UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST
OFFICE OF THE FACULTY SENATE

Faculty Senate Secretary, Ernest May, substituting for Presiding Officer Robert Wilson, called the 690th Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate to order on December 15, 2009 at 3:30 p.m. in Herter Hall, Room 227.

A. ADDRESS BY CHANCELLOR ROBERT C. HOLUB
(QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION TO FOLLOW)

Chancellor Robert Holub welcomed everyone to the meeting and wished them happy holidays. He wished that everyone has a good holiday season and that the New Year brings them health and happiness. One of the topics Chancellor Holub said he is going to talk about is the campus budget and what the budget is going to look like in the new year. He said that he does not know if that topic is going to bring us any happiness.

Before Chancellor Holub discussed the campus budget, he said he wanted to stress that, aside from the budget, everything is going great. We have, as you know, the best students that we have ever had by all academic measures. We have an 11% increase in applications for early admissions. Overall the increase in applications is 10% when compared to last year. We have better students. The faculty are doing a remarkable job, as always. The campus has been doing a remarkable job in terms of faculty awards and faculty grants. We have approximately $40 million in stimulus grants alone. This is a testimony to the excellence of our faculty. Chancellor Holub explained that he has talked to some other university leaders in the past month and we are very competitive in that area [stimulus grants]. He stressed that the faculty are doing a tremendous job of winning grants.

The Chancellor noted that the campus is doing well in terms of its physical structure. We have several new and very impressive buildings that have opened in the last two years. There are also several additional planned. Chancellor Holub noted that all the buildings planned since he became Chancellor relate to teaching, classrooms, or faculty research. He explained that this is what we are emphasizing in our building program going forward. He explained that the state needs to cooperate but we will see what we can do to get them to be cooperative.

With regard to the budget, things are not quite as rosy. What we decided to do after looking at the budget picture and sending out e-mails to people was to visit the individual faculties. Provost Staros and I have been going around to departments and colleges to meet with faculty in smaller groups. We feel it is important that the faculty understand what the budget situation is and what we are facing. He explained that the seemingly anonymous e-mails that you get explaining the situation are probably not something that are going to be read and appreciated. In these smaller groups, we think people can understand what is going on. People can ask questions and we can have a dialogue about things. We feel this is important. It is taking a good deal of our time but it is well worth it because the faculty does need to know what is happening.

It was in that context that Chancellor Holub said he suggested, when Secretary May asked him to speak at this meeting, that he give the budget presentation to the Faculty Senate. He explained that some of the faculty may have heard this presentation if they were in departments that have already been exposed to the presentation. The Chancellor asked that they please forgive him. He explained he is going to go through largely the same information that he has gone through when he has met faculty members across campus.

The Chancellor explained that, when he became Chancellor, the state was appropriating $230.9 million to the campus [see chart on slide 1]. He explained that the appropriation was actually $227 million in appropriations to the campus with a separate appropriation for Commonwealth College. The $230.9 million figure adds these sums together. The Chancellor explained that since he arrived, the amount of state funding has declined precipitously. That first year, the campus took a mid-year cut of $12,686 million to leave us with a base budget of $218 million. Then we carry the $218 million to FY ’10 and you will see that the state appropriation for that year was cut by over $30 million. Recently, we have received a mid-year cut of close to $16 million. You can see that our budget has declined from $231 million to about $171 to $172 million in the year and a half period since Chancellor Holub arrived. We carry that figure over until FY ’11 which is our real problem year, Chancellor Holub explained.

The campus has a slight reduction in obligations in FY ’11 due to people who took a special retirement incentive. That is a fairly small amount of money but we do not know that the $171 million will remain constant for next year. This figure could be greater or less depending on what happens in the budget cycle we are going through right now. We do not anticipate that this amount is going to be more, but it could be less. There may be further mid-year cuts in FY ’10 but we are hoping that there will not be. We are also hoping we are going to get at least the amount we projected in FY ’11.
On top of those changes to the base allocation from the state are also decreases in our budget due to fringe benefits. The state gives us close to 30% in fringe benefits to anyone who is hired and paid on state money. At a certain point when the state allocation is decreased, we have to make up those fringe benefits ourselves. For every dollar the state takes away in appropriations, they are actually taking away approximately $1.30. Here we have calculated the fringe benefits that were taken away - approximately $9 million in FY '10 and $2.5 million in FY '11. The total amount the budget has been reduced is $59.675 million. Then, if you add the fringe benefits to this figure, you get what these cuts really cost us. This is something we have to pay for these individuals. Adding this $11.5 million in fringe benefits to the $59.675 million in cuts comes out to $71 million in state funding that we have to make up for on the campus. That is why this is such a daunting task in such a short period of time. From FY '09 to FY '11, a $71 million hole appears in our budget.

Now, we look at the figures you have seen before from the last slide. This is the original appropriation, this is the appropriation for FY '10 and this is the estimated appropriation for FY '11. You can see what these assumptions are. You can see what the changes are in the appropriations. Here are other sources of revenue. One of the other sources of revenue are tuition and fees. Tuition and fees go up slightly from FY '09 to FY '10. You all know that there was a $1,500 increase in fees. This was mitigated as part of the rebates, so we did not get all that revenue in FY '10. Looking towards FY '11, you see the full magnitude of the increase in dollars. Then we have added, just as a placeholder, 3% into the tuition and fees. We have no idea what will happen with tuition and fees this year because that will be decided in the spring. These are just assumptions we have to make.

You will notice that financial aid has increased substantially. This was our promise to the families of students, rightly, to maintain access to campus. This is very important to us, that students who have the highest levels of need (low income students) still have access to campus. What you find is that we have added a significant amount of financial aid so that these students will not be harmed and will be able to attend. This of course has its cost and you can see that we are adding $11 million in financial aid just over this three-year period. This is quite a substantial amount. These include curriculum and fee waivers which you all know about.

We have other sources of income; interest income, income from cost recovery, auxiliaries. That is a fairly caustic figure of about $60 million. That gives us our net sources of income for these three years. As you can see, we are down in income from that point on in FY '11 but not too much because we have made up part of it in our fees.

Now we take those figures from the last slide. What we are dealing with here are changes to our base commitments. This is not a total of what we are using in utilities; it represents a $5 million change in what we are spending on utilities. Most of these are fairly small amounts in comparison to the whole budget. But as Senator Everett Dirksen said, ‘a million here, a million there and pretty soon you are talking about real money.’ Some of these do add up to real money. The largest amount is $9.29 million which includes salary increases. We do not know what is happening with that either. As most of you know, Governor Patrick submitted the contracts to the Legislature. There needs to be a supplementary bill passed by the Legislature for the contracts to go into effect but that has not happened yet. This figure makes the assumption that this will happen but we have no reason to think it will or will not. We just do not know where those things are at right now. There are negotiations that are going on throughout the state for other kinds of things. We do not know exactly how they will turn out. What we try to do is maintain faculty positions for the RFP process, for some of those replacements, because we feel it is important to do some of that. This is a change to our base budget but we felt that it was something important. This is one of the few places where we are spending money on the academic enterprise. Again, this is a very high priority for us.

Other items on this table include fringe benefits, which you have seen already from the previous slides. Operation maintenance and buildings – when a building comes online, there are operations costs that go with it. These include the Integrated Sciences Building in FY '09 and the Recreation Center in FY '10. A lot of miscellaneous items fall under the academic and administration units’ category, things like athletic scholarships. We assume that the Central University Assessment will go up by approximately this amount, but again we have no access to veto what goes to Boston. Central campus payments and short term debt are going to level-off in FY '11, we think. This is the RTF that goes back to the Deans, Departments and Principle Investigators. We will experience a decline in the long-term debt & capital pool because some of payments will have ceased. We will have new payments we will have to make in FY ’11 so it will go up in that year.

Utilities – we had to buy a lot of electricity when the market was fairly high in FY '09 and we are saving money in FY '10 and FY '11 by buying into the future now that the price is low. That is where we are for the base commitments. One-time uses are really base budget items. As you can see, they come out to be about the same. These are items that come up each year but we do not know what they are going to be from one year to the next. Still, we always seem to have these kinds of items that come up – deferred maintenance, for example. It becomes tantamount to something that is a base budget item because it is fairly dependable, even though it is not constant. Looking to see what we have in terms of a surplus or deficit, you will see we did alright last year. We came up with a very slight surplus. You see in FY ’10 and FY ’11, not to mention FY ’12 if you are looking further out, that we experience large deficits in our budget. I should mention that we reduced our base commitments
by $10 million from last year to this year. You all know about that because you participated in that exercise, so it is not as though we have remained stagnant.

What saves us this year, in FY ’10, is the $72.969 million in stimulus money we have received. This money has enabled us to do things this year that we would otherwise have had to cut. Some University systems such as the University of California and New York have received much less stimulus money for higher education. They have had to take cuts from one year to the next. We have had a grace year where we have had stimulus money. We are able to fund the things that we needed funded in FY ’10 out of that stimulus money. Unfortunately in FY ’11, you then reach what the Obama administration has termed the ‘funding cliff’ - where the one-time stimulus money is gone and the budget is made out of the state allocation - now $60 million less in the budget allocation than it had been in FY ’09. We do have some money here that is a one-time balance. Some of that can be used in FY ’11 and some of that is being invested in various projects that you have put forward in order to generate revenue to put us on a firmer financial footing. We will try to use that money wisely because we don’t know when revenues are going to come back to the state. One of the chief things we are trying to do is investing one-time money in programs that are going to enable us to be on a sounder basis going forward into the future.

This shows what we used the general funds for; most of it is for salaries and fringe benefits. You see the non-payroll operational-types of costs, you see the RTF, you see our assessment to the President’s Office, the debt service that we pay, and utilities that we pay. This shows where the funds go that we receive. The thing that is important about that is this is what we call the ‘fungible’ budget. Some of the budget is not fungible – we cannot choose not to pay debt, the assessment or utilities. You see salaries and fringe benefits makes up 84% of the fungible budget. The reason that this is significant is that we are going to make reductions in the budget. It is difficult to see how we are going to be able to avoid it. It is hard to see where we are going to cut from except by eliminating positions or laying people off. It is very difficult to see where that would come from, otherwise, with 84% of our fungible budget dedicated to salaries and fringe benefits. That is where we are in regard to the fungible budget.

The Chancellor told the faculty that their efforts and the efforts of their various departments are important because they can put us on a sounder financial basis than we currently have. He said these efforts can help put us on a different course on campus. We are looking at increasing non-residential students on campus as a way to increase revenues. We are looking at offering more courses during summer session and more residential courses in the summer. We have very good facilities to house students in and very good classroom facilities. We are going to increase our use of continuing education. Some of the Colleges and Schools have used this very extensively and we will be looking for more kinds of those opportunities. Those are things that you have been involved in over the past months. We are developing five-year bachelor’s/masters programs and professional masters programs which are revenue-generating programs. Every dollar that is raised through these kinds of endeavors is a dollar we do not have to cut. That is very important for us all to try to raise money in revenues in order to reduce this very large budget deficit that we have.

The Chancellor asked, ‘What are we doing on campus?’ Two of the things that he said he would like to talk about are increases in research activity and increasing support for research activity. We also have a proposal to reduce the cost sharing that we have by putting salaries on grants. That is being discussed now. The Chancellor said he knows that Provost Staros has discussed that with the Research Council. We have received a great deal of ARRA awards. We hope to be able to make an increased effort in research and that our research office will be able to maintain that kind of effort so that we can take these indirect costs from those awards. We are doing a lot more in our fundraising enterprise as well. We have a new Vice Chancellor there who has been restructuring that unit. The Chancellor thinks it will be a professionally run unit that will do a lot more in fundraising. They are looking to subsidize financial aid, for example, by raising money for financial aid so we can then take the funds we are currently allocating for financial aid and use it elsewhere.

Senator Richard Bogartz stated that he did not know what the campus’ $19.2 million to the President’s Office gets us. He asked, ‘what do they do for us?’

Chancellor Holub said that there are a number of things that you can point to that are obvious. He stated that they do our payroll for us, for example. They do some of our IT services. They do lobbying for us in the area of the state government. Those are three things that you can point to right off the top. Exactly what the details of all these are - he said he doesn’t have a breakdown of them either – but they provide back office services to a certain degree for the campus. If we did not have the Office of the President doing them, we would have to fund these services ourselves on campus. Whether we would spend $19 million on them or $15 million he could not say, but since not paying the allocation is not an option, he tries not to think about it too much.

Senator Marta Calas commented that what is or is not an option is a question not a statement. She asked have we tried to refinance the debt (the 12%)? Senator Calas noted the Chancellor said he does not know the details of what the President’s Office costs us, what they do for us. She thinks that this is an area to be explored. As the Chancellor said, a million here, a
million there, ends up being real money. In a way, this idea is an emergency measure that would help us in the short term. Many of the plans Chancellor Holub presented provide benefits in the longer term. This presentation has a lot of numbers. The question of what it really tells us in terms of short and long term measures is not very clear. We can be much more creative than what is illustrated in these charts. She wonders up to what point the faculty can contribute to several more creative ideas because the ones presented are ideas every other University in the United States is doing right now. We are not in any better competitive situation since everyone else is trying to do the same thing. She feels that if we are so good, we may be able to come up with many more ideas.

Chancellor Holub stated that he does not claim total originality in any of these ideas. They are certainly ideas that a lot of other institutions are talking about. He stated that he has been at many conferences over the past six months and talked to a lot of the leaders in higher education and a lot of these things are being explored by other institutions. His view on why we have a better chance of succeeding is because we have not tried these to the extent that we should have in the past. If you look at attracting non-residential students in the area - Connecticut, Vermont, New Hampshire, and Rhode Island all have a larger percentage of non-residential students than we do on this campus. Of those Universities, he thinks, it is obvious that we are the best institution in terms of the qualifications and the stature of our faculty. There is no reason why we should not be able to attract at least as many non-residential students as these other institutions.

The reason we do not attract the same number of non-residential students is not because of the quality of the institution or the quality of the education we are offering. The Chancellor thinks it is rather because we have not had the administrative apparatus that has established pipelines to non-residential students to come to the campus. That is the reason that the Chancellor feels we can make progress there. It is the same thing for a lot of these other areas. He does not think we have been assiduous enough in our application towards those areas. That being said, if there are things we can do that are more original, that would save us money, that would generate revenue, he and his administration are open to suggestions from the faculty and have been for the last year and a half. We have a Budget Task Force consisting mostly of faculty members. They are taking any and all suggestions from the entire campus community. We still have our web page where we are taking suggestions from anyone in the campus community who writes to us. We certainly do not want to limit ourselves if there are other suggestions that you have or you know people who have other kinds of suggestions that are more creative or more fruitful. We would be happy to hear about them.

Senator Marios Philippides echoed that these are indeed tough times. He urged the Chancellor to suggest to his Budget Task Force to look at what we pay the President’s Office; a million here, a million there helps. In addition to that, something perhaps more radical; he said that he has not seen any study of what we are going to cut when it comes down to athletics. We are loosing a lot of money with the teams and a lot of other universities have saved a lot of money. Perhaps the Budget Task Force can look into athletics as well before we come to academics.

Chancellor Holub stated that he felt looking at the assessment to the President’s Office was a waste of time. He stated that he does not see that this is going to save us anything. If anyone would care to do that and get breakdowns and things like that, then he thinks that is fine but he does not see that this is something we are going to make any process on simply because it is not that we are writing a check to the President’s Office. The President’s Office is the legal entity that is the University of Massachusetts and the campus gets a certain percentage that comes into the President’s Office. It is not that we are sitting down and writing a check for $19.2 million. That money is taken out before it gets to us. He does not know how you would expect anyone to get that money back, but if you have a way to do that then he suggested that they let him know.

Senator Philippides stated that perhaps we could save some money by cutting the payroll and doing it ourselves.

Chancellor Holub stated that is not an option. If we did the payroll ourselves, we would have to pay for doing the payroll ourselves and pay the $19.2 million. So that would not make any sense to do those kinds of things ourselves if we are paying someone else to do those things for us. It is like debt service. You could not say, ‘let’s not pay debt service for a couple of years.’ It is not just an option.

Senator Philippides suggested the Chancellor might be creative and find one.

Chancellor Holub reiterated that this idea did not make any sense.

Professor Elizabeth Chilton stated her question might actually be one for the Provost. There were a lot of creative revenue generation proposals that were submitted in October. What is the timeline for those? Some colleagues are inquiring.

Provost James Staros stated that he has been spending quite a long time going through a very long list of proposals. We had a stack of paper that was quite formidable. We are just about done with reviewing the proposals. We will be sending our recommendations to the Budget Office and they will be processing those very soon. He would expect that if not before the
winter Diaspora, then very soon after we all return we will have numbers for everyone. Some of these were really interesting proposals that we are going to encourage even if they are not going to be funded because some of these were well enough conceived that they ought to break even in the first year. He stated that they will be indemnifying against losses, a number of these proposals, that we will not be offering any up-front money to. Others asked for the sun, moon, and a few other planets and may get a little bit of start-up money. He said that they have $15 million in requests and the amount of money that is available to be spent is one order in magnitude less than that.

Senator Bogart asked the Chancellor to reflect on his conclusion that the way things are in respect to the President's Office is the only way they can possibly be - that there is no possibility of any kind of change. He said that he does not know of anything in the world, literally anything, that does not change so we might consider if something be done to change it. Is football on the table, or is it not? The last he heard, we loose about $4 million a year to football. Is this something we have to live with or is it something that is up for grabs?

Chancellor Holub answered that he has not really gone out to the Vice Chancellor's and Senior Staff with reduction figures yet. They have been focusing on revenue generation. He thinks there is a good deal of possibility for increased revenue generation in athletics. John McCutcheon, the Athletic Director, has been working on revenue generation and that is our focus. When we go out with a figure for reductions, then the Chancellor said he will come back, as will all the Vice Chancellors, and make suggestions and they will sit down and talk about it. He assumes everything is on the table, but he has to depend on the people who are reporting to him to look at their budgets and see what is going to be best for their units and that has not happened yet.

B. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. The Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Ernest May, Secretary of the Faculty Senate, reminded the Senate that, in addition to raising revenue and cutting expenses, there was one other thing that we can do to save money: change the way we do business. The biggest thing the Senate has done this fall is adopting the new General Education curriculum which involves changing the number of credits in General Education courses from three to four credits and adding the Integrative Experience as a capstone. At this point, we can reaffirm that approximately 100 General Education courses have been approved for the change from three to four credits and the announcements have gone out approving these changes. He explained that the Ad Hoc Committee on General Education Revision and Implementation (GERICO) and the General Education Council are still working their way through an additional 75 proposals and more proposals are still coming in so this is an ongoing process. He would like to thank the members of GERICO who have been very active and to the members of the General Education Council who took part in the review process. Secretary May said that this is probably one of the most efficient/speedy operations that the Senate has been involved in during the ten years he has been doing this. Another announcement from Secretary May is that after about 25 years, he is going to take sabbatical leave next semester. Marilyn Billings has been appointed by Chancellor Holub to graciously fill in as Interim Secretary during the spring semester. Secretary May stated that he will be on duty until the middle of January, and then he will be doing a scholarly project until early July. He wishes everyone well!

2. The Faculty Delegates to the Board of Trustees

Marilyn Billings, Associate Delegate to the Board of Trustees, reported that there were several meetings held on November 18th. The Committee on Science, Technology and Research was the first meeting that morning. President Wilson gave updates on the various science, technology, and research initiatives that have been taking place. The main event at that meeting was UMass Worcester talking about their research and development strategy. Jeff Brancato, from the President’s Office, gave an update on some of the stimulus money and how it has been used. After that, there was an Advancement Committee meeting where various development efforts ongoing on the different campuses were discussed. The third meeting was the Committee on Academic and Student Affairs (CASA). This was the first of the series on the acquisition of the School of Law at the Dartmouth campus. That was a very long meeting. Most of the meeting was taken up with that topic and there was a lot of discussion and debate that took place during the meeting. You all know the end result.

W. Richards Adrian, Delegate to the Board of Trustees, stated that the Committee on Administration and Finance (A&F) meeting primarily focused on the Law School, like the CASA meeting, and had a similar vote. All but two Trustees were there so the vote was 12-4 in favor of the Law School. The only other things that came up at the A&F meeting were a modification of the capital plan for this campus which added $190
Randall Phillis, President of the Massachusetts Society of Professors, stated that he just had a few topics that he would like to explore. He applauded the Chancellor’s efforts to develop an advocacy group for the campus. This was announced in his recent budget e-mail that was sent to everyone. He is eager to collaborate as best we can in that effort. He said that many of the faculty are already engaged in advocacy for the campus and have been for some time. To the extent that we can collaborate and complement each other’s work such that where your work leads in one direction, we might be able to lead in alternative directions to cover all the bases. To the extent that we can collaborate and work together, we will be more successful.

For example, they might be able to help in regard to the earlier questions about the President’s Office. President Phillis said he fully appreciates that the administrators on campus find it extraordinarily challenging to confront their boss about how much they are taking from the University. The unions, for each of the four campuses, could conceivably ask for these kinds of accountings to be made. The Boston, Lowell, Dartmouth and Amherst campuses could ask a coordinated group, ‘what are we getting for our money?’ All the money that is going to the President’s Office is conceivably not coming to us, so there is a rational for that request that is different than the administrators. This is a point of collaboration we might be able to achieve that could be fruitful. We can take some of the heat off the administration and instead put it on the faculty unions where it might be properly placed. He thinks this would be fruitful.

President Phillis also explained that the MSP is working with respect to the Law School issue at Dartmouth in developing an anti-cannibalism policy that is not unlike the legislation being proposed by Senator Stanley Rosenberg. Senator Rosenberg is trying to present legislation preventing movements of funds to cover some enterprise (say at Dartmouth – such as a Law School) that would require extra funding and therefore funding would be sucked out of the system from some other campus or campuses in order to fund that enterprise, so their win is our loss. There has been a long tradition in the UMass system where each campus is properly protected from this kind of shifting of funds, though it does seem to happen under the table perhaps from time to time. President Phillis thinks we could all come to an agreement to endorse a stable funding plan so that if one campus does something good, like the Amherst campus earns its own money in many ways that have been advocated for by the administration, then we should get to keep our money and it should not make us liable for a further cut because we are now raising our own money. That is the other component of this anti-cannibalism clause.

The MSP is also concerned about workload issues. If President Phillis reads the math right, we end up losing $50 million or more in the coming fiscal years. The entire MSP payroll is $110 million. We could fire every other professor on this campus and not quite come up with enough money to fill the hole. He appreciates the gravity of this situation and feels the presentations that the Chancellor has created could well be persuasive to convince the legislature that this is not a trivial matter. We are going to have to profoundly destroy many of the missions of public higher education in this state and that is something worth thinking about. As the workforce dwindles, because there is far less hiring, and we increase our work load, because we are bringing in out-of-state students, engaging these summer courses and doing various things, we are maxing out. We have an administration/union joint task force that has measured our workload and came up with 66+ hours a week of work for the average faculty member. That sounds like 100% time. In fact, many unions bargain for things like time-and-a-half for overtime. Instead of getting time-and-a-half for overtime, we are doing overtime and getting half time for that or no time. We are bumping up into a real-life problem here about how we can get the work done, and we are eager to talk through that problem with the administration.

Finally, the administration’s efforts to raise money are laudable. We understand the need for additional resources on campus in whatever way we can come up with. However, each time you divert faculty effort from teaching, there are unintentional consequences. For example, by spending more time in the summer teaching summer school, professors may not get their grant written. People will be asked to divert their grant funds to regular season salary, so-to-speak, and therefore will choose private funders that will not pay...
overhead so they do not have to do that diversion of funds. There are consistently, by definition - every economist will tell you this - unintended consequences of every fiscal choice you make. We must be mindful of that and be careful to preserve the scholarly mission of the University as we understand it now and not sacrifice that mission in a way that diverts our efforts away from scholarship into profit. It is a concern that we need to be mindful of and careful about. As we proceed in these very challenging years before us, we should pay attention.

C. QUESTION PERIOD (10-Minute Limit)

Senator Marta Calas wanted to reiterate what President Phillis said. She explained that they have had this experience at the Isenberg School with the online MBA programs. Because they have promised to maintain the quality of the online MBA, the regular faculty teach the online courses in addition to their regular loads. This is a very good way to earn extra money from the program for the faculty. What has happened is that the research mission of the school has suffered tremendously and that is a proven fact. We do not have to go any farther than across the street to see this and it has even been reported in the press.

Senator Bogartz stated that in the face of these matters, he simply has to raise a little levity. He said that it has been almost two years since he raised the question of the concrete platforms outside the library and their pitted and corrosive nature. Three days after he brought the issue up, he said he received word from Vice Chancellor Hatch’ Office that they were working on the issue. He thought, ‘that’s great.’ He thinks maybe it is time for another report.

Joyce Hatch, Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance, reported that now the state is working on the issue. She said they did just check in, probably just a couple of months ago, with Juanita Holler. It was a state contract, and we on campus cannot do anything about it. We are pushing back with the folks in the Division of Capital Asset Management (DCAM) to work with their subcontractors who put it in and they have to follow up. It is not lost; it is just one of those things. She said she is glad Senator Bogartz keeps bringing it up because we cannot lose sight of the issue. But this issue is in the state quagmire.

Senator Bogartz asked how many years before we decide that maybe we need to do something other than have it be on the state quagmire?

Vice Chancellor Hatch suggested Jay Schafer, Director of Libraries, might know a little more about this.

Jay Schafer, Director of Libraries, said that Vice Chancellor Hatch is correct in that this is a DCAM project and it is going through the DCAM process. He said that if you look around on the deck, you will see little holes that were drilled to take core samples of the concrete to test them - so there is some activity. They are trying to determine exactly what is wrong with the concrete and who is at fault.

Senator Bogartz thought this was a great answer.

D. ANNUAL REPORTS


Elizabeth Porto, Chair of the University Writing Committee, stated that the Committee’s main business last year was wrapping up the Junior Year Writing Program Review and promoting its recommendations. This report was completed the previous year. She said that the group also hosted two events, the Fall Social in November and a spring workshop in April on teaching multi-lingual writers. She said their main purposes were community building and providing and sharing resources. In addition, the Committee has been talking a lot about the role of information literacy in the Junior Year Writing Classrooms. Our main charge for this year is to prepare for the big Freshman Writing Program Review which will happen next year.

Secretary May remarked that, as usual, the Writing Committee does a great job of monitoring that program.

The report was received.

David Evans, Chair of the Research Council, reported that last year was a busy year because of all the changes at the University. One of the things the Council did was to try to improve the representation of the campus on the Council; in other words, the distribution of representation. He said they have also sought to involve faculty members who brought to the campus much more direct personal experience with funded research. We undertook an active recruiting process, and the Rules Committee was very supportive. Not only did we get a number of new very active members who bring a lot of experience, but they also agreed to increase the size of the Council to 18 members. Starting this fall, we had 18 Council members instead of 15 and next semester the Council is increasing to 19 members.

The Council is in some senses stronger and a good deal more active and able to respond to many of the challenges we face. Looking at this year, part of the Chancellor’s challenge is that we should significantly increase the amount of funded research on campus, which is a great idea. This does bring up the workload issue. At the same time we are doing this, we are being forced to cut back on staff and support services and are receiving, from the Federal Government, a number of new initiatives that we must do in order to get money. Some of you are familiar with these things and there is a Task Force that is looking at what we are calling ‘faculty burden.’ This is not workload, these are Federal Government requirements, from human subject’s review or export control and so on. There is a long list. These are all unfunded mandates that need to be dealt with in order to be competitive. The Research Council faces quite a heavy load at this point. Research is seen as an engine of growth for revenue, but, at the same time, PI’s largely feel like they are maxed out and cannot really cope. Yet we are being asked to do lots more.

Secretary May agreed that there is a lot going on in the Research Council. He said he attended their last meeting. It was very stimulating. (He could not attend previous meetings because it was during the time when the Rules Committee usually meets.)

President Phillis asked if the Research Council has developed any plans for targeted staffing that could help relieve some of the burden Chair Evans describes.

Chair Evans stated that the Council is looking at what units on campus are effective in providing support for areas such as proposal writing and pre-proposal award administration. The Faculty Burden Task Force is trying to look for positive examples of what units on campus are good at. At the same time, the office of the Vice Chancellor for Research and Engagement is undergoing a complete review of the three components of the Office of Research, Research Liaison and Development and how they can improve their services. Like everyone else, they are facing budget cuts and staff cuts. One of the concerns the Council has had over the years is that in downturns, we tend to layoff staff and support staff and when the upturn comes, we do not hire as many back. Over the time period, there is a trend downwards. At the same time, the complexity of bidding and managing funded research continues to increase. At some point, things have got to give.

President Phillis explained that this was the reason why he used the word targeted.

Chair Evans said he thinks that is something the Council should look at. He said it is a good suggestion.

The report was received.

E. NEW COURSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>CREDITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ART 243</td>
<td>“Monotype: The Painterly Print”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 275</td>
<td>“Digital Media: Still Image”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 345</td>
<td>“Digital Media: Printmaking”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 305</td>
<td>“Educational Psychology”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINGUIST 380</td>
<td>“Controlling the Discourse”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL 341</td>
<td>“Introduction to Metaphysics”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL 342</td>
<td>“Introduction to Epistemology”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL 354</td>
<td>“Introduction to Philosophy of Language”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL 355</td>
<td>“Introduction to Philosophy of Mind”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL 363</td>
<td>“Intermediate Ethics”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the courses ART 243, 275 and 345, CE-ENGIN 250, EDUC 305, LINGUIST 380 and PHIL 341, 342, 354, 355 and 363, as recommended by the Academic Matters Council.

The motion was seconded and adopted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>CREDITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ART 543</td>
<td>“Advanced Monotype”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEM-ENG/M&amp;I-ENG 571</td>
<td>“Physical and Chemical Processing of Materials”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEM-ENG/M&amp;I-ENG 572</td>
<td>“Physical and Chemical Processing of Materials Lab”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEM-ENG/M&amp;I-ENG 579</td>
<td>“Advanced Materials Engineering”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the courses ART 543 and CHEM-ENG/M&I-ENG 571, 572 and 579, as recommended by the Academic Matters and Graduate Councils.

The motion was seconded and adopted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>CREDITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ART 674</td>
<td>“Computer Animation I”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 684</td>
<td>“Computer Animation II”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOCHEM/CHEM 657</td>
<td>“Drug Design”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMPSCI 617</td>
<td>“Computational Geometry”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICROBIO 660</td>
<td>“Genomics and Bioinformatics”</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the courses ART 674 and 684, BIOCHEM/CHEM 657, CMPSCI 617 and MICROBIO 660, as recommended by the Graduate Council.

The motion was seconded and adopted.

F. NEW BUSINESS


MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Undergraduate Program Revisions in Philosophy, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 10-015.

Senator Calas said that she is curious to know about the History of Philosophy courses. She said that there used to be four courses and now they have been reduced to two. She noticed that History of Philosophy A is “Ancient and Medieval” and History of Philosophy B is “17th and 18th Century.” She wonders what happened to the 19th and 20th centuries? It seems to her that much of the contemporary theory of feminism, post-modernism, phenomenology and many other areas which have impacted multiple disciplines were more influenced by those later centuries.

Senator M. Christine King, Chair of the Academic Matter’s Council Program Subcommittee, said she could speak to the Academic Matters Council Program Revision that the Philosophy Department submitted. It was reviewed over quite a length of time. She hears Senator Calas’ concerns. The material that was submitted, in terms of revising the Undergraduate Program for Philosophy, was looked at by the Subcommittee. The Department completed multiple revisions in course naming and resubmissions and finally the Council did approve what they had submitted.

Secretary May reiterated that this was worked out over a long period of time. His guess on this, and he said he was not involved in the hands-on part of this, was that there are four courses of electives and obviously our Philosophy Department offers a number of courses in areas that Senator Calas mentions. However, since they are not required, it would be possible, that a Philosophy Major could end up with an emphasis almost entirely on the historical aspects of Philosophy, but this is the choice of the Department and it is within the practice of Philosophy Departments nationally. That was one of the purposes of their revision.

Senator Calas stated that she did not want to belabor this point, but looking into the history of Philosophy A and B choice of courses, the B would have been the one that would have been up to the 18th century. There are two courses, “History of Modern Philosophy” which for them means up to 18th century, and then there is
a “Continental Rationalism and British Imperialism.” It seems to her that this leaves out a lot of what would have been the most influential thoughts in the more recent history of philosophy. This is the expertise of the Department and she is just talking as someone who has benefited from the more contemporary expertise. It seems it is worth asking the question.

Secretary May asked Senator Calas if she would like to make a motion.

Senator Calas answered that she did not.

Secretary May reminded her that she could make a motion to refer this back to the Council if she wished.

Senator Calas stated that she did not want to make a motion.

Secretary May agreed that it was an interesting question and there is no one here to answer Senator Calas’ question definitively.

Senator King said she thinks the Program Committee of the Academic Matters Council could send a letter to the Philosophy Department acknowledging that there was some concern at this point about the more contemporary aspects of philosophy and ask them if they wanted to entertain sending them some additional work later. She would rather the Faculty Senate pass the program revisions stated in this document, for today, since the Council has been working on them for over a year.

Senator Bogartz said he thought it might be that the history of the more recent portions of philosophy manifest in the other courses that are not called history courses, per se.

Secretary May said he would suspect that there is an explanation here, but the problem is that we do not have a member or the Chairman of the Department here to explain that. He said that the Faculty Senate can vote to table it, or vote to refer it back to the Committee. He said that they can table it until the next meeting, but someone will have to make a motion if they want to do that; otherwise, if there are no further comments, we will come to a vote.

The motion was seconded and adopted, but it was noted that there were five nay votes for the reasons that were discussed previously, and that will be noted when the Subcommittee of the Academic Matters Council informs the Department.

2. Special Report of the International Studies Council concerning An Agreement of Education and Research Exchange between the University of Massachusetts Amherst, Amherst, Massachusetts, USA, and Hokkaido University of Education, Sapporo, Japan, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 10-016 with Motion Nos. 16-10 and 17-10.

MOVED: 16-10 That the Faculty Senate approve the Agreement of Education and Research Exchange between the University of Massachusetts Amherst, Amherst, Massachusetts, USA, and Hokkaido University of Education, Sapporo, Japan, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 10-016.

The motion was seconded and adopted.

MOVED: 17-10 That the Faculty Senate approve the Implementing Memorandum between the University of Massachusetts Amherst, Amherst, Massachusetts, USA, and Hokkaido University of Education, Sapporo, Japan, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 10-016.

The motion was seconded and adopted.


MOVED: 18-10 That the Faculty Senate approve the Establishment of the Center for Heritage and Society (CHS), as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 10-017.

The motion was seconded and adopted.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve changing the time period allowed for a student to exercise the Pass/Fail Option from the end of the Add/Drop period to the Mid-Semester Date (Last Day to drop with a “W”) time period, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 10-018.

The motion was seconded and adopted.

4. Special Report of the Academic Matters Council concerning Change in Credit Requirements for the Bachelor of Science in Electrical and Computer Engineering, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 10-019 with Motion No. 20-10.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Changes to the Degree Credit Requirements for the Bachelor of Science in Electrical and Computer Engineering, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 10-019.

The motion was seconded and adopted.


MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Bachelor of Arts (BA) in Computer Science, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 10-020.

The motion was seconded and adopted.

7. Special Resolution of the Undergraduate Education Council, Rules Committee, Campus Physical Planning Committee and Ad Hoc Committee on Strategic Oversight concerning a New Classroom Building and Improvements to Instructional Facilities, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 10-021 with Motion No. 22-10.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Resolution regarding A New Classroom Building and Improvements to Instructional Facilities, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 10-021.

Stephen Schreiber, Chair of the Campus Physical Planning Committee, commented that he thinks everyone knows the campus had been planning an $85 million Academic Classroom Building to alleviate the serious need for both departmental and classroom space, particularly within a certain size range. The University was relying on state funding for the bulk of this project, and the state funding has been pulled which is of great concern to many of us. The resolution is a combined effort of a number of Councils and asks the University to take a hard look at various funding sources. If the state is not going to come up with the funding for this building, there are other possibilities for how this could be funded either through University dollars themselves or University bonds. That is the essence of the Campus Physical Planning Committee’s work.

Secretary May asked for the permission of the body to step out of his role as Presiding Officer. He would like to make some comments about this since he will not be here in the second semester. (There was no objection.)

In the 32 years that Secretary May has been at UMass, this is the most physical growth he says we have experienced. We have had a lot of great success in building buildings on campus. We have recently completed the North Residential Area Apartments, the Power Plant, the Studio Arts Building, the Integrated Sciences Building and the Recreation Center. We have also engaged in two very serious and well-conducted studies, the Wilson Architects Study of research space and the Burt Hill study of Academic Classroom Space. The Wilson Architects study resulted in the plans for the new science building and the Life Sciences Building and assessment and recommendations for all the other research spaces on campus.

The Burt Hill study was a very complete assessment of all the classroom instructional space on campus. It resulted in the recommendations for an $85 million new classroom building to address our most urgent needs. The total need seems to be somewhere in the area of $400 million additional dollars over a period of time to upgrade all the existing classroom spaces.

We have completed the Recreation Center; the Life Sciences and Police Building and Marching Band Building are still active; but then the door seems to have shut. Although we have authorizations for some of
these projects and we got authorization recently for the dormitories, what we choose to pursue is a big question mark because it will be on the University’s dime if we go any farther than this. Most of these other projects were also on the University’s dime. The amount of state money in those projects is hardly more than 10%, so all those buildings above this line [recently completed buildings] are done with 90% of our own bonding and 10% with state funds.

The Burt Hill study is not complete yet, but Secretary May said that he participated in some of the process. Just off the top of his head, some of the points that are made in those recommendations are that basically 53% of our undergraduate instruction occurs in 19 large spaces of which this [Herter 227] is one. Some of them are so over utilized that it is impossible to take them offline. We added 1,600 students under Chancellor Lombardi. Chancellor Holub plans to add 3,000 or more over a decade. The need for large classes goes up as the size of the undergraduate population goes up. We are still constrained in these classrooms. We do have one new auditorium in the ISB, which is great, but it serves a specialized function. Many of the small classrooms are underutilized and some have them been converted to non-teaching purposes.

However, there is almost a complete lack of medium-sized classrooms in the 60-150 seat range. The existing classroom use is maximized; in other words, they are filled to the maximum number of seats allowed by the fire code, rather than optimized to create the best learning environment for the purposes of that classroom. Tablet armchairs, which are common in high schools, are ubiquitous in many of our classroom spaces to the virtual exclusion of other types of seating such as tables for seminars or many of the configurations that you see in the Isenberg School of Management, which has been upgraded. Most of our competitors have at least updated a substantial amount of their classroom configurations to something more like the School of Management. Many of our classrooms are not accessible to people with handicaps or special needs, which creates very strange situations for the Registrar’s Office when they get notice that a handicapped person is taking a class. This means they must rearrange classrooms on a very short notice at the beginning of the semester, which creates a cascading effect of changing as many as ten classes as the result of this situation. Obviously upgrading classrooms would involve making them accessible and eliminate this confusion.

Several departments are located in buildings destined for demolition or serious renovation so, while this is happening, they need a place to go. To completely upgrade our classroom stock to a high level, such that it would be a major attraction to our students, would certainly cost about half a billion dollars. By the time we get around to doing it, it will probably cost much more than that. The building that was proposed in the Burt Hill project would emphasize medium-sized classrooms and service about half the campus’ undergraduate scheduled credit hours in that one building. It would provide some departmental space for those departments that are in greatest need. This is what Secretary May has taken away from his participation in the study.

We tried to put together a resolution that most faculty can subscribe to that did not put an exact number on this problem. This resolution simply directs the administration to pay close attention to this issue. As we move forward, we are up to about 6% debt service to operations ratio. This is an important ratio, because when we go out and issue bonds, this issuance commits future students to pay for it (since the state does not seem to be coming back into the picture). There are certain parameters within which this operates. We had a very low debt service to operations ratio a few years ago, as low as 2-3%. We are up to something like 6% now. There is a Trustee policy that says anything above 8% needs special approval. Standard & Poor’s will start to give us trouble if we go over 10%. UConn is at an 11% debt service to operations ratio. Those are some benchmarks. We are at 6%, so we have a little headroom left, but the choices from here on out are critical because we will be getting up to a range where we will not be able to do much more fairly soon. There needs to be considerable weighting of the rewards and benefits of the various options that are ahead of us.

Provost Staros commented that while Vice Chancellor Hatch had to go, he would like to assure the Senate that they are already working on this problem as it is stated in this resolution. He said that he and his staff spent 3 ½ hours yesterday in their most recent meeting which they are looking at the total inventory of space on campus. They are looking to where we might be able to build more modern, intermediate-size rooms, exactly as described by the resolution. They are looking at problem-based learning spaces, which we do not have any of currently. They are looking at larger-sized classrooms or small lecture halls in the 90-125 seat size. Vice Chancellor Hatch’ staff has looked through every available building on campus to see where we might engineer a building into existing structures. We are looking to come forward to the executive management team with proposals for constructing the type of classrooms that are envisioned in this resolution. We hope these spaces will provide us a bridge until that new Classroom Building, which has been pushed out a couple
of years, can come back into reality. Provost Staros just wants to assure everyone that the administration and faculty really are on the same page here.

Chancellor Holub reminded the faculty that what he showed in his presentation was that we are paying $53 million in debt service. He said that if we borrow money, we pay more money in debt service, and that money can only come from our operating budget. There are a number of faculty members that feel we should not do this. They have been rather vocal in their opposition to spending anything more on capital expenditures and have suggested, instead, that we spend on the operating budget. As you saw, the fungible operating budget consists of salaries of individuals - faculty members and staff members. Those are the trade-offs that you go through. He knows you know that, he just wants to point out that bonding money and paying back the debt are not just free money. It means you cannot do other things you would like to do on the campus - which faculty themselves have advocated that we do.

President Phillis concurred that all of these things are challenging. If you push money one way or the other, then it means that you push something out that you might have funded elsewhere, like faculty salaries. The question that he has is a point of clarification. He is going to plead some level of ignorance on this, and so if he is not quite up to speed on the issues at hand, he hopes to be educated. The Classroom Building has been up and down, back and forth on the list of things that would get done for a long time. He does not remember a $190 million dormitory ever being on the list. He does not quite understand the dynamic here where a 1,500-bed dormitory facility instantly appeared on the list. As far as he knows, this dormitory appeared at the same time a long-standing Classroom Building project has been somehow pushed aside. He would love to learn how that happened.

Chancellor Holub replied that he would be happy to play the role of educator. As everyone knows, we are increasing the number of students on campus. We have a largely residential campus. We are obviously not in an urban area, so we have to look years out and say that if we are going to have approximately 2,500 more students in ten years then we need to have a place for them to live. We are exploring different possibilities. One of the possibilities is that we build a significant amount of housing on the campus. There are other possibilities that have to do with the Town of Amherst, and surrounding towns, which could build apartment-type complexes for students. We are exploring all of these options.

When you go to the Board of Trustees, what you need to do is put something on the table in order to progress with any kind of project. You need to put the maximum that you are going to spend, and so we have a kind-of maximum limit of $190 million. None of the estimates that we are looking at are $190 million. This kind of funding is much different than other kinds of funding because it is an auxiliary which means the students themselves, in paying rent for their housing, pay for that project, by and large. This is how you pay the debt service off of housing. This is quite different from the Classroom Building, which is either paid for by the state, usually through the state’s bonding which then gives that money to the campus in order to use or gives that money to DCAM with DCAM building the project. Or we can fund it ourselves, through bonding the money, which means we must pay debt service on it. Debt service on auxiliaries, whether it is housing or dining is paid for by the users of that so it is something that is quite different. It is something that we felt we had to get into the queue now because you can not go any further on these projects unless it is in the queue. The chief priority for the campus remains buildings that are going to house faculty and students: classroom buildings and research buildings such as the ones we have proposed. Anything that we are going to pay for, either out of our own pocket or that the state will fund on the capital’s bill, is going to be that type of building. The money for student housing will not come out of those pots of money.

Secretary May again asked to step out of his role as Presiding Officer to make a comment or two. (There was no objection.) He would certainly hope that the Town of Amherst could participate in building at least some of this in apartment-style housing. It would be a triple win. The Town of Amherst would get tax money, students would have less expensive rent, and the University would not have to expand its debt capacity in order to do this. This has not been a popular item in the Town of Amherst, but given their tremendous budget pressures right now, Secretary May would hope it might receive more favorable consideration at the town level than it has in the past. This would provide revenue. If we build these dorms on campus, there is no revenue to the Town of Amherst. With all our restrictions, with all the stipulations that they want to put in it, developers could build the housing and Amherst would get a substantial amount of tax revenue out of the project.

This also has to do with the long tradition here that the state has dropped out of the business of building classroom buildings (at least for us) in Secretary May’s service here. This is the third time the Classroom...
Building has been dropped. It seems that they love to see dormitory buildings built and then, after the bonds are paid off, we convert them to academic space. Secretary May notes that the Faculty Senate Office is in such a building right now, and the Linguistics Department is housed in such a building, one built in the early 20th Century. It is odd but, with only a couple of exceptions, we have rarely built buildings that were designed and built as academic space. Isenberg is one, the Integrated Sciences Building is another, and one of the Engineering Laboratory additions has academic space in it and was designed that way. Secretary May stressed that he does not envy anyone who has to make these decisions, and ultimately these decisions have to be made by the Chancellor because they involve balancing very difficult decisions between things and people.

Senator Amilcar Shabazz wanted to underscore the importance of being careful to preserve some of the great traditions of the campus as we look at maintenance, renovation, and improvement of some of our existing buildings as well as possible new buildings coming about. This is a good campus, and there are traditions in terms of where people have been placed and how people have worked together in some of these facilities. We should try to build upon those traditions and not displace or gentrify or create problems in the community that can be very, very terrible as we go into the next year. He just hopes that we take that in mind in all of our work on this. He was pleased to see some articles in the paper about the concern for the historic preservation of our buildings. He is worried about some of our other inherited traditions on this campus and urges that we be very careful as we proceed and act in very honest and open ways with departments and units that are in certain buildings as they are renovated or as new buildings come about.

Secretary May commented that there has been a professional study of the historic preservation aspect of the campus; he did not put it on his slides.

Secretary Bogartz thinks history has demonstrated that it is impossible to overestimate the capacity of the town of Amherst to generate resistance to the construction of student housing, even in the face of tremendous tax burdens. If the University were to take on the construction of the new dormitory space, would the rental income that results from that cover the costs of financing it or would we actually be diminishing the operating budget?

Secretary May explained that it is not the operating budget. He asked if someone would like to explain that issue.

Chancellor Holub explained that these are the things they are looking at right now; what it costs to build something. It also has to do with what it costs to put infrastructure in certain places on campus, whether infrastructure is already there or has to be rebuilt. What would be the cost of parking at various places? He said that there are a lot of different issues to explore but the general principle, when you are dealing with auxiliaries, is that the auxiliaries are going to pay for themselves. That is what we are aiming at, obviously, in the construction of student housing. This is not that we have something ready right now to go forward with but that is certainly what we are looking to achieve. We do not want to take money out of the general budget to pay for this, which would come out of the operating budget really. This would be the only place that the money could come from. We are looking for the housing units we construct to be self-generating.

Secretary May said that one can look back to what happened with the New North Dormitories, not to say that we will necessarily follow that model in the future. We are talking about very important questions. Would any money come out of our operating budget to cover the buildings, and the separate question of how the rents would be established. The New North Dormitories provides a model. That project went through a lot of evolution. It was originally supposed to be a 1,500-bed project for $72 million. It ended up being an 864-bed project for $93 million. The building went from a $48,000 a bed to $110,000 a bed in the course of two years as it went into design and construction. The price more than doubled the cost per bed as they went along, ending up with an extraordinarily expensive cost per bed.

Then the question is whether we should charge students who are in that facility the true costs of each bed there (which would be a sky-high rent) or distribute the cost throughout the whole system. For the New North project, they did a survey of parents and students about this issue, and they came up with an intermediate proposal. If they set rents at true cost, then 90% of students in that building would be from New Jersey and Long Island and the students who wanted to save money on their housing would be in the oldest part of the campus (if they went to buildings where the bonds were paid off so the rents could be very low). Under this proposal, the rents on campus got leveled out. New North has somewhat higher rents but nowhere near as high as they would be if students were paying the true costs. The housing operation, as a whole, with all 12,000 beds, is self funding.
This does drop to the bottom line. If what you are interested in is the total amount a resident student pays on campus, that will be increased if we build the new dorms, and it will be increased if we build the classroom building. The classroom building, at $85 million, translates to a $480 a year fee, according to Vice Chancellor Hatch, which allows for financial aid to kick in for 1/3 of that (or something on that order). These multi-million dollar projects do affect the bottom line, either on the academic side or on the student affairs side, in increased costs to the student. The argument that it is a separate consideration because it is an auxiliary project is partly true, but not completely true, because it falls to the bottom line of the student bill.

Secretary May then read the motion.

WHEREAS, the campus classroom stock is insufficient, in quantity and quality, for current instructional needs; and

WHEREAS, current plans call for an expansion of the student body; and

WHEREAS, the State has removed the proposed classroom building from its list of funded capital projects;

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Faculty Senate recommends that the administration develop a plan to respond to the postponement of the state-funded academic/classroom building, to include interim improvements and new construction within available funding; and be it further resolved that improvements to and construction of instructional facilities be viewed as the most critical capital priority for the campus.

The motion was seconded and adopted.

8. Special Report of the Committee on Committees concerning Nominations to Faculty Senate Councils and Committees, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 10-022 with Motion No. 23-10.  

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Nominations to Faculty Senate Councils and Committees, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 10-022.

An amendment was proposed adding to the Honorary Degree Advising Committee Charles Manz, Dept. of Management and reappointing Arthur Kinney, Dept. of English.

The motion was seconded and adopted as amended.

The 690th Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate stood adjourned at 5:20 p.m. on December 15, 2009.

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