Presiding Officer Robert Wilson called the 647th Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate to order on December 15, 2005 at 3:30 p.m. in Herter Hall, Room 227.

A. ANNUAL REPORT


Remarks by Carol Barr and Nelson Lacey, Co-Chairs, Athletic Council

Professor Carol Barr, Co-Chair of the Athletic Council, said that they would highlight a couple of the points in the 2004-2005 Annual Report of the Faculty Senate Athletic Council. She introduced Professor Nelson Lacey and herself. John McCutcheon, Athletic Director, was usually at the Faculty Senate meeting when they presented their report but he was unable to attend due to attendance at another meeting. He sent his apologies. The Council met once a month throughout the year for a total of 8 meetings. They organized their work according to subcommittees: Academic, Finance, Facilities, Compliance, Equity and Visions Subcommittees. In the past, they had “Meet the Coach” segments in which they invited a head coach of the teams who came and visited with the Council and discussed with them their philosophies, their challenges, the positive things going on in their program. They went through all the head coaches so they decided to have a “Meet the Administrator” segment. They decided to start to invite Athletic Department administrators to come to the monthly meetings to discuss what they do for the Athletic Department. In addition, they heard from Coach Don Brown, the head football coach, as well as Travis Ford, shortly after his hire in the spring. Also, in 2004-2005, they invited a number of guests to the Council meetings who discussed, from the University perspective, or outside, different initiatives or different issues that we focus on. In the 2004-2005 year, they were pleased to have in attendance at one of their meetings Trustee Robert Sheridan, Chair of the Athletic Subcommittee of the Board of Trustees. They also had Chancellor John Lombardi, Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs Michael Gargano, Associate Director of Financial Aid Anne Peramba, Linda Reed from the Undergraduate Registrars Office, and Raul Lorenzo from the Undergraduate Admissions Office.

Professor Barr listed some dominant issues that they focused their attention on in 2004-2005. In academics, she highlighted the dual advising system. In August 2003, the NCAA instituted a new formula for academic progress of student athletes. They required that, at the beginning of certain years, students have achieved a certain percentage of their requirements in their academic discipline so they were satisfactorily progressing towards graduation and achieved that with a certain GPA. The Athletic Department and the Academic Support Services unit needed to pay particular attention to the courses that the student athletes were taking. They were quite involved in advising student athletes to make sure that they are continuing their eligibility towards graduation, according to NCAA rules. The Council was concerned that that was putting too much onus on the Athletic Academic Support Services staff. Student athletes needed to also get sufficient advising from their academic advisors because it was not fair to ask the athletic advisors to know all the nuances about academic disciplines across campus. Our academic advisors certainly don’t know the NCAA rules and what these student athletes need to abide by. The dual advising system seemed to be the best solution. The Academic Subcommittee really took a strong proactive approach and discussed this with the deans of undergraduate advising and a number of other people. The Athletic Council members were happy to report that, during the fall of 2004, a dual advising system was put in place for incoming students and freshman student athletes. During the spring of 2005, that dual advising system was put into place for all student athletes. The students were getting the best of both worlds. They were getting advising from their Athletic Support Services for athletic eligibility purposes, as well as advising from their academic units to make sure they were taking the right classes and the right progression.

The track and field facility is beautiful. It is a top-notch facility located down by the soccer/softball complex and that will be up and running this spring. The Athletic Department was hopeful that the A-10 championships would be moved to UMass because of this beautiful facility that is now in existence for the track and field teams.

The Council continued to push for the Recreation Center. It has been an ongoing topic of interest for the Council for a number of years. The project was put on hold in 2003 because of the University’s budget cuts. They continued to push that it was an important unit for the whole campus. It was not an Athletic Department building for usage by the athletic department. It was for usage by the campus community; students, faculty, etc. Trustee Robert Sheridan was contacted to join them at an Athletic Council meeting.
He came out and met with them in December of 2004. Trustee Sheridan then invited Professor Barr and Professor Lacey to attend a May 2005 meeting of the Athletic Subcommittee of the Board of Trustees. Professor Barr was able to attend, but Professor Lacey was in Portugal. They listened to the push for the Recreation Center and the Athletic Council was pleased to hear that the project was back online. The Recreation Center was needed for this campus, no question about it. It was needed for student usage, for faculty usage, and for the prestige of the campus.

In the finance area, she reported that the Business Office was restructured under the Associate Athletic Director for Business and Personnel, Jaime Segin. The Finance Subcommittee was quite impressed with the budget reports and the information they received from Jaime. They felt that administrative oversight was quite apparent within the Athletic Department, coming from Jaime, as well as Athletic Director John McCutcheon.

To sum it all up, the Athletic Council is a very engaged, very active, and very involved Council. Beyond Council topics of interest, the University is currently going through NCAA certification, which is an 18-month process that every Division I school must go through every ten years. Of the three subcommittees of that certification process, all three are chaired by a member of the Athletic Council. They are quite involved in athletic issues, even beyond Council duties and responsibilities. Professor Barr stated that she or Professor Lacey, on behalf of the Athletic Council, could be contacted if the Faculty Senators had any Athletic Department issues or topics they would like them to pursue.

Senator Roland Chilton asked if they had the graduation rates by team since it didn’t seem to be in the Annual Report.

Professor Barr replied that the graduation rates by team was not included in the Report. She didn’t have that information. She had no idea what the graduation rate by team was. It can be an issue that the Council will look into and collect that information from the Athletic Department. It was a very important issue, especially at this time of year and also during March Madness time of year, when the football graduation rates come out. The press gets very involved in this area as well. Overall, the student athlete graduation rate is approximately seventy one percent which exceeded the student body rate of around sixty percent for this University. It also exceeded the average for NCAA Division IAA schools.

Professor John Jenkins expressed concern his department had that neither the faculty nor the graduate teaching assistants, who are teaching sections, fully understand the importance of filling out and submitting in a timely fashion the student status reports that come out from time to time. Did Professor Barr have a document that they can make copies of and pass out at a workshop to explain this better to the faculty?

Professor Barr said that the grade sheets come out of the Academic Support Services unit. She said that she could communicate it back to Academic Support Services so that they could get the information out.

Senator Brian O’Connor said that he and his wife attended the Sports Luncheon in the Campus Center. They were there at the invitation of one of their majors who received the fall Female Student Athlete of the Year Award along with a Male Athlete of the Year Award. He was able to speak and then the student spoke on her behalf. It was well attended but it didn’t get the recognition that he hoped it would get. He noticed, in the program, that there were many students who had received the award in previous years and it was very impressive because of not only their athletic accomplishments, but primarily their academic accomplishments. Last year, we had four student athletes who went on to medical school. One of them got into every medical school she applied to, including Harvard and Stanford and ended up going to Stanford. Something like that should be mentioned somewhere in the report, especially for the Trustees.

Professor Barr agreed with Senator O’Connor. She said that, in years past, that information was included in the Report. It had been taken out. She thought that it should be put back in.

Senator Mokhtar Atallah asked if there had been any changes in the location of the Recreation Center on campus?

Professor Barr said that they got a report from Cliff Resnick in Campus Planning at their November meeting. His presentation showed that the Recreation Center would be across the street from the Mullins Center. There were some older buildings there that would be knocked down. It would be next to that parking lot so that the parking lot would be shared between the Recreation Center and Boyden.
Ernest May, Secretary of the Faculty Senate said that the report was somewhat different in what it emphasized and elaborated on than previous ones. The interface between athletics and academic affairs was elaborated on quite a bit in this one, having to do with the changes in the NCAA rules and the dual advising system. Of course, we want to have an outstanding athletic program. When you think of what student athletes did - the baseball team played about 58 games between the end of March and the end of school, for example - the kind of stress that must put on the students was pretty amazing. Did Professor Barr or Professor Lacey have any comments or suggestions, because obviously we have to maintain academic standards, and that is what we were here to do. Were there any areas we can look for improvement in that area?

Professor Barr said that she thought that they were doing a fantastic job. It could be her personal opinion, but looking at graduation rates and the honors that the student athletes were receiving, she thought it was good.

B. NEW COURSES (10 Minutes)

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>CE-ENGIN 778</td>
<td>“Drinking Water Indicator Organism and Pathogen Microbiology”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLISCI 750</td>
<td>“Research Design”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the courses CE-ENGIN 778 and POLISCI 750, as recommended by the Graduate Council.

The motion was seconded and adopted.

C. NEW BUSINESS

1. Special Report of the Academic Matters Council and the Graduate Council concerning a Name Change from the Department of Exercise Science to the Department of Kinesiology, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 06-013 with Motion No. 10-06.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Name Change from the Department of Exercise Science to the Department of Kinesiology and the same name change for all undergraduate and graduate degree programs, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 06-013.

Senator Juan Zamora asked if there were any other important schools that call their Exercise Science departments Kinesiology? Were we the only ones that called it that?

Joseph Hamill, Chair of the Department of Exercise Science, said that the trend is that the name of Kinesiology was more prevalent now than the name of Exercise Science. It had been recommended by the Academy of Kinesiology that that be the case.

The motion was seconded and adopted.

2. Special Report of the General Education Council concerning A Recommended General Education Designation, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 06-014 with Motion No. 11-06.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the General Education Designation for HONORS 292J, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 06-014.

The motion was seconded and adopted.


MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve that the General Education designations be withdrawn from ENVIRDES 597A, ENGLISH 320, LEGAL 333 and 460, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 06-015.
Senator O’Connor commented that he imagined a student saying that they had taken this class and that it was no longer a Gen Ed class. How long was the grandfathering clause?

Senator Atallah replied that the reason that they were being withdrawn was that they have not been taught in awhile and the department does not intend to teach them again.

The motion was seconded and adopted.

4. Special Report of the Committee on Committees concerning Nominations to Faculty Senate Councils and Committees, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 06-016 with Motion No. 13-06.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Nominations to Faculty Senate Councils and Committees, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 06-016.

The motion was seconded and adopted.

D. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. The Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Secretary May thanked everyone for their work this semester. He also wanted to celebrate the completion of the first round of the UMA 250 allocations. The Chancellor, the Provost, and the Academic Affairs staff certainly did a lot of work in making this the most data-driven and transparent process that the campus had seen in a long time. The Senate put together a Task Force and they had several very thorough meetings discussing this. The outcome was available on the web. He thought that it was a great day. They had some 96 searches identified. This certainly was a record for the campus in his memory. Anyone who was related to this process should be congratulated and it was certainly cause for celebration on the campus.

2. The Representative of the Massachusetts Society of Professors

Professor Steven Brewer said that it looked like the last roadblock to the Governor approving the contract and forwarding it to the legislature had been resolved. The Governor had 45 days to sign the contracts and chose not to in that time. President Wilson’s Office went to extraordinary lengths to continue the negotiations and the last roadblock which related to professional development funds was finally resolved. The professional development funds were not going to be included within the contract directly, but the MSP had it in writing that the Governor’s Office will submit additional funding for the University equal to the amount of the professional development funds in the spring. Also, the timing of raises had changed slightly. The contract, rather than beginning in January, is going to begin in April. The subsequent two periods are going to start in January, rather than in February. He didn’t recall the exact details. In any case, the Governor’s Office had not yet actually forwarded the contracts to the legislature, but they were not aware of any further roadblocks and looked forward to that process happening as expeditiously as possible. The MSP also asked him to comment on the fact that their health insurance premiums, which were raised to 20% during the period of financial exigency in the state, were going to roll back to 15% beginning in January. When that measure was passed, it was written in as a temporary measure, but many of them expected it to be permanent. When the MTA went back and saw that the language said temporary, they were able to get the legislature to, in fact, roll it back. They should be seeing a little bit more money, come January. As of this fall, contract faculty who were less than 50% were part of the bargaining unit. Previous to that time, they were not. The MSP had organized a series of meetings for contract faculty who were less than 50%, trying to find out what the issues were. There were many issues that they had brought forward. Over the course of the spring, the MSP will be organizing a series of meetings to reach those people and figure out how they can best serve their needs. If there are contract faculty in your department at less than 50%, you might reach out to them and encourage them to contact the MSP and get involved in that process.

E. QUESTION PERIOD (10-Minute Limit)

Senator Richard Bogartz asked a question about the 60% graduation rate. He wanted to know how the number compared with other universities that the University of Massachusetts Amherst compared itself to.
Chancellor John Lombardi replied that sixty one percent was a little low. Most of our competitive context was in the 63-64% range. A few were even higher than that, but they had different student profiles than we do. The ones that were nearer to us were in the 63-64% range. That was why we initiated our new advising process to try and focus clearly on getting students through the system. Our dropout process happens usually somewhere between the second and third years. It is where we lose most of our students. This is usually the result of students not having a track to their major from the beginning. They don’t learn early on what it is they need to do to be successful in their major. They imagine they can be successful. They wake up in the morning, after their year and a half, and discover that they don’t have what it takes to get in their major, so they drop out, or they leave, or they go to another university, or they transfer. Our job is to get them on track early, to give them the courses they need to find out whether they have the skills to succeed early and then track them through to success. When you do that, you can improve your graduation rate anywhere from 4 to 8 points, which would be a significant improvement for us. That is where we are and that is the track we are on.

The 647th Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate stood adjourned at 4:11 p.m. on December 15, 2005.

The proceedings of this meeting are available on audiotape in the Faculty Senate Office.

Respectfully submitted,

Ernest D. May
Secretary of the Faculty Senate