Presiding Officer Robert Wilson called the 683rd Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate to order on March 26, 2009 at 3:30 p.m. in Herter Hall, Room 227.

A. OPEN DISCUSSION OF THE FACULTY SENATE’S PRELIMINARY REPORTS ON REORGANIZATION
   MODERATOR: JOHN MCCARTHY, CHAIR OF THE RULES COMMITTEE
   (QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION TO FOLLOW)
   (See attached)

Randall Phillis, President of the Massachusetts Society of Professors, stated one of his favorite statements is: your most valuable possessions will be stolen from you when you are sleeping only feet away. The size of the crowd and the posture of some makes President Phillis concerned about this campus’ engagement in this process. This is the biggest academic transformation at the University in at least 25-30 years. The notion that faculty are not seriously engaged as an entirety is disconcerting. Faculty members must participate in the construction of any new organization of this University. Finding ways to more completely and thoroughly engage the breadth of the faculty in that process is critical.

The MSP is currently organizing efforts to engage the faculty around personnel issues. The most immediate effect of any reorganization will be personnel decisions that face people in the coming year. People who are coming up for tenure in the coming year may face a college personnel committee that is foreign to them and foreign to their own departmental personnel committee that will be making recommendations. The faculty decide how those committees will be composed, who will populate those committees and how those reviews will occur. But, the composition and nature by which those committees are constructed and voted in and execute their task is decided by the faculty. These are critical decisions. The MSP not only wants junior faculty who are facing a tenure decision or mid-career faculty who are facing promotion but also senior faculty to participate heavily and deeply in the process of building a new structure.

President Phillis stated he is very interested to hear discussion about the rationale for restructuring to be couched more consistently in discussion of scholarship and academic value rather than monetary value or efficiencies. He appreciates the need for monetary value and efficiencies as much as anyone. He just negotiated a contract that had a zero pay increase for a year which was not the most popular way to come in as the new president of the union. But, it is troubling that there is not as much rhetoric, discussion and conversation about the academic value and scholarly gain that can be held by a new structure. If the campus has better research support, there are curriculum opportunities available. A number of the things said here are consistent with the views that he has heard overall.

President Phillis stated he hopes that faculty carefully consider the implementation timeline for reorganization. The Chancellor has charged the Faculty Senate to determine two things: one, is the proposed reorganization of value and should it occur or not? If the Faculty Senate deemed the reorganization to have negative value, little value or not have enough value to merit its implementation, then the Faculty Senate should speak up. They should measure that mostly on the scholarly and academic value of the Reorganization Plan as described. This Plan should not be viewed as inevitable. It should be viewed as a decision that derives from proper faculty governance. Faculty governance means the efforts of the Faculty Senate and all the faculty who work on this project appropriately. The Senate has at least a one-year reprieve. Just on Tuesday, the Governor announced that federal stimulus money would cover the University’s budget for the coming year. There is less certainty for FY11, the following academic year. The Senate now has time to explore the relevance of the kinds of changes that they are looking at. If no such organization is seen as feasible, then the Senate should choose against it.

Ernest May, Secretary of the Faculty Senate, stated that after he received the report from the Task Force on Reorganization, the Chancellor issued his March 12 memo on reorganization. The Chancellor outlined several specific actions. He did not approve or disapprove of either the seven college model or the CAS model, although he approved an ongoing seven college model with the possibility of a CAS model.

The Trustees’ Wellman Document states that the Trustees will consider, upon recommendation of the appropriate faculty governing bodies, plans for the establishment of new schools and colleges and plans for the closing of already established units. In Secretary May’s opinion, this requires that the Faculty Senate vote on each of the actions which the Chancellor has indicated he is going to implement by the Fall of 2009. The
Chancellor’s memo is not as specific of a document as needs to go to the Trustees. But, the reorganization update of March 12 can be condensed to the following seven actions that need to be considered: 1) the closing of the College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics, 2) the closing of the College of Natural Resources and the Environment, 3) the establishment of the College of Natural Science, 4) the relocation of the Department of Communication Disorders from Public Health and Health Sciences to the School of Education, 5) the relocation of the Department of Resource Economics from the College of Natural Resources and the Environment to the Isenberg School of Management, 6) the relocation of Landscape Architecture and Regional Planning from Natural Resources and the Environment to the College of Humanities and Fine Arts, and 7) the relocation of the Department of Psychology to the College of Natural Sciences.

If Secretary May has missed something, someone should let him know. It is going to take some work to vote on all of this by May 7 so that it can be on the agenda for the Trustees at the June meeting. This would be the only meeting that could approve this prior to the Fall semester.

Senator Bogartz asked what would happen if the Faculty Senate did not vote on this proposal by May 7.

Secretary May stated the Trustees can basically do anything they want. Their normal procedure would require a recommendation from the Faculty Senate to implement this proposal. They can override their previous rules and create new rules. They have done that before.

Senator King stated Secretary May forgot to include the creation of a College of Health Sciences and the administrative merger of the School of Nursing under a newly created College of Health Sciences.

Secretary May stated that he believes that the Chancellor left a Dean of Nursing in place.

Senator King stated there is no College of Health Sciences. There is a School of Public Health and a School of Nursing. The plan calls for the creation of a college and an administrative merger of the School of Nursing.

Secretary May stated that the Chancellor’s document states: the School of Nursing will retain its autonomy and have a dean from among the current School of Nursing faculty but will be administered through the College of Public Health and Health Sciences.

Senator King stated that the campus does not have a College of Public Health and Health Sciences. The campus has to create a College of Public Health and Health Sciences. There is a school. Also, there is a question about what it means to have a dean but to be administered from a college.

Senator Curt Conner asked if anyone at the meeting believes that the University of Massachusetts is rocketing forward in the public eye. U.S. News and World Report would say, “No. We are not.” The University’s reputation has remained level or is creeping slowly downward.

The campus has a new chancellor who has come here and said part of the problem is the organization. Does anyone believe that the management here is at an optimum? Does the campus actually have as many provosts, vice provosts, chancellors, vice chancellors, department heads as it should have? Are there other models that the campus can follow that are actually better? Those are the questions that Chancellor Holub has posed. He was pushed faculty members a little bit, and the campus had to see if it could actually save money. The campus has realized that, indeed, reorganization might create a more efficient structure, cut out some of the redundancy in management and make it less difficult to apply for grants. Currently, faculty have to go through three deans and five department heads to get a signature on a disciplinary grant. The University does not even have electronic signatures.

Several deanships are vacant at the moment. As the MSP would argue, the campus can put off reorganization for another year and a half. But, Senator Conner welcomes Chancellor Holub’s decision to open this question to campus debate. Chancellor Holub has listened to every single suggestion being made and is weighing these ideas. Instead of being contrarians, faculty members might be more supportive. The faculty could help the University rise to a new level, increasing scholarship and academic achievement. No one is changing degree requirements. The departments are staying intact. They are just being put under different organizations. No one has told faculty what courses to teach or how General Education should be defined.

Senator Conner agrees that everyone needs to be involved in debating this issue. He disagrees that the Faculty Senate should debate this for 2-3 years or as long as it can be put off. There are many opportunities right
now, some of which have been created by stimulus money. For instance, in the area of renewable energy, Senator Conner and other faculty members can take advantage of opportunities right now.

**President Phillis** stated the MSP is not asking for a negation of the plan. They are relatively agnostic about whether or not the plan is a good one. They think 2-4 weeks is not a sufficient amount of time to build the optimal plan. The optimal plan is done with careful consideration, ensuring that the new structure is built carefully and properly. Senator Conner suggests that any change will be positive.

President Phillis doubted that a new organization would allow Senator Conner to accomplish anything new with respect to renewable energy. In the current organization, there are a variety of opportunities available, none of which prevent Senator Conner from accessing federal funding opportunities. If the University has the time, it should spend more than 2-3 weeks considering the best possible structure for the campus.

**Senator Bogartz** stated that during Senator Conner’s speech, he shifted back and forth from the claim that there is virtue to making change to specifically endorsing the Chancellor’s plan. Senator Bogartz was not quite certain which stance Senator Conner was taking.

**Senator Conner** stated he was advocating change which he thinks is required after the 30 years he has been here. As to the specific plan, Senator Conner stated he thought Chancellor Holub was open to various organizations or changes to his plan. Senator Conner believes the Faculty Senate should advise the Chancellor on possible modifications to his plan. Senator Conner does not think it should take more than a year to do this. He does not think the Senate needs to form five more committees. If no one is engaging in this issue, then why should the Senate take a year to consider it?

**B. NEW BUSINESS**

Introduction and Comments by David Evans, Chair of the Research Council, and Carol Sprague, Director of the Office of Grant and Contract Administration


**MOVED:** That the Faculty Senate approve the Principal and Co-Principal Investigators: Eligibility, Roles, Rights, Responsibilities, and Obligations, as presented Sen. Doc. 09-032.

**Chair David Evans** stated that the original document was distributed in 1992. Back then, it was designed for research that was done primarily by individual Principal Investigators (PIs). The landscape has changed significantly since then. There are more disciplinary and group research efforts. The document did not reflect that. That was the reason for starting on revisions and for the expansion of this document.

The document expands the definition of who can be a Principal Investigator and a Co-Principal Investigator (Co-PI). It makes more explicit the responsibilities of deans and department chairs when they approve of an individual to be PI who is not a full-time or permanent employee. This is an attempt to head off a variety of problems that the Office of Grant and Contract Administration has faced. It expands on the definitions of various titles of investigators and others who might be involved in a research team. It codifies current practices surrounding requirements of research administration and incorporates them into one document. The rules, regulations and procedures that the campus is held accountable for now are much more extensive and are beginning to bite us financially and otherwise when we do not pay attention. As the recipient of sponsored projects, faculty members who are Principal Investigators take on considerable responsibility. Chair Evans stated he has been a PI for forty years and can say that PIs are often not aware of how much responsibility they are taking on and what this responsibility entails. It is left to the Office of Grant and Contract Administration to remind PIs what they are supposed to be doing. The Office of Research Administration envisions this document as the beginnings of a manual for training.
Carol Sprague, Director of Grant and Contract Administration, stated the Office of Grant and Contract Administration felt it was important to have everything in one document so that it can easily be accessed, especially for new people who might be coming to the University.

Senator Conner asked can if the Office might be able to add electronic signatures.

Director Sprague stated they are working on that.

The motion was seconded and adopted.


MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the General Education Designation for HONORS 292B, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 09-033.

The motion was seconded and adopted.

E. NEW COURSE

There is no report associated with the following motion:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>CREDITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMPSCI 460</td>
<td>“Introduction to Computer and Network Security”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the course CMPSCI 460, as recommended by the Academic Matters Council.

The motion was seconded and adopted.

The 683rd Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate stood adjourned at 4:33 p.m. on March 26, 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