edifice Complex.’ We have an edifice crisis. I think it was superbly presented to the Trustees. I honestly can’t think of a more effective presentation than we saw. To me, and Associate Delegate Billings can vouch for this, UMass Amherst is really showing how we are dealing with these issues, which is about as well as anybody could.
Finally, I’d like to make an announcement. We had an honor to our Dean of the Commonwealth Honors College. Gretchen Gerzina was officially named the Paul Murray Kendall Professor of Biography. Congratulations, Dean Gerzina.

*Marilyn Billings, Associate Delegate to the Board of Trustees:* The only other piece that I’ll add is that the School of Earth and Sustainability was approved by the Board of Trustees. I’m sure you’ve seen the announcements, but I wanted to make sure to bring it forward to the attention of this body.

B. QUESTION PERIOD

*Senator Frank Hugus:* My question is not about football, but about Amazon. Several weeks ago, there was a survey given to all faculty about Amazon, which many of us filled out with some bemusement because it seemed to address hardly any of the problems and criticisms that had been voiced on the floor of the Faculty Senate. Nonetheless, we haven’t heard anything about Amazon and that survey since then. That’s one thing. The other is that I tried—I really tried—to put my books on SPIRE, but I don’t want to do it through Amazon. But the only way apparently is through Amazon. My question now is: Is there some way for those of us who don’t want to deal with Amazon to opt out?

*Andrew Mangels, Interim Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance:* I have to say that I don’t know the answer to your question, Senator Hugus. I’ll follow up with Ruth Yanka and get back to you.

C. ELECTION

[Presiding Officer Bogartz handed the gavel to Secretary Peterson]

PRESIDING OFFICER OF THE FACULTY SENATE

Nominee: Richard Bogartz, Psychological and Brain Sciences

(Further nominations will be accepted from the floor.)

There being no further nominations, Professor Richard Bogartz, Psychological and Brain Sciences, was re-elected Presiding Officer of the Faculty Senate by acclamation.

[Secretary Peterson returned the gavel to Presiding Officer Bogartz]

D. SPECIAL MOTION OF THANKS TO PROFESSOR JUDITH GOODENOUGH

At this the 758th regular meeting of the Faculty Senate, held on April 28, 2016, we have the privilege of honoring you on the occasion of your retirement from the faculty of the University of Massachusetts Amherst. We applaud your leadership in faculty governance.

We note your service to the University as Senator, 1998-2016; member of the General Education Council, 2000-2009; member of the Status of Women Council, 2004-2010; member of the Undergraduate Education Council, 2005-2016; member of the Nominating Committee, 2000-2016; member of the University Press Committee 2000-2009; member of the University Writing Committee 2014-2016 and member of the Ad Hoc Committee on Student Plagiarism, Ad Hoc Committee on General Education Revision and Implementation and General Education Task Force.

The motion was adopted.

E. MOTION FROM A GROUP OF SENATORS

Whereas, given our university's enormous needs in terms of hiring faculty, repairing ailing infrastructure, and supporting our students; and
Whereas, given the hikes in tuition the university has had to impose after two years of no fee increases; and

Whereas, given the high-cost of operating and marketing a Division I football program, which has shifted millions of dollars away from core teaching and research activities; and

Whereas, given the very low attendance at games by students and alumni; and

Whereas, given the fact that after five years of this initiative, UMass' team will, in the fall of 2016, be without a conference, joining only Notre Dame, Army and Brigham Young University; and

Whereas, given the recent advances in our understanding of the physically destructive nature of football collisions, which may result in some of our student athletes leading shortened, physically and mentally debilitated lives, therefore be it

MOTION: Resolved, that the Faculty Senate urge Chancellor Subbaswamy, President Meehan, and the Board of Trustees of the University to end Division I football (Football Bowl Subdivision) at the University of Massachusetts Amherst and either move to a different division or discontinue NCAA football altogether.

Presiding Officer Richard Bogartz: I would like to set up a few ground rules. First of all, this strongly suggests that we employ alternation when we have a situation like this with pros and cons in quite a number. I’m going to ask that people opposed to the motion line up on one side, and the people in support of the motion line up on the other. Robert’s Rules of Order allocates ten minutes per speaker and two times to speak, but you don’t get your second time until everybody who wishes to speak has had their first. If we allotted ten minutes per speaker, we’d be in trouble. I’m going to ask for a motion that requires two-thirds majority to pass that we limit speakers to three minutes each.

The motion to restrict speaker’s time to three minutes was made, seconded and adopted.

Senator David Gross: I have a couple of very brief points. My two points are based in evidence, not in my emotions about the situation. The first of the points relates to the cost of the football program. It’s very clear that the program is and has been revenue negative and that the expenses of the program have increased since we moved to the FBS division. I also agree that these costs only represent a small fraction of the University’s budget. However, the total dollar amount of the money spent is, to a small unit such as a department or an academic program, relatively large from their perspective. I suggest that those costs, even the limited amount of costs that are possible to move, would benefit the University if they were moved to academic programs. My second point, which is by far the key point, is that the risk to football players’ brains that arises from this activity is something that we really need to consider. There is now compelling evidence that repetitive head accelerations of the type that occur in football collisions lead to permanent brain damage. By continuing to support the football program, the University is not only failing to protect its students from these serious injuries, but it is, in fact, promoting actions that endanger students. It is truly beyond my comprehension how we can let this continue.

Senator Frank Hugus: I would like to speak in favor of this motion and I would like to say at the outset that it is not my purpose here to advocate for the ending of the football program. My concern is that we are in over our heads and that we should get out of the Football Bowl Subdivision. I’m not interested in seeing football come to an end here. I would also like to address some points made by the Chancellor, and he will have the chance to respond to my remarks. He said, in the first paragraph of the memo that he sent to faculty, that one of the frustrations was the lack of broad consultation, the lack of clarity as to financial implications. That’s true, and that’s still the case. However, I think that a meeting like this one that we’re having today will help bring some clarity to the matter. I hope that we would continue to have a dialogue because, clearly, the situation, as it stands now regarding football, is untenable.

I have some real problems with the Football Bowl Subdivision, because I think we’re being asked to embark upon a fool’s errand. I think that the deck is stacked against programs like UMass’s, worthy as the goals might be, because there are so many conferences and programs in the country, like the University of Texas, Ohio State, and
all the others that you have probably heard more often than I have. They have such resources and such experience that they really are the ones who are going to come out ahead and we are not. They have the money, the resources, and the experience.

I’m also concerned because many of the Football Bowl Subdivision programs have problems with their players both on and off the field, as well as academically. I won’t speak to the academic implications, because I think that we all are familiar with those. What concerns me most is that I read stories in the press about football players from universities like, for example, Notre Dame, Baylor, or LSU, where these players have been accused of rape and sexual assault. Another example is the student football player from Texas Christian University who was arrested for robbery and assault. I don’t want to see that kind of behavior come to this campus, but I’m afraid that when you risk a lot and invest a lot into a program, even good universities or great universities, like Penn State, which has had its own problems, can, in fact, fall into the trap of protecting the athletes. I am at the end of my time, so I will end with that, although I have, as you can imagine, quite a bit more to say.

**Chancellor Kumble R. Subbaswamy:** The first thing that I would like to say is that I think, by now, you know my commitment to a systematic process through which we both plan and make budgeting decisions. In fact, my Deans are tired of me pulling them through this, my Vice Chancellors are tired of all this openness. You have, on the floor of this Senate, complimented me for the collaborative and transparent process. Whether it is one percent or thirty percent of the budget, I believe in systematic planning and systematic decision-making, and not decision-making through resolutions and referenda. Whether it is the SGA that passes a resolution that says I should do something or should not do something or what have you, that's not how I make decisions. One of my fundamental problems with decision-making through resolutions, particularly when it comes to the budget and planning, is that it just doesn’t allow for systematic enough deliberations and discussions, and emotions take over, and debate formats take over. That's fundamentally where I come from.

I was not going to say anything in response to anything somebody else said, but Senator Hugus really compels me to say this. Folks, there are a lot of things written across the country about philosophy professors who have been accused of sexual assault, sexual violence, and insensitivity. Are we not going to have a philosophy department because of that? Guilt by association is something I deeply resent. Our student-athletes do not deserve it. The department does not deserve it. There should be an apology made for that. I urge you to please make the decision based on local circumstances, not through whatever you read in the newspapers. I have great respect for you and believe you will make sound judgments.

Second of all, I would like to say that, with all due respect, I don’t know that a random group of senators are the experts on how viable our program is. Even I am not, by myself, an expert on that. That's why I hired a very promising, well-known, well-connected, and experienced athletic director. You should hear from him about the viability.

The third thing is about CTE. In my memo, I had it wrong: it is not concussive, as I thought. It is chronic traumatic encephalopathy. The chronic focuses on things that happen chronically. Again, I am not an expert, and I am not going to pretend to be. I don’t know who here is, but I am not. I am driven certainly by what the national conversation is and what the NCAA protocols are, as well as monitoring our own department and what is going on there. In fact, the Student Athletic Council has appointed a sub-committee on Student Athlete Health and Wellness, and you should probably hear from them, instead of hearing from random people who don’t have a direct knowledge of what’s going on. Thank you very much for listening.

**Senator Steven D. Brewer:** I’m not an expert on football; football has never been a very big part of my life. But I’m reminded of the statement by Cardinal Newman that the root of the word university is universe, meaning that a university contains something of everything. I’ve always been against the idea of voting something off the island by saying, “I’m against this, and think it should be gotten rid of.” At the same time, I think it’s worth revisiting what brought us to these circumstances, which was that the University was presented with essentially a fait accompli that there was going to be a change to the football program such that would require a huge infusion of capital. We were presented with this extremely rosy scenario wherein, yes, we would be spending a lot of money, but it would bring in a lot more money. It would be this wonderful thing and be a good opportunity to bring in a lot more people from Boston. I don’t want to stand here and say “I told you so,” but we told you so. We recognized that the predictions were overly optimistic and that many of them were unlikely to happen, and we wanted to have a fuller
I agree that chronic traumatic encephalopathy is very serious. I think that if you tried to have a protocol that had students experience what happens during football, it would never get approved by the Institutional Review Board. It’s been grandfathered in because it’s a historical process that people have done for a long time. I think it’s something to take another, careful look at. I welcome the Chancellor’s idea that we have a transparent process to examine these issues and to have the opportunity to look at this issue from a much fuller sense. If this resolution results in that, then I think it has been a success.

Michael Trehey, UMass Amherst Minuteman Marching Band Manager: Before we talk about cancelling the program and things like that, I want you to remember that the Marching Band has been the lifeblood of this University for a long time. Many of you may have met Mr. Parks or been in the building that he built for us. Many universities now model that building and this program in order to build up their own football and band programs. Now we’re trying to take that apart. It just doesn’t seem fair to me. Our band has 400 people that support the football team. And it’s not just the football team; it’s the fact that we go out. We go to Boston, to New York City, to Penn State. We are in this town and we are part of this campus. And now it is getting torn away from us. I can’t believe this; it boggles my mind. The band is crushed. This would be an absolute blow to us. We’re at 400 now, but our numbers would probably drop to about 150, if that. For us, it is hard to even imagine that this could come about. I can’t express how much we need this football team. Thank you.

Senator Susan K. Whithourbe: I’ve obviously spoken here before, and I always come with two competing arguments in my head about it. A third one has recently entered. Yes, I love the band. I love sports. I attend many random games—they aren’t random to the students, but I go to more than just the big ones. I know how hard our students work and I see them struggling every morning as I make my way from Lot 42 past Boyden Gym. I see the shape that our gym is in, the conditions that our crew team is rowing in. These are, in my opinion, the worst imaginable circumstances for our student-athletes, and yet they come here. They work their hearts out, and the rest of their bodies and minds as well. In terms of football, I’ve been on the finance side of the equation for a long time. But in thinking about the athletes, and what we’re asking them to do—this, to me, has been the hardest. We’re asking them to put their bodies out there, their brains, so they can be regularly brutalized by people who are generally one and a half to two times their size because of the division that we’re in. When we’re being outplayed and beaten up, I just don’t think this is communicating the respect we have for our University and the respect that we show to our students. I worry very much about the long-term consequences. Now that we know what they are, it seems unconscionable to me to continue to put our students, our local students here on this campus, into those situations on a chronic basis. Thank you.

Ryan Bamford, Director of Athletics: I’ve had the good fortune of meeting many of you and, for those of you I haven’t, I look forward to meeting you. Senators, thank you for letting us come to speak to you on this important issue this afternoon. Please bear with me, I have a bit of a cold. I wanted to first start by telling you that the thing that is of paramount interest and importance to us in Athletics—and it’s not just the football program—is the health and safety of our student-athletes. That is the most important thing we do in every single day—giving our students a great experience and making sure that it is a healthy experience and a safe experience. So particularly troubling in the motion was the section about the debilitating nature of football. We don’t put our kids in harm’s way. I would never do that, my colleagues would never do that, and this University would never do that. I wanted to start with that because it was arguably the most important thing here.

I want to share with you a little bit about my background, because I think it helps to paint a picture as to why I’m here and where we think we can go. I’ve been in college athletics for fifteen years. Fourteen of those fifteen years—I just started at UMass a year ago—I’ve been at AAU institutions. I was at Yale University for nine years, and at Georgia Tech for just shy of five years. I came here because I see where this place is going. I see where this place is going academically and in research, and I know that we can take it to great heights. I know it because I believe in
the leader that we have in our Chancellor. Our goal in Athletics is to create a model—and football is a big piece of this—that complements the academic experience and all the great things that we do on this campus every single day.

You heard it from the SGA President and you heard it from the band: this football program instills pride. It instills pride in those on campus and in those who have an affinity for the University of Massachusetts. That is not insignificant and we don’t take that lightly. We have 120 young men who work hard every single day to make you, our students, our alumni, and those who care about this place proud. I’m proud to be their athletic director because of that. It would be a mistake, after being here for only a year, to tell you that we even want to have this conversation about discontinuing the program or moving down a division.

One of the criticisms that I know we’ve gotten, and I want to attack it head on, is the idea that we are not playing games on campus, that we’ve been playing games at Gillette. I can tell you that I inherited a program when I got here a year ago, and it had one home game scheduled for the 2016 season and we were going into independent football. We’ve now scheduled twelve games for 2016 and 2017, and we have eleven of twelve scheduled for 2018. At the end of this fall, when we market our program, we’re poised to bring all of our 2017 home games back to our campus. That is really important and powerful as we build an engaged community around this football program. We want it back here; college football is meant to be played on a college campus. Thank you.

Max Page, Professor of Architecture: I would like to make three quick points. First, I would like to thank the makers of this motion. It’s a wise, eloquent, and reasonable motion that highlights the range of reasons for why we should end Division I football. Second, I’d like to urge the administrators here who have, according to our Bylaws, the right to vote to abstain. I’ve had the experience, as a senator here for several years, that you are directed here to vote a certain way. That doesn’t seem to be in the spirit of open debate. You’re here, and I understand that, and I understand that we haven’t changed our Bylaws, but you really should abstain from voting, because you’re being directed to vote in a certain way.

The third point I wanted to share is one particular reason that I agree with all the other reasons that the makers put in this motion, but I want to focus on one thing. I spent an enormous amount of time, as many of you have as well, advocating for greater funding of this University, as the MSP President, in my various roles with the MTA, and as one of the founders of PHENOM. One of the premises of our argument when we go to the legislature is that there is a broad, wide-ranging support among alumni and others for the program. But then we launch a new Division I football program, and the attendance is embarrassing. It has declined greatly. Our average home attendance was 11,124; that includes Band Day at Gillette, that includes many millions of extra dollars that we have spent trying to bring in more people. We have never even gotten close to what was predicted by various chancellors, presidents, and other athletic directors that we would have 30,000 or 35,000 people attending. When we go to the legislature and say that we are a sleeping giant and we have this broad support and then we look at the 6,000 people not filling a 60,000-stadium at Gillette is embarrassing. Attendance has gone down from a height of 16,000, which barely keeps up with what is considered legitimate within Division I, and now it’s down to 11,000, despite a team that was supposed to be good, a well-regarded coach, and lots of money put into various ways of getting people there. So what I’m saying is that, among all the other reasons, I just want to highlight that it makes our advocacy for public higher education and the UMass campus a lot harder when we have invested lots of attention on this one program, which has clearly failed to rally students, alumni, or any others to attend. It makes us look bad. Thank you.

Senator Rebecca Spencer: First, I’d like to start by apologizing to Matt Sparks and any other student-athletes in the audience for the comments of Senator Hugus. As a fellow senator and a fellow faculty member, I want you to know that that is not the opinion of all of your faculty. We do not all assume that you are going to be rapists. In fact, I recognize all the hard work that you’ve done. I recognize Matt as a 21st Century Scholar. I recognize that many of our football team are first-generation college students that are working much harder than many of the other students in our population.

As perhaps the only Ph.D. in neuroscience in the audience—I’m sorry if I’m wrong on that—I share my fellow senators’ concern about the devastating effect of multiple concussions. In recognizing this as well as the concerns, which came up as part of the FBS Ad Hoc Committee when it existed a year ago, we introduced the Student Athlete Health and Wellness Subcommittee as part of the Athletic Council. Its scope is “to support the Athletic
Department in issues of student-athlete health and welfare, and to report to the campus as a whole via the Faculty Senate the process and progress in this area. The Subcommittee will review approaches to health and welfare and specifically include concussions and mental health.” In the subcommittee’s first year, we, a group of five of your faculty, met with Jim Helling, the mental health counselor, as well as Jeff Smith, the Associate Athletic Director for Sports Medicine. We reviewed the departments’ concussion incidents and response. These matters will be presented with you in the current year’s subcommittee report, to be shared with all of you. Next year, and in years after, we can ask questions as to whether these are indeed sufficient and best practices.

A few years ago, I hosted Dr. Ann McKee as a speaker as part of our neuroscience colloquium series. Dr. McKee is the person that you see in the news when you read about CTE. I can assume, by many of your comments, that you were not here for her talk. If you were, you would have learned that she remains an avid Green Bay Packers fan. She is an expert in CTE and has seen all of these cases, and, nonetheless, she does not believe that eliminating football is the solution. While I share many of my fellow senators’ concerns for concussions, I, too, agree that eliminating football is not the solution. Rather, I ask that you use this concern to guide the Student Athlete Health and Wellness Subcommittee.

Given that this motion is not just about concussions, I want to remind you that, one year ago, we hired Ryan Bamford. We hired him because he is a visionary and an expert in athletics the likes this campus has never seen. I’ve spent the last few days doing one-on-one senior exit interviews with student-athletes, as I’ve done for many years now as part of the Compliance Subcommittee of the Athletic Council. Just like other years, behind closed doors, the graduating student-athletes have given me their genuine impressions of their experience here as student-athletes at UMass. I perhaps have a perspective that none of you have heard. This year, they were positive. This year, they were all thrilled with Ryan Bamford’s administration and were sad to be leaving without having more of a part of that experience. Likewise, in my ombuds role as the Faculty Athletic Representative, I went from hearing seventeen cases of concern this time last year to zero cases of concern this year. These are the immediate rewards of this hire. I want to remind you, though, that we hired Ryan Bamford to direct athletics as well as our football program. I urge you to let him do his job. Let him do what we hired him to do.

**Senator Marta Calas:** I will try to be very brief. First of all, I had wanted to say something else, but I changed my mind because, from what I have heard in this conversation up to this point, I think we are having some kind of confusion. We are implying that football implies all of the athletics in the University. Somehow, we are not going to have a band. But, if I remember correctly, when we had Mr. Parks as our band leader, the band was going everywhere, it was fabulous, and we didn’t have a great football program at that point and it didn’t hurt the band. So I don’t think that the combination of having a great band and having a football program is necessarily equivalent. We should keep that in mind as well.

Secondly, I think that the question of football is a question that is larger than just saying that it is about concussions, even though I completely agree with everyone who has spoken on that matter, because that is a real problem. But in terms of the consequences, we are talking about the future and how to move the program forward. The future may not be what everybody thought it was in the past: that everybody was going to have programs like the great programs that already exist, and that it is just a matter of time until we are as far along as that. In the larger culture, many parents are not as happy with the idea of American football being the primary sport that their children are playing or learning about. We have to be mindful that the story about concussions is not just the story about the particulars of this place and this game, but actually about the larger picture of who will be the players. Who are the people who actually want to play football? If you think about the different networks that carry the games in different forms, they are actually hurting for audiences. In fact, they are recruiting women right now for the front offices in order to find ways to bring in new audiences to American football. I think that is one way to think about these things. It is not just about the present, but also the future, and we have to imagine that the future may not be like the past. The past only repeats itself when we are blind to what doesn’t repeat. Thank you.

**Anthony Vitale, President of the Student Government Association:** I’ve heard a lot of things on that side, and I’ve heard some keywords, like respect, transparency, and communication. But this is the first time that the Student Government Association—the representative unit of the undergraduate body, the largest body on this campus by number—has heard of this. This has not been a discussion. This motion is not a discussion. I don’t know if you guys were planning to have a discussion in this room without telling the undergraduates what you were planning—
the people who pay the salaries of everyone in this room, this side and that side. Was it not going to be spoken about to us, the student-athletes and the undergraduates as a whole? This needs to be discussed with undergraduates, with administrators, and with faculty. You can’t just come up here and make a motion, like Chancellor Subbaswamy said, in which one side is just able to dominate the discussion. That being said, I mentioned earlier the tremendous amount of support. I just want to discuss—what was the outreach that was undertaken? Was there outreach to alumni, undergraduates, graduates, or administration? If I opened Facebook or my email, I would probably find 500 unread messages from people. I had planned to read some of them, but I guess you can’t filibuster in these meetings, can you? But I could read hundreds and hundreds of comments telling me, “Please support football. I love football. The only reason I am still connected to UMass is because of football. I donate to the University because I come back for football. I contribute to the local economy when I come back for football games, and this is why I love UMass so much.” I don’t want to take up too much time, but I want to make it known that this is not a discussion. This motion is not a discussion; this is a statement that was made without consulting the fee- and tuition-paying students on campus. Please keep that in mind, when you vote, that this is not a discussion and that we need to seek to have one in the future.

**Senator Ernest May:** This time of year, in the past, I have made statements about all the wonderful projects that we have approved over the course of the year. This year, there is a list like that, with initiatives that have been approved, like the new department of biomedical engineering with three levels of degree programs. In the proposal, it says that it won’t cost any new money, but, of course, we know that it will. There are other initiatives out there, though I won’t go through them all. On the other hand, the campus is still involved in a staff hiring freeze and you can’t hire staff members. In my department, there are three open staff positions. The budget is an issue, as the Chancellor has told us. I have a grandson coming to campus next year whose student debt will be increased by at least $5,000-$6,000 due to the fact that our athletic program as a whole generates one of the largest deficits in Division I-A in the country. So, budget really is an issue and it translates directly into student debt.

Everyone on this campus is measured—there are metrics. Students are graded, faculty are evaluated by students and by their peers, and the administration is evaluated by faculty and by other administrators and, in fact, by the whole University community. The football program needs to be evaluated also. It’s been five years. As previous speakers have mentioned, the way that this program was established was by a fait accompli before Chancellor Subbaswamy came here, and the prospects were set up as very rosy. By any set of metrics, the 1-A move has failed. That’s not to say that we weren’t fairly successful in 1-AA; we were. I really think that it is time to call the question by an agreed-upon set of metrics, and there have been committees that were looking at these metrics. In addition, CTE is a major liability. Another aspect of this is that there is no television market out here. Part of the reason to get into Division I-A was to capture part of the Boston TV market and that failed. You end up with cameras panning an almost completely empty stadium. As everyone in marketing knows, marketing a defective product is a negative, not a positive. Advertising something that is failing just makes you look like a failure. So, to those proposals and to those people who contacted the SGA President, I would urge them to attend the games and to write the checks, because there has not been an upsurge in giving as a result of the Division I-A move. The costs get transferred to my grandson and all the students on this University’s student loans.

**Lucas Patenaude, Secretary of University Policy and External Affairs, Student Government Association:** First, I would like to start by echoing the words of the Chancellor that using scare tactics and relating the actions of athletes on other college campuses, and saying that our students here or even implying that our students and our athletes may carry out such deplorable actions is wrong and is not how we carry out a fruitful and positive discussion on this situation. The second point I’d like the bring up is regarding Title IX. If this program is cut, under the guidelines of Title IX, the funding for athletic programs for female athletes on this campus will suffer serious cuts if the football funding is no longer there. The football program also provides a huge opportunity for underrepresented students in the Commonwealth as well as across the country. A lot of underrepresented students in the Commonwealth would not have the chance to come and get such a great college education if it weren’t for the UMass football program. It says in the mission statement of this University that this University is committed to providing a high-quality, high-caliber education to every student in the Commonwealth and every student across this nation. If we cut the football program, we are eliminating the opportunity for a great, high-caliber education for those underrepresented students who do not have the opportunity to come here. If we cut this program, we are saying, “No more education for underrepresented students.” It will become a lot harder for them to come to such a great University. There’s been a lot of discussion coming from this side about how this is a failing program, it’s not working, no one’s coming to the games, we’re losing, all that stuff. All great football programs across the country
didn’t start by filling their stadiums with 50,000 people, they didn’t start by winning championships left and right. They had to start small, they had to start from somewhere. You don’t start from the top. Ann Landers has a quote that “most people do not recognize opportunity because it is disguised as hard work.” This University knows how to do hard work; we will not quit on this. We win together, we lose together, and the UMass football program will live forever.

Amilcar Shabazz, Professor of Afro-American Studies: I didn’t know anything about sides of the room, but I rise to speak against this embarrassment of a motion. I heard a faculty member say yesterday that “UMass has no football tradition.” Alas, such an untruth spoken by someone who has written about the architectural history of the UMass campus. It is sad to see truth sacrificed for political expediency and to buttress an argument to deceive a fool. What is a tradition? If we do any handing down of information, beliefs, or customs from one generation to another, then surely football is a tradition on this campus. The sport that, in the U.S., we peculiarly refer to as football, made its historical appearance on this campus in 1879. In a piece on the history of Mass Aggie in the 1883 yearbook, games were noted against schools like Amherst College, Yale, and other nearby teams. Indeed, we had our first undefeated season in 1879—we only played one game. But it was against Amherst College and we beat them, 4-0. We’ve had two other undefeated seasons; I’ll tell you, if we have another one, everyone will be behind UMass football, except for maybe a few people. Of course, baseball is the first sport to appear in our history and, interestingly, the nine players received their uniforms thanks to “the generous aid of the faculty.” Indeed, when football started, it was with the generous aid of the faculty.

George Bridgeforth, who, from as best as we know, became the first African-American student at UMass Amherst—and our first African-American graduate from what was then known as Massachusetts Agricultural College—was on the football team. No scholarship athlete, mind you; he was a scientist and went on to work with Booker T. Washington and George Washington Carver at Tuskegee before taking the helm of the Industrial and Educational Institute of Topeka, Kansas. He was a scientist and an educational administrator. He was not about football, but he played and enjoyed the game while he was here. Indeed, we are distinguished by having the first African-American to be the head football coach of a predominantly White institution: Matthew Bullock who, here in Massachusetts, was also the first African-American to coach a White high school team, Everett High School, and then came here in 1904 to coach here until 1907. We had winning seasons. Current NFL players include Rob Blanchflower with the Pittsburgh Steelers, Victor Cruz with the New York Giants, and Vladimir Ducasse with the Minnesota Vikings, James Ihedigbo with the Detroit Lions, and several others. We have a tradition. A tradition of greatness, notwithstanding some losses, notwithstanding how things were done in the move to Division 1-A. I think we ought to stand behind football as a very old tradition on this campus and make it work so we can all be proud to be part of the UMass Nation. Thank you.

Senator Bruce Baird: I was a member of the 1986 undefeated Springville High School Red Devil State Champion football team and I was a student-athlete at Columbia University as a wrestler. I’m only saying that because I don’t start out with a knee-jerk reaction against football. But we know more about this game than we did in 1986, and we’re supposed to be the institution that acts on our new knowledge. That’s the institution that we are supposed to be. I’m a little surprised about the fact that some people here are trying to back away from the connection between football and CTE. I’m surprised that the athletic director can assure us that no athletes are getting put in harm’s way. If there is a concussion in any football player, they have been put in harm’s way. There’s just nothing we can say against that. Finally, the National Football League recently tried to conclude a settlement with former players for $800 million relating to brain damage. However, the judge threw out the upper bound on the limit. There is no upper bound on this limit at all. However far up that settlement goes is however much the National Football League is on the hook for. They can deal with this; the National Football League makes a lot of money. Can we afford this? When one of our players suddenly has brain damage and we’re on the hook for that player for the rest of their life, can we live with ourselves for putting that player in that position? And can the institution pay for that player for the rest of their life? These are the things that I want to emphasize. Thank you.

Matthew Sparks, Student-Athlete: Good afternoon, I’m a senior civil engineering student who also played on the football team for the past four years. I am here today to tell you about why I think it would be a mistake to discontinue NCAA football at UMass Amherst. After two turbulent years, during which even I might have argued that the move to FBS had failed, we finally have some positive momentum built up. We have a head coach with a history of success at this University and a beautiful Football Performance Center. We have an excellent athletic
director with the vision to bring the entire department to new heights. Beyond that, though, I have also experienced the tremendous impact that our football has had on the community outside of the university. Our work with the Holyoke Boys and Girls Club and our development clinics have been outstanding, positive influences on the youth in this region. Another often-overlooked point is the diversity our football team brings to our campus. Student-athletes make up a significant portion of the minority population on this campus. Many of them use the degrees that they earn here to be leaders in their communities. That is why I believe that either cutting scholarships or football as a whole is a mistake and will have significant impact not only on campus but throughout communities in our entire region. Thank you.

**Senator Lisa Saunders:** I’d like to thank Senator Gross and others who brought this motion before the Faculty Senate. I’d like to offer some impressions that I’m getting from the discussion today. Proud tradition notwithstanding, I think we have to acknowledge the tenor of the debate. The presumption, it seems, is that we’re trying to discontinue it altogether, although the motion indicates that football might return to campus, so it makes it seem more threatening than otherwise, even as we look at what’s up there. The other thing is this painting of Senator Hugus’ arguments with a broad brush around rape. That is really unfortunate, I think. He wasn’t talking about anyone at UMass when he made the comment and he was cut off before he got to continue. But what it brought to mind for me, especially when the Chancellor said careful when thinking about everything you read in the paper, is that I do recall reading about UMass football players being assaultive very recently in the paper. I’m not supposed to think about that when I hear Senator Hugus’ concerns? Excuse me, are there now thought police in the Senate, too? Finally, I would be very careful calling football a recruitment tool for diversity. Some very bright students in my own class have done research on football in Division 1—until you bring really good GPAs and graduation rates, don’t disparage the efforts of the rest of us trying to diversify the campus and work with students who come prepared to do the work and are successful. Don’t pretend that football is the leading star in the work we do in diversity here. I’m appalled that anyone would even bring it without data to back it up.

**Nelson Lacey, Professor of Finance and Member of the Athletic Council:** I am your COIA representative. COIA is the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics. I’ve been representing you for about a year and a half. I came here today hoping for a spirited discussion and you haven’t disappointed me. Thank you very much. At this year’s COIA meeting at the home of the NCAA in Indianapolis, Brian Hainline, the chief medical officer, spoke to our group. I’m not a fan of the NCAA, but they hired a really great spokesperson for their medical issues. He alerted us to a study that the NCAA just completed about sports-related concussions. It was a five-year study that concluded in 2015. I just want to read to you the top five collegiate sports in terms of incidences in sports-related concussions. Leading the list is men’s wrestling, second is men’s ice hockey, third is women’s ice hockey, fourth is men’s football, and fifth is women’s soccer.

I was thinking that, about two and a half years ago, Professor Page and I were up on this stage giving a report on the Ad Hoc Committee on FBS Football. A group of senators presented a report titled “Failure to Launch.” Some of you who authored that report may be out here today. I was wondering, or imagining, what would have happened if the University had taken the conclusions of the report and ended football two and a half years ago. Here’s what I think would be true today, two and a half years later: we would have the same number of faculty here, we would still be talking about our ailing infrastructure, and we’d still be discussing tuition hikes and budget cuts. There would be one thing that would be different: we’d be at a university called the University of Massachusetts, the school that had no football program. That is what I think would be the ultimate difference, if those conclusions from that report had been accepted. Thank you.

**Senator Farshid Hajir:** I would like to urge my fellow senators to vote against this motion for a number of reasons. I find the motion is flawed in a number of important ways. The first flaw: Just to reassure all the students, if this motion passes, it is a non-binding motion. Football will not stop. I hope you understand that. This is a non-binding motion and what it will mostly do is bring bad publicity to a program that has a lot of positive aspects to it. The second thing is that there is an Athletic Council, as Senator Spencer talked about, and this motion didn’t go through them. I find that to be a big flaw for senate operations, because that's the proper pathway. I also would have phrased it differently as “the senate feels the need for it to be strongly studied” or something like that. That goes to faculty governance. As you know, the University is governed through a sharing process and it used to be, maybe 50-75 years ago, that faculty members ran the universities essentially and very small numbers of faculty members became administrators. Over time, as happens with any institution or system, people become specialized. So we have administrators and faculty members and weird people like myself who, as a department head, has a
foot in both worlds. There are certain things which need to be left to the administration. I’ve only been at the University for fourteen years, but in my fourteen years here, there’s never been a chancellor that comes even close to sharing governance with the faculty as much as Chancellor Subbaswamy has. I think it is a disservice to him and how he has treated the Faculty Senate during his time here to present this motion in the first place. I’m a very highly-paid administrator, and if Mr. Bamford came to me and said, “Farshid, differential equations should be eliminated. I think they are no longer necessary for engineers or scientists,” I would say, “Mr. Bamford, I respect your opinion but what the heck are you talking about?” This motion is akin to the same thing. Mr. Bamford is a highly-paid administrator and these kinds of decisions about the overall benefits of the program to the University should be left to him and the rest of the administration. I also find the motion itself to be incoherent and inconsistent. If you really believe that the problems with concussions and CTE are such a big problem, then you wouldn’t put into the motion that we should move from one division to another. That is a decision best left to the administration. Thank you.

The motion failed on a standing vote of 26 opposed and 14 in favor.

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>AFROAM 392</td>
<td>“Songbirds, Blueswomen, Soulwomen”</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPSCI 150</td>
<td>“A Mathematical Foundation for Informatics”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPSCI 266</td>
<td>“Internet Law and Policy”</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPSCI 267</td>
<td>“Information Risk Management”</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPSCI 269</td>
<td>“Trust Assurance and Cybersecurity Capstone”</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOURNAL 436</td>
<td>“Narrative Video Journalism”</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUSIC 160</td>
<td>“Culture, Society and the Broadway Musical”</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIOL 326</td>
<td>“Asian Americans in Media and Popular Culture”</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECO 622</td>
<td>“Conservation Biology”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECO 645</td>
<td>“Urban Ecology, Evolution and Behavior”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MOTION: That the Faculty Senate approve the courses AFROAM 392, COMPSCI 150, 266, 267 and 269, JOURNAL 436, MUSIC 160, SOCIOL 326 and ECO 622 and 645, as recommended by the Academic Matters and Graduate Councils.

Senator Frank Hugus: Looking at the credits assigned to these courses, I see that all but three are four credits. This seems to me to be an accelerating trend of courses going from three to four credits. It seems to me that we need to look into this because we’re having problems in some of the departments getting the students to have the correct number of courses so they can graduate.

The motion was adopted.

G. NEW BUSINESS

CONSENT AGENDA (ITEMS 1-14)
[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, Academic Priorities and Program and Budget Councils concerning a Revision of the Biotechnology Concentration in the Animal Science Major in the Department of Veterinary and Animal Sciences, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 16-048 with Motion No. 27-16.

3. Special Report of the Academic Matters, Academic Priorities and Graduate Councils concerning a Program Name Change in the Department of Languages, Literatures and Cultures: Asian Languages and Literatures to East Asian Languages and Cultures, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 16-049 with Motion No. 27-16.

4. Special Report of the Academic Priorities and Program and Budget Councils concerning a Proposal for an Emeritus Academy at the University of Massachusetts Amherst, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 16-050 with Motion No. 27-16.

5. Special Report of the Academic Priorities, Graduate and Program and Budget Councils concerning Revision of the Masters in Public Health with a Concentration in Biostatistics, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 16-051 with Motion No. 27-16.

6. Special Report of the Academic Priorities, Graduate and Program and Budget Councils concerning Revision of the Master of Business Administration/Master of Science (MBA/MS) Sport Management Dual Degree Program, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 16-052 with Motion No. 27-16.

7. Special Report of the Academic Priorities, Graduate and Program and Budget Councils concerning a Certificate in Business Analytics, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 16-053 with Motion No. 27-16.


10. Special Report of the Academic Priorities, Graduate and Program and Budget Councils concerning a Certificate in Statistical and Computational Data Science, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 16-056 with Motion No. 27-16.

11. Special Report of the Academic Matters, Academic Priorities, Graduate, Program and Budget and Research Councils concerning the Establishment of a Department of Biomedical Engineering (BME) in the College of Engineering, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 16-057 with Motion No. 27-16.

12. Special Report of the Academic Matters, Academic Priorities and Program and Budget Councils concerning a Bachelor of Science (B.S.) Degree in Biomedical Engineering, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 16-058 with Motion No. 27-16.

13. Special Report of the Academic Priorities, Graduate and Program and Budget Councils concerning a Master of Science (M.S.) Degree in Biomedical Engineering, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 16-059 with Motion No. 27-16.

14. Special Report of the Academic Priorities, Graduate and Program and Budget Councils concerning a Ph.D. Degree in Biomedical Engineering, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 16-060 with Motion No. 27-16.

MOTION: That the Faculty Senate approve 1) the Revision of the Requirements for the Major in Hospitality and Tourism Management, 2) the Revision of the Biotechnology Concentration in the Animal Science Major in the Department of Veterinary and Animal Sciences, 3) the Program Name Change in the Department of Languages, Literatures and Cultures: Asian Languages and Literatures to East Asian Languages and Cultures, 4) the Proposal for an Emeritus Academy at the University of Massachusetts Amherst, 5) the Revision of the Masters in Public Health with a Concentration in Biostatistics, 6) the Revision of the Master of Business Administration/Master of Science (MBA/MS) Sport Management Dual Degree Program, 7) the Certificate in Business Analytics, 8) the Certificate in Business Leadership, 9) the Certificate in Genomic Data Science,
10) the Certificate in Statistical and Computational Data Science, 11) the Establishment of a Department of Biomedical Engineering (BME) in the College of Engineering, 12) the Bachelor of Science (B.S.) Degree in Biomedical Engineering, 13) the Master of Science (M.S.) Degree in Biomedical Engineering and 14) the Ph.D. Degree in Biomedical Engineering, as presented in Sen. Doc. Nos. 16-047, 16-048, 16-049, 16-050, 16-051, 16-052, 16-053, 16-054, 16-055, 16-056, 16-057, 16-058, 16-059 and 16-060.

Senator Frank Hugus: I read the revised Major in Hospitality and Tourism Management over with some interest. I’m happy to see that one of the options that the students will have to fulfill some of the requirements is taking a foreign language. On the other hand, I didn’t see anything in the report about encouraging study abroad. If there was a major that would profit from students studying abroad, this would seem to be it.

MJ Peterson, Secretary of the Faculty Senate: They didn’t write it directly in the program, but I am aware that Isenberg is fairly active in promoting study trips abroad of various types that do take students to cities that expose them to the business, the culture, all of the fun, and a fair amount of good food.

Senator Curt Conner: I’m quite concerned that we have these degrees in biomedical sciences, but have yet to hire a single faculty member in this area. This is administration from the top down. Normally, you put together a curriculum after you have the faculty in place, not before you hire anybody. This is a great concern to me that we’re doing this in an opposite manner, saying this is what you will do, and then hiring people into that place. It doesn’t seem like a very good way to run an organization.

Senator Rod Warnick: I’m a member of the Hospitality and Tourism Management department. We do have a very active summer abroad program. This summer, we’re taking over 26 students abroad. We also have an international program that brings students here during the summer. Last year, we had about 50 students who were here for a three-week period. So it goes both ways—we send students abroad and we bring international students here for acculturation in the United States. The programs have worked quite well.

Katherine S. Newman, Provost and Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs: I just wanted to speak briefly to Senator Conner’s concern. The program in biomedical engineering was put together by the College of Engineering, using the talents of the many people who will be able to contribute to the program before we’ve hired a full faculty. We have authorized the hiring of a new department chair, but we have to go about this by presenting the full program and moving it up all the way through the state level in order for a new department to actually be officially established. It would be very difficult to hire a new department chair if they don’t actually have a program to run. We’re very eager to get started on this, and our colleagues in the Medical School are very encouraged by our collaboration. We have lots of faculty members, as he knows, in the College of Engineering who will be able to contribute. There are quite a few experts already on campus. But it’s true, in order to be able to hire the faculty that we intend to hire, we need to have the program started.

John McCarthy, Senior Vice Provost of Academic Affairs and Dean of the Graduate School: The other issue with biomedical engineering is that, because it takes about two years to get a new degree program through the full approval process, including the Board of Trustees and the Department of Higher Education, it really is necessary to do that now. When the faculty are fully in place, when they have a department, a chair, faculty from the College as well as newly hired faculty, they can then revise the curriculum where appropriate through the Senate processes, which, of course, are much swifter than the state processes.

The motion was adopted.

15. Special Report of the Nominating Committee concerning Nominations to Faculty Senate Councils and Committees, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 16-061 with Motion No. 28-16.

MOTION: That the Faculty Senate approve the Nominations to Faculty Senate Councils and Committees, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 16-061.

The motion was adopted.
OLD BUSINESS (Tabled from the 757th Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate)

A Resolution on an Inclusive Campus at the University of Massachusetts Amherst

Whereas, the University of Massachusetts Amherst in its Diversity Strategic Plan has affirmed its commitment to diversity, justice, and inclusive excellence as strategic priorities (https://www.umass.edu/chancellor/sites/default/files/Diversity-Strategic-Plan-04-06-15.pdf); and

Whereas, the Faculty Senate supports diversity, justice, and inclusive excellence as the University of Massachusetts Amherst strategic priorities; and

Whereas, the Faculty Senate affirms its commitment to an educational environment and campus community in which academic freedom and free speech prevail, disparate and provocative viewpoints and ideas can be expressed and debated, while rejecting acts of hostility, bigotry, hatred, discrimination, anti-Semitism, Islamophobia, and racism; and

Whereas, in February, March, and April 2016, members of the campus community at the University of Massachusetts Amherst witnessed appalling incidents of racist, anti-Semitic, and anti-Islamic behavior; and

Whereas, such actions at the University of Massachusetts Amherst are contrary to the goals in the Diversity Strategic Plan and the Diversity Mission Statement of the University of Massachusetts Amherst (http://www.umass.edu/diversity/about); and

Whereas, everyone on the campus of the University of Massachusetts Amherst deserves equal rights and justice as well as the ability to pursue intellectual inquiry in an inclusive setting, therefore be it

MOTION: Resolved that the Faculty Senate, while affirming academic freedom and freedom of speech, opposes demeaning the personhood of anyone regardless of race, gender, sexual orientation, religion, color, age, viewpoint, ethnicity, ability, or national origin, and that we support efforts at all levels of the University of Massachusetts to actively create an inclusive campus community and educational environment.

Daniel Gordon, Professor of History: I’d like to encourage the Faculty Senate to vote in favor of this resolution. Many of you were here for the last meeting, but some of you were not. Briefly, by way of background, there was a previous resolution and, after considerable discussion, the Faculty Senate agreed that the wording should be changed to consider the First Amendment and free speech. The first version, while it may not have been the intention of the authors of the text, came across as potentially threatening academic freedom and free speech. I’ll remind you that the title of the previous version of the resolution was “A Resolution Opposing Hate Speech at the University of Massachusetts Amherst.” The title of the current version is “A Resolution on an Inclusive Campus at the University of Massachusetts Amherst.” The present text is not perfect, but it does squarely address the concerns raised at the previous meeting of the Faculty Senate, so I encourage you to vote for it.

The motion was adopted.

The 758th Meeting of the Faculty Senate was adjourned at 5:05 pm.