Presiding Officer Robert Wilson called the 653rd Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate to order on April 27, 2006 at 3:30 p.m. in Herter Hall, Room 227.

A. ADDRESS BY ROBERT FRANCIS, ASSOCIATE VICE CHANCELLOR FOR FACILITIES AND CAMPUS PLANNING, AND JAMES CAHILL, DIRECTOR OF FACILITIES AND CAMPUS PLANNING

“CAPITAL PLAN UPDATE”

(See attached)

Senator David Ostendorf asked if they had a contingency plan for 900 students if they did not get an occupancy permit for the new dorms.

Director Cahill said that he did not, but Housing does. They can house all of these people. As soon as everything was done, the students would be moved into the buildings.

James Hunt, Communications Manager, Facilities and Campus Planning, added that the certainty of having three of the buildings done was very high. They were worried about a smaller number of students. The final building was the one that was potentially the problem. There were options that could compress the number of alternate spaces that they needed to provide for to a number smaller than the number of students in the fourth building. With each passing month, they meet with the construction manager to determine the extent to which they were still on schedule. The good news was that every month that went by, they had been able to stay on schedule. That reduced the probability that they were going to have these problems at the end. The steam line was mobilized and underway. It was a known set of circumstances. They did not see that as a problem. It was a race to the finish to see that the fire pump passes the flow test and that the fire inspector shows up for the fire alarm test. Then you have to get the elevator guy to do the drop test on the elevator. How do you contingency plan for that? There were lots of things that they could do to work-around. Student Affairs was already planning those work-arounds.

Director Cahill said that they were pretty certain about the steam line going through the north quad to the housing. The bigger challenge was the steam line at the center of the campus because there was a lot more work there. The contractor was committed to complete this and they were doing everything they could to get that utility line in as well.

An unidentified speaker asked what fuel would be used for the steam plant.

Director Cahill relied that it was gas and oil -- dual fuel.

James Hunt stated that they were also going to have co-generation capabilities. They will have back pressure turbines that produce electricity from steam going into the turbine and then they will use the exhaust steam coming out of the turbine for heat. They were also going to have a gas fire generator that will give them the make-or buy-ability that was really important at this time. To keep the operating budget from getting overwhelmed by these fluctuations and permanent increases in commodity prices, they have a set of make/buy options available to them that will allow them to co-generate up to 11 megawatts of power at roughly three cents per kilowatt hour compared with what they anticipate will be a market price of around sixteen or seventeen cents per kilowatt hour when the plant goes in service. That was a big advantage.

Senator W. Curtis Conner stated that he was the faculty representative of the rugby team and wanted to know where the rugby field will be located?

Director Cahill replied that it should be next to the tennis courts. There should be room in that area for all of the things they want to put there.

Senator Roland Chilton mentioned that there had been plans in the past for construction of a heating plant that never worked. Was there any danger that that might happen this time around?

Director Cahill replied, no. There was a thermodynamic problem in the old plant. By the time the steam was sent down the hill, it condensed, so it was not hot enough and it was a very long ways away.
Secretary Ernest May stated that other committees had looked at the desirability of using green principles and possible Leed certification. Could you describe how that was working out in these projects?

Director Cahill replied that every project that they were doing today was using the Leed system and structure to design high performance buildings here that were user-friendly. They were not seeking Leed certification. They were actually using the system that was published. A great deal of thought went into it to achieve as much of the Leed or green building criteria that they can. What they were seeing in today’s buildings was the operable windows were coming back. For years and years, buildings were being built hermetically sealed where you could not open the windows. You were relying on all mechanical ventilation systems and then you have a problem and you have a stuffy building. It was still problematic when you were doing a laboratory building where you had such enormous amounts of air coming in and out and you had contaminated air going out and fresh air coming in. It was a bit problematic using operable windows in those facilities. They had specific workshops for every building project that they were working on. Three of the workshops included one of the pioneers in developing the Leed system itself. They were going through all of the criteria determining which of those criteria they can achieve. It was a balance between achieving these criteria and meeting the budget requirements of the project. They were doing everything they could to meet those criteria without going through the certification process.

B. ANNOUNCEMENTS

2. The Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Secretary May reported that the UMA 250 Task Force had been meeting monthly in the second semester and they met this week with Chancellor Lombardi and some of his staff. They were on track to have a record year of faculty hiring. They do not have the final numbers in yet. They were looking forward to having a successful year next year, as well. There will be a lot of deliberation between now and next September on that front. Also, he reminded Councils and Committees that the Senate has an informal service guarantee that they try to observe that, if they have proposals for new courses or other things that come in by the beginning of the semester, they get them done by the end of the semester. The final meeting of the Faculty Senate was May 18 and they hope that they get all of those items that were in by the beginning of the semester acted on. They do act on a lot of things faster than that, when possible, but try not to keep anything in the works for longer than a semester.

5. The Representative of the Massachusetts Society of Professors

Professor Steven Brewer stated that the faculty contracts had been signed and funded. They learned today that, on June 2, the raises should appear in faculty paychecks. On June 16, faculty should get the retro related to this particular contract, which would leave them with just one piece of retro going back to 2001 that was still outstanding for their compensation. The most current issue was that the current budget proposes to raise their health insurance contribution from 15% to 20% and all were encouraged to contact legislators to try to encourage them to keep it at 15%. The back-story was that it was raised to 20% during the period of financial exigency, as an emergency measure, and then was dropped back to 15% just last year. Now the plan was to raise it back up to 20%. It was something that represented about $600 a year to the average faculty member.

6. The President of the Graduate Student Senate

Uri Strauss, President of the Graduate Student Senate, stated that the GEO contracts had been funded by the legislature and, if they got their pay from the 2001 year, they would be all caught up. Graduate Student Senate elections were underway. For the first time in several years, all the positions were being contested. They were taking it as a sign that they had managed to create at least a little bit more interest in the Graduate Senate than they had in the past. He announced that he was not running again for leadership so someone new would be up here next year. There would be many new faces, regardless of how the election turned out.

C. QUESTION PERIOD

Senator Richard Bogartz asked about the goal of UMass Amherst becoming a part of the AAU. He stated that he frequently found horse “manure” on the public pathways of the campus. He thought if there was no way to keep the horse “manure” off the public pathways, surely there was no way to find their way into AAU. For several years, he had not seen any police on horses and he had not seen any horse “manure” until a couple
weeks ago. Why do they have to have police riding their horses on the campus because inevitably they were going to have horse “manure” on the public walkways?

*Chancellor John Lombardi* responded that he encountered the same phenomenon himself walking by the Library on the pond side. There were some references to previous occupants of the path who were not of the two-legged variety. He hoped that it was an anomaly that would not require him to issue complex memos and activities. If someone observes that it was not cleaned up next week, please send him an email and he will be on the case. Why do they have to have horses? They have a reasonably effective horse patrol; however, it was not usually a routine horse patrol. Usually the horses were moved out when there were crowd control issues to be addressed. They were effective in that way, but they were not normally used for ordinary patrolling. Usually the bicycles were used, which leave no visible marks.

D. **BYLAW CHANGES (Third Reading)**

Special Report of the Rules Committee concerning Bylaw Changes, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 06-023A with Motion No. 24-06.

**MOVED:** That the Faculty Senate approve the Bylaw Changes, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 06-023A.

(This motion was read at the 651st Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate on March 30, 2006 and at the 652nd Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate on April 13, 2006. The final vote will be taken at this meeting.)

Senator Roland Chilton stated that students contacted him calling his attention to the Section 4-3-2 on page 4 of the Special Report on the Bylaw Changes. The change that was being made added a line to the student members.

His motion was to amend that statement by adding this language after “or as otherwise deemed appropriate by the Rules Committee.” The language to add was the phrase, “when these organizations fail to appoint student members by the end of the second week of the fall semester.”

He suggested that they all agree it was important to have student members on the Faculty Senate committees. He had been on many committees over the years and the student members, when they were active, alert and present, had been more than helpful on many occasions. As he saw it, what the Rules Committee wanted to do was to encourage and increase the student participation on these committees. The problem that they had in the past was that, very often, the student government organizations did not get around to appointing student members, sometimes for the whole year. He suggested amending this so that they would encourage student government leaders to send and appoint members to these committees. If they failed to do so, then the Rules Committee could try to encourage other students to participate.

Secretary May provided some background information on the issue. They had more student participation this semester than they had in the past, partly because the Senate created a 1-credit practicum for student members. During the course of this year, they had activated that and it had been relatively successful. They had a lot more this year than they had in the past. They still have, by our calculations, 14 undergraduate vacancies and 14 graduate vacancies, totaling 28 vacancies. The process for electing student government leaders was very complicated. It took place in the spring. They had a lot of other things to do. The process of postponing this until the second week of September, when many of the committees have already met, created another complication. He preferred that the SGA and the GSS appoint the student members and that would be the end of it. If this will help do that, that was fine with him. They made a little progress, but they still have more than 50% of the student slots vacant.

This motion was seconded and adopted as amended.

E. **NEW COURSE**

There is no report associated with the following motion:
COURSE | TITLE | CREDITS
--- | --- | ---
AFROAM 265 | “The Blues Came Down Like Dark Night Showers of Rain” | 3

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the course AFROAM 265, as recommended by the Academic Matters Council.

Senator Bogartz asked what the course was about.

Professor Robert Bernatzky replied that it was a comprehensive exploration of the history of the blues, including the study of the music and lyrics in historical, social, political, and esthetic context.

This motion was seconded and adopted.

F. NEW BUSINESS

Special Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Student Plagiarism concerning An Addition to the Academic Regulations, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 06-032 with Motion No. 34-06.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Addition to the Academic Regulations, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 06-032

Senator Conner stated that they needed to add a phrase to the Student Regulations. It would enable them to check documents submitted for courses for originality using plagiarism-detection services and be able to store them in a database so they could search future submissions for originality.

The motion to amend the Academic Regulations was made by adding one specific sentence to the regulations: “Student work at the University may be analyzed for originality of content. Such analysis may be done electronically or by other means. Student work may also be included in a database for the purpose of checking for possible plagiarized content in future student submissions.”

They were making this an explicit use of submitted material, as opposed to an implicit use, specifically, the inclusion in the database for checking future submissions. This was the database of the University of Massachusetts’ submitted documents. That was the purpose of having this allowed in the Regulations so that students were forewarned and, by granting this, they have explicit use to do this checking.

Senator W. Brian O’Connor stated that according to the report, “no form of cheating, plagiarism, fabrication, or fabricating of dishonesty will be condoned in the University community.” If the young Harvard student who admitted to plagiarizing in her novel were a student here, would she be subject to this document?

Senator Conner replied only if the student submitted it for a grade in a course. The phrase that Senator O’Connor read was something that was already part of the Academic Regulations, which they were not moving to strike or modify.

This motion was seconded and adopted.

The 653rd Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate stood adjourned at 4:41 p.m. on April 27, 2006.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Ernest D. May
Secretary of the Faculty Senate