Presiding Officer Robert Wilson called the 677th Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate to order on October 30, 2008 at 3:30 p.m. in Herter Hall, Room 227.

A. ADDRESS BY SENATOR STANLEY ROSENBERG
  (QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION TO FOLLOW)

Thank you for the opportunity to speak with you this afternoon. I try to come by at least once a semester. I think this is an opportune moment. I have a number of things I have on my mind that I want to share with you. I will put them into three categories. First, I would like to talk about the actions in the State Senate this morning. Second, I would like to talk briefly about Question 1 because of its import and potential impact on the campus and the University System. Finally, I will answer questions.

This morning, we took some very dramatic and very difficult actions. I start with this because I feel that the news we heard in the last few days about Senator Wilkerson basically cast a pall over the work of the State Senate. Absent some very forthright, dramatic action, I feel that the work and actions of the Senate basically would be operating under a cloud. This morning, I offered an order in the Senate along with Minority Leader Richard Tisei to call for Senator Wilkerson’s resignation. This resolution was unanimously approved both in the Caucus and on the floor of the Senate. Senator Tisei and I also offered a second matter before the Senate today, an order which sent the current case to the Senate Ethics Committee for complete and expedited investigation. Next Tuesday, the people in the district that she represents will have the opportunity to either return her by virtue of the sticker campaign she is running or to cast their votes for one of the other two candidates. In any event, on Tuesday the voters of that district will have the opportunity to make a decision. But, the Senate felt it could not wait until next Tuesday. We had to act today because as long as she is a member of the Senate, every action of the Senate will be in doubt and will raise questions in the mind of the public.

Unfortunately, Senator Wilkerson has had a long history of difficulties, including having pleaded guilty to federal charges of income tax evasion. There were also a series of lesser situations here in the Commonwealth that related to campaign finance law and things of that nature. But, the current charges and allegations, which were announced earlier this week by the FBI and the U.S. Attorney’s Office, basically go to the heart of the work of the legislature. These allegations of having taken bribes and acted in a corrupt manner go beyond anything else in that track record. We ended up deciding today, after a three-hour caucus, that we had to protect the integrity of the body and our actions during the remainder of this calendar year. There will be actions taken several times each week. We will have informal sessions, and we could be called back into formal session because of the fiscal problems. Senator Wilkerson will now have to make a decision whether or not to resign, whether or not to continue her campaign, and the people in her district will have to make a decision on Tuesday. If Senator Wilkerson does not resign, then the Ethics Committee of the Senate will immediately begin the investigation and will take action as quickly as possible so that the matter can be resolved within the Senate body.

This is the most difficult day I have faced in the 28 years I have worked in the State House. I hope that Senator Wilkerson can come to grips with the situation at this time and will choose to resign. If not, we will move forward expeditiously. She will have due process. It will be a full and open process, consistent with the Senate rules, and we will adjudicate the matter later within the next two months.

That is the sad news of the day. The good news of the day is that we did a supplemental appropriation bill this morning which actually did not contain any real good news except for state employees. The legislature did not include the Governor’s proposal to go to a new tiered structure for health insurance premiums for employees. That matter is on hold, and it will not go into effect at least until we have formal sessions. It could come back, but at least for the remainder of this calendar year and this legislative term which ends the first week in January, the employee share of health care will remain the same as it has been in the recent past.

In 1988, I had the privilege of serving on the Public Service Committee, which is the committee of jurisdiction for the state pension system, and we worked on a plan to fully fund the unfunded pension liability. At that time, it was about $16 billion that we needed to pump into the state pension system in order to fully fund it. The plan was well-received by the financial community, the bonding community and Wall Street. We were one of the first states in the country to take on this enormous task of fully funding an unfunded pension liability system. The plan was to do it over a 40-year period, and we are about halfway through that period.
The good news is that we were doing so well that we were actually able to accelerate the process, and we were going to be able to pay it off by 2023 instead of 2028. The current fiscal situation is such that the legislative leaders have reviewed this and decided to push it to 2025 which would still be three years ahead of the original timetable of 2028, but it would only be a little bit behind where it might have been if we were able to keep with the current schedule. The good news is that we are continuing to make steady progress on a very ambitious plan that will secure and protect the pensions of public, state employees here in Massachusetts. We were running ahead of schedule, and we are still going to be running ahead of schedule even though we are going to push it out a couple of years.

We are not out of the woods yet. It is highly likely that there will be additional cuts in the state budget after the 1st of the year and we will see what happens with capital gain taxes and the April income tax revenue which is our largest source of revenue. April is a very important month to us, but it is very likely that we will have to do some additional cuts within this fiscal year. Economists are advising that the state will have at least 1-3 additional difficult fiscal years after that. Next fiscal year’s budget will be in significantly worse shape than this fiscal year’s budget as a result of a number of situations relating to obligations that must be met and shortfalls in various forms of revenue. Every single revenue source right now is behind benchmark.

All of this leads me to the final subject: Question 1. As you know, Question 1 is a citizen initiative to eliminate the state income tax, which would remove 40 percent of the spending from the state budget. A very simple but accurate accounting for the budget is that about 25 percent of the state budget goes to health care, including the group insurance commission for state employees and retirees. Approximately 25 percent of the state budget goes to local aid to cities and towns. Approximately 5-7 percent of the budget goes to debt service to pay for roads, bridges, schools and courthouses. Approximately 5-7 percent goes to the pension system we were just discussing. Then, there were a series of other areas that together would comprise another 12 or 15 percent which have to do with administrative overhead, rents, fuel, utilities and things of that nature. The final 25 percent of the budget is all of the discretionary services. Those are things that are not mandated either by the Constitution, federal law or contract. In that pool is everything including the public higher education system; all the environmental programs; most of the social service programs including mental health, mental retardation, services for the disabled, the blind, the deaf, the hard of hearing; the courts, the police, public safety and the state police. Basically, about $7.4 billion of the budget is in that final pool. The Massachusetts Taxpayers Foundation, which has proven itself over and over again to have been very accurate and fair in its assessments of state finances, reports that of the discretionary spending we would have to eliminate approximately 70 percent if Question 1 passes. It is not necessarily going to be across the board, but think approximately 70 percent of the state appropriation to the University, approximately 70 percent of the appropriation for daycare, mental health services, mental retardation services, the environment, the state police and the courts. That is essentially what we are talking about because approximately $12.5 billion of the budget is untouchable. The University is in the $12.7 billion that can be touched. There is no way to eliminate the state income tax without dramatically cutting discretionary services and local aid. Property taxes will rise fairly dramatically, and state spending in the discretionary portion of the budget will be dramatically reduced. That is the harsh reality.

The last time this question was on the ballot, 45 percent of the people voted for it. Until a couple of weeks ago, the polls were running 50-50 until people were asked if they were prepared to pay the increased property taxes. By the end of the impact questions, it went back to the 45-55 ratio. The last week or ten days has indicated that, although people are angry, frustrated and fearful, they are seeing this as an unwise move and a bad way to send a message to legislature. They are increasingly skeptical of this as a solution to our problems, and so, in the last couple of polls I saw, the number of people that are against it are outweighing the people who are for it. That said, we have less than a week left, and there are still people who do not know what the question is, have not read it, will walk into their polling place and read it for the first time and say, “Gee, that sounds like a great idea.” For those of you who care about the University, public services and have some interest in your own jobs and in this institution, you might consider doing a little bit of work with your friends and neighbors over the next few days to make sure they understand what this question really will do.

That takes us back to the beginning of my conversation with you and the situation with Senator Wilkerson. There is never a good time for this, but I do not think you could find a worse time for such a situation to arise because cynicism runs amok among the public. They want to believe the worst of their legislature and their legislators, and Senator Wilkerson’s actions and the allegations spread upon the front pages of our newspaper will certainly not do very much to encourage and enhance people’s belief that we are people who are there to do the right thing for the right reasons. I hope our actions with regard to Senator Wilkerson will suggest to people that we do understand the severity of this situation.
Ernest May, Secretary of the Faculty Senate, stated that several years ago Senator Rosenberg and Senator Panagiotakos put together a lengthy study of funding for higher education. It made a great case for the values that most of the people in this room represent, and it made some progress. Now the University is faced with a huge fiscal challenge, and so that is probably not applicable. Secretary May stated the University is descending in a saw-tooth pattern of privatization. Has there been any discussion of a higher education plan that would take this fact into account? There are few households now that include 18-year-olds or students getting ready to go to college, and there will be even fewer in the next 5-10 years. Is there any planning taking place to create a rational response to this situation?

Senator Rosenberg responded that the study to which Secretary May refers was focused on and was generated as a result of the recognition among some of the senators, including some of the Senate leaders in particular. The Commonwealth has an increasing need for seats in its public higher education system that are affordable. An increasing number of families are looking for opportunities for education but do not have the means to send their family members to private colleges and universities. That was the genesis of the study. The report demonstrated very clearly that there was this dramatic need. At that time, there were approximately 60,000 jobs a year going unfilled in Massachusetts because the Commonwealth did not have the trained workforce needed to fill those jobs, most of which required at least two years of college. We came up with the plan and it passed in the Senate but not the House. That was in the last term and this term, it got out of committee but it never even got onto the Senate floor because it was clear that the momentum was not there to do it.

We refocused our energy on the Capital Bill (a bond bill that Senator Rosenberg filed this term). It was $4 billion and had grown to a need of $4.4 billion. The Governor agreed to $2 billion and, as you know, it is now law. The University is starting to see that money flow into the campuses. That was the accomplishment for higher education in this term. There is a major effort underway in the executive with a little bit of legislative input. The Governor’s Readiness Project is moving to the next stage. They came up with “a zillion” recommendations. Now they are trying to figure out which ones they can afford and how are they going to pay for it. Senator Rosenberg addressed the point Secretary May made about the public higher education system essentially becoming a privatized system. The Commonwealth went from a state-funded to a state-supported to a state-assisted system. Senator Rosenberg did not know what they call the UVMs and the UNHs when there is only 10-12 percent state support, but the Commonwealth is heading in that direction, unfortunately, unless it can find in the legislature and public the will to reverse that.

Senator Rosenberg is awaiting the recommendations and the strategic plan that the University and Chancellor will put together. He is interested in the direction the University thinks the Commonwealth should be heading. It is uniquely positioned within the public higher education system in Massachusetts. UMass Amherst is the Land Grant; it is the flagship. After years of arguing and fighting, it has got the UMass Board of Trustees to start calling it the flagship campus. The President’s Office has started to talk to this campus in terms of differentiated policies that would recognize that there is a difference between a flagship and the other four campuses. That said, they still do not have a plan that has been signed, sealed, and delivered, and Senator Rosenberg is interested to see if the University and Senate are on the same page and if the Senate can move that plan forward. This and the Worcester campus are uniquely positioned within the public higher education system. Therefore, the two campuses have the ability and capacity to apply a vision that would not be possible in Dartmouth, Lowell or Boston. There are many more options available here than at the other three campuses. Senator Rosenberg came here as a student when 90 percent of the budget was paid for by the state and when you could afford to stay here on your summer work study and a little bit of loan money that you could pay off in a few years after college. Had it not been for this institution, Senator Rosenberg would not have had the same opportunities. He has a strong bias in that direction, but it does not mean that another vision is not possible. Still, he worries about those kids who have the capacity but not the means.

Senator Marios Philippides asked what would happen if Question 1 passes? Senator Philippides said he has heard the legislators are investigating ways of not reenacting that proposition. He asked if Senator Rosenberg had an update on that. If there is nothing the Senate can do, what are the legislators doing to invalidate 2 ½ so the property taxes could go up?

Senator Rosenberg stated that if Question 1 passes, it is a law. Therefore, $3 billion would be cut out of the budget in January and $9.7 billion would be cut in July. That would be phased out over the subsequent 12 months. Over an 18-month period, we would lose $12.7 billion. The legislature can amend or delay the new statute, and they can repeal it outright. They can try to ignore it and suffer the consequences if there is a court case where we are then ordered by the court to implement it, which would surely be the case.
There have been no discussions at this time about what the legislature would do. They are all focused on getting the public to defeat it. In the past, the legislature has usually either implemented a ballot question as approved or amended it to some degree. They did this with the rollback of the income tax to five percent. They amended it so that they would rollback to 5 percent over a long period of time based on certain economic triggers. That would be an example of amending it but still moving forward in a more gradual way.

With regard to Proposition 2 ½, that has been historically sacrosanct. Only one change has been made in Proposition 2 ½ in all the years that it has been on the books. Interestingly, it was a bill that Senator Rosenberg filed as a freshmen state representative to change the override from a 2/3 majority to a simple majority for an operating override. That was in 1988 and there have been no other changes since. There were no changes prior to that, the bill having been adopted by the people in 1981. The legislature would be extremely reluctant to touch Proposition 2 ½. That said, if this question passes, you would have to expect that to be on the table for discussion because it would be irrational to have every community doing overrides and having the chaos and extra expense of massive numbers of overrides. It simply just would not make sense. Whether people in the legislature would change it or not is up for debate, but at this point, Senator Rosenberg believes it would be discussed.

If Question 1 passes, Senator Rosenberg expects there would also be discussion about increasing some other taxes such as the sales tax or meals tax, none of which are more progressive than the income tax. The income tax is not a progressive tax because it cannot be graduated, but it is more progressive because of deductions, credits and things of that nature than the sales or meals tax.

**Senator Richard Bogartz** asked what kinds of incentives would manipulate legislators into taking better care of the University.

**Senator Rosenberg** stated there has been progress over a long period of time in terms of the number of people elected to the legislature who are either graduates of one of the campuses or who have family members who have been graduates. The Speaker’s stepdaughter is here. Another House chair’s daughter is here. There are maybe 3-5 legislators right now who have children who have students here. People are beginning to develop a much better understanding and appreciation of the institution and the campus. That said, it is not necessarily turning into what we would like to see. This is partly because there is still a mentality that public higher education is a bargain compared to private higher education. Secondly, there is so much competition in the budget from areas where there is no other option. We have tuition and fees as an option. Students can borrow and pay off their loans over time, which is exactly what is happening in the private higher education system. When there is money, the legislature is more than happy to give us money. In recent years, we have gotten a disproportionate share of the growth revenues. But, anytime we hit the wall, and unfortunately we hit the wall every 5-8 years, the progress that is made gets undone, and unlike in previous generations, we do not go to a new high. We do not even get back to the old high. That is why, as Secretary May pointed out, a few years ago, we were at 65 percent. We are now down to about 27-28 percent. They love you, but they do not want to pay for you. I do not have any more ideas of how we can incent them. All we can do is educate them about the value of this place and keep fighting to get them to be aware of who is going here, what the value is, and what the norm is in the industry. I keep talking about the norm, which means something to us but for most of them does not mean much.

**Senator Steven Brewer** stated that President-elect Barack Obama wants to offer tuition credit to students. Senator Brewer stated this would be a great thing except that in Massachusetts tuition is only a tiny part of what students have to pay. The larger part is fees. Student loans and financial aid opportunities are always a mixed blessing for students in Massachusetts because of the bizarre and byzantine way in which the fees and tuition have become intertwined. Is there any way to address this issue in the state so that there would be some sanity about the way tuitions and fees are done here?

**Senator Rosenberg** stated he has finally convinced people here that this is not a bad thing, but it keeps getting blocked in the House. Senator Rosenberg is considering filing legislation that would make this a local option. In this case, each of the Board of Trustees would get to decide whether to do it or not. But, there are a couple of state and community college presidents who have the ears of very powerful legislators. They have convinced them not to let it go through. If President-elect Obama were able to get a tuition credit bill through the legislative process in Washington, that might actually shift the whole debate and make it a no-brainer finally.

**Secretary May** thanked Senator Rosenberg. As the University faces tough times, it could not have a better champion in Boston than Senator Rosenberg.
B. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. The Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Secretary May recognized the passing of Paul Utgoff, the former chair of the Research Council, with a brief moment of silence. Professor Utgoff was a highly esteemed professor of Computer Science.

The Faculty Senate regrets that it inadvertently scheduled the October 9 meeting on Yom Kippur. Undoubtedly, the Senate did the right thing by canceling that meeting. Secretary of Education Paul Reville, who is also a UMass Trustee, was scheduled to address that meeting. He has been rescheduled to address the meeting on December 11.

The Senate would like to congratulate Provost Seymour on the completion of her eight-year term as Provost. She provided a steady hand at the helm of the academic ship during a series of storms. On her watch the UMA 250 reversed the decline of tenure-system faculty on this campus. Secretary May also congratulated Dean Janet Rifkin on her announced retirement as dean of the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences at the end of this year.

In response to a request from the central administration, the Rules Committee has supplied the faculty nominees for search committees for the following positions: Provost, Vice Chancellor for Research and Engagement, Vice Chancellor for Advancement and Dean of Social and Behavioral Sciences.

Since the last Faculty Senate meeting five weeks ago, the global and local economic outlook has changed dramatically for the worse. Private endowments are down almost 25-50 percent in some places, and state budgets are being reduced. The most plausible explanation as to why public higher education seems to absorb the highest relative share of these cuts concerns demographics. In the 1950s and 60s, over 50 percent of households included at least one person 18 or under. Today that number is less than 33 percent. Elected officials now seem more concerned about health care, crime and prisons than public higher education. Public higher education is becoming more and more privatized, mostly in an ad hoc way and without any clear plan. The Senate is working with Chancellor Holub to develop a task force to address these immediate and future issues which are obviously very serious issues for the campus.

3. The Chair of the Rules Committee

John McCarthy, Chair of the Rules Committee, called the Faculty Senate’s attention to the excellent report on the Junior Year Writing Program. It is the quinquennial report of the University Writing Committee. It is very detailed and certainly conforms to Chair McCarthy’s experience teaching these kinds of courses. It has some interesting recommendations. The Rules Committee will be talking with some representatives from that committee on November 17 and discussing what can be done about these recommendations, especially those that do not cost a lot of money.

4. The Representative of the Massachusetts Society of Professors

Max Page, President of the Massachusetts Society of Professors, updated the Senate on three major efforts that the MSP has been involved in this fall. First, the MSP and the parent union, the Massachusetts Teachers Association (MTA), have been working for the past eight months to eviscerate Question 1. The goal is to take away Beacon Hill’s excuse for why there is never enough funding for public higher education. The last time this question was on the ballot, voters almost passed the elimination of the income tax. Since then, legislators have been saying they could never reconsider enhancing revenues. The MSP and MTA believe that if voters kill Question 1, even in the midst of this awful economic crisis, they can begin to talk about a fair tax system that supports the University the way it should be supported.

MSP and other union members on campus have phoned over 3,000 voters in Western Massachusetts and have helped register over 1,000 previously unregistered students. Stephen Gencarella was very active in making that happen. MSP also sent another couple thousand postcards to parents of students, urging them to vote no on Question 1. MSP dues have also helped pay for the ads and the organizing that will lead to this strong victory. President Page noted that Chancellor Holub came
from a non-unionized campus. This is a perfect example of what a strong union is able to do: mobilize its members on behalf of the University. When it comes time to make the strong case to the legislature, Chancellor Holub will surely want to have MSP right behind him.

The MSP bargaining team chose to accept the parameters authorized by the Governor, although they had to file an unfair labor practice to get those offers. MSP accepted these parameters because that is what the economic situation demands. When the cost of living is taken into account, it is a salary offer that will leave members with salaries perhaps 9 or 10 percent below the value they are today. The MSP recognizes this is not the time to close the gap between UMass faculty salaries and the salaries of faculty at top public universities. Ultimately, if the University wants to join the group of the very best public research universities, it will have to address that gap.

MSP hoped accepting these parameters would resolve the contracts very quickly, but, unfortunately, it has not. There are a few very important outstanding issues that MSP feels very strongly about and expects the administration here as well as the President’s Office to move on so that MSP can finally, after eleven months, get to a contract and move on to the bigger and better fights.

Finally, MSP hopes to be involved in the debate over the short-term and long-term budget problems. MSP has issued a statement of principles that should guide this discussion which includes information on how to make short-term cuts while thinking about long-term advocating. In terms of natural resources, in this state, there are cranberries and brains. It is important to see the future jobs, businesses and research that will be part of the economic recovery. President Page urged MSP members and Faculty Senators to become involved in this debate.

5. The President of the Graduate Student Senate

*Nahir I. Otaño-Gracia, President of the Graduate Student Senate,* stated she is from the Comparative Literature unit in the Languages, Literatures and Cultures Department. She is proud to be president of the Graduate Student Senate this year. Her father is a physicist and her mother is an accountant. Both are professors. Although she is working in the opposite spectrum, she is still proud to be involved in the family tradition. President Otaño-Gracia stated that UMass is her community and home. Like the new Chancellor and the Dean of the Graduate School, she would like to see it flourish and become a better place. This can only happen if students, staff, professors, children, and the community have faith and security in the quality of life offered to them. President Otaño-Gracia is in agreement with Dean Mullin. The University needs to work for a high quality of life for graduate students despite severe budget cuts. Without a good quality of life, students cannot produce the quality of work the University of Massachusetts is capable of producing.

C. QUESTION PERIOD (10-Minute Limit)

*Senator Bogartz* thanked Vice Chancellor Joyce Hatch for looking into the problem with the granulating platforms around the Library. Within two days, someone from her office got back to him.

*Dan Gerber, Chair of the University Service, Public Service and Outreach Council,* read a statement on behalf of the Faculty Senate Council on University Service, Public Service and Outreach. Traditional approaches to university service and outreach tend to view institutions as providing the knowledge, information and expertise for the benefit for external constituents. Since 2006, the University Service, Public Service and Outreach Council has been promoting the concept of engagement that emphasizes mutual beneficial partnerships with communities that enhance research, teaching and scholarship. These principles were initiated in advance in a 2001 report from the Kellogg Commission on the future of state land grant universities. Recently, the Outreach Council provided the guidance and oversight for the application to the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching to receive the community engagement designation. In light of this newly initiated search for Vice Chancellor for Research and Engagement, the Outreach Council would like to know how Chancellor Holub defines engagement, as this might have significant implications to the Council.

*Robert C. Holub, Chancellor,* stated research has changed a great deal over the last thirty years on university campuses. One of the things that is very important now is that researchers do not just apply for grants, receive funding and then do their research. There is a great deal more involved at most institutions, including UMass Amherst, where there is an active engagement with industry and local, state and federal government. Different partnerships have formed so the use of the title Vice Chancellor for Research and Engagement was
to reflect the reality of research at a contemporary research university. It was meant to do nothing more than that.

With regard to engagement on a mature campus, one that is a flagship and also the land grant institution, there are going to be many offices involved with engagement. The Research Office is one of them. Obviously, there are other areas. Vice Provost for Outreach Sharon Fross is dealing with areas that are very important for our engagement. She actually works closely in many cases with what was the Vice Provost for Research, and Chancellor Holub does not expect those kinds of partnerships to be discontinued by the change in position. Chancellor Holub is aware of the report and signed it. He has no desire to change the notion of engagements that is operative. One of the areas where engagement has been operative and will continue to be operative is in the office of research, but it certainly will continue in other places. It is the University’s mission as a land grant institution and as the flagship for the state.

Senator Brewer wondered what the status of the 250 Plan was given the financial situation.

Chancellor Holub stated in his understanding of the 250 Plan, it was put into effect predicated on a special allocation from state government. There has never been a special allocation from state government for the 250 Plan. It was nonetheless put forward in the first few years without a special allocation where the state had better finances and there was some discretionary funding. Most of the discretionary funding that was received by the campus was not going to be dedicated to things that had to be paid. Fixed costs were given to the Amherst 250 Plan.

In the first year, there was a large and differentiated allocation that went not just to hiring faculty but also to other aspects of support for faculty. Those aspects have decreased over the years, which means faculty were hired without the requisite support that was originally conceived of in the plan. Now the University is faced with a situation where not only does it not have additional discretionary funding but it has money that is being cut from the campus. There have been cuts on this campus before which makes it more difficult because a lot of the logical places to cut from have already been cut by Chancellor Holub’s predecessors. It is difficult to proceed forward with hiring 50 faculty members in a year when your budget is being cut.

Chancellor Holub is developing a plan to go ahead with faculty hiring but at a different pace and with a slightly different focus. That would involve hiring faculty for strategic types of initiatives that would be coordinated with facilities projects and development so that there is a coordinated effort between faculty hiring and other areas of the central administration. There will be a call for faculty to develop these kinds of initiatives. The University may not be able to fund them, but it will look to those areas as a place to add additional faculty members.

Chancellor Holub stated he supports having additional faculty members on campus. It is going to improve education and research. It is going to support all the values that Chancellor Holub shares with faculty, but there are certain budget realities that make that situation of continuing with hiring additional faculty members or with allocating money for hiring additional faculty members an impossibility this year.

D. ANNUAL REPORTS


The report was received.

M.J. Canavan, Chair of the University Computer and Electronic Communications Committee, thanked some of the guests that spoke to the Committee, including: Chris Misra, a network analyst from OIT who met with the Committee to provide it with context for the new data security policy on campus; Heidi Dollard, director of administrative applications at OIT, who constantly answers questions and concerns around SPIRE and provided a sneak preview of Version 9; and Ed Blaguszewski, director of news and information, who provided the Committee with an overview of the new campus alert system.


The report was received.
Rick Adrion, Chair of the Program and Budget Council, stated it was a quiet year. The Council spent most of its time looking at various issues having to do with capital planning and the revised plan for professional education and dealing with program reviews.


The report was received.

Secretary May reported on behalf of Laura Lovett, the chair of the Status of Diversity Council. The Council recommended that the University look at the University of Michigan’s Expect Respect web site and program and possibly do something similar. It would at least provide an organized place for the University’s policies, procedures and expectations with regards to issues that affect the civility of the campus community.


The report was received.

Stephen Gencarella, Chair of the University Writing Committee, stated that the Committee just completed a five-year review of the Junior Year Writing Program. He thanked Anne Benz, David Fleming and the Writing Program and the Associate Director of the Junior Year Writing Program, Genevieve Chandler. Without Deputy Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education John Cunningham’s support, the Committee would not be successful with writing on this campus. He thanked the members of the Committee who helped prepare the report, including Steven Brewer. Chair Gencarella also thanked all of the program directors for Junior Year Writing.

There is a lot of positive news. Twenty-six years after the program was initiated, it is still running strong and is a gem of this University. Every department and person involved believes very strongly that Junior Year Writing is necessary for the intellectual and professional development of students. They have praised its purpose in the major and in General Education, and very often people have praised its importance in training students into active citizenship.

As expected, the first challenge the Junior Year Writing Program faces relates to resources. The Program needs resources to keep student classes small, to train teachers and graduate student instructors. Then, it needs general resources for making sure that the program remains at such a high caliber. The second challenge relates to community. A number of programs across campus reported a feeling of isolation in connection with other Junior Year Writing Programs. The Committee regards this as an opportunity to build towards the future.

There were a number of recommendations for the administration, for the University Writing Committee and for the Junior Year Writing Program. There were five recommendations for each, ranging from addressing ESL issues to addressing resources and financial needs. The only other issue to take up in the future deals with graduate student writing needs. The Committee looks forward to moving on some of what was detailed in the 30-page document. It always welcomes suggestions as it continues to build strength in this nationally renowned program.


The report was received.
E. BYLAW CHANGES

Special Report of the Rules Committee concerning Bylaw Changes, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 09-007 with Motion No. 03-09.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Bylaw Changes, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 09-007.

(Inasmuch as these are changes to the Senate’s Bylaws, this is the first of three readings of this motion. It will be read again at the 678th and 679th Regular Meetings of the Faculty Senate and voted on at the 679th meeting. The motion may be debated and amended at all three meetings.)

Secretary May stated that the Senate has already added the Executive Vice Chancellor for University Relations as appropriate to several councils. He offered an amendment to change the name of the University Advancement Council to the University Relations and Advancement Council.

The motion to amend was seconded and adopted.

F. NEW COURSES

There are no reports associated with the following motions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>CREDITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BMATWT 204</td>
<td>“Construction Materials and Methods”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMATWT 420</td>
<td>“Advanced Topics in CAD”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMPSCI 220</td>
<td>“Programming Methodology”</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMPSCI 240</td>
<td>“Reasoning About Uncertainty”</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMPSCI 325</td>
<td>“Usability”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMPSCI 370</td>
<td>“Introduction to Computer Vision”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMPSCI 446</td>
<td>“Search Engines”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMPSCI 466</td>
<td>“Applied Cryptography”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMPSCI 473</td>
<td>“Introduction to Computer Graphics”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMPSCI 474</td>
<td>“Advanced Image Synthesis”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLSOILIN 382</td>
<td>“Writing for Sustainability”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the courses BMATWT 204 and 420, CMPSCI 220, 240, 325, 370, 446, 466, 473 and 474 and PLSOILIN 382, as recommended by the Academic Matters Council.

Senator Marta Calas asked if there was a change in program associated with the new computer science courses.

Secretary May stated there is a rather large curricular change in the works in the undergraduate Computer Science program to make it much more broadly available.

The motion was seconded and adopted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>CREDITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMPSCI 513</td>
<td>“Logic in Computer Science”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMPSCI 529</td>
<td>“Software Engineering Project Management”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the courses CMPSCI 513 and 529, as recommended by the Academic Matters and Graduate Councils.

The motion was seconded and adopted.
That the Faculty Senate approve the course CMPSCI 673, as recommended by the Graduate Council.

The motion was seconded and adopted.

G. NEW BUSINESS

1. Special Report of the Rules Committee concerning the Amherst Campus Honorary Degree Procedures, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 09-008 with Motion No. 07-09.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Amherst Campus Honorary Degree Procedures, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 09-008.

Secretary May stated this is a response to a lengthy discussion on revising honorary degree procedures. Besides cleaning up language, there has been an insertion of two steps. Before the recommendations for honorary degrees leave the campus, the Rules Committee, in executive session, will look over them and try to ensure that they have broad community support. They are not trying to do the work of the Honorary Degree Committee, but, if there are any red flags, the Rules Committee wants to alert the administration. Also, if the Trustees or President exercise their prerogative to add honorary degree recipients to the list that the campus submits, the Committee wants to review that in executive session. This preserves confidentiality while creating a slightly more complicated process to avoid any mishaps in the future.

Secretary May stated the University has to operate within Trustee policy. Some suggested that these honorary degrees be voted on by the Senate in open session. The Trustee policy calls for confidentiality in the process. Therefore, this opens it up to nine elected senators, without opening the process up to public scrutiny which could cause difficulties and embarrassment. This preserves the idea of faculty primary responsibility for degrees, but it delegates it to an elected body of the Senate.

The motion was seconded and adopted.


MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Establishment of a Capital Asset Task Force (CATF), as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 09-009.

Secretary May stated the campus is engaged in two studies, one of which is in progress. The other will start soon. These studies have to do with research and teaching space on this campus. These are extensive studies, and they will project us for the next 25-50 years, providing some kind of planning for the research and teaching space on this campus.

This Task Force will review the draft plan that the consultants come up with. Before the consultants complete their report, they will have comments from this Task Force. If there are still things to be said, this group can recommend to the Chancellor. It is a recommendatory, vetting group that will provide an additional layer of input for faculty.

The motion was seconded and adopted.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Establishment of an Ad Hoc Committee on the Impact and Implications of Digital Scholarship, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 09-010.

Secretary May stated that the Research Library Council determined that this was a topic that both the Library and the faculty needed to know more about. They wanted to present the opportunities and challenges of digitization and the new world of scholarship to the campus community.

Arthur Kinney, Chair of the Research Library Council, added that there is some complication for the dissemination and production of scholarship. There is also some complication for academic personnel procedures. There is a wide range to how we work in the new digital publication and dissemination of knowledge.

The motion was seconded and adopted.

4. Special Report of the International Studies Council concerning an Academic Exchange Agreement between the University of Massachusetts Amherst and the Hong Kong University of Science and Technology (HKUST), as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 09-011 with Motion No. 10-09.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Academic Exchange Agreement between the University of Massachusetts Amherst and the Hong Kong University of Science and Technology (HKUST), as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 09-011.

The motion was seconded and adopted.


MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the General Education Designations for ANTHRO 306, LINGUIST 101 and PLSOILIN 190E, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 09-012.

The motion was seconded and adopted.


MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Nomination to the Academic Honesty Board, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 09-013.

The motion was seconded and adopted.

H. OLD BUSINESS

Special Report of the Committee on Committees concerning Nominations to Faculty Senate Council and Committees, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 08-030D with Motion No. 32-08.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Nominations to Faculty Senate Councils and Committees, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 08-030D.

The motion was seconded and adopted as amended.

The 677th Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate stood adjourned at 4:55 p.m. on October 30, 2008.

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

Respectfully submitted,
Ernest D. May, Secretary of the Faculty Senate