Presiding Officer Robert Wilson called the 664th Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate to order on September 20, 2007 at 3:30 p.m. in Herter Hall, Room 227.

A. WELCOMING REMARKS FROM INTERIM CHANCELLOR THOMAS W. COLE, JR.

Ernest May, Secretary of the Faculty Senate, introduced Dr. Thomas W. Cole, Jr., as the interim chancellor, stating that Cole will provide a steady, strong hand through this year which promised to prove turbulent.

Chancellor Cole is currently president emeritus of Clark Atlanta University. He is a native Texan, is a summa graduate of Wiley College, where his father was president. He holds a Ph.D. in organic chemistry from the University of Chicago. He was a faculty member, department chair and provost. He served as visiting faculty at the University of Illinois at Champagne/Urbana and at MIT. He was director of the NSF funded Atlanta Resource Center for Science and Engineering. He worked for periods of time at Proctor and Gamble and at Celanese. He was President of West Virginia College. He was Chancellor of the West Virginia Board of Regents. He oversaw the merger of Clark College and Atlanta University. Then, he was president from 1989 to 2002. He has traveled widely, including Africa, China, and Germany. He has received many honors, including honorary degrees and held many public service positions.

Thomas W. Cole, Jr., Interim Chancellor, Good afternoon. I want to thank Ernie for that gracious introduction. Chancellors do not usually have good things said about them, and I want you to believe what he said, because I expect and hope he will be saying the same thing this time next year. Mr. Presiding Officer, it is good to be here. Thanks for the invitation to join you on this first meeting of the year of the University Senate.

A lot of people have asked me, “What are you going to do this year?” It has been three weeks since I have been here. I do not have all the answers. I will not have all of the answers in ten months. First of all, I would say it is very exciting to be among you, to be part of this community, to be part of this University. This is a University that I had no direct contact with prior to coming but knew a lot about because I have known a lot of your colleagues over the years. This institution has a world-class reputation. There is extraordinary research and teaching going on here. I am going to have more to say about that tomorrow, so I encourage you to come to the Convocation, and I am going to say something else about my impression.

If I had to characterize this year, I would not characterize it as a caretaker year. The first conversation Jack Wilson and I had about the interim appointment was that it will not be a caretaker appointment. It is very important that we go forward with the faculty hiring without missing a beat. It is very important that we continue to the Capital Projects construction and the planning for the next round. It is very exciting to be a part of the Life Sciences Initiative which is going to transform the whole landscape of life sciences in the state of Massachusetts. So, it is a good time to be part of this community and part of this family.

I have had several conversations with the Provost about how to engage the faculty, the deans, and the division directors and have serious and substantive planning in conversation about the priorities of the University at Amherst. She and I are on the same page when it comes to how you do that in a meaningful way, so that what emerges is a set of priorities and documents and reports and understandings and recommendations which we all can buy into, that represents our collective thinking on what is in the best interest of the University at Amherst.

I have some appreciation for the politics of years past and the politics of present. I have some appreciation that I am learning overtime about how this University falls within the whole realm of public higher education in the state of Massachusetts. As Charles Dickens said, “It is the best of times and worst of times.” In a real sense, it is a good time. But, these are the only times we have, and so we have to do with them the best we can. We can engage in a strategic planning exercise that helps us focus on the Life Sciences Initiative. There are going to be some old conversations about the General Education requirement and how that is structured and the second round of facilities planning, Capital Projects, and the priority needs that will help address the
instructional and research requirements of the University. There is going to be a lot going on, so I hope that what emerges from my one year here will be a set of recommendations and proposals that will be handed off to the next chancellor, so that he/she, when that assignment is given, can also hit the ground running and have a good sense of where this University is and where some of the priority areas are.

There is a story that goes: campers were backpacking in the wilderness, and they had on the usual backpacking gear, back satchels and hiking boots, and they came across a grizzly bear. One of the hikers sat down and took off his hiking boots and put on his tennis shoes. His friend said, “Don’t you know you cannot outrun a bear?” And, he looked up at him and said, “Oh, I know that. I just have to outrun you.” So, I don’t want to outrun you, and I don’t want you to outrun me. We are in this together, and I think if we work together through this next year, we won’t always agree, but I think there are many issues in which we can agree. We can come forward with a set of recommendations that will help continue to move this University forward. I’m delighted to be here, and I look forward to an exciting year.

There is one thing I forgot. I am a fast learner. You notice the chair I sat in? I was told that is the hot seat for chancellors. So, I have already accepted that one. But, being a part of this faculty gathering is something that I have always cherished. I come from faculty ranks, so I understand where you are coming from. I understand what some of the issues are. I want to make sure there is no impediment to communication across all lines here at the University of Massachusetts Amherst.

B. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Principal Administrative Officers

Charlena Seymour, Provost, stated the University ran four searches for deans of the schools and colleges. She said she wanted to introduce these new deans to the faculty and thank the individuals for taking on this major responsibility.

Provost Seymour introduced D. Anthony Butterfield, also known as Tony Butterfield, first. Dean Butterfield is now serving as the Dean of the Isenberg School of Management. He came to UMass Amherst in 1972 following a position as a research associate at the Sloan School of Management at MIT. He quickly rose to the rank of full professor at UMass in 1979. He has served in several leadership roles in the Isenberg School of Management, including Chair of the Department of Management from 1988 to 1998 and as director of the Ph.D program in the 1980s and since 2002. He received his Bachelor’s degree from Yale University, and his Master’s and Doctoral degrees from the University of Michigan.

D. Anthony Butterfield, Dean of the Isenberg School of Management, stated he is happy to be at UMass and to be in his role. The Isenberg School has fantastic students, fantastic faculty, fantastic staff, and a fantastic alumni base. And, with those four fantastics, Dean Butterfield stated, it would be a fantastic year.

Provost Seymour introduced Priscilla Clarkson, Dean of Commonwealth College. Dean Clarkson has been at the University of Massachusetts Amherst since 1969 when she first arrived on campus as an undergraduate student. After earning three degrees from the institution, she was hired in 1977 as an assistant professor to the then the Department of Exercise Science which is now Kinesiology. She was named a full professor in 1991 and just last spring was named a distinguished professor by the Board of Trustees. She served as associate dean for the School of Public Health and Health Sciences from 1994 to 2006.

Priscilla Clarkson, Dean of the Commonwealth College, stated she has been at UMass since before the Library, before the Campus Center, and before the stadium. But, the reason she is here is she loves the University and loves the Amherst area. She is excited to be dean this year. There are many new initiatives unfolding. They have a strategic planning process, and she hopes to share some of these new initiatives as the year progresses.
Provost Seymour introduced Nancy Cohen, Dean of Public Health and Health Sciences. Dean Cohen has been at the University of Massachusetts Amherst since 1985, beginning her career at UMass as an assistant professor in the department of nutrition. She received her Bachelor’s degree from Cornell University, and her Doctorate from the University of California Davis and is a licensed nutritionist and dietician. She is an active researcher in the fields of nutrition and food safety, currently serving as principal and co-principal investigators for four active grants. Dean Cohen was promoted to full professor in 1998, the same year she was named head of the Department of Nutrition.

Nancy Cohen, Dean of Public Health and Health Sciences, stated it is an exciting year for the School of Public Health and Health Sciences. The School is undergoing a renewal. They have new faculty, new initiatives, and new degree programs and are searching for the permanent dean this year. Cohen looks forward to working with the faculty and following in the tradition of Priscilla Clarkson, John Cunningham, Eileen Breslin, and her predecessors in this role.

Provost Seymour introduced Steve Goodwin, Dean of Natural Resources and the Environment. Dean Goodwin received his Bachelor’s degree from the University of Maine, his Master’s from the University of Virginia, and his Ph.D from the University of Wisconsin. He came to UMass Amherst in 1986 as an assistant professor in the Department of Microbiology. He was awarded the College Outstanding Teacher Award twice and was the co-PI on a $200,000 grant from the Pew Charitable Trust. He was promoted to full professor in 2000, and he has served as associate dean at the College of Natural Resources and the Environment since 2002.

Steve Goodwin, Dean of Natural Resources and the Environment, stated that the University is really made up of two things: faculty and students, and he looks forward to working with the Faculty Senate this year. He has worked as a chair of a couple of Faculty Senate committees for a couple of years, and he recognizes the importance of some of the work that the Faculty Senate does. He is looking forward to the coming year.

Joyce Hatch, Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance, stated there are currently four projects under construction. Three will be completed this spring. The Skinner building will be completed this spring. The new Studio Arts Building will be ready at some point during the spring semester, and some of the studios may start to open this semester. The new heating plant will be ready for testing starting possibly in December. The go-live date for actually doing a conversion will be sometime mid-spring semester, March or April. The other project underway is the Integrated Science Building, and that is on schedule. That is scheduled to open a year from this spring, for the spring semester.

There are two construction projects that will begin shortly. There will be ground-breaking ceremonies sometime this fall. The new Recreation Center will be built near the Mullins Center. There will also be a ground-breaking for the new Transportation Center, a garage for the PVTA. The Transportation Center is being built on Federal funds that came with the help of Congressman Olver.

There are also some landscape improvements going on in the heart of the main core campus, between Whitmore and the Library. There are a lot of diggings going on, and shrubs have been disappearing. This is part of a larger master plan. It would be good to do a presentation to this group to give the context of the whole plan. This is going to be a model area for the rest of the campus.

Paul Kostecki, Vice Provost for Research, stated that the research activity numbers from last year show that the University had the largest increase in memory – an eleven percent increase. It crossed $130 million in sponsored research activity. The year before, it was about
$115 million. There will be a new report on sponsored research activity coming out in the next month or so. There was also an annual open house at the Research Administration Building, behind the Hills Building, on Friday at 3:00.

2. The Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Secretary May welcomed the new senators: Anne Averill from Plant, Soil, and Insect Sciences; Samuel Gido from Polymer Science and Engineering; Christine King from Nursing; John McEldowney from Aerospace Studies; Peter Veneman from Plant, Soil, and Insect Sciences; and Ralph Whitehead from Journalism/Communication.

The summer of 2007 may have been the most politically turbulent summer in the history of the University. The Secretary, Rules Committee, and general faculty were called upon to take unprecedented actions, including meetings of the general faculty, a vote of no-confidence in the vision for the “One University Plan,” an ongoing struggle with the President’s Office and Board of Trustees over campus autonomy and the future organization of the UMass system, failed dean searches in two colleges, the departure of a chancellor, and the appointment of an interim chancellor. There’s a chronology of the formal actions of the Rules Committee, the general faculty, the Executive Advisory Council and the Intercampus Faculty Council available as a handout. Transcripts, minutes, and documents emanating from these meetings are available on the Faculty Senate web site, which is: umass.edu/senate. There are also some resolutions of the Intercampus Faculty Council from June 18th.

The Governor appointed an independent commission which was not the Tocco commission. He appointed new members to the Board of Trustees which generally fit the profile the committee asked for. There were other issues about the appointment of chancellors and presidents, some of which he did, and some of which he did not do.

There is a General Faculty meeting scheduled on Friday, September 28 at 3:30 p.m. in Campus Center 101. That meeting will include updates. It will include potential resolutions to be considered by the meeting on issues of continuing concern with the respect to the actions of the Board of Trustees.

There will be another Faculty Senate meeting on October 4 to address other business. These are very turbulent political times, but, at the same time there is unprecedented good news and good things happening: all of the building and the research that is going on, and also UMA 250. Paul Kostecki is going to give a presentation on the Clean Energy initiatives which is a very upbeat, inspiring kind of assessment, and it has got statewide support. About 80 percent of the research that is taking place in the area of clean energy is taking place on this campus. Bryan Harvey is going to give an update on the UMA 250 Plan which is also very upbeat and very aggressive. This could be the biggest hiring year in the history of the University, since the late 60s or so.

3. The Chair of the Rules Committee

Marilyn Billings, Chair of the Rules Committee, thanked the Rules Committee for all the hard work it did over the summer. She also thanked the Faculty Senate for the opportunity to be chair of the Rules Committee.

4. The Faculty Delegates to the Board of Trustees

W. Brian O’Connor, Faculty Delegate to the Board of Trustees, stated it has been a busy summer. The Rules Committee met with Jack Wilson on the 16th of July to discuss the criteria for the interim chancellor. There were several other meetings of the Trustees.
At yesterday’s Board of Trustees meeting, Chair Tocco introduced the Secretary of Education, Dana Mohler-Faria. Chair Tocco talked about the Capital Program. One of the interesting announcements that he made was that the Trustees are planning a retreat for November 5 and 6 to which the chancellors will be invited. They will discuss two topics: How the University can become a member of the top 15 universities, and a Western Mass initiative to see what the Amherst campus can do to help Springfield and the Berkshires to rebuild their economy.

President Wilson mentioned the endowment has grown, to either $305 million or, counting the quasi-endowment, to $345 million. This does not compare to the $39 billion of UMass’ neighboring institution on the Charles, but it is a step in the right direction. As Paul Kostecki mentioned, there has been a tremendous growth in active research on this campus, and intellectual property among all the campuses has gone up from $28 million to $41 million. Charlie Hoff, a former trustee, made the largest personal gift ever to the University for scholarships. The total gift is $10 million, but it is a matching gift, and it is a very interesting situation because the gift for the scholarships has to be matched by the campuses as well as the state government. He is a very clever businessman, and he worked out this deal to get everybody involved. Another unique thing about the scholarship is that it is not limited to his campus. His campus is the Lowell campus. The majority of the scholarship money goes to the Lowell campus, but Amherst had anywhere from 10-15 scholarships as does the Medical School and the other three campuses.

On this campus, Dr. George Huber of Chemical Engineering has been appointed the John and Elizabeth Armstrong Professional Development Professor. Dr. John McCarthy of linguistics was appointed as a distinguished professor of the University.

There was the approval of the Administration and Finance Capital Plan, and Joyce Hatch has given a report. The figures are $669,956,000 for this campus alone. They voted to establish a task force to review the Women’s Ice Hockey Program on this campus, and to report back to the Athletic Committee. Jennifer Braceras, the trustee, is the chair of this Committee and is also the chair of the Chancellor’s Search Committee. At the first meeting, they identified the need for a Women’s Ice Hockey Program. If it is approved, or if it is voted to go that far, then they will come up with a feasibility study.

There was a task force established to review the current status of the Men’s Football Program. UMass Amherst is in 1AA, and the Trustees want UMass Amherst to move up to 1A, which was not mentioned at the meeting. The NCAA has declared a moratorium on movement from any division for four years, so this obviously will not stop the committee. There was quite a discussion. Several trustees raised the issue: Why? UMass Amherst doesn’t make money on Division 2A—how in the world will they make money with division 1A? Their plan is to play these games in Foxboro, so they can have a thousand people in a sixty thousand seat stadium. And, the way that they will sell tickets is that, if a person is on a waiting list for tickets for the Patriots, which of course is a huge waiting list, he/she will move up if he/she agrees to buy season tickets for UMass football.

Senator O’Connor met with four of the new trustees and was very impressed with them. They seem to have a passion for public higher education.

5. The Representative of the Massachusetts Society of Professors

Steve Brewer, Representative of the Massachusetts Society of Professors, stated that there is a new faculty contract that has been agreed to with the bargaining team, over the course of the past year. It has now been ratified by the faculty. The next step is for it to be ratified by the faculty union at UMass Boston, which is part of our bargaining unit. Once that happens, it should go to the Governor to be signed, and then it will go to the legislature, who will produce a spending bill that they will agree to, and then the Governor signs it again, and
then finally faculty will have a contract again. It will be retroactive, back to July 1. For the agreement, it is a two and half percent increase in salaries with one percent merit, which the personnel committees will decide this year. There are also several other outstanding agreements. One is for non-tenure system faculty. Now there will be two promotion opportunities: senior lecturer, seven years, and another level of lecturer to be agreed upon. The promotion increment for full professor has been increased. We are going to have professional development again this year for the first time in three years. Although Governor Romney agreed to provide a spending bill for professional development, he never did, and went out of office with that unfunded.

There has been movement forward toward issues that the faculty decided were very important last year. One of those is having a central pool for anomalies. The anomalies process on this campus is dependent on the college. Some colleges fund many anomalies. Some colleges fund few or no anomalies. It is entirely dependent on the resources available to the dean. There will be a small pool for central anomalies, and, over the course of the next few years hopefully, it will grow, so that there can be a much more transparent process about dealing with faculty salary anomalies going forward. There is also going to be a centralized computer replacement fund. There are a number of labor management committees that have been established to deal with family issues and the implementation of some of the aspects of the contract. Faculty that are interested in participating in those are welcome to do so.

It was just a one-year contract. Unfortunately, that means there will be a new bargaining team as of January. There were some outstanding members of the bargaining team this past year: Max Page, Stephanie Luce, Holly Lawrence, Randy Phillis, Sharon Domier, and Beth Boyer, from MTA.

Senator Brewer will not report for the MSP after this meeting. Steve Gencarella, vice president of the MSP, will be coming to report for the MSP subsequently.

C. QUESTION PERIOD

Senator Roland Chilton asked Chancellor Cole if he planned to continue University momentum by encouraging the Trustees and the President’s Office to support the University of Massachusetts Amherst Foundation.

Chancellor Cole stated he would absolutely support the University of Massachusetts Amherst Foundation. He stated that he just learned that as of September 15 gifts from donors and pledges are six percent ahead of where they were this time last year. The Executive Committee meets next week, and they will discuss whether they are on schedule and can continue the momentum. This is a tough time though, so Cole said he and others may need to repair some relationships. He has talked with the leadership of the Foundation Board, and they are onboard. They are eager to continue their support of the University of Massachusetts Amherst.

Senator Richard Bogartz asked Brian O’Connor if the Trustees, when going on retreat and discussing raising the University of Massachusetts into the top fifteen, were talking about the university system or the University of Massachusetts at Amherst. If they were talking about the former rather than the latter, did O’Connor see this movement as redounding to the benefit or the detriment of UMass Amherst?

Senator O’Connor stated that, in most cases, he believes universities are ranked individually. They rank Berkeley, not the California system, and Michigan at Ann Arbor rather than any other branch campus. However, in this situation, O’Connor stated he thinks they are looking at all five campuses as an aggregate, the Medical School and this campus doing most of what they want to do to get the University into the top fifteen.

Unfortunately, this retreat is an executive session, so the chancellors will be able to go, but no one else will. O’Connor wishes faculty could be there to raise those very issues because obviously they are the ones that
have to do the work. O’Connor stated that this has been Chair Tocco’s view since the first time he addressed the Intercampus Faculty Council which consists of faculty representatives from all five campuses that meet right after the Trustees. Last September, right after he was elected chair, he brought this up – that his goal was to bring the University to the top fifteen.

Secretary May stated this is going to be a central discussion at the General Faculty meeting. There will be an agenda item on this partly because, in addition to what Brian O’Connor said about the two topics which were mentioned, Chair Tocco announced that the results of this retreat would include action steps. Those familiar with the Massachusetts Open Meeting Law will resonate to the combination of important organizational and restructuring plans and action steps in relation to closed meetings and public boards. This is a serious issue. There was also an RFP put out in the middle of the winter, January or February, for a study of how to get UMass in the top fifteen, and the firm that got the contract was run by a person named Samels. The Faculty Senate requested that report under the Fair Freedom of Information Act and was denied access to that report based on the fact that it was a draft, not a full report. This may be an extension of the private meeting that was discussed by Student Trustee Mishy Leiblum in a previous General Faculty Meeting. At the previous meeting, the “Vision for One University Plan” was presented in outline form by President Wilson. Secretary May suspects they have the completed report by Samels now and are preparing to act on that.

Senator Bogartz stated that rather than do what is really needed to bring UMass Amherst up to the top fifteen, he thinks the Trustees want to do a statistical juggling that will make it appear as if the University of Massachusetts is in the top fifteen, by adding all these numbers together.

Senator Maria Tymoczko asked if the Board of Trustees stated under which provision of the Open Meeting Law they are meeting.

Secretary May answered that Chair Tocco does not pay attention to the niceties of the Open Meeting Law, and the general counsel, Larry Bench, who is an assistant attorney general, always seems to say that everything that Chair Tocco does is legal.

Senator Tymoczko stated the faculty might want to take stronger action against the Trustees and sue.

Secretary May stated there is already an action pending on the Open Meeting Law violation which was alleged to have occurred last spring on May 4. Secretary May stated that that type of process takes a long time to work itself out, and it does not involve substantial penalties even if the party is found to have violated the Open Meeting Law. It is recognized that there was a violation, but there is not a substantial penalty. He stated that if one suspects that there is an impending violation of the Open Meeting Law, one, of course, could seek an injunction.

Senator Tymoczko stated it might be something that the MSP as well as the Rules Committee should address. Senator Tymoczko also addressed Joyce Hatch, stating that the UMass Amherst campus was traditionally one of the garden campuses of the country. Senator Tymoczko asked what the campus would be losing in terms of that garden campus aspect with the cutting down of flowering bushes.

Vice Chancellor Hatch stated that, as part of the project, they have been going back into the files to look at the history and documentation of special species of trees on campus. Hatch stated she would like to do a presentation on the theory behind what is underway. She said there would be some replanting of the foundation shrubbery. They are working with landscape architects, the consultant that helped with the whole plan. Hatch said she would like the opportunity to share the whole plan because it is part of a larger concept. She also stated that a lot of the shrubbery that was dug up was old and scruffy and should have been trimmed over the years.

Secretary May stated the Campus Physical Planning Committee has a subcommittee looking at this, which is chaired by Jack Ahern. Secretary May stated that there was some very lively discussion about this last spring, which resulted in the landscape architecture people walking around campus and making some important points about the variety of species represented in the campus landscape. They are working out a
plan to make sure that species are continued to be represented somewhere even though the visuals are going to change. The value in having a wide variety of species will be maintained in the ultimate plan.

_Vice Chancellor Hatch_ stated they will continue to work and share the plan ahead of time with this Committee and work through the Committee. She said sometimes there is feedback that was not included in the original plan, and it was helpful to have that dialogue.

D. **ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, ON BEHALF OF THE FACULTY SENATE, OVER THE SUMMER 2007**


MOVED That the Faculty Senate affirm the actions taken by the Rules Committee over then Summer 2007, as listed on this agenda, Item D.

_Secretary May_ stated that after the General Faculty meeting, which was held just after the Trustee meeting on June 21, one of our legislators mentioned that it would not be a good idea to go away and not pay attention to what was going on over the summer. So, we formed a widely representative group that consisted of about fifty people: leadership of the Senate, leadership of the MSP, and other leadership of the campus to meet on a regular basis, every two weeks and every month as needed, in order to monitor the situation, to stay informed and to provide a campus response during this period of transition.

The Ad Hoc Committee on System Performance and System Structure is intended to provide input to the Governor's Readiness Project higher education task force which has just been announced. We did not want to preempt the Governor because the Governor had observed what we asked for; he negated the Tocco commission, and he put his commission in its place. But, we want to get our vision of what we view as the system structure which will support the mission of this campus appropriately into the conversation.

_Secretary May_ stated that we need to be proactive and not reactive when the Governor’s commission becomes active.

_An unidentified speaker_ asked why the Executive Advisory Council was called a council. He asked if the EAC stands in the same position as the Academic Matters Council, or since it only has a three-year lifespan, should it be named something else?

_Secretary May_ stated that, despite its name, the Executive Advisory Council is an ad hoc committee with a three-year lifespan.

_An unidentified speaker_ asked if that should be changed in the motion.

_Secretary May_ said, no.

The motion was seconded and adopted.
E. **ELECTIONS**

1. **Two Associate Delegates to the Board of Trustees**

   **Nominees:**
   - Marilyn Billings, Library
   - Alexandrina Deschamps, Women’s Studies
   - Arthur Kinney, English

   There were no further nominations from the floor. Senators Marilyn Billings and Alexandrina Deschamps were elected as Associate Delegates to the Board of Trustees.

2. **Two At-Large Members of the Rules Committee**

   **Nominees:**
   - John McCarthy, Linguistics
   - Ralph Whitehead, Journalism

   There were no further nominations from the floor. Senators John McCarthy and Ralph Whitehead were elected as At-Large Members of the Rules Committee by unanimous vote.

3. **Chair of the Rules Committee**

   Maurianne Adams was elected Chair of the Rules Committee by acclamation.

   Senator O’Connor requested that the Faculty Senate express its greatest appreciation for the excellent service Professor Arthur Kinney has demonstrated to this body and in the University community in general for the past fifty years. He has been and will continue to be an outstanding University citizen and scholar.

F. **ANNUAL REPORTS**


   The report was received.

2. **2006-2007 Annual Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Online Learning, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 08-002.**

   The report was received.

   Marilyn Billings, Co-Chair of Ad Hoc Committee on Online Learning stated that in a few minutes the Committee of the Whole will focus on Online Learning, presenting highlights from this report and from the Joint Task Force as well as updates that have been happening over the summer.

G. **FINAL REPORT**

   Final Report of the Joint Task Force on Online Learning, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 08-003 with Motion No. 02-08.

   **MOVED:** That the Faculty Senate accept the Final Report of the Joint Task Force on Online Learning (JTFOL), as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 08-003 and thank the Task Force for its excellent work which is now complete.
Senator Chilton asked to substitute the word “accept” for “approve.”

The motion was seconded and adopted.

H. COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

OPEN DISCUSSION – ONLINE LEARNING

PANEL

1. Marilyn Billings, Co-Chair, Ad Hoc Committee on Online Learning – Moderator

Senator Billings stated they wanted to have this Committee of the Whole Section on Online Learning because online learning is becoming more prevalent everywhere in the country. The Committee has been working hard with issues surrounding online learning. Billings introduced Sara McComb, Co-Chair of the Ad Hoc Committee on Online Learning, to discuss the “talking points” document and other highlights.

2. Sara McComb, Co-Chair, Ad Hoc Committee on Online Learning – “Talking Points”

Professor McComb stated that the Committee split into four subgroups: one looking at academic standards and issues of quality assurance; one looking at comparative outcomes; another on technological infrastructure; the other looking at support materials.

In the last three years, stated McComb, the Committee has had four significant contributions. The first was the introduction of SPIRE coding, which is described in five gradations from 100 percent in-person to 100 percent online. This is now something that instructors can use when they put their courses into SPIRE.

The Committee also looked at comparative assessment and made three significant strides in that area. The first: online SRTI data is now incorporated into all of the SRTI reporting. The second: the committee did a pilot survey of courses where an instructor taught both an online and an on-campus version. The preliminary results show there are not differences in student performance across delivery modes. There are some other differences to work out while collecting more data, but the initial finding is that the performance does not vary. There are very different populations in on-campus and online venues, so there could be a whole host of control variables. It becomes very complicated to sort out the differences in the two populations.

The third accomplishment was the creation of a “Talking Points” document. The entire Committee came together and created a list of issues to help people who are considering creating an online program or online class.

The last accomplishment was an outline of different types of faculty support that is available across campus. The intent would be to have this wiki available for all the people who are teaching online to have one place to go to find out if there is some face-to-face instruction available, or help, or what the technology resources are.

Finally, the Committee had a three-year charge and is asking the Faculty Senate for 1-2 more years to focus on the issues discussed in the Joint Task Force Report and to incorporate online learning into the standing committees.

3. Ted Djafaris, Chair, Joint Task Force on Online Learning – “Report of the Task Force”

Professor Djafaris stated the report created by the Joint Task Force was produced after a broad, stimulating and productive discussion on the topic. According to the report, using the
internet for educational purposes is here to stay. With all of its shortcomings, it is a tool that can be effectively integrated into the educational process. Student learning is at the core of this debate, and the fundamental question is how to use this new tool in the best possible way. The Task Force believes this is a multi-dimensional problem, including students, learning, academic policies and procedures, program and administration issues, faculty organizational concerns, alumni issues, and state issues as well. The hope is that the University community will embrace the concept and begin to find ways to move forward. The community should proceed with caution, preserving the residential character of the University of Massachusetts in Amherst. There are many aspects that need to be worked out, and the Task Force shed some light on the issue and framed the debate.

Richard Rogers, Faculty Advisor to the Provost – “Update on the summer’s Joint Task Force on Online Learning’s Recommendations and Progress”

Professor Rogers stated that this summer he has been taking actions to try to implement and get started on the Joint Task Force’s recommendations.

The Provost’s Office asked, what standards and practices should online courses follow? The Task Force answered that online courses should not be treated any differently than any other courses at the University of Massachusetts Amherst. These courses should follow the same procedures.

The Task Force indicated what kind of investments should be made to improve the use of all instructional technology on campus. The Provost’s Office moved on a few things. Approval has been given to hire an instructional designer to be housed in the Center for Teaching. That search is about to get underway. We will create a Teaching Commons on the top floor of the Du Bois Library, the 26th floor. It will complement the Learning Commons and be a place where instructors can work on improving their course content using IT. Student helpers will assist in this process and staff the Teaching Commons. There are also plans to build a Testing Center on campus for a proctored, secure place to take examinations for the online community and all courses. Originally, the Provost’s Office planned to build the center in the basement of the Library, but the building inspector would not approve the space for human occupancy in the basement. The ceiling is not high enough. They are looking for another space to put at least sixty computer stations for a Testing Center.

The Learning Management System was just updated by Academic Computing, so SPARK is now running the latest version of Blackboard’s VISTA. It is now the same platform as UMASS online runs, but a version ahead.

QUESTIONS

Senator Chilton asked if someone could expand on the idea that online courses be reviewed in the same process as other courses. He asked what happens if someone offers a course from some distance, even if it has the same name as a course that has been approved for face-to-face teaching? Would it be reviewed by the Faculty Senate or the Academic Matters Council?

Secretary May stated that it would be the same procedure for online as for other courses. Any new course is initially approved as an experimental course with a few signatures. Then, it is submitted for regular approval through the whole process. Once it is approved, then that course number gets approved forever, and the department is at liberty to change instructors or make minor changes in content, and that would include changes in the delivery mode to online. The Senate delegates quality assurance to the department, once the course gets initial approval. The question as to whether or not, when the course moves to online, that needs additional review, is a question for further review. At the moment, it is up
to the department and programs to exert the same quality assurance standards that they do for regular courses.

Senator Christine King stated that there are multiple places to go for online learning assistance, including the CPE, the office on the second floor of the Graduate Research Center, and the Learning Commons. She asked Professor Rogers, how should faculty decide who and where to go for assistance?

Professor Rogers responded that the idea behind the Teaching Commons is to provide this common space, because there are teaching support services throughout the campus, Academic Computing being a great example, the Center for Teaching another, CPE itself, and the Library. This is a space where no new services will be provided, but it will be a clearing house, a place to come, make presentations, work with people one-on-one and also to be supported by students when the experts cannot be there.

Senator King asked if instructors should continue to go to CPE for CPE courses, and to the Faculty Resource Room in the Graduate Resource Center if the course is through the regular university.

Professor Rogers stated it should be more of a blended model than what King described. If an instructor did not know where to get started, the Teaching Commons would be a great place. There would be someone there aware of all the services provided on the campus, help direct instructors to the right place, and set up a meeting with an expert. Then after that meeting with the expert, the instructor could return to the Teaching Commons with a student helper to try to implement their great ideas.

Professor McComb stated that ACOL will also post a list online of all the different types of support available on campus. She said it is important to have a central place online where people can figure out that there is even a teaching commons to go to.

Senator Marta Calas stated she had nothing against online teaching but had concerns about the “Talking Points” document. She said this document promotes teaching online rather than portraying the negatives to online instruction. She wanted to know more clearly what was intended by this document.

Senator Billings stated one of the purposes of the document was to provide a place for people to go to find information about online learning and to educate them about some of the issues involved with online learning. The Committee spoke with colleagues in the field as much as possible and received feedback from other faculty members who were not on the Committee. The Committee incorporated those kinds of suggestions and changes into the document, and that is why it is a “Talking Points” document. It is not a policy. It is open for discussion.

Secretary May stated that the Research Council promotes research, the General Education Council promotes general education, the Undergraduate Education Council promotes undergraduate education, and so the Ad Hoc Committee on Online Learning is promoting online learning. Many of the people doing online learning are enthusiastic about that, and that is great. However, the survey provides some balance. It provides a reality check. Online learning is a small but significant percentage of what the campus is teaching right now. In-person plus, in person with a little bit of technological assistance, is the preferred teaching mode on campus. So, this survey provides a reality check as to where the faculty is on this, and there is an extended version of this survey that will be up on the Faculty Senate web site.

Senator Calas stated she does not have a concern about people teaching online or not. If ninety-nine percent of the campus wants to teach online, that is great. She said she is trying to clarify that all the information about teaching online cannot be answered with the
“Talking Points” document, in which all of the issues are positively spun. So, there are things that are negative about teaching online that should also be portrayed in this document.

Senator Billings suggested Senator Calas meet with her off-line to discuss the topic further.

Senator John McCarthy asked if it was in the Task Force brief to consider the technical limitations of SPARK, and whether those limitations were preventing faculty from doing what they wanted.

Professor Djaferis stated that the Task Force tried to deal with high level issues. It was not in their charge to look that low. The point is well taken. Having five different platforms at the University might be a difficult thing to work with, and it is one of the issues that needs to be worked out.

Senator McCarthy stated that there are also many things that the platforms cannot do. For example, they cannot stream video. There are students who watch streamed video all the time, but they cannot get it from the learning platform.

I. OLD BUSINESS

(*Tabled from the 64th Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate)


MOVED: That the Faculty Senate adopt the 2010-2011 Academic Calendar, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 07-050.

The motion was tabled until the next Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate.

2. Special Report of the Committee on Committees concerning Nominations to Faculty Senate Councils and Committees, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 07-038A with Motion No. 42-07.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Nominations to Faculty Senate Councils and Committees, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 07-038A.

The motion was seconded and adopted.

J. NEW BUSINESS

Special Report of the General Education Council concerning Recommended General Education Designations for AFROAM 390J and COMM-DIS 210, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 08-004 with Motion No. 03-08.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the General Education Designations for AFROAM 390J and COMM-DIS 210, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 08-004.

The motion was seconded and adopted.

The 664th Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate stood adjourned at 5:15 p.m. on September 20, 2007.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Ernest D. May
Secretary of the Faculty Senate