A. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Ernest May, Secretary of the Faculty Senate, commented that this year did not turn out as badly as it could have. The budget forecast coming out of the Senate for this University is a just $3-4 million down. This budget is nothing like the disaster everyone imagined just a few weeks or months ago. This is very fortunate.

There are many building projects underway on campus. We opened the ISB this spring. We are going to open the Recreation Center in September. Two huge research buildings are going to be started soon and done in 2-3 years. We have a new classroom building that will be finished in 3-4 years. These are all major investments by the state. The state could have put these buildings in a number of locations, but they are putting them here. This is all positive news for the campus.

It has been a hectic year for the Senate, the Budget Planning Task Force, the Reorganization Task Force and the other groups responsible for lubricating the gears which got us to the end of the year in relatively decent shape. The University is providing a service to citizens of the Commonwealth and the country which is even more necessary, perhaps, then if the economy were booming. Secretary May expressed his appreciation to all the people who helped the Senate complete both routine and extraordinary business.

2. The Chair of the Rules Committee

John McCarthy, Chair of the Rules Committee, stated the motions the Senate will be voting on later are submitted by the Chancellor in his capacity as President of the Senate. Chair McCarthy stated he will be reading the motions because the Chancellor is not here. The Rules Committee felt it was necessary to maximize the time during which the proposals for Reorganization could be considered to give maximum opportunities for units to reach a Memorandum of Understanding. That is why the Senate scheduled this additional meeting beyond the normally scheduled Senate meetings. Unfortunately, the Senate did not consult the Chancellor’s schedule, and he has a meeting of the Board of the UMass Foundation today and cannot be here. He has sent a representative, John Cunningham, who is fully briefed and will be able to answer questions.

3. The Faculty Delegate to the Board of Trustees

W. Brian O’Connor, Faculty Delegate to the Board of Trustees, stated twelve years ago, on this very day, George Sulzner from the Political Science Department nominated Faculty Delegate O’Connor. Twelve year later, Senator O’Connor is completing his term. There will be an election later on. He wanted to thank Ernie May and the alternate delegates, Alex Deschamps and Marilyn Billings, for subbing for him on a number of occasions. It was a tremendous opportunity and learning experience. He only regrets that he is not a good note taker and cannot write well. Otherwise, he could write a very interesting book about how the University works. The University is in good hands. UMass Amherst has had its problems with the Central Administration, but it has always been a stimulating experience to explain to the Trustees how the faculty and staff think the University should work. Sometimes they listen, sometimes they do not. But, they do listen.
Secretary May

Special Motion of thanks for Professor W. Brian O’Connor:

At the 686th Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate, held on May 14, 2009, we have the privilege of honoring Dr. Brian O’Connor on the occasion of his retirement from the position of Faculty Delegate to the University of Massachusetts Board of Trustees, after 12 years of service (1997-2009). We applaud his leadership in faculty governance, his unremitting pursuit of excellence in every aspect of undergraduate and graduate education, and his exemplary representation of the faculty to the Board of Trustees.

The special motion was adopted by unanimous consent.

4. The Representative of the Massachusetts Society of Professors

Randall Phillis, President of the Massachusetts Society of Professors – I have a point of order with Senator O’Conner and the Trustees. The motions that will be considered today will then move forward from the Faculty Senate. My understanding is that there will be a Committee on Academic and Student Affairs meeting on May 27 in Boston. Then, there will be a vote of the Trustees on the June 10th. Is my understanding of the timeline correct?

Secretary May – That is the schedule of which I am aware. That is the Board’s schedule.

President Phillis – I rise today to raise concerns about college Reorganization motions before the Senate. I want to make it clear that I am not here to block the reorganization plans of the Chancellor, per se. I do not feel that our existing organization is necessarily best, nor do I believe that any other particular organization is by definition best. I do know that every possible organization will have its strengths and weaknesses. My goal is to help us consider the way to make the best possible plan we can at this time.

As a point of information, I want to clarify why the MSP has concerns about this and what our role is. The MSP is the sole entity on campus that can negotiate collective agreements between the faculty and the administration. We work very hard when we do so to make sure that those agreements are crafted carefully and in great detail. This is largely because we are also formally responsible for defending individual faculty when administrative decisions do them harm with respect to their employment or their scholarly work. What we found is that if we get the details of collective agreements right up front, we have less work to do after the fact. In this current environment, the idea of, “Don’t worry, we’ll work out the details later,” has the MSP gravely concerned, because it will undoubtedly raise our workload after the fact and is more likely to contribute to harm done then to processes carefully considered ahead of time.

I want to talk about the idea that process matters because process affects outcomes. The process that we’ve been engaged in to get to this point is rather curious. The Faculty Senate is now asked to vote up or down on a rather profound set of reorganization plans, and many specifics are unclear or even opposed by the faculty units affected. These reorganization plans are being imposed by the Chancellor on a very short calendar, and I think that this artificial timeline has clearly forced the issue to come to a vote before their implications are clear and fully defined. The Chancellor’s rationale that these reorganization events will save money is not supported by the facts nor by the campus administrators who are working out the details about exactly executing the reorganization plans. The Chancellor’s plans are not congruent with the advice of the Faculty Senate Task Force on Reorganization, and some of the proposals are unanimously opposed by affected units. The Faculty Senate must measure its role as the chief advisory unit of faculty governance that stands for the faculty to protect their interest and provide long-term stewardship of the University. The idea that the reorganization plans must be done now just because a senior administrator says so is not reason to act without full understanding of the implications of the reorganization plans.

Let’s talk about why details matter. The Faculty Senate is very good at exploring details. For any of us who have tried to get a simple course proposal through, we all know that this body requires an excruciating level of detail for any plan to be voted properly. I have to submit not only the edition of the textbook I will use but specific page numbers of readings for particular
assignments on my syllabus. This is completely different than the level of detail that we’re looking at now. For example, Resource Economics has a Memorandum of Understanding that they had drafted to this point in their proposed move to the School of Management. What is left off of that Memorandum of Understanding – which does include a promise to do no harm and there are good things up front – it does not include things like teaching load, resource allocation, staff support, advising. Is this really the level of detail that the Faculty Senate seems to think is appropriate to vote up or down on a motion to move something as important as the movement of a particular department to a new college. It seems totally incongruent with the history of the Faculty Senate.

The other thing is the premise to “do no harm.” At this point, I want to think of the proposed movement of Landscape Architecture and Regional Planning from the College of Natural Resources and the Environment to HFA. This department has voted unanimously against that proposed move. These faculty have grants from the National Science Foundation, the Environmental Protection Agency, the Department of Agriculture. They require accreditation for their degree programs that assumes their connections to the sciences. They are already in a College of Sciences (Natural Resources and the Environment). The proposal is to move them out. They work on problems that are at the core of the green technology revolution that we, as a culture, need so profoundly. They ask questions about the nature of the built environment and how that environment affects our lives, our culture and our planet. This is as much a discipline akin to the scientific core of the new proposed College of Natural Sciences as any. It has an interdisciplinary nature that will celebrate the qualities of this new college when it is created. The tradition is less clearly met, by far, by moving that department to the College of Humanities and Fine Arts. The Chancellor objects to alternatives to the movement of LARP to HFA because he might look foolish because the HFA faculty are not clearly bench scientists. That is disconcerting to me, for many of my colleagues in NSM as well as those who will be in the new College of Natural Sciences. Their lab bench is underwater or on an island watching birds or in a park. The definition of bench science needs to be carefully considered, and, if some definition by the Chancellor needs to be met before a college is included, then I think we have to carefully consider many other departments that are about to join the College of Natural Science.

An alternative approach has been suggested for LARP. That includes, within the College of Natural Sciences, the creation of a School of the Built Environment. This would include LARP, the Wood Technology Group, perhaps Architecture—that could move from HFA into the College of Sciences. They have indicated they would be willing to make such a move. This could be a cutting edge interdisciplinary group that could move toward something this culture, this country, this planet needs desperately. It’s the careful scientific consideration of the built environment and how to best do that in this day and age.

What’s the question? The question is: what is the job of the Faculty Senate? Is it to protect the wishes of the Chancellor or to do the right thing for the faculty? Is it your job to preserve and protect the interests of the faculty and their ability to perform their scholarly work to the best of their ability? Is it your job to act as stewards for the University to ensure the integrity of our enterprise and protect against ill-advised proposals from the administration? Is it the job of the Faculty Senate to protect the ability of all faculty in any unit to perform their scholarly work to educate their students in the best possible way and to weigh the value of proposed changes accordingly? If so, then you must vote to modify suggested changes that are before you today that will certainly include suggestions for LARP, perhaps for the School of Nursing and some other considerations. Finally, I want to stress that there are members of other bargaining units here today. When you read the Chancellor’s Reorganization Plans, he is explicit in the idea that he will save administrative costs. Many of us have come to learn that that is code for “cut staff.” Few administrators disappear and uncomfortable numbers of staff individuals are in jeopardy. I am uncomfortable with the idea of saving administrative costs, and, from the point of view of the MSP, where we want to think about our working lives and our ability to get our work done, we are concerned that consolidation and the loss of staff members on campus could well jeopardize faculty’s ability to get their work done well. How many extra staff do you have in your departments, and how will the consolidation events that occur affect your working lives?
B. QUESTION PERIOD (10-Minute Limit)

Senator Steven Brewer, Biology – On April 27, the Senate Office called for nominations for the Delegate to the Board of Trustees. On April 28, after discussing the issue with several people including my chairman, Brian O’Connor, who encouraged me, I sent an email to the Faculty Senate Office announcing my willingness to be a candidate. When the agenda for this week’s meeting was announced in May, I found my name had not been forwarded as a candidate. I wanted to direct a question to the Secretary of the Faculty Senate as to why a nomination that was submitted was not put forward since it is clear that any Senator can be a candidate for the Delegate to the Board of Trustees.

Secretary May – Senator Brewer is correct. Nominations are accepted from the floor. The Rules Committee formed a small nominating committee and considered the suggestions which had come in and put forward this name. We greatly appreciate the work you have done in respect to your service, but you were not the selection of that Committee. Your name can be nominated from the floor. We would be happy to do so. I will do it myself.

Senator Brewer – Were there any other candidates who were stricken from the list?

Secretary May – Not to my knowledge.

Senator W. Curt Conner, Chemical Engineering – I’ve listened to the arguments here being presented with respect to the affiliation of specific departments and how that might influence their funding at NSF or the Department of Energy or NIH. That is so patently false; it’s unbelievable. You don’t even put down the college that you’re associated with in any application for any of those agencies. The association between a college has nothing to do with the success of a grant at all. Saying that you need to be associated with a specific college and therefore you can be funded better or you’re at a better position to be funded for any of those agencies is not correct. So I don’t want us to use that. Now, the argument, of course, is let’s put things put off until we get all of the i’s dotted and the t’s crossed. It’s prolonging us moving forward as a university to excellence, which we want to do. We can put it off and if we had to wait until the Faculty Senate dotted all the i’s, crossed all the t’s and filled out all the things, it would be 3 or 4 years before that could happen. I think we need to move now, and not forget that the Academic Priorities Council and others have looked at this and actually have recommended that the proposals that are there are not that onerous and actually could be very functional and could improve significantly the atmosphere here. The Academic Priorities Council spent many hours on this this spring and it should not be viewed just as a single individual trying to sell his or her wishes to the rest of the community. That, again, is an improper characterization at what’s being done.

Senator Marta Calas, Isenberg School of Management – I want to follow on Randy’s comment because I think this is something that has been bothering me for awhile and, given the fact that we are perhaps the school that had the most recent experience with mergers and reorganization, there are certain things that should also be acknowledged, specifically in our own expertise in the context of organizational studies. The question of merging is a matter of being compatible with the people who come to us. In our case, it was Sport Management, previously Sport Studies, and Hospitality and Tourism Management, previously HRTA. It was almost as if the idea of compatibility of human beings has precedence or, in some ways, influences the way in which the merger eventually happened. From experience, I can say that the merger that happened in the School of Management, from a human point of view, was a good merger and we, more or less, like each other. In some cases, we like each other better than we used to like each other before the merger. On the other side, many have been sold on the matter of synergies and we have worked so well with each other in the merger, precisely because we have very little synergy. We are very much the same department we were before the merger. We have reproduced many of our programs. Before we merged, there were many courses being taken by the students in what was HRTA in our courses and the people in Sport Studies and in what was called Fashion Marketing. At this point, we probably have more sections of the courses and we have reproduced the separation of the courses as specialties that we may not have had in the past. This is true specifically in the case of the Ph.D. programs. All together, we have many more courses and less students in many of our prior courses because they are now dispersed.
We had to spend money to bring the people into the building because they would have otherwise gone somewhere else. We haven’t had enough money to create another wing to bring the Hospitality and Tourism Management people into the School of Management, so they are still on the other side of campus.

President Phillis – I would just like to make clear that I did not speak in opposition to all possible moves, and I do understand that many of these moves are widely favored by many of the faculty. I actually worry about the process, and I think that the process is bad, but I think there are many moves that are OK. There are, however, particular moves that are unsettling for the reasons I outlined. There are many members of LARP who are here today whom I think will speak about the impact of the proposed moves on their professional lives, and I think, instead of thinking about what the details from the NSF or whatever kinds of things may be proposed by Senator Conner, that the faculty will speak directly to that.

C. ELECTIONS (10 Minutes)

1. PRESIDING OFFICER OF THE FACULTY SENATE
   Nominee: Robert Wilson, Hospitality and Tourism Management
   There were no further nominations from the floor.
   Presiding Officer Wilson was re-elected by acclamation.

2. DELEGATE TO THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES
   Nominee: William Richards Adrion, Computer Science
   A ballot election was held resulting in the election of William Richards Adrion as the Delegate to the Board of Trustees by a vote of 21 to 10.

D. BYLAW CHANGES

   Special Report of the Rules Committee concerning Bylaw Changes, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 09-034 with Motion No. 36-09.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Bylaw Changes, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 09-034.

The motion was seconded and adopted.

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Special Report from Robert C. Holub, Chancellor of the University of Massachusetts Amherst, concerning A Proposed Campus Reorganization Plan, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 09-050 with Motion Nos. 55-09 through 61-09.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the establishment of the College of Natural Sciences, including the departments of Food Science; Microbiology; Natural Resources Conservation; Plant, Soil, and Insect Sciences; Stockbridge School of Agriculture; Veterinary and Animal Sciences; Astronomy; Biochemistry and Molecular Biology; Biology; Chemistry; Computer Science; Geosciences; Mathematics and Statistics; Physics; Polymer Science and Engineering; and the program in Environmental Sciences, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 09-050.

The motion was seconded.

Senator Richard Bogartz – In accordance with the recommendations of the Reorganization Task Force and also in accordance with the recommendations of the Academic Priorities Council, except for a difference in the number of divisions suggested, I move to amend the motion to read “that the Faculty Senate approve the establishment of the College of Arts and Sciences which would begin with
the existing divisions HFA, SBS, NRE and NSM being put under one college administrative structure which would include a dean of the college and four divisional associate deans.”

*Presiding Office Wilson* – Dick, even though you discussed this with me ahead of time, I have to rule that motion to amend out of order as it is an entirely new motion.

*Senator Bogartz* – I appeal the decision.

*Presiding Office Wilson* – You are free to do that and the way an appeal works is that it needs a second, first of all, and the second has now been made. It requires a majority vote to uphold the decision of the chair or to not uphold the decision of the chair. A majority or more will uphold my decision. If it doesn’t receive a majority, then it would be allowed as an amendment.

*Senator Bogartz* – Shouldn’t we have an opportunity to consider this? We are the Faculty Senate.

*John Cunningham, Deputy Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education* – I think I need to point out that if the only common words are “that the Faculty Senate approve,” then the Faculty Senate has probably made only one motion in the past few years.

*Presiding Officer Wilson* – Vote on the motion that appeals my decision. If you are voting in favor, you are voting in favor of my decision. If you are voting against, you are voting against my decision.

There was a standing vote which sustained Presiding Officer Wilson’s decision – 18 in favor, 12 opposed.

*Senator Judith Goodenough, Biology* – Are we voting on the amended motion?

*Presiding Office Wilson* – No, the amendment was not allowed. I overruled the amendment saying it was not proper, and it was sustained. At this point, there is discussion on the motion to establish the College of Natural Sciences, including all of the departments that are listed. If there is no discussion, we will vote on that motion that is on the agenda.

*Senator Bogartz* – In a 20-page document which most of us have in our possession, the Reorganization Task Force made the case for a College of Arts and Sciences. In about three paragraphs, the Chancellor dismissed all of that with a few superficial arguments concerning possible conflict between a dean of a College of Arts and Sciences and a provost in administering such a body and so on. He did that in less than half a page. I think the case that was made by the blue ribbon Task Force is far better than the case the Chancellor has made for this semblance of a reorganization and I think we ought to defeat this motion and come back to a College of Arts and Sciences consideration as soon as we can.

*Deputy Provost Cunningham* – I would just like to point out that establishing a College of Natural Sciences does not rule out a future College of Arts and Sciences, if that’s what the faculty wishes to explore. So, whether you have NRE and NSM or a College of Natural Sciences, in the future, you can still get to a College of Arts and Sciences if that’s the direction that it leads us. So, this is in no way ruling out a College of Arts and Sciences by establishing a College of Natural Sciences.

*Secretary May* – I would try to repeat the opinion that one of the Provost candidates who is the current dean of the College of Arts and Sciences at the University of New York at Stony Brook gave on that subject. His opinion was that once you admit some of the life sciences that were formerly in NRE into a College of Sciences, you do not have a College of Arts and Sciences any more. This is an applied area which does not really fit well into a College of Arts and Sciences, so that, in fact, this reinforced what I have heard through the grapevine – that the option of a College of Arts and Sciences is considerably diminished by this motion.

The motion was adopted by a 15 to 14 standing vote.
MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the transfer of the Department of Psychology from the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences to the College of Natural Sciences, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 09-050.

The motion was seconded.

Secretary May – I would like to present a substitute motion that reads as follows:

56-09A That the Faculty Senate approve the transfer of the Department of Psychology from the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences to the College of Natural Sciences, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 09-050, conditional upon the receipt by the Rules Committee of an appropriate Memorandum of Understanding by June 9, 2009.

The substitute motion was seconded.

Presiding Officer Wilson – A motion to substitute is treated really in the same fashion that an amendment to a motion is made. It requires a second. If there is a second, we will then discuss that and vote on that. If it passes, it will substitute for the original motion. If it doesn’t pass, then the original motion will still be on the floor. The motion to substitute has been made and seconded.

Senator Brian Ogilvie, History – Ernie, who would determine what an appropriate Memo of Understanding is?

Secretary May – We do not have a Faculty Senate document which specifies a procedure for transferring a department from one place to another, but we have a past practice. That was back in the ’90s when Provost Glen Gordon presented a reorganization plan such as we are dealing with today. Among the prime features of that plan was the transfer of Sport Management and HRTA from what is now NRE into the Isenberg School of Management. A main feature of that plan was Memoranda of Understanding which addressed six areas such as personnel, staff, budgetary support, etc. This seemed like a good practice, so I declared this a past practice, and I made requests to the departments and the receiving units to try to create a Memorandum of Understanding in each case. It seemed like a very good practice to establish some basic understanding of what the details were before the unit was simply placed at the mercy, as it were, of a new dean. As Professor Phillis has pointed out, there is more or less precision in some of these memoranda, and greater precision is desirable, but something is better than nothing, and that’s why I’ve requested for each of the transfers taking place that as many of the details as possible be spelled out. I don’t believe that either the administrators or the departments that are moving are objecting to this. In fact, it offers some protection for the department and it requires the dean to have some thoughtfulness. The problem here is that this is a very complicated process and time is short. I was hoping to have all of these memoranda here by this meeting, but, in some cases, that was possible and in other cases, it was not. In fairness, concerning the College of Sciences, the College of Sciences hasn’t even been created yet. It isn’t really created until the Trustees’ vote. We are asking something that is literally impossible, but we are trying to do something that would create the same effect. The reason is that when the Trustees vote occurs, there will be a moment when they turn to me or to Rick Adrion or to Brian, whoever is there as the representative of the faculty, and ask if this has been vetted by the faculty and the answer will be what it is.

Senator Ogilvie – My question really hinges on the word “appropriate.” Will it be the Rules Committee who determines whether that Memorandum of Understanding is appropriate?

Secretary May – That’s correct. The Rules Committee, by our bylaws, acts for the Faculty Senate during the summer.

President Phillis – I just want to suggest that this is exactly the crux of my comments earlier. There is no memorandum of understanding whatsoever about the movement of Psychology to the new College of Natural Sciences. There may well be, it may be great, for all we know, but I want to emphasize “for all we know.” I don’t want to stand in the way of the actual moves per se. I think some of them could lead to quality outcomes. I am against the process that fails to follow through on the details. It is flawed. It is unfortunate and I think the Faculty Senate, as we face further moves down the road next year (the Chancellor has clearly telegraphed the fact that further reorganization
is in the cards) should have a more rigorous and robust process for considering the quality of those proposals then there is today because now you can move a department without any details at all.

**Senator Marios Philippides, Classics** – I’m concerned about a time and I’m concerned about the Rules Committee. I know that the Rules Committee has always done very good work, but we’re talking about a major decision here that will be left to a few people representing all of us. I’m wondering, in terms of procedure, can we table this motion if we want to and come to it next September?

A motion to table the motion was made and seconded.

**Senator Bogartz** – I oppose the motion to table on the grounds that a few days ago, the Psychology Department voted unanimously in favor of this transfer and so, if you are considering protecting the Psychology Department against something that it may not want, it wants it.

**Senator M. Christine King, Nursing** – So just to get procedure right, am I speaking on the tabling of the motion right now? I would then support tabling the motion right now. My concern as a faculty member on campus is what role do faculty have in the creation of these Memoranda of Understanding? That’s not clear to me. It’s clear that the Psychology Department, by its Memo, voted to support the move into the College of Natural Sciences, but who gets to create this Memorandum of Understanding? Is it only an administrative function or do faculty have a role? I feel like, as a faculty member, I’m asked to vote on something that I’m not clear what the process for governance is in creating that Memorandum which may have an impact on other faculties and departments later down the road.

**Chair McCarthy** – If the Psychology Department and the Dean of the College of Natural Sciences could get this Memorandum of Understanding to the Rules Committee a few days in advance of June 9, there is no reason by we couldn’t email it to all the Senators and then it could be vetted. People could send us feedback. If it seemed like there were real problems, we could object, talk to the chair of Psychology, talk to the Dean, and so on.

**Presiding Officer Wilson** – That could be a motion to amend the motion to table to a definite period. A point of information is that I was checking my *Robert’s Rules of Order*. A motion to table requires a two-thirds vote to pass it. If you choose to, you can make a motion to amend this.

**Chair McCarthy** – Point of order, I can amend a motion to table?

**Presiding Officer Wilson** – I don’t think so. The time is amendable, but other than not, no.

**Senator Bogartz** – Can you table the motion before you decided whether it’s amended or not? - because, after all, Ernie has offered an amendment to the original motion. That amendment has not been voted on yet and I might point out that if we defeated that amendment, all of this mess would go away.

**Presiding Officer Wilson** – Right now, we have a substitute motion and the motion to table, in my understanding, is a motion to table the substitute motion – to postpone to a definite period of time because we cannot, in fact, accept a motion to table to a definite period of time something that is not before us right now. What is before us is the motion to substitute. If the motion to substitute is defeated, then the original motion will be on the floor.

**Chair McCarthy** – I would urge defeat of the motion to table to allow the presentation of an amendment to the substitute motion. The amendment will ask for the Memorandum of Understanding to be received by the Rules Committee and distributed to all Senators by June 5, 2009.

**Presiding Officer Wilson** – Right now, there are three items before us. There is the original motion, there is the motion to substitute that calls for “conditional upon the receipt by the Rules Committee of an appropriate Memorandum of Understanding by June 9, 2009” and there is also a motion to table to a specific time, December 15, and that relates to the motion to substitute.
A vote was taken on the motion to substitute “to table to a specific time period, December 15,” and this motion to table failed.

There are now two items before us – one is the original motion and the other is the substitute motion. What we are discussing now is the substitute motion.

Chair McCarthy – I move to amend the substitute motion by inserting the words after “upon the receipt by the Rules Committee” – “and email distribution to the Senate” and to change the date from June 9th to June 5th.

Presiding Officer Wilson - This amendment was seconded. Is there any discussion on that amendment? What we are discussing now is the amendment to the substitute. We will then go to a vote on the amendment to the motion to substitute. We’re not voting on the substitution right now. We’re voting on the additional words that were added to that. So we’re voting on whether or not we should add to the substitute motion as it exists “that the Faculty Senate approve the transfer of the Department of Psychology from the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences to the College of Natural Sciences, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 090-050, conditional upon the receipt by the Rules Committee and email distribution to the Senate of an appropriate Memorandum of Understanding by June 5, 2009.”

The motion to amend the substitute motion carried by a vote of 20 to 0.

We now have before us the substitute motion.

Senator Bogartz – In the cascade of motions and amendments, if someone mentioned it, I’ve lost who it is that’s supposed to reach the understanding, presumably somebody from the Psychology Department and who?

Secretary May – The department chair negotiates with the central administration which will provide appropriate representation of the administration, either from the Provost’s Office level or designated administrators of their choosing. I hate to say in public what seems to be agreed upon, but it is not announced, so I won’t.

President Phillis – So can I just point out that this is a fatal flaw in the process, that, if you have administrators dealing with administrators to argue about the fate of the faculty without including the faculty, there is a fatal error in that process and that must be fixed.

Presiding Officer Wilson – Just a point of information, when our departments merged with the School of Management, the faculty had significant participation in those agreements and understandings.

Deputy Provost Cunningham – I would just like to take a second to speak against the substitute (motion) because I’m in favor of the original without the memorandum issue. There are two things about this. First of all, we formed a College of Natural Sciences with lots of departments without any memoranda about what they are doing and what’s involved, and now we’re going to ask Psychology to have a specific memorandum to join them. That’s a little unusual, I think. Secondly, my friend Randall has pointed out that the models we have don’t talk about a teaching load, an advising load and I would urge you to ask yourselves if your own college has written memoranda that you have any access to talk about your teaching loads, your advising numbers and those issues. I don’t think they exist on campus and to make a department create those to get into a college, I think is a little unusual and out of place.

Senator Calas – I just wanted to point out that when the HRTA transfer occurred into the School of Management and the Memorandum of Understanding was created, the department already existed and so did the School of Management. Transferring Psychology into a nonexistent college defeats the purpose. The question is not that Psychology wants to be moved or not, the question is that Psychology wants to be moved to something that does not exist. Why not let the college start and then move Psychology?

Senator Bogartz – An interesting point, but, what the motion says is that the Faculty Senate approve the transfer. It doesn’t say that the Faculty Senate transfer the Psychology Department. We’re just
approving of that transfer. When the necessary entity exists for Psychology to be transferred, we approve it.

Presiding Officer Wilson – We will go to a vote on the motion to substitute that reads “That the Faculty Senate approve the transfer of the Department of Psychology from the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences to the College of Natural Sciences, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 09-050, conditional upon the receipt by the Rules Committee and email distribution to the Senate of an appropriate Memorandum of Understanding by June 5, 2009.”

This is just voting on the substitute motion. If you vote in favor of this, it will take the place of the original motion and we will vote on that. If you defeat this substitute motion, we will still have the original motion to deliberate.

The substitute motion as amended passes by a vote of 14 to 11. This now takes the place of the original motion. There is only one motion before us and that is the substitute motion as amended which is now open to further discussion. We will now go to a vote on the substituted motion as amended which reads and is identical to what you just voted on – “That the Faculty Senate approve the transfer of the Department of Psychology from the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences to the College of Natural Sciences, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 09-050, conditional upon the receipt by the Rules Committee and email distribution to the Senate of an appropriate Memorandum of Understanding by June 5, 2009.”

56-09B That the Faculty Senate approve the transfer of the Department of Psychology from the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences to the College of Natural Sciences, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 09-050, conditional upon the receipt by the Rules Committee and email distribution to the Senate of an appropriate Memorandum of Understanding by June 5, 2009.

The substitute motion as amended passed by a standing vote of 22 to 7.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the transfer of the Department of Resource Economics from the College of Natural Resources and the Environment to the Isenberg School of Management, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 09-050.

57-09 This motion was seconded.

Senator Conner – Does the department that is being moved also favor this move?

Carol Barr, Associate Dean, Isenberg School of Management – I was a member of the Task Force that worked on the Memorandum of Understanding between Resource Economics and the ISOM. That Memorandum of Understanding was distributed to all faculty in Resource Economics and they approved the Memorandum of Understanding. There was agreement on both sides and we’re excited.

Daniel Lass, Acting Chair, Resource Economics – We did indeed present the Memorandum of Understanding to the Department. The Department voted unanimously, 12 for and 0 against, in favor of the Memorandum of Understanding.

Senator Calas – I would just like to say that different from when Sport Management and HRTA came to us in which the faculty was very involved in all the discussions, the faculty has not been at all involved in the question of Resource Economics. This has been a purely administrative activity. In principle, I think this could be a good idea, but in terms of process, the process was not fully done as it was in the case of the prior merger.

The motion was adopted by a standing vote of 23 to 2.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the transfer of the Department of Landscape Architecture and Regional Planning from the College of Natural Resources and the Environment to the College of Humanities and Fine Arts, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 09-050.
This motion was seconded.

**Senator Brewer** – I would like to offer a substitute motion. “That the Faculty Senate approve the inclusion of the Department of Landscape Architecture and Regional Planning (currently in the College of Natural Resources and the Environment) in the College of Natural Sciences for a period of one year to allow the Department to assess the new administrative structures of the Colleges that will result from reorganization, to conduct planning meetings with allied departments, and to present a proposal for the permanent location of the Department that will best support its research and educational missions.”

The motion was seconded.

**Deputy Provost Cunningham** – On behalf of the Chancellor, I have a substitute to the substitute.

**Senator Brewer** – Don’t we have to vote for the first substitute first?

**Presiding Officer Wilson** – No, this is similar to an amendment to it so a substitute is treated as an amendment. John can make this. If there is a second, we will vote on that. If it passes, it will substitute for your substitute and then we’ll work our way up.

**President Phillis** – Point of order. I believe that this is a fundamentally different question. We’re talking about the target receiving college for this department and the crux of the difference is fundamental to the nature of the substitute motion that Professor Brewer suggested. I don’t see quite how it’s a friendly amendment.

**Presiding Officer Wilson** – It’s not a friendly amendment and, in fact, a substitute motion can be completely adverse to the motion.

**Deputy Provost Cunningham** – “That the Faculty Senate approve the transfer of the Department of Landscape Architecture and Regional Planning from the College of Natural Resources and the Environment to the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 09-050.”

**Senator Enoch Page, Anthropology** – Are the Social and Behavioral Sciences supposed to be moved to HFA?

**Deputy Provost Cunningham** – No, there is no motion to do that in this set of motions.

**Senator Philippides** – I would like to ask the Department of Landscape Architecture and Regional Planning which substitute motion they like.

**Presiding Officer Wilson** – I’d like to rule that out of order at this time because we are not at a point where we can have that discussion.

**Senator Philippides** – Let me re-phrase. Do they like this motion?

**Presiding Officer Wilson** – I would welcome your questions, but I think at this point we need either a second on John’s motion or no second and, at that point, we will open that up to discussion and your question will be the first one that we will address.

**Elizabeth Brabec, Department Head, Landscape Architecture and Regional Planning** – Our substitute motion is the first one that requests a year of study, not the second one. At this point in considering a move to the Social and Behavioral Sciences, we are not at this point ready to consider whether that is an appropriate move or not for our department. The reason for that is that I was not informed of this directly from the Chancellor. I actually heard about it through Ernie (May) as the substitute motion was being submitted. I have not had time to confer with my faculty on whether this is an appropriate direction for us to go. That said, we have considered over the past several months a variety of different options for us and the best option for us at this point is to remain with our current cohort of Natural Resources and the Environment’s departments that are moving to the College of Sciences.
I would like to go into our entire rationale that supports our motion at this point. We are requesting our motion for a year of study under circumstances that we really would rather not be under today. We voted unanimously against the move to Humanities and Fine Arts and I’d like to tell you why. This is not about resistance to reorganization. It’s not about resistance to change. It’s not about winning a fight, so please just remove that from your thinking. This is about finding the right change for the department, the right location for it to be successful in its mission of sustainable development practice. We’ve had many meetings as a faculty to discuss the best location of LARP as the different possibilities and opportunities evolved. As you know, starting in November, we started talking about a College of Life Sciences and the Environment which we were in strongly in favor of. There was discussion of a College of Arts and Sciences which we were also in favor of and then finally in March, we ended up with a College of Sciences.

So we’ve gone through multiple iterations about what would make a good home for our department. We’ve communicated our present position throughout this process and our present position is that we are a science-based program. The disciplines of Landscape Architecture and Planning are at the center of green technology and sustainable development. There are really five points to consider in this. Our core strength is that we are science based. We have historically been in a science program in the College of Natural Resources and the Environment and previous to that in the iterations of agriculture and all of those colleges since 1903 when the program was developed. We have been a science-based program, a science-based department since then. Our branding and our competitive strength are in the science of sustainable development and ecology. It’s what distinguishes us nationally. Graduate students, faculty recruitment, all of that is based on our brand and would suffer from a move away from a science college. Our research funding stream depends on this science basis. We are now or have had projects funded by the National Science Foundation, the EPA, Department of Agriculture, among others. With all due respect to the former speaker who said it doesn’t matter what college you’re in, I have sat on review panels for NSF where we have minutely looked at the pedigree of each of the proposals and the individuals who are the PI on the proposals and considered what college they were in. So, that has been my experience. We teach and manage Landscape Contracting which is one of the most popular programs in the Stockbridge School of Agriculture. Under the present reorganization proposal, Landscape Contracting would be the only Stockbridge program that would be in a different college and would therefore be challenged by many cross-college logistics.

For reasons that are really unclear to us, we’ve been slated to be moved to the College of Humanities and Fine Arts or SBS. It’s been decided without input and certainly not our agreement. Some programs nationally are located in association with Arts Colleges, that is true. Now there are two very different types of Landscape Architecture and Planning programs. Some are in the arts, some are branded in the arts and some are in the sciences. We, like the University of Michigan, like the University of Wisconsin at Madison and others, are in the science area. That is who we are. Even before the reorganization was considered, we had begun the process of planning a new entity around sustainable development. The closest we’ve come to an identity or a name for that entity is the School of the Built Environment. It would be interdisciplinary with a core of programs and departments including ours, possibly Building Materials and Wood Technology, possibly Architecture and other aligned programs such as Urban Forestry, the Stockbridge Programs of Landscape Contracting and Arboriculture and others who may feel interested in joining us. It’s interesting to note that out of those six entities, five are already in the College of Sciences, if we were to stay with our current cohort.

This idea of a School of a Built Environment is a core that is desperately needed at UMass. It would put us on the map, in a leadership position nationally and in the work on managing the impacts of climate change and sustainable development. We do not have this at UMass right now. We are trying to build it for the University. We’re not asking to move to a college that we have no historic relationship with. We’ve been, as I’ve said, in the College of Natural Resources and the Environment from its inception and before that in science and ag-based colleges since 1903. We’re only asking to stay with our cohort of departments in the new College of Natural Sciences. What would it mean if we were to be moved to HFA? It would remove us from close association with peer applied scientists in Natural Resources Conservation for one and collaboration with others who support our brand. Location in HFA would push us towards a rebranding, would spend a lot of time refocusing who we are in the direction of an arts-related program. That would take many years and many replacement hires to sort out that difficulty for us, that lack of a focus of who we are, and it would sever a direct
relationship with the Stockbridge School, Extension who we work very, very closely with and international partners as well.

I was not granted a meeting with the Chancellor to discuss this move directly, face to face, until Tuesday of this week, even though I consistently expressed our strong reasons and our motivations for wanting to remain with our science cohort. So, we are in the position today of asking for two things: one, a year to consider the current organizational structure of college reorganization. We have been told by the Chancellor that it is not possible for us to move into the College of Sciences, but we feel that that is our home. That is where we should be. We want to enter into meetings with other interested departments and programs who would form the new School of the Built Environment and consider where we should be located, where the structure is, whether it’s in the College of Sciences or whether we could locate in another area. This is in line with other study periods that have been identified in the reorganization – study periods of one year. During that year, the least impact of the department would be to remain with our current cohort of departments under our current dean in the new College of Natural Sciences. The move, if you can really call it that considering there would be no real move, would be seamless. There’s no change in budgetary structure. There’s no change in the business office. We would have the same people managing our money and there’s no real change in leadership since the dean is our dean today. We also have no tenure cases coming forward so that doesn’t become a confounding problem. We are asking at this point to allow us to plan and effectively create the right home for our department.

**Elisabeth Hamin, Landscape Architecture and Regional Planning** – We are a highly interdisciplinary field and we have connections that range across the arts, but we lean heavily on the sciences in how we go about it. I’d also like to say that I’m a Co-PI on a $2.7 million grant that is under review right now at the National Science Foundation with Don DeGroot in Civil and Environmental Engineering and my main task this summer is writing more of these sorts of grants. Now we all know that the most important thing in getting grants is doing good work. But we also know that they are always looking for reasons to be able to put aside grants and I don’t want to give any easy reasons to put us aside. We have very good friends in the arts and architecture; Steve Schreiber has been a really ongoing important supporter and some of our colleagues do very art-related work like Annaliise Bischoff. We are a very diverse department, but because of our history and who we are and where we get most of our money, the College of Sciences is, at least for this year, the best place for us to be.

**Jack Ahern, Landscape Architecture and Regional Planning** – Just a few brief comments on my personal portfolio of work. I’ve been here for over 20 years and my CV is characterized by collaborations with people in other departments in the College. I have built my whole career around this type of interdisciplinary work, not at the intentional exclusion of other folks on campus, but somehow being in the same College facilitates, encourages, promotes and rewards this type of collaboration. It’s been manifest in regular requests for guest lecturers; also in co-membership on master’s and Ph.D. committees. I have had several grants in collaboration with faculty from Plant and Soil Sciences and from Natural Resource Conservation resulting in publications, journal articles, and books. I’m a collaborator on a NSF proposal that is going forward this summer that’s led by a colleague from Natural Resources Conservation. So, from my perspective, my career has been characterized by this. I feel the organizational structure supports, recognizes and rewards that and I would like to see that continue.

**Ellen-J. Pader, Landscape Architecture and Regional Planning** – I think I’m in a particularly good vantage point to figure out where my department lies because of my own background. I come from the humanities. I have a BA in English and Art History. I had a year as a senior fellow at Stanford Humanities Center and Law School. I have a Ph.D. in Anthropology and Archeology from Cambridge University, so I’m steeped in the social sciences. Now I’m just finishing my 20th year in Landscape Architecture and Regional Planning. My research spans social theory from the humanities and social science perspectives, urban planning, anthropology, architecture, law, nutrition, mental health and currently I’m working Co-PI on a project with people from Plant and Soil Sciences, Nutrition and Extension. This direction, I’m sure, would not have taken place if I weren’t in this college and through committees, being on the curriculum committee, having met people and talked. What I want to mention is why I think we particularly fit in the science program. When I got here, I think the hardest thing for me to understand was that the students felt very different. I always came from an arena in which it was knowledge for knowledge, that we found fine social theories and better ways of theorizing and thinking and didn’t think as much about the outcomes of the applications – how it really related in the real world. What I’ve learned is that my
students here really have that professional attitude. They want to know “so what.” To teach them the importance of theory is my challenge as someone from humanities and social sciences, but they need to know the “so what’s.” The whole difference is to really understand the application and I think that if we’re not in a school in which that is really respected and understood, I think it’s to the detriment to us and to the students.

Steve Schreiber, Director of the Architecture and Design Program – We were thrilled when the Chancellor’s initial plan to relocate Landscape Architecture and Regional Planning to our same college was first put forth. The original proposal actually had Landscape Architecture and Regional Planning headed towards a combined College of Humanities and Fine Arts and Social and Behavioral Sciences, known as CHASS. As much as I would like to see a future with Landscape Architecture and Regional Planning being in the same college as Architecture and Design which is a program in the Art Department, I think that the most compelling argument for the substitute motion for the College of Sciences is that it buys a year and, during that year, this SBS/HFA merger will be discussed and I think that Landscape Architecture and Regional Planning should be afforded this same year. To the Architecture and Design faculty who are the most likely colleagues in the Humanities and Fine Arts, we think that it makes all the sense in the world that they stay with their cohorts, stay with their dean, stay with their business office and basically use this year to figure out really what the best future for them and for the design professions is.

President Phillis – I noticed that the current dean of the perhaps soon-to-be defunct College of Natural Resources and the Environment is here with us and I would like to hear his comments about the discussion at hand.

Deputy Provost John Cunningham – I just want to clarify the substitute to the substitute aiming at the College of Social and Behavior Sciences. This was characterized to me by the Chancellor as something that had been discussed and had been checked with Associate Dean Bob Feldman who is becoming the Dean of Social and Behavioral Sciences and so I feel bad if it wasn’t really clear that this motion was going to exist and include the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences, but I just wanted to convey that the Chancellor thinks it was something that was discussed and, if there was a misunderstanding, I want to apologize for that part of it.

Steve Goodwin, Dean, College of Natural Resources and the Environment – I definitely would like to at least to speak to that part of it, the Chancellor’s substitute motion and Randy said the perhaps soon-to-be defunct, but, if I’m correct, didn’t you just vote for it to be defunct before I got here? This is a very difficult situation and you can hear from the different conversations around the nature of the department that it’s a very broad department. It’s been very successful in what it’s done. It’s done very well in the College of Natural Resources and the Environment. Perhaps the reason why Elizabeth’s meeting with the Chancellor only occurred on Tuesday was, in part, my fault because I didn’t really push for that meeting until I felt that all the other conversations that could be had had been exhausted, so I don’t think the Chancellor was so much trying to avoid having the conversation with Elizabeth. I thought it was a very good and productive conversation. I would also say that I think the Chancellor’s substitute motion is certainly made in good faith. Part of the conversation we had and I was part of saying that SBS also might be a good fit. Quite frankly, when you look at the department, it has elements of it that fit well with Humanities and Fine Arts and it has elements that fit well with Social and Behavioral Sciences. We’ve proven over the last several years that it has elements that fit quite well with the other science colleges that have been part of Natural Resources and the Environment. I do want to make sure that it’s clear that I think the Chancellor is making his motion in good faith. I think the department’s worked hard to get its case out there and I think it is indeed in a difficult situation as with the continued uncertainty of what the final set of configurations the schools and colleges might be.

Senator Howard Peelle, School of Education – Just a simple, basic, informational question and perhaps Steve or the department chair can say how many faculty and how many students are we talking about in LARP?

Professor Brabec – We’re talking about 16 faculty at this point, two open positions that have been frozen along with everyone else’s and approximately 250 students. Those are spread across the Stockbridge program, two undergraduate programs, Environmental Science and Landscape Architecture, two master’s programs and a Ph.D. program.
Presiding Officer Wilson – What we have before us are really three choices and we will work from the last one up. We will work from the 58-09B which is an amendment to the first motion to substitute: “That the Faculty Senate approve the transfer of the Department of Landscape Architecture and Regional Planning from the College of Natural Resources and the Environment to the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 09-050.” Before we vote, if you pass this, this will substitute the prior substitution and then we’ll go vote for that to substitute for the original motion. If you defeat that, we will then vote on the original motion to substitute.

The motion to substitute the substitute motion, 58-09B, failed.

Now let’s consider the motion to substitute: “That the Faculty Senate approve the inclusion of the Department of Landscape Architecture and Regional Planning (currently in the College of Natural Resources and the Environment) in the College of Natural Sciences for a period of one year to allow the Department to assess the new administrative structures of the Colleges that will result from reorganization, to conduct planning meetings with allied departments, and to present a proposal for the permanent location of the Department that will best support its research and educational missions.”

If you vote in favor of this and it passes, it will replace the original motion and then we will vote again on that. If you vote against it, then we will just flip back to the original motion.

58-09A That the Faculty Senate approve the inclusion of the Department of Landscape Architecture and Regional Planning (currently in the College of Natural Resources and the Environment) in the College of Natural Sciences for a period of one year to allow the Department to assess the new administrative structures of the Colleges that will result from reorganization, to conduct planning meetings with allied departments, and to present a proposal for the permanent location of the Department that will best support its research and educational missions.

The motion to substitute, 58-09A, carried with a vote of 25 to 1.

The motion that you have just voted on has taken the place of the original motion so we will now vote on it. It reads: “That the Faculty Senate approve the inclusion of the Department of Landscape Architecture and Regional Planning (currently in the College of Natural Resources and the Environment) in the College of Natural Sciences for a period of one year to allow the Department to assess the new administrative structures of the Colleges that will result from reorganization, to conduct planning meetings with allied departments, and to present a proposal for the permanent location of the Department that will best support its research and educational missions.”

The motion carried by a vote of 26 to 1.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the closing of the College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics and the College of Natural Resources and the Environment, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 09-050.

This motion was seconded and adopted.

Senator W. Brian O’Connor, Biology – I know the hour is late so I won’t say much, but I just have to say something. I look around here and see a lot of people in NRE, a lot of people in NSM. It’s like moving out of your old house into a new one. I know I spent almost 38 years in NSM, as well as a lot of other people. Just for the record, it was a hell of a good time, it was a great school, both NRE and NSM, but I think it’s going to be even greater when we move into a new mansion.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the School of Public Health and Health Sciences be renamed the College of Public Health and Health Sciences, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 09-050.

The motion was withdrawn by John Cunningham on behalf of Chancellor Holub.
1. MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve that the School of Nursing become an administrative unit within the College of Public Health and Health Sciences, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 09-050.

The motion was withdrawn by John Cunningham on behalf of Chancellor Holub.

2. Special Report of the Academic Matters and Research Councils concerning Undergraduate Program Revisions in Latin and American Studies and Program Name Change from Latin American Studies to Latin American, Caribbean, and Latino Studies, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 09-052 with Motion No. 63-09.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Undergraduate Program Revisions in Latin American Studies and the Program Name Change from Latin American Studies to Latin American, Caribbean, and Latino Studies, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 09-052.

The motion was seconded and adopted.

3. Special Report of the Academic Matters and Program and Budget Councils concerning Changes to the Degree Credit Requirements for the Bachelor of Science in Kinesiology, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 09-053 with Motion No. 64-09.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Changes to the Degree Credit Requirements for the Bachelor of Science in Kinesiology, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 09-053.

The motion was seconded and adopted.

4. Special Report of the Academic Matters, Academic Priorities and Graduate Councils concerning a Name Change from the Department of Art to the Department of Art, Architecture, and Art History, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 09-054 with Motion No. 65-09.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Name Change from the Department of Art to the Department of Art, Architecture, and Art History, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 09-054.

The motion was seconded and adopted.

5. Special Report of the Graduate Council concerning Refining the Master of Science Degree Requirements in Kinesiology, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 09-055 with Motion No. 66-09.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve Refining the Master of Science Degree Requirements in Kinesiology, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 09-055.

The motion was seconded and adopted.


MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the General Education Designations for HONORS 292R, SRVCLRNG 293 and RES-ECON 162, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 09-056.

The motion was seconded and adopted.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Withdrawal of the General Education
Designation for GEO-SCI 360, at the request of the Department, as presented in Sen. Doc.
No. 09-057.

The motion was seconded and adopted.

The 686th Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate stood adjourned at 5:40 p.m. on May 14, 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