Presiding Officer Robert Wilson called the 636th regular meeting of the Faculty Senate to order on December 16, 2004 at 3:30 p.m. in Herter Hall, Room 227.

A. ADDRESS BY SHARON FROSS, VICE PROVOST FOR UNIVERSITY OUTREACH AND DIRECTOR OF CONTINUING EDUCATION

(see attached)

QUESTIONS

Secretary of the Faculty Senate Ernest May, noting that Vice Provost Fross has probably had an opportunity to assess or understand a little of what is going on at the other UMass campuses, asked if she could give a brief run-down of how she has assessed the activities that are going on at those other campuses.

Vice Provost Fross responded that she had not had that much time. She’s been fast, but not that fast. She is just becoming familiar with the other universities. They do have significant continuing education units and they seem to be very specialized in certain areas; however, they cannot match what a flagship university can do.

Senator Marta Calas said that it struck her that Vice Provost Fross’ presentation was extremely managerialist. She wondered if Vice Provost Fross had considered ways in which she could interface with the academic community, specifically framing the issues in the language that they usually use.

Vice Provost Fross responded that she typically tries to do that. She purposely used Outreach language, because they are externally focused and they have to be able to move within the University and outside of the University. Regarding interfacing with the academic community, she has done so with John Hird and others from the Outreach Council. She is always going to try to use language that is familiar to the academic colleges; at the same time, she has to be very forthright in what they have to do as they look at programs. Although she does try to use more universal language, sometimes she has to use language that is specific to this area.

Secretary May noted that even though there are many broad-based projects that need to be accomplished to really move forward, sometimes having a few—even small—successes early is helpful to get an organization energized. He wondered if she had noticed any specific opportunities or new initiatives that seem like something she would like to pursue in the near future.

Vice Provost Fross responded that there are a number of opportunities. Because a number of the Units have been under interim leadership and the Division has been under interim leadership, and because of the budget difficulties that the University has encountered, there is pent-up need and pent-up demand. And one of the things that she sees from a variety of the academic colleges is a real interest in bringing new programs forward. When they are working with external groups, they are really very interested in applied programs, and bringing Peg Wherry and others on board will allow them to do that development very quickly. When you are looking for an early success story, they have been working with the community colleges here to look at what degree completion programs are needed, so she thinks that they will be able to provide a variety of such programs to different populations where they are, beginning in fall 2005.

B. DISCUSSION ITEM:

“FIRST CHOICE: THE UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST EARLY ACTION ADMISSION PROGRAM”

MICHAEL GARGANO, VICE CHANCELLOR FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS AND CAMPUS LIFE

Thank you very much for the opportunity to come speak to you today about this proposal which is the First Choice Early Admission Program. I would like to share with you a little bit about it and how we got to this stage.

Nationally, in student recruitment, student recruitment policy and procedures have changed dramatically. There used to be a point in time that you actually could start student recruitment in the senior year of high school. What we have found nationally, and I have also found in my very short time here at the University, is that students and families as early as the tenth grade have already started to make their campus visits. They are making as many as ten to twelve campus visits during that period of time. In some cases, a lot of these students have even spent a night visit on college campuses. What that has led to is that, as students get into the start of their senior year, they have already made a decision about where it is that they want to continue their education. What we have found at UMass Amherst is that the number of students who are looking to commit to our University at a much earlier stage has increased. In
fact, we have more and more students looking at UMass Amherst as their preferred choice and their top-choice institution.

At UMass, we have what is often regarded as the very traditional admissions program. It is called regular decision with a January 15th deadline and we generally have a notification in April of your acceptance. Most of the universities that we are competing with for students, such as Michigan, North Carolina, Delaware, Penn State, and Rutgers, have instituted early action admissions programs. What we are proposing today is for the University of Massachusetts Amherst to consider a first-choice early-action program for those students who have selected UMass Amherst as their top choice. Our particular proposal is a little bit different than what you might find nationally. Our proposal actually has an application process that begins in November with notification in December. The December notification is very significant because it still allows a student to apply for the regular decision deadline of January 15th. Our program is different than some of the national programs you may have read about in that it is a non-binding decision, so it does allow a student to apply to other universities. The regular decision allows students to make multiple campus visits and to kind of take their time as they go through this very important process in their life. The First Choice Early Action Program assists those students who have actually already made up their minds where they would like to attend.

It also does a number of other things. By early acceptance, it reduces a lot of the anxiety that families experience as they go forward. It will allow us institutionally to process our financial aid a little bit earlier. It will allow for better planning because we will have some sense of what our incoming class will be as well. We think it will provide us with the same competitive advantage that other universities have. We think it will be very worthwhile for UMass Amherst to consider.

I hope you all will consider this in a very, very positive way. It is very significant to us, especially as we begin to get into this next stage of student recruitment. Our proposal is that this will be implemented with our next cycle which will be in 2006. The significance of today is to allow us, beginning in January, to start the various internal processes that we need to undertake as well as the marketing and other initiatives that need to occur. As a point of reference, we have checked with the Massachusetts Board of Higher Education on this and they have given us the go. We have also checked with the President’s Office of the UMSS System and they firmly endorse it as well.

I have a lot more that I want to talk to you about regarding admissions and where we are in this time of the year, but at this point, if someone had questions about First Choice, I would be happy to take those now.

QUESTIONS

Senator Juan Zamora asked if there is any way of finding out what academic areas the students are interested in during this admissions process; for example, engineering, social sciences, etc.? Secondly, do they take into account minority students?

Vice Chancellor Gargano responded that absolutely they do. Regarding Senator Zamora’s first question, generally what you find nationally is that students who apply early really do have a sense of what it is that they want to study. This particular program provides the opportunity to students who want to commit to the University early on to apply early. It actually will provide us great opportunity to assist students from socioeconomic areas that are deprived because it will actually give us a greater opportunity to work with those students on financial aid packages, the processing of the application, and all of those types of things.

Senator Christine King asked if there was going to be a limit to the number of applicants accepted in this program?

Vice Chancellor Gargano responded that there will be. The national average is around 27%-28%. He anticipates that early on, for our campus, we are looking at between 300 and 600 students. These programs really have to build.

Senator King then asked if a student is applying to the University without a declared major, either because they want to get into an upper-division major like the School of Nursing or they are not exactly sure what they want, will they be eligible as well for this?

Vice Chancellor Gargano responded that yes they would. In some particular cases Admissions would have to work directly with the deans. For example, take the performing arts, where you have to go through a portfolio, recital, things of that nature, so we would have to work closely with the deans to go through that next stage of admission.

Senator Seshu Desu asked about the thought process in making this non-binding.
Vice Chancellor Gargano responded that probably four or five years ago there were a number of universities that had binding early action programs. It came under scrutiny by the public because they believed that it limited access of being able to move from one institution to the next. He thought that perhaps for UMass Amherst a non-binding program would still allow students to declare that UMass Amherst is their first choice, but it also gives them the opportunity to change their minds. His sense is that they will not change their minds because, once they come here, he thinks they will fall in love. He did want to give students and their families that one particular option. The fact is, even nationally, with binding early action programs, it is not necessarily a contract that really prevented anyone from moving from one institution to another institution.

REMARKS FROM VICE CHANCELLOR GARGANO REGARDING THE CURRENT ADMISSIONS PROCESS

Let me just share with you a few other things about what is happening in Admissions. We are at that critical stage in the process over the next six weeks leading up to January 15th and the application deadline. Our Admissions Counselors have been on the road and spent an enormous amount of time in the Commonwealth as well as in New York, New Jersey, Washington D.C., Colorado, and California as well as everywhere else. The good news is that, at our tables at these college fairs, we have been overwhelmed with interested potential applicants. The quality of the questions that we are getting from parents and from students alike reflect very well on this University because the quality of the questions directly complement our faculty and the breadth and depth of our academic programs. Students see coming to UMass Amherst for the education is their number one priority.

We anticipate this year to receive approximately 21,000 applications. That will be a slight increase from last year, which was about 18,000 applications. We are expecting a first-year class of right around 4,240 which is very similar to what we had this year and which we easily could accommodate in our residence halls. We also see increased parental involvement with students and parents being much more engaged in the selection process and wanting to know the complete services that will be offered to their sons and daughters.

We also made a strategic adjustment in our student recruitment this year. We have spent considerably more time recruiting at the community college level. We think that is very important for us. It strengthens our bond with those institutions. We also believe that, in a matter of time, it will have a dramatic impact on our ALANA recruitment here at the University as well as recruitment of other students. We have spent considerable time with President Pura at Greenfield and with Ira Rubenzahl at Springfield Tech, who we managed to convince to give us an Office of Admissions at Springfield Tech. What we have now is a real seamless transition for students who go to STCC and then automatically come into UMass Amherst. While we do not have an office a Holyoke, we have strengthened that bond as well, and we think that that will be very, very important to us in our growth and our student recruitment as well.

On the road, we see an increase in the interest in the sciences, for example, biology. We see an increase in the interest in pre-med and pre-law. We also see an increase in the number of students who want to major in the social and behavioral sciences or the humanities and fine arts. Honestly, business is still very high on students’ and parents’ lists. Something else that we find very, very interesting is the number of parents and students who have already started to think about graduate school. They now see this as a continuation. A bachelor’s degree is good, but I want to be able to get my master’s as well and can I do that at UMass Amherst and how will we be able to do that?

We will also institute this year a lot of the same practices we did last year with yield once we admit our students. Last year, we started with the Minute Man Round Up which is a program where we had a senior of the current student body call every one of the new students that were admitted to the University to answer any of their questions. It was very successful. We will continue with that. Next week, we start hometown visits in which students currently at UMass Amherst will go back and visit their high schools during winter session and speak to the students and guidance counselors and recruit that way as well. Then, as I think most of you know, the month of April will be completely dedicated to receptions and other kinds of activities, both on campus and off campus, in the Commonwealth and nationally, that will further emphasize why students should come to UMass Amherst.

We feel good about where we are headed. We certainly feel good about what the world at large is saying about UMass Amherst. Folks here really deserve all the credit.

C. NEW COURSES

There is no report associated with the following motion:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>CREDITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NRC 211</td>
<td>“Animal Sampling and Identification”</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURSING 433</td>
<td>“Community Health IV: Restorative Nursing II”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the courses NRC 211 and NURSING 433, as recommended by the Academic Matters Council.

This motion was seconded and adopted.

D. NEW BUSINESS

1. Status Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Online Learning, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 05-018 with Motion No. 15-05.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate accept the Status Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Online Learning, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 05-018.

This motion was seconded and adopted.

2. Special Report of the Academic Matters Council and Graduate Council concerning A Joint Proposal to Require Submissions of Proposals to the Faculty Senate in Electronic File Format, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 05-019A with Motion No. 16-05.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate require that all submitted proposals be accompanied by an electronic version of the proposal in Microsoft Word format, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 05-019A.

This motion was seconded and adopted as amended.

3. Special Report of the Academic Matters Council concerning Change in the Credit Limit for Practica and Guidelines for Numbering Practica Courses, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 05-020 with Motion Nos. 17-05 and 18-05.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve an increase from 15 to 18 in the number of credits in elective practica courses which may be applied to undergraduate degree requirements. Elective practica courses are to be numbered 298, 398 and 498, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 05-020.

This motion was seconded and adopted.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve that practica courses required by a degree program are to be designated permanent course numbers other than those used for elective practica courses, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 05-020.

This motion was seconded and adopted.


MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve a change to the Application of Academic Standing Requirements to Students Returning under the “Fresh Start” Policy, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 05-021.

This motion was seconded.

DISCUSSION OF MOTION

Professor John Jenkins, Chair of the Academic Matters Council, noted that the motion as listed requires some clarification. This was adopted by the Faculty Senate on May 6, 2004 and what is at issue now is a modification to the policy. He presented an alternative wording to the motion: “That the Faculty Senate approve a change in the current provisions of the ‘Fresh Start’ Policy as listed under Article II on paragraph one of Sen. Doc. No. 05-021.” The one change is listed under II 2, and it is underlined and has to do with the grade of “C-,” which replaces the “CD,” which was previously in place. All that is being changed is the grade of “C-,” and this is to conform to the new grading policy.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve a change in the current provisions of the “Fresh Start” Policy which describes how courses will be counted towards graduation credit and into the cumulative GPA, to read as
follows: “General Education and free elective credits passed with a grade of C- or better in the first admission will be counted toward graduation credit upon readmission but will not be included in the cumulative average, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 05-021.

This motion was seconded and adopted.

5. Special Motion by the Academic Matters Council and Undergraduate Education Council:

*Professor Jenkins*, prior to making the motion, praised the Student Government Association and its representatives, both undergraduate and graduate, for the commendable way in which they have sought counsel and worked with the Academic Matters Council and Undergraduate Education Council instead of coming to the end of the process and wondering if an administrator would simply do something about the problem. They are duly involved in the process and have been very pleasant to work with.

**MOVED:** That the Academic Matters Council and Undergraduate Education Council support actively examining ways to reduce textbook costs to students, whether by adopting models from other campuses or by developing a new model suitable to our campus. In addition, the Academic Matters Council and Undergraduate Education Council are committed to exercising leadership in examining this issue with faculty across the campus.

This motion was seconded and approved.

6. Special Report of the International Studies Council concerning An Agreement for a Student Exchange Program between the University of Massachusetts Amherst and Kansai Gaidai University, Hirakata, Osaka, Japan, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 05-022 with Motion No. 21-05.

**MOVED:** That the Faculty Senate approve the Agreement for a Student Exchange Program between the University of Massachusetts Amherst and Kansai Gaidai University, Hirakata, Osaka, Japan, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 05-022.

This motion was seconded and adopted.


**MOVED:** That the Faculty Senate approve, for the period from January 1, 2005 through May 31, 2006, the Senegal Ecotourism and Sustainable Development Program sponsored by Living Routes, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 05-023.

This motion was seconded.

**DISCUSSION OF MOTION**

*Senator Brian O'Connor* asked for a clarification as to the reasoning behind putting a time limit on the approval for the program, specifically does this mean that if the program is going to be extended, will the International Studies Council have to come back and present it again for approval?

*Professor Donal Carbaugh, Co-Chair of the International Studies Council,* responded that yes, that is what this limited proposal means. There was one case prior to this that is similar, but that program has yet to be initiated. The concern of the Council is that they have in this particular proposal a third-party provider. Since this is a new kind of arrangement being made between the University and a third-party provider, they wanted to have a limited time to see how it was going, while they also have the opportunity, in sub-committees, to discuss certain kinds of criteria they would like to apply to this kind of program. For that reason, they did not want an indefinite time period, but to have a shorter time period and then revisit this particular proposal with the benefit of that plan.

This motion was adopted.

8. Special Report of the Committee on Committees concerning Nominations to Faculty Senate Councils and Committees, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 05-024 with Motion No. 23-05.

**MOVED:** That the Faculty Senate approve the Nominations to Faculty Senate Councils and Committees, as presented
This motion was seconded and adopted.

E. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Provost

_Provost Charlena Seymour_ shared that they are running searches this year to fill academic executive positions. The four dean positions which they are now advertising are: Dean of Natural Science and Mathematics, and Mike Malone of Engineering is the Chair of that search; Dean of the Social and Behavioral Sciences, and Lee Edwards is the Chair of that search; Dean of the School of Education, and Cleve Willis is the Chair of that search; and for the Director of Libraries search, Linda Slakey is the Chair. Also, they are holding a search for the Graduate Dean and Tony Butterfield is the Chair of that search. They are also undergoing two evaluations of deans this year: Dean Tom O'Brien of the Isenberg School of Management, and also Dean Linda Slakey of Commonwealth College. In addition, they are holding a search for the Associate Provost and Director of International Programs, and they are completing the pool for the search committee.

2. Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance

_Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance Joyce Hatch_ made an announcement regarding a classroom blitz happening during this intersession. They have done this for the last two years and once again were going to be focusing on space while people are away, probably starting next week. They are going to be doing work in Goessmann: the connector between old Goessmann and new Goessmann, the two auditoria—hopefully new seats in those two auditoria; Fernald Auditorium; and hopefully some work in Hills South, if not there, then some other smaller classrooms.

3. Vice Provost for Research

_Vice Provost for Research Paul Kostecki_ shared information regarding the Faculty Research Grant program which was reinitiated this year. In their first cycle of submissions, they received forty-one submissions representing most of the schools. It totaled over $700,000 worth of proposals. He saw this as a very good sign. It was an indication of a high level of activity of grant-getting by the faculty, and he commended them for that.

4. Secretary of the Faculty Senate

_Secretary May_ congratulated the Councils and Committees on completing their work for the fall semester. Many are discussing substantive issues. For example, the International Studies Council’s examination of third-party providers for study abroad, which is a whole new area for that Council. He had been asked, on behalf of a Senator who could not be at the Faculty Senate meeting, to ask a question, to which he supposed a response would be forthcoming during the Question Period. “It has been said in various quarters that the University is exploring connections with the Department of Homeland Security and that it may develop an Institute for Homeland Security and seek funds for various aspects of the University through it.” If so, there is a follow-up question, which he would ask during the Question Period.

5. Faculty Delegate to the Board of Trustees

_Faculty Delegate to the Board of Trustees Brian O’Connor_ had a quick reminder that there will be a special meeting of the Board of Trustees on Tuesday, December 21st to vote on acquiring the law school (SNESL). He was hoping to attend that meeting.

F. QUESTION PERIOD

_Senator Calas_ asked if there was any news regarding PeopleSoft and Oracle, aside from the fact that there is no PeopleSoft any longer?

_Vice Chancellor Hatch_ responded that right now, this year, we are upgrading from an old version of the finance program on PeopleSoft to the 8.8 version, and they are about to do that on the human resource side as well. The best information that people are getting is that as long as we are on an updated, maintained version of PeopleSoft, Oracle has put out some information that they will maintain PeopleSoft, at least until they are able to do a translation to the best combination of PeopleSoft and Oracle. They are looking at a version in the future. For us, we are talking about
four years out. We are fine with our PeopleSoft; we are doing the right thing by updating as planned. The next time we need to upgrade, they will have a translation worked out for the best product. We are not concerned. At the moment, we are doing what we need to do, and they have come out with a statement that they will maintain this system until they can provide a translation, and they will not charge us for the conversion to the translation.

**Chancellor John Lombardi** in response to Secretary May’s question on behalf of another Senator regarding current or future connections with the Department of Homeland Security noted that, to date, we have not arrived at anything as formal as an institute. He did not think that we had arrived at anything as formal as a good target. There are a number of things possible for us that various faculty and programs may be interested in applying for, such as grants that are associated with Homeland Security, but we are not yet big time in this operation. We have some people who are working on the part that has to do with managing crises and being prepared and that sort of thing. We have a few people doing research on various aspects that are related to homeland security in terms of identification of threats and that sort of thing, but we are not yet in a mode to create anything being called an institute. We had a conversation with the New England Land Grant Institutions over the possibility of creating some kind of joint approach that would be New England-wide, but he cannot say that that prospered. He said that we are currently in a state of watchful waiting. He was not sure we actually know what Homeland Security as target for development might be. We are still working on it. If you want to get excited about it, probably now is not a good time. Wait a little while, maybe there will be a reason down the line.

**Secretary May** shared the rest of the comment given to him by the Senator who could not be at the meeting and said that he thought it was a matter for future discussion.

‘It is well-known that aspects of the PATRIOT Act are constitutionally questionable and in fact are under judicial review. The University, much like the Supreme Court, has historically had a similar form of independence from governmental interference.

Therefore, we request a full and complete discussion of what the plans, purposes, and prerogatives of such an institute would be and how the University and its faculty can maintain a secure position with no threat that research goals for our faculty and students are compromised.

In addition, we should know exactly what powers are assumed by the UMass police force in its search for information among faculty and students. The town of Amherst has passed a resolution that binds the police in Amherst to obedience to the Bill of Rights and therefore the rights of any person subject to interrogation. Since the University of Massachusetts lies within Amherst, it should be bound by these laws as well or explain exactly how they act outside of them and what entitles them to do so.’

**Chancellor Lombardi** responded that he was not sure that that was a question. The fact of the matter is that the University of Massachusetts Amherst is firmly committed to the independence of its faculty and support for the intellectual freedom that defines this place. At the same time, the University is subject to all the laws and rules of the United States of America and, so far, we have been unable to overturn that control.

The 636th Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate stood adjourned at 4:58 p.m. on December 16, 2004. The proceedings of this meeting are available on audiotape in the Faculty Senate Office.

Respectfully submitted,

Ernest D. May
Secretary of the Faculty Senate