Presiding Officer W. Brian O’Connor called the 721st Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate to order on November 15, 2012 at 3:30 p.m. in Herter Hall, Room 227.

**Presiding Officer W. Brian O’Connor** announced that the meeting would begin with the Chancellor’s portion of the announcement period because Chancellor Subbaswamy would be required to leave the meeting early to attend a lecture.

**Chancellor Kumble Subbaswamy** stated that the University’s strategic planning process is moving forward. There will be an update in December that, because the planning is the work of a joint task force, should include no surprises. There was a successful alumni event in Boston, the Salute to Service Banquet and Scholarship Awards. The Chancellor congratulated the University’s advancement team and its relations team for their success. The Boston-area alumni were thrilled that the University held a major event in the city. Robert Kraft was the featured attraction, as he received a legacy salute to service award. Mr. Kraft spoke very highly of the value of the University of Massachusetts. The University will continue to reclaim its mantle as the flagship land-grant university of Massachusetts in and around Boston.

There will be some changes upcoming in the Chancellor’s Office. Susan Pearson is officially retiring as of January 13, 2013, at which time she will be working part-time at Chancellor Subbaswamy’s request. The Chancellor does not plan to fill the vacant Deputy Chancellor position for an indefinite time. There is a lot of work that needs to be done. There is a separate faculty/MSP assistant provost position that will replace the portion of Ms. Pearson’s position relating to the MSP. Thinking about these changes, Chancellor Subbaswamy and Special Assistant to the Chancellor John Dubach agreed that a full time Chief Information Officer needed to be appointed at the University. Vice Chancellor Dubach has been doing too many jobs for too many years—any one of which could completely fill his time. A national search will take place, and the Chancellor will solicit suggestions for a search committee from the Senate and other units on campus. This is an important change in the Chancellor’s Office that will play a role in how the University moves forward with its technology strategies. The appointment should be made by July 1. The Chancellor has briefly discussed this with the Rules Committee.

### A. UPDATE ON FY12 YEAR-END ATHLETIC BUDGET BY JOHN MCCUTCHEON DIRECTOR OF ATHLETICS

(QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION TO FOLLOW)

The Excel document accompanying this update may be accessed at:

http://www.umass.edu/senate/fs/fs_minutes_12-13.htm

**John McCutcheon, Director of Athletics**, noted that his address would be both an update on the FY12 year-end budget and a progress report on the Athletic budget for FY13. Last spring, the Athletic Department told the Senate it would present this information with particular emphasis on the transition to FBS Football. There is more information in the document presented to the Senate than could be discussed in length, but Director McCutcheon would present an overview of the data. A more detailed report would be given to the Athletic Council’s Budget Subcommittee and the Ad Hoc Committee on FBS Football.

The first column of the document’s first page shows the department’s original budget. To the right of that are the year-end actuals as confirmed by the Athletic Department’s audit process that concluded in October. The first line is the base subsidy from the state. We began with a $10 million allocation and that increased somewhat at the year’s end. Below that is the non-base state and university subsidy. The original amount was what the department included on the pro forma for football in terms of bridge funding. That did increase significantly from $619,000 to $1.3 million. The reason for that was basically the buyout of the former football staff. Most of these numbers are what was presented to the Senate last spring. There has been little change for FY12. Moving down the two columns, there are not many variables from one year to the next, with the exception of revenue from TV and radio sponsorships. There was a decrease from what was projected in that area. That decrease is basically due to the loss of a couple of major sponsors. One of these sponsors was Big Y which shifted its advertising philosophy away from collegiate athletics. They dropped UConn as well. Continuing down, there are not many differences between the projections and what was actually realized. Compensation shows an increase. This is due to the football transition and the buyout of the former staff. At the bottom, the balance between funding sources and expenses was $27,365,232. That is pretty much the same number as was presented in the spring.

Moving over to FY13, the Athletic Department’s original budgets are in the third column. These can be compared with updates for moving forward. There continues to be a line item for bridge funding of $270,000 that is related to football, but primarily is for the allocation towards women’s sports. That has moved up somewhat as a department. There is an increase related to coaching changes in Men’s Ice Hockey. The line that will get the most attention in all of this is that addressing ticket and guarantee revenue for football. The original projection was $1.9 million. The current projection is around $1.2
million. This will be spoken to specifically when football is individually discussed. Ticket revenue for basketball, hockey
and the various other sports has not changed. There has been an increase in what the department is putting in from the
fund balance to offset shortfalls and other areas. Other than that, there is not a whole lot of difference between the original
and current projections. The department is showing a challenge right now of about $715,000 between projected expenses
and income. That is primarily and directly related to football.

The second sheet of the presentation shows the FY12 budget in a format requested by the Faculty Senate, breaking the
budget down by sport in terms of compensation, scholarships and operating expenses. The variances in this sheet generally
relate to the buyout of former staff and other transition costs.

The next page breaks down administrative details. This format was also requested by the Faculty Senate in the spring.

Concerning football, there was a request to compare the current state of the program against the original pro forma. The
first column of the fourth sheet shows the FY12 pro forma of three or four years ago. It then shows the revisions to that
budget and the final accounting. The only major variance there is the $678,000 for the one-time buyout of the former
coaching staff. For the most part, these are the same figures that were presented in the spring. The next sheet regarding
FY12 football revenue is in a format designed in cooperation with the University’s Administration and Finance Office. It
attempts to break down where funding came from, in terms of program-generated revenue versus what is typically
regarded as institutional support. This is listed different ways in different reports, but there are basically two versions, one
at the top and a condensed version at the bottom that lists it by simply discriminating between institutional support and
program-generated revenue. It is really just a reiteration of the figures from the previous sheets in a different format.

Moving forward to FY13, costs are broken down sport-by-sport. It presents some details about where each sport is. There
is not a whole lot of variation. Similarly, administrative areas are represented for FY13.

Finally, the FY13 projected expenses for football as compared with the original pro forma. Some areas do go up. The
increase in scholarship funding is pretty much dictated by the increasing cost of scholarships and not an increase in the
number of scholarships. One line under “compensation foundation” is that the University does fund a portion of Coach
Molnar’s salary from a privately-raised fund. Most of the other numbers stayed fairly similar. Travel costs have been
significantly more, particularly regarding air travel. Since the year began, the cost of charters and air travel in general has
been a significant challenge. For equipment and uniforms, the budget was augmented by fundraised money in order to buy
new uniforms. Game expenses went up primarily because of the increased cost to officials that was approved by the
conference after the budget was established. In regard to expenses, the department is pleased that it has been able to offset
many expenses through one-time allocations for salaries, equipment and other areas. About $228,000 of additional
expenses were offset with additional fundraised dollars. The last page addresses football revenue. The base allocation has
stayed the same as the original pro forma. The departmental support in other areas has increased somewhat. A lot of that
came from an allocation received from the MAC. UMass received $150,000 as part of Temple’s departure from the
conference. That money was used to augment the football marketing campaign. The line that addresses ticket sales will get
the most attention. Football has not reached its goal for this year. This line incorporates three areas: ticket sales, revenue
projected from VIP suites, and additional parking for a VIP area. Ticket sales are running about half of where they were
projected. The box situation has been a very difficult one. Per the University’s contract, it receives six boxes at Gillette
Stadium which were projected to be sold for upwards of $125,000. Unfortunately, the University has been unable to work
out a process with Gillette in which Gillette would be able to let the University know which boxes those would be and what
size they would be in a timely fashion that would have enabled the University to sell them to potential leasers. That is a big
issue that the University needs to work out with Gillette and a significant loss of revenue. The bottom line on all this is that
there is about a $715,000 shortfall for football this year. The department will continue to work at offsetting that shortfall
over the course of the fiscal year with additional fundraised dollars, sponsorships, and other forms of revenue. It’s a
challenge that the department will work through. The overall experience at Gillette has been positive, other than the
number of attendees. The comments of those that have gone to the games have been positive. The department has learned
a lot about what is and is not effective in terms of marketing and outreach. The department is in a pretty good position going
into the spring. Income from guarantees goes from $875,000 this year to at least the $1.6 million that has been contracted
for next year. There will be a sixth home game next year, as well. Those two components would have offset the challenge
this year even without the box and parking revenue. There are still challenges, but the program is in a good position.

Senator Richard Bogartz thanked Director McCutcheon for the detailed breakdown. When Senator Bogartz sees the word
‘revenue,’ he thinks of money coming in. From the standpoint of the athletic enterprise, there is money coming in and
going out, but it is different than the University. The University is feeding money to the athletic enterprise and the athletic
enterprise calls this revenue. Senator Bogartz sees this money as an expense, rather than as revenue; it is an expense to the
operating budget of the University. When football revenue roughly matches football expenses, it is at a cost to the operating
budget of the University. It would be nice if there were tabular representation of how much the University is putting out to athletics and how much is actually coming from external sources.

_Director McCutcheon_ noted that the sheet separating University support and program-generated support comes close to the packaging that Senator Bogartz is requesting.

_Senator David Gross_ asked about the cost of the stadium and what is currently projected regarding that.

_Director McCutcheon_ stated that what the department was prepared to speak about was the FY12 budget and an update on the FY13 budget to date. There may be an opportunity in the future to speak to the stadium, with Vice Chancellor James Sheehan present. The support facility and athletic training facility of the stadium and the new press box have a total projection of $34.5 million. The project is moving forward very well. Those facilities will be used year round, will not only for the few football games held at the stadium any given year. Football will occupy space there year round, as will other sports such as the Women’s Lacrosse team. There will also be opportunities for other University functions.

_Senator Curt Conner_ said that not a single one of his students has been to a football game. They don’t go to Foxborough; it is too far away. The University is losing a fair amount of the campus that would be part of athletic support. He wondered where the development costs—payment for vice chancellors for development, et cetera—were listed on the presented budget.

_Director McCutcheon_ noted that the University took 38 busloads of students to the first game against Indiana and has taken between six and eight busloads full for the other games at Gillette Stadium. There has been fairly significant student involvement. Football will not be at Gillette forever. This is a two-year situation where football has to play all of its games at Gillette because the stadium on campus is inadequate to support FBS-level competition. In particular, the press box can’t handle what is needed for that level. As soon as those renovations are complete, games will move back to campus and the students will be more engaged in terms of homecoming and the MAC’s longstanding tradition with ESPN of midweek games. As we move forward, there will be a nice balance between Gillette and the campus. In terms of the developmental costs, those are not included with any sport budget. They are not assigned with basketball or hockey or field hockey or any of those things. They are included overall in terms of what is done in the overall departmental budget, but some of the department’s development officers are actually funded out of central advancement. The costs for what the Athletic Department funds are listed under the administrative budget line.

_Senator Conner_ noted that you have to be careful of spending too much to raise too little.

_Senator Audrey Altstadt_ stated that the number of busloads of students going to football games doesn’t mean anything to her because she doesn’t know how big the buses are. She wanted to know how many actual people are attending the games. She has lived in Amherst for over 20 years, and she has rarely seen the small McGuirk stadium full for football. In the much larger Gillette Stadium, she imagines that these people take up even less space. Part of the idea with the move to Gillette was to draw people from Boston. She wonders how many attendees—students and others—are at the games. Secondly, she wondered what the term ticket guarantee means exactly. Who guarantees that money? And if the sales don’t reach the amount of the guarantee, where does that additional money come from?

_Director McCutcheon_ stated that when UMass plays at institutions like Michigan, Wisconsin, Penn State, or Notre Dame, those institutions pay UMass the guarantee. These are situations that are one-time games. Those schools will not return to play a game at UMass. Those guaranteed income numbers are guaranteed by the institution the team is competing against.

_Chancellor Kumble Subbaswamy_ noted that a school like Michigan, with its 109,000 person capacity stadium, is so sure it will make so much money on a football game, the guarantee they give the other team is a pittance. There is no question about that money coming in.

_Director McCutcheon_ further noted that UMass football has been averaging just under 10,000 people at Gillette Stadium. That number is determined according to NCAA standards. Only tickets actually sold or present attendees can be counted. This is significantly higher than what the team averaged on campus, but there is still work to do. UMass football needs to reach out to the eastern Massachusetts market. The current numbers are not where they should be and there is great potential to increase attendance. Once games come back to Amherst, it is expected that the attendance will grow here as well.
Senator Frank Hugus returned to the question raised by Senator Bogartz regarding money coming in to athletics. According to the information that has been distributed, approximately 70% of revenue for athletics—about $18 or $19 million in both FY12 and FY13—comes either from the University (that is, the state) or from student fees. The academic side of the University could sure use a little bit of that money. He wonders what will happen if there is a mid-year rescission and the money is not available for either the academic or athletic side. How is the academic side of the University going to be held harmless?

Chancellor Subbaswamy noted that there is some very interesting comparative data that Faculty Senate Secretary Ernest May shared with him about the different college athletic conferences and the percentage of the athletic budget that comes from the University in one form or another. In the conferences outside the SEC, Pac-12, and Big Ten, somewhere between 80 to 90% of the athletic budgets come from the universities. These are at institutions comparable to UMass—schools that are similar in size, in UMass’ conferences, and in the same geographic area. The 70% figure here is on the low side. That is not justification, just context. When universities like UMass participate in conferences in a series of sports, a commitment is made. If UMass were playing in the SEC, revenue—especially from television—grows and the state subsidy decreases. Having said that, the University operates by separating departments. The Athletic Department is a department like any other. When it shows revenue, the University subsidy is part of that. If you look at the budget for the English Department, its revenue would show money that comes from the state and tuition dollars allocated to that department. In accounting terms, the University subsidy is a revenue source for all units. That is the way it is depicted. When and if there is a decision to adjust football, the University will discuss with various consultative bodies how the reductions will be absorbed, what will be done centrally if there are cash reserves, and how much will be absorbed by the units. It will not be across the board. Based on that discussion, all departments will absorb a certain amount. The Athletic Department’s portion will be determined in a similar way, by using well-understood principles for—first and foremost—protecting students and other priorities. Discussions will take place, priorities will be set, and, accordingly, there will be reductions assigned to all departments.

Senator Max Page stated that the Ad Hoc Committee on FBS Football would present its review of the athletic budget. He believes that what Senator Bogartz stated is correct, that there should be, and in the Ad Hoc Committee’s report there will be, a specific acknowledgment of what are tax payer contributions to the total budget. The marketing budget was a big chunk of money this year, $500,000 was added, but that is not necessarily considered part of the athletic budget. Senator Page wondered what marketing would look like in the coming years.

Director McCutcheon noted that the $500,000 was an allocation made by former Chancellor Holub last spring that went to University Relations. It was a one-time allocation with no guarantee moving forward. The Athletic Department learned a lot from the use of that money in terms of how it was invested and what was and wasn’t effective. Whether that will be there or not in the future is undetermined.

B. PANEL DISCUSSION

"Reclaiming and Maintaining Excellence in a Changing World: Diversity, Equity and Inclusion at the University of Massachusetts Amherst"

MODERATOR:
AMILCAR SHABAZZ, PROFESSOR OF AFRO-AMERICAN STUDIES

PANELISTS:
NILANJANA DASGUPTA, PROFESSOR OF PSYCHOLOGY (4 Min.)
DÉBORA FERREIRA, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, EQUAL OPPORTUNITY AND DIVERSITY OFFICE (4 Min.)
MZAMO MANGALISO, ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF MANAGEMENT (4 Min.)
JOEL MARTIN, VICE PROVOST FOR ACADEMIC PERSONNEL AND DEAN OF THE FACULTY (4 Min.)
XIMENA ZÚÑIGA, ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF STUDENT DEVELOPMENT, SOCIAL JUSTICE EDUCATION, SCHOOL OF EDUCATION (4 Min.)
(See attached)
C. ANNUAL REPORTS


The reports were received.

Maurianne Adams, Chair of the General Education Council, stated that, for the past two years, the Council has been following the charge to change the General Education curriculum. A year ago, 75% of General Education courses had been transitioned from three-to four-credit courses. In the past year, the Council has transitioned the Social World courses to four credits each. The Council has worked hard on the Integrative Experience. This fall, there were 74 Integrative Experience courses offered. In the spring, there will be more than 60. The University is well on its way to achieving the success of the Integrative Experience. This has been a massive undertaking. It has involved extraordinary collaboration on the part of the administration—Martha Stassen’s Office of Academic Planning and the TAs there—faculty proposers, department chairs, Integrative Experience coordinators and deans, as well as the very hard working General Education Council of over 30 people. It has been an institutional change and a great achievement.

Presiding Officer W. Brian O’Connor, on behalf of the Senate, thanked Professor Adams and the General Education Council for the incredible job they have done. He served on the General Education Council and knows personally about the incredible amount of work Professor Adams and the Council are doing.

D. BYLAW CHANGES


MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Bylaw Changes, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 13-001A.

Ernest May, Secretary of the Faculty Senate, moved to amend Sen. Doc. No. 13-001A by replacing it with 13-001B. One of the changes is simply technical. The membership on many councils and committees is described as including at least one representative from each school or college. The recent addition of the Schools within Colleges policy has created and will create schools that should not be included in that definition. For the previous language, we are substituting “one representative from each school or college headed by a dean.” We will not include schools that are headed by a director, such as the Stockbridge School or the proposed School of Computer Science. The representation will stand as it currently does. The other change has to do with the General Education Council. The Council has recommended rather extensive changes to the Committee on Variance. The previous Committee on Variance was very restrictive. The only variances they could consider were those based on misadvising. The current Vice Provost for Undergraduate and Continuing Education, Carol Barr, the Chair of the General Education Council, Maurianne Adams, and the Council itself have approved a slight relaxing of that standard.

The amendment was seconded and adopted.

The motion was seconded and adopted as amended.

E. NEW COURSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>CREDITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANIMLSCI 382</td>
<td>“Small Animal Nursing”</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTHRO 310</td>
<td>“Cultural Diversity in Northeast North America”</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOURNAL 435</td>
<td>“Web Design for Journalists”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the courses ANIMLSCI 382, ANTHRO 310 and JOURNAL 435, 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>PUBHLTH 507</td>
<td>“Violence as a Public Health Issue”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the course PUBHLTH 507, 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>CE-ENGIN 627</td>
<td>“Rock Mechanics”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECO 634</td>
<td>“Analysis of Environmental Data Lab”</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSYCH 682</td>
<td>“Theory and Practice of Psychotherapy with Adults”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the courses CE-ENGIN 627, ECO 634 and PSYCH 682, as recommended by the Graduate Council.

The motion was seconded and adopted.

F. NEW BUSINESS


MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Revision to the BBA Degree in the Isenberg School of Management, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 13-015.

The motion was seconded and adopted.


MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Revision to the Undergraduate Degree Requirements in the Department of Kinesiology, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 13-016.

The motion was seconded and adopted.

G. OLD BUSINESS

Amendment to the Special Report of the Committee on Committees concerning Nominations to Faculty Senate Councils and Committees, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 12-050D with Motion No. 61-12.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Nominations to Faculty Senate Councils and Committees, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 12-050D as amended.

The motion was seconded and adopted as amended.

H. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Principal Administrative Officers

James Staros, Provost, reminded the Senate that the Chancellor had mentioned a search for a new Assistant Provost to take on the role of MSP negotiator and other aspects of faculty affairs. That search committee came forward with five candidates to interview on campus. That process is over, the committee has made its report, and the administration is proceeding to fill that position. The decision of Ted Djaferis to step down from the position as Interim Dean in the College
of Engineering required creating a search committee under the rules outlined in Sen. Doc. No. 90-029C. That committee did an incredibly expeditious search and delivered its report this week. Discussions are proceeding.

2. The Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Ernest May, Secretary of the Faculty Senate, stated that there is much activity in the councils. They seem to be consolidating the changes and successes of the past several years. There are many implementation issues such as those illustrated in the General Education requirement changes. The University is starting to plan for a future that continues to evolve very quickly. Our closest competitors for students have been somewhat more strategically focused than UMass Amherst. Boston University dropped football, but was recently invited to join the AAU. Northeastern dropped football, but now has the largest applicant pool in the country. UConn made the most of its lavish supply of state dollars by rising above UMass Amherst in the U.S. News and World Report rankings and making a big success of its athletic program. Our campus is still the largest, most comprehensive and overall the best public university in New England, but we are not as strategically focused as our competitors. At the next Senate meeting, there will be an update from the Joint Task Force on Strategic Planning.

I. QUESTION PERIOD (10-Minute Limit)

Senator Curt Conner acknowledged the recent election. The unions on campus decided to run an illegal phone bank supporting a single candidate in the recent U.S. Senate race. Fortunately, a discussion was held at the Provost’s Office looking into it. Senator Conner was part of this discussion. He believes that the University needs some assurance that no University facilities were employed for this illegal activity, including Hampshire House and phone services and/or email addresses. It is illegal in Massachusetts to use those facilities to support a single candidate. Senator Conner is glad that some action was taken, but would like to have on record the fact that the administration opposes such illegal uses of state facilities.

Provost Staros stated that the Provost’s Office has had a discussion with the union leadership.

Presiding Officer O’Connor stated that he, personally, was shocked when he read about these actions. He has been at the University a long time and has never heard of this happening. It slipped under somebody’s radar.

Senator Conner stated that we have to come down against such activity as a University or else there will be, in particular, trouble raising money in the future.

Provost Staros noted that this sort of activity could put the University in trouble with the legislature. The University has to strictly oppose this.

Senator MJ Peterson reminded the Senate that this issue is not just about future fundraising; it is a violation of state law.

The 721st Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate stood adjourned at 5:50 p.m. on November 15, 2012.

Respectfully submitted,

Ernest D. May
Secretary of the Faculty Senate