Presiding Officer W. Brian O’Connor called the 714th Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate to order on February 2, 2012 at 3:30 p.m. in Herter Hall, Room 227.

A. PRESENTATION BY JUANITA HOLLER, ASSOCIATE VICE CHANCELLOR FOR FACILITIES AND CAMPUS SERVICES, AND DENNIS SWINFORD, DIRECTOR OF CAMPUS PLANNING
“MASTER PLAN UPDATE”
(QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION TO FOLLOW)
(See attached)

Senator Curt Conner noted that his department, Engineering, has quadrupled in size over the past three years. Other related departments have doubled in size. Yet there are no buildings planned in the area of Engineering. He wondered if the planners missed the demographics or if they just made them up.

Mr. Swinford stated that the sciences have been very successful on this campus, and student interest is verifying that. The area surrounding Engineering is a dense and complicated part of campus. Before the Master Planning process began, the planners executed a detailed study of the science and engineering master plan with Wilson Architects. The study went into great detail about how to accommodate growth in these departments. There are new footprints for a number of new buildings in the area, or relatively nearby. There is an ability to grow. The University is trying to get planning caught up to reality. It simply takes time to deliver new buildings and laboratories. It is understandably frustrating to feel this lack. The planners are working to meet the campus’ needs as fast as they can. New space is becoming available in the New Laboratory Science Building. It may not benefit Engineering directly, but some of the backfill space may benefit more than just the users moving into the new building. The planners did not invent any demographics and they do have a plan to address the needs of the Engineering department.

Senator Steven Brewer noticed that North Pleasant St. is represented with a dashed line in slide #15. He wondered what that meant.

Mr. Swinford stated that North Pleasant St. is a very special facility. There have been several plans that proposed closing North Pleasant St., diverting transportation around campus. That is still a goal for the campus. Ultimately, or in a utopian world where all the issues surrounding closing the street could be solved, North Pleasant St. would be closed. North Pleasant is not the University’s street. It belongs to the Town of Amherst. It is a key facility for residents of North Amherst to get to Amherst Center. Many people use it and, depending on the time of day, many people avoid it. The dotted line indicates that the University is going to work toward reducing its demand on that street. Parking spaces and service areas that are accessed via North Pleasant are going to be rerouted. The University is looking to reduce its destinations along that stretch. The design for the street is far more pedestrian friendly, with clear crosswalks and possibly a change of surface material. We hope to create a condition in which the volume of traffic on the street is reduced. The greatest advantage that North Pleasant provides for the campus is in public transportation. Most students from the other four colleges that come to UMass to take classes come on buses that stop along North Pleasant. To some extent, it is the University’s transit spine. Mr. Swinford, as well as many people he has discussed the issue with, feels that the public transit system needs to be supported. In this age of sustainability, we are looking to diminish our dependence on single-occupancy automobiles, and to do that we need to support public transit. Our policy toward North Pleasant is to dial down demand on that road in hopes of using it only for buses.

Senator Brewer further addressed the growth projections, which show a 20% increase in students but only a 10% increase in faculty and staff. He wondered what the calculus was that gave the planners those numbers.

Mr. Swinford stated that he would not be able to share the exact calculus because he does not know it. To some extent, the projections are proportional to today’s conditions. They are estimates that have been determined in line with the Framework for Excellence document. The plan that Mr. Swinford put forth with the list of projects is aspiration. Many of the projects do not yet have funding.

Joseph Larson, Professor Emeritus and Former Secretary of the Faculty Senate, thanked the Senate for allowing him the opportunity to speak. The group that Professor Larson represents, Preserve UMass, was concerned when the funds originally allocated for planning were seriously cut back. The group was concerned that the result of such cuts would be a less-than-satisfactory plan. The group met with Associate Vice Chancellor Juanita Holler and she promised a professional plan. Professor Larson asked Mr. Swinford to tell Associate Vice Chancellor Holler that Preserve UMass is glad that she produced on that promise.
With respect to Mr. Swinford, who has been leading the details on the Plan, Professor Larson noted that this planning process has been more open and participatory than any that the University has seen since he began his tenure in the early 1950s. That is very positive. Moreover, for the first time, there is a campus plan that addresses the historic concerns of Preserve UMass. The Plan actively proposes adaptive reuse, a constructive way to go. Professor Larson noted that Mr. Swinford has put himself as a target on the stage many times—in the Campus Center, before small groups, before the Town of Amherst—and Professor Larson could not see any permanent scars, and he thanked Mr. Swinford for his willingness for discussion. There are still one or two issues that Preserve UMass is concerned about, but those questions will be resolved in another venue. Professor Larson hopes that this Plan does not end up in the stack of Master Plans in the archives, or some closet in Whitmore, that have been sitting there since they were written. This Plan deserves to have some life to it, and Professor Larson hopes it is successful.

Mr. Swinford appreciated the kind words, but stated that the planners cannot take credit for the open and participatory process without the direct support of University leadership. It was clear that Campus Planning wanted an open process, and Chancellor Holub made it possible to execute that process. The commitment of the campus to recognize the importance of master planning and create a group on the campus to focus on planning that is well staffed creates a culture of planning, and not just a plan. When you merely create a plan, it is easy to put it on the shelf. When you create a culture of planning where individuals often discuss the physical conditions of the campus in an open atmosphere, a culture of planning is created. He hopes that a legacy of this culture has begun.

B. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Principal Administrative Officers

Chancellor Robert Holub began by welcoming the Senators back for the spring semester. The Governor’s budget, the first step in a long haul of budgetary work that will not be completed until June, was recently released. The University is pleased that it provides two important items. The first is a 3.5% increase for union employees on June 30. If the contract is reached, it provides 1.75% beginning July 1 and an additional 1.75% on January 1. It is a positive budget, but it is unclear where the additional money is going. The money was not added to the base budget, the appropriation. We assume it will be, as it has in previous years. Right now, however, it stands as a one-time appropriation. If it stands as such, it will be difficult for the University because it will go away after this year. The budget presents a bill for the FY14 year, as the two 1.75% increases mean that more money will be necessary to meet the budget. The needed money is about $2.1 million, which presents the University with an immediate deficit. The bill does not include increases for non-union employees. Traditionally, the University has given equal pay increases to non-union employees. If the University did that, it would need to appropriate $2 million. Other than that, the budget is flat. It has not paid for any of the increases the University had last year in salaries, which were raised 3.5%. There is nothing for the merit and market increases that the University is in the process of implementing. There is nothing for capital construction or any other cost increases. Tempered with the positive news of union employee pay increases, there is a note of caution: what we have is a flat budget and increased costs. The budget process is long, and it will be followed with interest.

Ernest May, Secretary of the Faculty Senate, acknowledged the long process of revision involved in the state budget, but stated that the budget could present a substantial deficit to academic affairs on campus. He wondered how this was being addressed, and how the deficit compared to the total campus budget for academic affairs.

Chancellor Holub stated that many approaches are being taken regarding the budget. Currently, academic affairs represent approximately $250 million of the campus’ budget. The Governor’s budget could present a $15 million deficit to academic affairs, even after including the proposed 3% increase in tuition and fees.

Provost James Staros updated the Senate on recent and ongoing dean searches. On-campus interviews are taking place for the deans of the Graduate School and Social and Behavioral Sciences. Interviews for Humanities and Fine Arts will quickly proceed as well. He looks forward to those searches concluding successfully very soon. He was disappointed to note, however, that the search for the Dean of Engineering has again failed after a massive attempt to secure a qualified candidate. The search committee had nearly secured a candidate in May, but the committee will now be dissolved until further notice.

Carol Barr, Vice Provost for Undergraduate and Continuing Education, updated the Senate on the progress of Integrative Experience implementation. Plans and proposals for IE’s have been submitted by nearly every department on campus. The faculty and departments have worked hard and the majority of proposals are looking very good. The General Education Council has been doing a phenomenal job. It met over January and meets about every other week to get these proposals through the approval processes. After Gen Ed Council approval, proposals will go forth to the Registrar’s Office, hopefully
by the March 1 deadline to get into the course scheduling processes so that students can register for them, and the University can have a successful Integrative Experience curriculum in place, by the fall.

2. The Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Ernest May, Secretary of the Faculty Senate, added to Professor Joseph Larson’s comments on the Master Planning process. It has been a very participatory process and Secretary May thanked Chancellor Holub for supporting that process, as it has not been the case during past planning processes. There are many moving parts to the process, and it is good to think of it as a living process. This project needs to continue to evolve over time.

The Health Council is reviewing the complex issues regarding the future of University Health Services, especially the new building. There is an administrative committee headed by Susan Pearson that is also looking at it. It is a very complicated issue, and hopefully we can get to a better place. This issue involves healthcare in this entire area. It is not limited to a simple campus issue, as healthcare is changing everywhere. The UMass Memorial Health Care system, which controls many of the healthcare provisions in central Massachusetts, recently laid off a number of employees.

The Research Council is reviewing the Innovation Institute, a major positive initiative for the campus. This is another complicated initiative.

Reiterating Vice Provost Barr’s comments on the work of the General Education Council, Secretary May noted that the Gen Ed reform and the Integrative Experience are composed of numerous moving parts. The processes are evolving all the time and creating a more engaging and sustainable curriculum for the undergraduate population, which is the core business of the University. It will make the University a better place, and better able to compete for excellent students in the decades ahead. It certainly deserves the support of all faculty and administrators on all levels. To date, there are at least a dozen fully-approved Integrative Experiences, and at least 60 more to go. The General Education Council has never been so active and engaged as it has been for the past year.

In the process of Gen Ed reform, an online system has been developed for submission of course and IE proposals. This process is being expanded to the Faculty Senate as a whole, so the infamous Course Approval Procedure Guide will, over time, be put online. The Provost’s Office has been working hard on this process for two or three years.

4. The Faculty Delegates to the Board of Trustees

Secretary Ernest May noted that at the Science and Technology Committee meeting, the UMass Medical School put on one of its “dog and pony shows,” including five Howard Hughes Scholars—very distinguished and well-supported professors—describing the new Translational Medicine Facility, which will be quite phenomenal. Some very big issues are being addressed. One of the professors is hoping to cure diabetes, and another has produced the treatment which prevents the transmission of HIV across the placenta, a huge advancement for the third world that prevents transmission from mother to child in utero. Many smaller problems are being addressed as well. Their presentations are always inspirational.

There was also a report of the Mental Health Services on the campuses. One important takeaway from that presentation was that between 25 and 30% of students nationwide arrive on campus with some kind of prescription medicine, usually psychotropic medicines. This is an issue not only for University Health Services but the faculty who need to be aware of the situation.

Finally, the Intercampus Faculty Council is considering the general question of the relationship between the University of Massachusetts and the state university campuses in the area of doctoral programs. The state universities that were recently upgraded from state colleges have a surging interest in doctoral programs. Most of the interest is in applied doctoral programs such as the Doctorate of Nursing Practice, Criminology or Education. They have the authority to offer such degrees in conjunction with the University of Massachusetts. It is not such an issue on the Amherst campus, but it has led to some sparks at other campuses and will continue to be an issue of discussion in the future.

5. The Representative of the Massachusetts Society of Professors

Randall Phillis, President of the Massachusetts Society of Professors, wished the Senate a happy Groundhog’s Day, and was pleased to report that because there was a shadow, there will be six more weeks of bargaining for the MSP, as opposed to a month-and-a-half, had there not been. In short, the MSP is in bargaining mode, and President Phillis is pleased to agree with the Chancellor on so many of the points he made earlier. The MSP, through significant effort over the past two or three months, managed to secure an offer of 3.5% raises for the coming two years for the faculty and members of the MSP’s bargaining unit as well as every other bargaining unit on the campus. Moreover, through the MSP’s coordination
with administrators on the Amherst campus and through the work of the MTA, as well as efforts from the President’s Office, a collective bargaining reserve, which was named as such in the Governor’s Budget—an advancement that, although once standard fare, has not occurred for decades—has been secured. This is a huge victory. However, as Chancellor Holub pointed out, that money has to move to the base budget to be secure in the future, and the base budget did not increase at all, which means it was cut, as there are issues with inflation. The University needs to worry about that, and it needs to act on it. We cannot simply watch what happens in Boston. We need to act upon the players involved to persuade them that defunding the University and public higher education is not the proper action they should follow. On March 8, all higher education bargaining units will be having a common lobby day in Boston to persuade legislators that it is necessary to change the path from defunded to proper and increased funding for higher education in the state. President Phyllis strongly encouraged everyone present to join the MSP in going to Boston to make a case for public higher education. Everyone on campus has a persuasive story to tell about how proper funding for higher education makes a difference for the citizens of Massachusetts.

C. QUESTION PERIOD (10-Minute Limit)

There were no questions.

D. ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, ON BEHALF OF THE FACULTY SENATE, OVER THE JANUARY BREAK

NEW COURSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>CREDITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ART 330</td>
<td>“Photography III”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 333</td>
<td>“Art in the Expanded Field”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART 431</td>
<td>“Photography IV”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLASSICS 355</td>
<td>“Slaves and Freed Slaves in the Classical World”</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH 385</td>
<td>“Creative Writing: Nonfiction”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOURNAL 333</td>
<td>“Introduction to Digital Photojournalism”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLISCI 277</td>
<td>“Making a Global World”</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLISCI 310</td>
<td>“Race and American Politics”</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLISCI 329</td>
<td>“Political Psychology”</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLISCI 350</td>
<td>“Diversity and Politics”</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLISCI 376</td>
<td>“What is Politics?”</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLISCI 473</td>
<td>“Is Democracy Possible Everywhere?”</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBHLTH 303</td>
<td>“Introduction to Environmental Health Sciences”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate affirm the approval of the courses ART 330, 333 and 431, CLASSICS 355, ENGLISH 385, JOURNAL 333, POLISCI 277, 310, 329, 350, 376 and 473 and PUBHLTH 303, 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>E&amp;C-ENG 544</td>
<td>“Trustworthy Computing”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRC 585</td>
<td>“Introduction to GIS”</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGIONPL 587</td>
<td>“People and the Environment: Applications of Environmental Psychology Research to Planning and Design”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate affirm the approval of the courses E&C-ENG 544, NRC 585 and REGIONPL 587, as recommended by the Academic Matters and Graduate Councils.

The motion was seconded and adopted.
E. **ELECTION**

At-Large Member of the Rules Committee (Spring 2012 Semester only) to replace Mari Castañeda, who has resigned.

**Nominee:** MJ Peterson, Political Science

*Senator Richard Bogartz* moved that the nominations be closed.

The motion was seconded, adopted, and Senator MJ Peterson was unanimously elected At-Large Member of the Rules Committee.

F. **NEW BUSINESS**


**MOVED:** That the Faculty Senate approve the Establishment of an Ad Hoc Committee on FBS Football (ACFBS), 29-12 as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 12-020.

*Chancellor Holub* noted that he could not be at the December meeting in which the proposal to form this Ad Hoc Committee was approved. He urged the Senators to vote against the proposed motion. When he first saw the motion, he assumed that it was put forth by the Athletic Council because they possibly found themselves overburdened or unable to track the FBS Football transition as closely as they would want. He has found out since, from faculty members serving on the Athletic Council, that this motion was brought forth, in a way, against them. It is a bad precedent in this body, or any body, to disrespect and dishonor the work of people it has itself appointed to accomplish specific tasks. Not as the Chancellor, but as a faculty member, Chancellor Holub urged the Senate to oppose this motion. The members of the Athletic Council work hard and do a good job. They attend meetings regularly and are incredibly attentive. If the Faculty Senate wants more reports from them, or wants anything from them that they have not provided, then that should be communicated to them. To appoint a committee that usurps what they do is not the right thing to do. Chancellor Holub is aware that some individuals have misgivings about the University’s move to FBS Football, and he respects those objections. As a faculty member at UC-Berkeley for 27 years, he heard all the objections against Division I athletics. There are many valid reasons to object. The objections are not stupid or insipid or factious. There are good reasons to be opposed to many things that go on in Division I or FBS athletics. He does not agree with all the objections, but he does understand them. If the Faculty Senate wants to make objections to the administration, however, it should make objections directly to the administration, and not take them to the people that are working hard for the Senate itself. There is an expression in German, *Der schlägt den sack und meint den esel.* In the Latin of the *Satyricon* it goes, *Qui asinum non potest, stratum caedit.* It basically means, *You hit the sack, but you meant the ass.* It is not particularly flattering to call the administration the ass, but Chancellor Holub believes that if the Senate wants to make objections, it ought to direct them at the target it means to hit, and not dishonor and disrespect the faculty members working for it.

*Senator Richard Bogartz* stated that he understands why some members of the Athletic Council might feel that this was an attempt either to usurp their functions or to undercut them or to make some kind of declaration about them. He has been a party to some of the discussions involving people favoring the Ad Hoc Committee, and nothing he heard would indicate that this Committee hopes to usurp any responsibilities; nothing indicated that the Athletic Council was not doing its job. It was more along the lines of, “It would be nice to have multiple perspectives on this. It is a complex matter and we ought to have more than one group looking at it.” That is the way the conversations went. If there are persons who believe that this is intended as an insult to the Athletic Council, he would like to say that he does not believe that is so. Nor does he think, if the motion is passed, that it must be an insult to the Athletic Council. The Council is free to take it however it wants, but the intention was not to be as an insult. With respect to the administrative “ass,” Senator Bogartz believes that many people have made their remarks in that direction already concerning football, and does not believe any more needs to be said.

*Senator Max Page*, the drafter of the motion, noted that this is simply a vote on the implementation of the motion. The original motion, from the December meeting, asked that the final document be approved by the Senate. There was an extensive discussion at that meeting, during which several people opposed the motion for the various reasons brought up by the Chancellor. The Committee’s formation has already been approved, and this is just the implementation of the specifics concerning the Committee. It is a very broadly-represented Committee.
Senator Frank Hugus stated that, like the other speakers, he has no doubt that the Athletic Council will be vigilant in looking at what goes on with football, as it does with everything else in the athletic program. However, this is probably the single most important and potentially dangerous aspect of the University of Massachusetts that has been faced in a number of years. The consequences of this are not foreseeable and he believes that as many people need to be studying the issue as possible. There is precedent for this motion. About 15 years ago, when another Chancellor decided that the University should explore a move into what was then called Division IA, the Senate, with the cooperation of the administration, appointed a special committee to study it. It was not the Athletic Council; it was an ad hoc committee. That is a parallel and historical precedent, and Senator Hugus sees nothing wrong with this motion. He has nothing but admiration for the work of the Athletic Council.

The motion was seconded and adopted.


MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Special Report of the Provost concerning Schools within Colleges, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 12-021.

Senator Bogartz added that an interesting discussion took place concerning this issue within the Academic Priorities Council, commenced by a presentation by John McCarthy. He believes that it should be mentioned that the departments hoping to join and become schools were combined via bottom-up affiliations of academic interest, and not via impositions from above. At one point, having read the description of what a school is, it sounded like it could be a fairly vacuous thing, possibly little more than a change of stationary, but Senator Bogartz was assured that there will be an approval process in which people will study why certain groups would want to join to become a school.

Senator Curt Conner noted that there should not be an increase in administrative positions associated with a department if it joins another department to create a school within a college.

Secretary May moved to amend the motion in the following way:

At the end of the fourth paragraph of the fifth section, the following sentence should be added: “If such agreements prove insufficient for cross-college schools, then additional enabling legislation may be needed in the future.”

John McCarthy, Special Assistant to the Provost, noted that the amendment was made in response to a concern raised by the Academic Priorities Council. The report of the Academic Priorities Council acknowledges the possibility of schools reporting to more than one dean. At the moment, that is not contemplated, but its future consideration is made explicit by the amendment.

Presiding Officer W. Brian O’Connor referenced the fact that this motion is only enabling legislation. Specific proposals will have to be brought before the Senate before any school, in this new sense, will actually come into existence.

The amendment was seconded and adopted.

Special Assistant McCarthy wanted to make it clear that the four schools will not be renamed colleges by passing this motion; that would require additional action by the schools and then by the Senate. This legislation constitutes an invitation to the schools to be asked to be renamed colleges.

The motion was seconded and adopted as amended.

3. Special Report of the Academic Matters, Academic Priorities, Graduate, Program and Budget and Research Councils concerning an Institute for Holocaust, Genocide, and Memory Studies, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 12-022 with Motion No. 31-12.

The motion was seconded and adopted.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Institute for Holocaust, Genocide, and Memory Studies, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 12-022.

The motion was seconded and adopted.
4. Special Report of the Academic Priorities, Graduate and Program and Budget Councils concerning a
Concentration in Applied Molecular Biotechnology (AMB), as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 12-023 with
Motion No. 32-12.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Concentration in Applied Molecular Biotechnology (AMB),
32-12 as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 12-023.

The motion was seconded and adopted.

5. Special Report of the Graduate and Program and Budget Councils concerning a Master of Business
Administration (MBA) with a Focus in Health Care Administration (HCA), as presented in Sen. Doc. No.
12-024 with Motion No. 33-12.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Master of Business Administration (MBA) with a Focus on
33-12 Health Care Administration (HCA), as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 12-024.

The motion was seconded and adopted.

University of Massachusetts Amherst, Amherst, Massachusetts, USA and Cuhk Business School, The
Chinese University of Hong Kong, HKSAR, China, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 12-025 with Motion No.
34-12.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Exchange Agreement between the University of Massachusetts
34-12 Amherst, Amherst, Massachusetts, USA and Cuhk Business School, The Chinese University of Hong
Kong, HKSAR, China, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 12-025.

The motion was seconded and adopted.

7. Special Report of the International Studies Council concerning an Exchange Agreement between the
University of Massachusetts Amherst, Amherst, Massachusetts USA and the Antai College of Economics
and Management, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, China, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 12-026 with
Motion No. 35-12.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Exchange Agreement between the University of Massachusetts
35-12 Amherst, Amherst, Massachusetts USA and the Antai College of Economics and Management, Shanghai
Jiao Tong University, China, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 12-026.

The motion was seconded and adopted.

8. Special Report of the Rules Committee concerning the Establishment of an Ad Hoc Committee to be
named the Joint Provost/Faculty Senate/Massachusetts Society of Professors Committee on the Evaluation
of Teaching (JCET), as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 12-019A with Motion No. 28-12.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Establishment of an Ad Hoc Committee to be named the
28-12 Joint Provost/Faculty Senate/Massachusetts Society of Professors Committee on the Evaluation
of Teaching (JCET), as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 12-019A.

Secretary Ernest May moved to withdraw the motion. The Faculty Senate believed it had an understanding with the MSP
(which clearly has primary responsibility regarding negotiating the evaluation of teaching as part of the contract), but that
turns out to have not been the case. The MSP is asserting its authority to be the sole negotiator of tenure standards and
other items as well as the evaluation of teaching. JCET was to serve as an advisory committee to the administration on
matters surrounding the evaluation of teaching. Then the administration would negotiate the language that would become
part of the contract with the MSP. The MSP has decided that it wants to take jurisdiction over this process, and it will
likely set up a committee similar to JCET, and although members of the Faculty Senate will be involved, it will not
formally involve the Faculty Senate at this time.

Senator Bogartz stated that he trusts Secretary May’s judgment, but not the logic behind withdrawing this, as he does not
see what the problem is if the committee serves only in an advisory capacity.
MSP President Phillis stated that the contract is now open. The MSP is engaged in full-on bargaining with the administration. The administration put a proposal on the table to modify the tenure standards, or at least to evaluate the current standard and consider modifications to it. One of the issues surrounding tenure standards is the evaluation of teaching, as well as research and service. Given that the evaluation of teaching is an open contract item, the MSP felt it was critical to engage in the negotiations properly. If the administration wants to change something about a clear contractual concern, they should come to the MSP and figure out how to do it, and not do it instead through the Faculty Senate, which does not have authority to bargain. The MSP is the sole entity on campus that has the authority to bargain on behalf of the faculty. The MSP is asserting its legal responsibility to bargain on behalf of the faculty. The MSP is just making sure that bargaining is carried out properly. It is very interested in considering the issues this committee was going to consider, and it is not as though these issues will not be worked out, but the MSP does not want to come in behind a Faculty Senate committee and be expected to approve or deny something it wasn’t involved in creating.

Senator Curt Conner believes that the evaluation of teaching is not the sole responsibility of the union, as it is a main aspect of the entire University. There are better ways to evaluate teaching than with student surveys, and all the issues should be discussed by the Faculty Senate.

President Phillis personally agrees with Senator Conner’s thoughts on evaluating teaching. There are complicated and important ways to consider the quality of teaching. They extend well beyond the SRTI form. That is not the MSP’s point of dispute. However, the evaluation of teaching is unambiguously considered in promotion, tenure, and merit considerations, which are most certainly the purview of the union and the contract. The MSP is eager to engage the participation of Faculty Senators and other members of the campus to think of how to best handle this.

Secretary May noted that there used to be a Faculty Senate Committee, the Academic Personnel Policy Committee, that was charged with dealing with any personnel policy issues that were not taken over by the union when it was formed some 30 years ago. It was disbanded because it had so little to do after the union was formed. It is now up to the Rules Committee to provide input to the Faculty Senate and MSP if the Senate wishes to continue reviewing this issue. The AAUP has two statements on the evaluation of teaching, one rather old one and a newer one that considers the exact point brought up by Senator Conner regarding the inadequacy of student evaluations alone.

Senator Howard Peelle stated that, regardless of the particular disposition of this motion, in order to benefit from examining the evaluation of teaching, it makes sense to involve the Center for Teaching and Faculty Development, who are on campus and have dozens of years of experience.

Senator Bogartz noted that the charge of this committee would be to investigate, investigate, and outline! He does not see the problem of a group like this. At this very meeting, Senator Bogartz stood up and said that it would be a good idea to have more than one perspective on football. He believes multiple perspectives are still valuable. He does not see how this committee undercuts the union’s bargaining position at all. It just provides information. It might even help the union’s bargaining position. It’s a matter of finding out what’s going on.

President Phillis stated that the union is currently striving to reconstitute the committee that the Faculty Senate formed, with members of the administration, Faculty Senate, and faculty members at large, to do a thorough and complete job with a diverse set of perspectives and points of information. The MSP will pursue this correctly with all due diligence.

The motion to withdraw the motion was seconded and adopted by a vote of 13 in favor to 5 opposed.

The 714th Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate stood adjourned at 5:20 p.m. on February 2, 2012.

Respectfully submitted,

Ernest D. May
Secretary of the Faculty Senate