A. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Principal Administrative Officers

Charlena Seymour, Provost, stated she wanted to say goodbye to Richard Rogers, someone for whom she has had the greatest respect and admiration. He has made major contributions to the campus. He has worked his heart off for the last six to eight years in the Provost’s Office.

Rich Rogers was hired in the Provost’s Office in the academic year 2002 for a two-year appointment as the Faculty Advisor to the Provost for Undergraduate Education. He provided such outstanding leadership and service that six years later, in March 2008, his title was changed to Associate Provost for Academic Technology to fit the increased number of functions that he developed and coordinated on campus. In his application letter for the position, Rich wrote: “The position description contains wonderful language about Undergraduate Education but remains general and vague as to what this person’s job will involve beyond to motivate members of the campus community to achieve and maintain excellence in Undergraduate Education.” Obviously, Rich did not need anyone to tell him what to do because he made form fit function.

Rich Rogers chaired the Provost’s Instructional Technology Task Force which collected baseline information about utilization of instructional technology on campus. As the Chair of the Learning Commons Committee, he led the effort to get Microsoft to name UMass Amherst as the first IT Showcase School in the nation. He chaired the Classroom Improvement Project that has been installing IT into the classrooms. He has led the effort to create a Teaching Commons which had its first “Get With IT” program for thirteen faculty last summer and a Teaching Commons that will open officially in the spring. Faculty should read Rich’s IT blog on the Provost’s website to get the full scale of his magic.

His relentless pursuit of quality and the delivery of services to the campus have made the IT agenda significantly better. Rich Rogers encouraged the campus to consider new ideas, even unchartered waters. Provost Seymour appreciates all that Rich Rogers has done. He has done it with great care and real down-to-earth knowhow.

2. The Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Ernest May, Secretary of the Faculty Senate, stated he would like to second the Provost’s praise for Richard Rogers. He also served as the Chair of the Undergraduate Education Council for the last six years. Mostly, faculty do not welcome someone who is even partly associated with the administration, but Richard did such a superb job that no one ventured into that territory. He is extremely effective and zeros in on the problems that need to be addressed with elbow grease, time and intelligence. Every classroom that uses technology has seen the results of his efforts. He will certainly be missed in that role.

Recently, Chancellor Holub sent his Reorganization Proposal by email to the entire campus community. In his memo to the Faculty Senate, dated February 4, Chancellor Holub made an additional request: “I would like a recommendation on this proposal from the Faculty Senate and would appreciate your take on the appropriate action to get such a recommendation to me. As we have previously discussed, it will be important to receive the Senate’s recommendation by the end of the current semester.”

In order to respond to Chancellor Holub’s request and to fulfill the Faculty Senate’s responsibilities as outlined in the Wellman Document, the Rules Committee has requested reports on the Chancellor’s Reorganization Proposal from the following Councils: the Academic Priorities Council, the Undergraduate Education Council, the Graduate Council, the Program and Budget Council, the Research Council and the Outreach Council. Preliminary reports from these Councils will be due on March 6, 2009, which is the same date that the Task Force on Reorganization is set to report. In
addition, any Council or Committee that wishes to comment on Chancellor Holub’s Reorganization Proposal is hereby invited to do so. Comments should be delivered to the Faculty Senate Office by March 6. It will then become the responsibility of the Rules Committee to aggregate the various reports and comments from Councils and Committees, to coordinate with the Chancellor’s Task Force on Reorganization, and to bring a report to the floor of the Faculty Senate before the completion of the Spring 2009 semester. Secretary May encouraged all faculty senators to be involved in this process.

Several Councils and Committees are holding hearings. In addition, the Faculty Senate has charged the Councils that are supposed to prepare reports along the following lines: 1) the Academic Priorities Council is focusing on the academic vision: overall, does this reorganization position the campus for increased success as it emerges from the recession?; 2) the Graduate Council is supposed to address the impact on graduate education and evaluate that; 3) the Program and Budget Council is looking at the budget implications of the significant administration savings. It will consider whether or not the reorganization will position the campus for increased success now and in the future. The Council will also explore the costs of reorganization; 4) the Research Council is supposed to look at how the Chancellor’s Reorganization Proposal may position the campus for greater success in research now and later when things presumably get better; 5) the Undergraduate Education Council is supposed to look at the impact on Undergraduate Education; and 6) the Outreach Council is supposed to look at the impact on Outreach. Needless to say, given the scope of the entire process, this is a fairly compressed timeline. But, given the severity of the economic conditions in the country, Secretary May did not think the Faculty Senate had any choice but to try to meet its responsibilities to the campus, to colleagues and to the Institution by doing this on a compressed schedule.

At the General Faculty meeting on Monday, four resolutions were passed including the call for the Chancellor to produce a Strategic Plan which cannot be done overnight but needs to interface and intersect with reorganization. The campus certainly would not want to do a reorganization that was not aligned with a Strategic Plan. These things are not proceeding in the same order that they might if the Institution were not under duress, but they are proceeding, and the Senate will try to get something voted on by the end of the semester.

3. The Faculty Delegate to the Board of Trustees

W. Brian O'Connor, Faculty Delegate to the Board of Trustees, reported that on January 15 from 8:00 a.m. to noon, the Trustees held a retreat. Usually, these are closed meetings reserved exclusively for the Trustees, and this was the first time that Faculty Delegates were able to attend. It was fairly well attended. Approximately three-fourths of the Trustees were there.

The first speaker was Chair Rob Manning. He said that the University either had to maintain excellence or run the risk of becoming a community college. Michael Widmer, the President of the Massachusetts Taxpayers Association, gave a half an hour talk. He said that this is a multi-year problem that he foresees going through fiscal year 2011. He said that the State depends too much on taxes associated with capital gains. The State always says that it is going to save at least half of the capital gains for rainy day stabilization funds, but it never does. He did not paint a tremendously rosy picture. One of the Trustees asked him, “what should the State invest in at this point?” He tiptoed around the question, but in following comments, it became clear that the Life Sciences and Information Technology were two areas to invest in and could get the University out of some of these problems.

Senator O’Connor said the retreat was very informative and he participated in the discussion more than usual. The faculty representatives were asked if the faculty would appreciate the Trustees’ involvement in reorganization. Senator O’Connor said UMass Amherst appreciated the advice but did not want to be micromanaged. The Trustees seemed shocked, especially John DiBiaggio, who is the sole academic on the Board. He was aware things were bad but was not aware how bad they were. Each Chancellor, including Chancellor Holub, had a PowerPoint presentation which laid out what they were doing on their particular campus.

Last Wednesday, Senator O’Connor attended the Committee on Science, Technology and Research meeting. Chancellor Michael Collins from the Medical School gave a report on the Life Science Initiative. The Stem Cell Bank at the Medical School and the Registry are up and running. With the previous administration in Washington, the Stem Cell Bank was not very viable because of the ban
on federal money for stem cell research. But, that was one of the first things that President Obama changed when he got into office. That is going to be a tremendous asset to the entire University because it opens up that area of research for the other four campuses.

President Wilson was not at this meeting because he was with the Governor in California trying to drum up biotech research companies to come to Massachusetts. But, Vice President Tom Chmura reported that, according to the Association of University Technology Managers, UMass earned $41 million in Fiscal Year 2007 in technology license income. The majority of this money was generated by the Medical School in Life Sciences, but this campus also contributed to the income. This placed UMass 13th among 194 Universities participating in this survey. It also ranked UMass number six among all public Universities reported. MIT ranked 7th and Harvard ranked 22nd, so UMass was behind MIT but ahead of Harvard in this area.

The next meeting was of the Advancement Committee. Obviously, the donations are not as good as they should be. Then, the Committee on Academic and Student Affairs met and approved a new PhD program in mathematics education at the Dartmouth campus with one abstention.

Then, a panel of seven students who have studied internationally and nationally during the summer and academic year spoke. The UMass Amherst representative was Megan Kolb, who is a BDIC (Bachelor’s Degree with Individual Concentration) major in the areas of music, dance and theater production. She talked about spending an entire semester and summer in London with a leading theatrical company. Then, there were some medical students from the Worcester campus who literally played doctor in the Dominican Republic even though they are not MDs yet. Another student from the Boston campus worked with Professor Padraig O’Malley. Professor O’Malley takes citizens from South Africa and Northern Ireland and puts them in the same room with Shia, Sunni and Kurds from Iraq. He has the people from South Africa and Northern Ireland convince these people to solve their problems by talking. The student described that within 48 hours, the Shias and the other warring factions were able to sit, talk, and actually look at each other. This panel presentation showcased the best and brightest students at UMass. This was a marvelous anecdote, and the Trustees were really impressed by it.

Marilyn Billings, Associate Delegate to the Board of Trustees stated she went to the Committee meeting on Administration and Finance this morning. The meeting started at 8:00 and went to at least 11:30. President Jack Wilson had an extensive presentation that will be available for faculty to see if they are interested. The discussion centered on the budget and the implications of a $1500 fee increase.

In an attempt to rally the troops in support of a fee increase, Chancellor Marty Meehan also talked about what was happening on the Lowell campus. Then, there was a lengthy discussion about the fee increase. Chair James Karam said that we are facing an unprecedented cutback. The more we delay, the worse it will be. A number of students were concerned that they did not have enough information to vote about a fee increase and asked for additional information. The Secretary of Education, Paul Reville, had many questions about tuition and fees and the expected family contribution. Other Trustees talked about UMass getting more students from higher incomes. These students would be paying the higher fees that go to scholarships for those who cannot afford to pay. There was also additional concern that no one knows what is going on with the Federal Stimulus Package yet. The Chair of the Board, Robert Manning, wants to set up a subcommittee of Trustees who will work with the administration and Chancellors on matters related to the budget. They would also be present on the campus. There was also a motion made and seconded to table the fee increase for a couple of weeks. There was a 6-5 vote to postpone this agenda item. This means that the Administration and Finance Committee needs to meet again before the full Board of Trustees meeting on February 27 in Dartmouth.

Secretary May stated that the slides from these meetings are on the Faculty Senate website. The latest ones will be added soon. There are some interesting slides from the Science, Technology and Research Committee.

The slides from this morning show a convincing justification for a departure in financial aid. UMass would follow the same model private institutions use to guarantee certain levels of support. While you cannot exactly guarantee that a person who makes $30,000 a year will not pay more than $1800—this person could have a $1 million trust fund in addition to their $30,000 income, for
example—these slides spell out basic levels of aid. According to this model, if you make less than $78,500, the median income in Massachusetts, you would receive grants and scholarships rather than loans. There are a number of factors in this new approach to financial aid which benefit low and lower middle income people. This proposal, which was out on the table, would split the $46 million financial problem half between fee increases and half between institutional cuts. This is the type of deal that more or less governed things in the past. However, it did not come to pass. Secretary Reville demonstrated an alarming lack of understanding about how this works. He and the Governor seem to be focused on K-12.

Trustee Edward Collins, who is the union representative on the Board, made a motion to amend which would have increased the fees to $3100. This would have covered the entire problem and avoided any layoffs on the campuses. That motion to amend failed for lack of a second. The UMass Amherst student Trustee made it very clear that the upper middle class constituency that she seems to represent were definitely not interested in subsidizing students at the lower end of the spectrum. It was surprising to see former Chair Stephen Tocco, who made the motion to postpone any decision on this, win a 6-5 vote.

Over the next nine months, there is going to be a Trustee Task Force of five trustees who will be visiting each campus to help manage this situation. This is not something that the Chancellors will be looking forward to. Also, Lowell and Dartmouth had student Trustees who spoke in favor of the fee increase. At Lowell and Dartmouth, the students felt that the loss of quality would outweigh the problems if they did not have the fee increase.

4. The Representative of the Massachusetts Society of Professors

Steven Brewer, Representative of the Massachusetts Society of Professors, stated that on February 18 from 12-1 p.m. there is going to be an all-union, all-student event at the Campus Center Auditorium. It is going to be an informational session: understanding the budget crisis. The goal is to reach out to people who are aware there is a budget crisis but do not have much information about it or have not been able to get access to information.

April 8 will be this year’s PHENOM lobby day. The Chancellor has agreed to sponsor busses and lunches, as he did last year, to carry students and other interested people to the State House to lobby the legislature about the value of public higher education. Faculty members are extremely welcome to attend. Faculty might also encourage students to participate. It is very interesting to go and see how the legislative process works, to meet with legislators, and to present the kinds of things that go on. It is a very interesting and worthwhile thing to do, especially if you have not done it.

Finally, if you did not see it, the Chancellor addressed retirees recently. In his last paragraph he said: “and we will have to retrench in some areas.” The MSP, in accordance with the contract, has requested the retrenchment plan that the Chancellor is referring to. Hopefully, MSP will see that and have some better understanding of how to contribute to the retrenchment the University envisions.

B. QUESTION PERIOD (10-Minute Limit)

Senator Richard Bogartz stated the Scheduling Office is broken, but there may be ways to help it. Senator Bogartz’s departmental scheduling representative had some suggestions: it might be a good idea to give scheduling representatives or instructors the ability to add graduate TAs to SPIRE, to change online/offline status of courses in SPIRE after the classes start, to add or delete comments in class notes in SPIRE and/or to add or delete faculty instructors to undergraduate courses. If none of these are viable options, then perhaps the Office could hire a couple of temporary workers for the start of the semester who would be trained to do a very narrow set of functions to expedite tasks that need to be accomplished quickly when the term starts. For example, they could add TAs. It is strange to go a couple of weeks where teaching assistants cannot get onto SPARK to add the grades that have already accumulated because there is a backup.

In response to Brian’s comment, Senator Bogartz wondered how the Trustees were not aware of how bad things are.

Senator O’Connor stated he might have been a little too harsh. Obviously, the Trustees are very concerned about the status of the University budget. But, Senator O’Connor stated he thought it was horrible to not second a motion to at least allow it to be discussed. The attendance of the Trustees also bothers him. Two or
three years ago, it was very good. Five or six years ago, it was horrible. Now, it is beginning to dwindle down. Obviously, all of the Trustees are business people with the exception of John DiBiaggio who is an academic. He was the President of three institutions and knows what the University is up against. He made the statement that this is very serious. He was telling the Trustees that people in higher education are going through this economic crisis, too. No one likes to think about how bad it is, but they now know that it is very bad. It is also interesting to hear different signals from students. Some of the campuses are for the fee increase, and UMass Amherst students are not.

Secretary May stated that the President’s Office has decreed that there is no problem. President Wilson told us that in the middle of January, and up until today, the official word was that the University had everything under control and would manage it. The meeting today was not able to come to its predetermined outcome. This was the first visible indication that things were not going that smoothly. Even when private institutions come to a kerfuffle as big as this, they keep the surface smooth. The many big changes they make underneath the surface are fairly invisible to their clients, so that if you were a student at Harvard, you would not necessarily notice these changes. That is what the President’s Office was trying to do. That seems to be coming apart a little bit.

An unidentified speaker stated that the story about the vote is on the front page of The Boston Globe. Should the Faculty Senate write a letter stating its position on the tuition fee increase?

Secretary May asked the Chair of the Rules Committee and the Budget Planning Task Force if he had any comments on that.

John McCarthy, Chair of Rules Committee and the Budget Planning Task Force, stated that the Budget Planning Task Force already made its recommendation. They recommended a fee increase of about 15 percent, which is exactly what this campus has requested. They also recommended the high aid model. In addition to that, they recommended an increase in the formula of financial aid so that the neediest students would be protected entirely from the effects of this fee increase. Unfortunately, the Task Force was never able to garner student support for this. Chair McCarthy stated they seem to be seeing the results of that now.

An unidentified speaker asked if they wanted to publish that in The Globe.

Chair McCarthy stated it is not really newsworthy. The recommendation was done in December.

Secretary May stated that President Wilson had an op-ed piece in today’s Globe. It was a rationale for the high tuition, high aid model. The proposal is a high tuition, high aid model which would be a departure from the current policy. The Budget Planning Task Force thought this was a good way to go, but both students voted against it.

When the Chair of the Rules Committee or the Secretary of the Faculty Senate speaks for the faculty, he thought it was best to know if the faculty was in favor of the recommendation. There would have to be some kind of poll. Maybe the faculty needs to discuss whether to take a stand in favor of the high tuition, high aid model.

Randall Phillis, President of the Massachusetts Society of Professors, stated it seems that the Budget Planning Task Force has voted and made a recommendation. The question becomes: is that recommendation of the Budget Planning Task Force a matter of public record that could be cited by The Globe or any other news source?

Chair McCarthy stated he could send an email to The Globe tonight. Chair McCarthy’s view is that getting a fee increase is more important than changing the financial aid formula. If the student representatives want a $1200 fee increase and no improvement in financial aid for lower income students, then he would recommend taking that deal. The University is desperate.
C. SPECIAL REPORT

Special Report of the Nominating Committee for Secretary of the Faculty Senate, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 09-022.

Senator Billings stated that the Nominating Committee understands that Professor Ernest May is willing to continue in the Secretary position. In the light of truly excellent performance by Professor May during his tenure in this position, the Committee is pleased to unanimously nominate him for reappointment to the Office of Secretary of the Faculty Senate.

Additional nominations may be made from the floor.
The final vote will be taken at the 681st Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate.

D. NEW BUSINESS


MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Supplemental Guidelines for the Graduate Certificate Proposals, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 09-023.

The motion was seconded and adopted.


MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Policy concerning Safety and Training Protocols for Visiting Scientists and Scholars, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 09-024.

Frank Hugus, Director of the International Programs Office, stated that item 4.6 in the report states that the visitor must obtain a campus ID. To do this, he/she completes a non-employee/non-student form which is hand carried to OIT for processing. This is not quite the procedure that is used for international visitors. Usually, international visitors come to the International Programs Office and the Office takes care of getting the ID for them. This is to help them and to make sure their visa or permit is in order. This is more of a procedural matter than a substantive matter, but he wanted people to be aware that there is a slight difference for international visitors.

Secretary May stated the Senate could pass the motion, and if the Research Council wanted to make a technical correction at a later meeting, they could add a little bit of language to cover international visitors.

The motion was seconded and adopted.


MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Creation of a W.E.B. Du Bois Center, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 09-025.

The motion was seconded and adopted.
E. **OLD BUSINESS**


   **MOVED:** That the Faculty Senate approve the Final Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Certificates, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 09-001.

   The motion was seconded and adopted.


   **MOVED:** That the Faculty Senate approve the New Honors Designations Proposal, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 09-016A.

   The motion was seconded and adopted.

3. Special Report of the Committee on Committees concerning Nominations to the Faculty Senate Councils and Committees, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 09-021A with Motion No. 22-09.

   **MOVED:** That the Faculty Senate approve the Nominations to the Faculty Senate Councils and Committees, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 09-021A.

   *Senator Arthur Kinney* stated there is a full list of members, but this motion only affects the two shaded names.

   The motion was seconded and adopted.

The 680th Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate stood adjourned at 4:28 p.m. on February 12, 2009.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Ernest D. May
Secretary of the Faculty Senate