UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST
OFFICE OF THE FACULTY SENATE

Presiding Officer W. Brian O’Connor called the 722nd Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate to order on Tuesday, December 11, 2012 at 3:30 p.m. in Herter Hall, Room 227.

A. “UPDATE BY THE JOINT TASK FORCE ON STRATEGIC OVERSIGHT”
NANCY COHEN, BRYAN HARVEY AND AMILCAR SHABAZZ, CO-CHAIRS
(FOR BACKGROUND, SEE http://www.umass.edu/provost/node/137)
(See attached)

B. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Principal Administrative Officers

Provost James Staros welcomed Christopher Hollot as Interim Dean of the College of Engineering. He then acknowledged the motion at the end of the agenda regarding a Learning Management System, presenting some historical contexts, as there are a couple of assumptions embedded in the motion. A little more than two years ago, in anticipation of the end of the University’s Blackboard Vista license, which ends at the end of December 2012, John Dubach and Provost Staros created a committee to evaluate future options for the University. The committee was fairly broad, including faculty who are heavy users of LMS across campus. At the time, the administration believed the committee was representative, but, in retrospect, it appears many people did not feel that they were represented on the committee. In any case, the committee recommended that the University move to Moodle, an open-source system that has been implemented and is up and running for spring courses. Some time later, UMassOnline, recognizing that its Blackboard Vista license would end in June 2013, began the same process. UMass Amherst’s administration kept in touch with them hoping that the two entities could coordinate systems. Provost Staros personally communicated with the CEO of UMassOnline as UMass Amherst moved toward the Moodle decision. The CEO acknowledged the communication and Provost Staros believed that UMassOnline was moving in the same direction as UMass Amherst. In the end, they picked another Blackboard product, Learn Seven. UMassOnline went on the pathway for a new commercial license. UMassOnline serves UMass Amherst’s division of Continuing and Professional Education, so CPE began a migration to Blackboard Learn Seven and the campus started the migration to Moodle. Hearing much feedback, particularly from the Deans, who felt that their positions had not been put forward in the committee, the Chancellor charged Provost Staros to chair a small administrative task force to look at LMS. That task force created a new LMS advisory committee (referenced in the motion) in which each College or School was represented. Provost Staros met with each representative and charged each one to survey the faculty in each School or College to present a balanced perspective. The motion seems to predispose that the end result of this process is one—and only one—LMS. That is not a foregone conclusion. That is one of the things the task force is looking at. That being said, Provost Staros stated that he believes the motion to be a continuance of the idea to open up and get a full discussion started among the faculty. He applauds the framers of the motion for putting it in a rather tight timeframe in order to keep the process moving. The administration is favorably disposed to the motion.

Michael Malone, Vice Chancellor for Research and Engagement, noted that, independent of the University’s strategic planning, the Office of Research and Engagement is planning for a life sciences industry engagement strategy in order to secure an investment that was earmarked for the University in the Massachusetts Life Sciences Act in 2008. Some faculty in the life sciences will be contacted to participate in that. A third Assistant Director has been appointed in the Grants and Contracts Office, and two people have been hired to improve grant processing. A continuous improvement process is also being put into place so that each award, proposal, or other transaction will be given an opportunity for quick feedback.

Carol Barr, Vice Provost for Undergraduate and Continuing Education, congratulated the faculty for getting through another semester. She reminded the Senate that grades are due at midnight, December 25. The Registrar’s Office will be feverishly working on the grades on the 26th and 27th. The 28th is a holiday, so the Registrar’s Office will only have two days to process grades and the assistance of the faculty to submit grades on time will be crucial.

2. The Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Ernest May, Secretary of the Faculty Senate, welcomed the Senate to the last meeting of the semester. He is sure that the Trustees will be impressed with the great progress that the flagship campus is making on so many fronts. The Rules Committee has met with a group of faculty concerned about IT issues, as well as CIO John Dubach. There is discussion about the formation of a new council on academic technology. The Rules Committee has also met with a group of senators concerned about FBS football, as well as Chancellor Subbaswamy. The Rules Committee generally feels that a few quantitative and a number of qualitative issues related to FBS football need to be addressed. Among them are the overall support of institutional support for athletics compared to peers, the costs and benefits of continuing FBS football, the costs and benefits of
withdrawing from the FBS and MAC, the options for the future of football on campus not at the FBS-level (including FCS, Division III, and dropping football altogether), how the various options for football and the athletic department overall will impact the campus’ ability to attract a highly-qualified student body and provide a high-quality education at a reasonable cost with particular attention to concerns about high levels of student debt, and which option or options are in the best long-term interests of the campus. The updated strategic plan for the Athletic Department is available on their website. Finally, a little bit of procedure. Since there seems to be the possibility of procedural issues introduced later in the meeting, the FBS Report will be introduced by co-chairs Nelson Lacey and Max Page. They will entertain questions and discussion. There is no time limit set on the agenda, but Robert’s Rules of Order states that no speaker should speak more than twice with a ten minute limit each. The Constitution and Bylaws are not suspended should there be a motion to suspend the rules. Suspending the rules suspends the orders of the day—that is, the published agenda—in order to create the possibility for a motion to be introduced that is not on the published agenda. A vote to suspend the rules requires a two-thirds majority. If the motion to suspend the rules passes by a two-thirds vote, then the motion not on the agenda can be introduced, seconded, discussed, amended and voted with a simple majority. Should there be a quorum call in respect to the motion not on the agenda, the number of voting senators required for a quorum is 37. There are 73 voting members of the Senate at this time. Robert’s Rules states that any vote taken with less than a quorum would be invalid.

4. The Faculty Delegates to the Board of Trustees

W. Richards Adrion, Faculty Delegate to the Board of Trustees, noted that, as had been mentioned several times, the Trustees were meeting at the time of the Senate meeting as a Committee of the Whole. They would meet again the following morning in what is generally a consent agenda surrounded by a few speeches. The meetings at the University are not the most interesting of the season.

5. The Representative of the Massachusetts Society of Professors

Randall Phillis, President of the Massachusetts Society of Professors, began by noting that the MSP was concerned about the Learning Management System issues on campus and is very pleased that Provost Staros mentioned the possibility of using Moodle and Blackboard side-by-side. One seems better for on-campus classroom support and the other seems better applied to distance learning. Having those options is important, and the MSP applauds the interest in pursuing that. Commenting on strategic planning, Professor Phillis was struck by the fact that, at the beginning of the strategic planning conversation, it was stated that the notion of having a residential campus was unsustainable. He asked correction from Associate Provost Harvey if that was taken incorrectly. Over the past four or five years, the University has been working hard to provide a curriculum to sustain a lot of students coming to campus and receiving the best possible education as residents. If that is not the sustainable goal, it is disconcerting.

Associate Provost Harvey stated that the comment in question, which is elaborated with more detail in the planning guide, notes that the model in which students come to a university campus and learn—rather than learning with more emphasis on distance learning technologies—is very difficult to sustain. It involves a lot of time and effort. So, looking forward with the best information at our disposal regarding state appropriations, student fee raises, etc., the question is about determining what would be a sustainable strategy to make residential learning continually possible.

7. The President of the Student Government Association

Akshay Kapoor, President of the Student Government Association, began by offering an apology for his attendance at Faculty Senate meetings over the semester. He had a conflicting class, but attempted to be present for at least part of every meeting that he could. Hopefully every council and committee has student participation. If not, the SGA will try to arrange students to serve. It has been a very productive year for the SGA, and President Kapoor will update the Senate more fully next semester. He did address two issues that will be noticeable in the first couple weeks of the new semester. With the help of the Provost, the New York Times will be available on campus in the dining commons and Student Union again. The purpose of this initiative is to present students with a more global perspective. Another programming that is coming back is the Service Shuttle program. A PVTA bus with a police officer on board will be going to major off-campus areas to discourage people from walking back on dangerous streets or drinking and driving. President Kapoor hopes that the faculty will take mercy on his fellow students during the last few weeks of the semester.

C. QUESTION PERIOD (10-Minute Limit)

Senator Steven Brewer asked the Senate how many people had read both of the reports that came out of the committee that Provost Staros established for the Learning Management System. He also wondered how many people were aware of this committee prior to its issuing the reports.
Senator Richard Bogartz stated that, since the issues of sustainability and resource strategies had come up, it is important to realize the context that the University is in. It’s called war. Right now, there is a substantial number of people in this country who are interested in shrinking government. Reducing taxes is their means. We hear, unfortunately even from the political left, that the point of this is to protect the rich and protect the income of the rich. Senator Bogartz does not think that that is what it is about at all. He thinks the point of it is to destroy the public processes: education, police, roads, hospitals, insurance. Everything that is done for the public by government is to be destroyed so the profitizers can come in, pick up the pieces, and turn it into profit-making machinery. That is the destiny of universities if they continue along the trajectory that this state is moving in by continually shrinking appropriations to education. Senator Bogartz does not know exactly how to rouse the University to enter the war. Right now, we are just sitting on the battlefield getting shelled. Something needs to—in the very least—be thought about with respect to this question as to why it is that government is being shrunk.

D. INTERIM REPORT


Nelson Lacey, Co-Chair of the Ad Hoc Committee on FBS Football, introduced the Ad Hoc Committee’s Interim Report. Given that Secretary May introduced procedural issues earlier, it is clear that this report is of great interest to some in the Senate. There are three forces that brought Professor Lacey to present this report. Along with Rebecca Spencer, he is co-chairing the Athletic Council; along with George Richason, he is co-chairing the Finance Subcommittee of the Athletic Council; and, along with Max Page, he is co-chairing the Ad Hoc Committee on FBS Football. About a year ago, there was a discussion and motion to form the Ad Hoc Committee. At the time, Professor Lacey passionately argued that the Senate did not need such a committee. He garnered a few votes, but the Senate was overwhelmingly in favor of creating the Ad Hoc Committee. After that meeting, Secretary May asked Professor Lacey to co-chair the Committee, so his takeaway from that instance is to be careful what you don’t wish for. The Ad Hoc Committee has met four times since then, twice with representatives of the Athletic Department, and Professor Lacey is very happy about the work that the Committee has done this year. He is glad that the Ad Hoc Committee was formed.

Senator Max Page, Co-Chair of the Ad Hoc Committee on FBS Football, offered a few summary points before opening up to questions. The report is not a work of literature. There is no soaring rhetoric or eloquent turns of phrase. That is intentional. The Committee has tried to present the numbers as they were found. The Committee hopes that the report is a solid ground for real, robust debate—a debate that did not happen when the decision to move football to the FBS level was made. Senator Page reasserted what is stated in the report: that Chancellor Subbaswamy and his staff have been completely transparent with the data they have and have been quick and thorough in their responses to various queries. The numbers are different than athletic budget numbers because the Committee was looking at the full costs related to the move to FBS and the operation of that program. Many universities don’t include costs of marketing, building new facilities, female scholarships triggered by additional male scholarships, et cetera, when tallying athletic budgets. The Committee decided it needed to look at the full range of those costs. The costs and/or benefits of winning or losing have not been included in the report, nor has the potential for additional alumni giving or the costs of staff outside the Athletic Department devoted to this effort. The Chancellor himself has said that he has had to spend a lot of his time on this issue. The Committee may look at that in the future. There has been some confusion surrounding the $700,000 deficit that the Athletic Department has claimed for football this year. That is a large number, but it is not, of course, as large as the $8,200,000 figure that the Committee has determined. Although the idea of a deficit is important for debate, what is more important is the total budget. People should be asking how much of the University’s resources are being spent on this particular endeavor and questioning if that is the right amount. Reasonable people can be on different sides of that debate. The report and the motion that will be put forth by a number of senators is not an attack on the Chancellor or the President. Over and over, many of the individuals who question the move to FBS football have noted how pleased they are with the arrival of Chancellor Subbaswamy and President Caret. This report and motion are about having a robust debate about a very important effort and a costly endeavor. Senator Page’s views are well known on this issue. The most important action at this time is to hear questions about the report and comments about the issue.

Senator Bruce Baird referenced an article from the October 2011 Atlantic by Tayler Branch titled “The Shame of College Sports.” That article outlined various court cases moving through various systems to hold colleges and universities responsible for injuries that are sustained in intercollegiate athletics. He wondered what sort of actuarial assumptions are being made about the cost of sustaining injuries. As is well known, concussions and subconcussive impact has been a major story surrounding football recently. Secondly, Senator Baird brought up a recent New York Times article by Ken Belson titled “Concussion Costs May Rise, and Not Just for the NFL.” That article discusses lawsuits in the NFL regarding insuring the health of NFL players. The conclusion of that article is that the NFL will be able to deal with this because they create $8 billion in revenues every year. However, those revenues don’t exist at lower levels. Senator Baird wonders what kind of actuarial assumptions are being made about the legal costs of dealing with lawsuits about athletic injuries.
Dan Clawson, Professor of Sociology, stated that former Chancellor Lombardi used to say that if you want to know the values of an institution, you should not look at the speeches that its leaders make, but at the budgets that they produce. With that in mind, let's look at the costs that UMass is allocating to football and its great importance. Professor Clawson is opposed to having football on campus. In opposing that, he is no way attacking Chancellor Subbaswamy or the integrity of the University. The decision to move to FBS football was made by former Chancellor Holub in his waning days. The rest of us will be living with this decision much longer than him. When John Lombardi was Chancellor, he noted his enthusiasm for football and his desire to have a terrific football program. He supported upgrading the football program under the condition that it be completely self-sustaining. Now, football is being given $8 million. What are some other things that the University could do with $8 million a year, every year going forward? Obviously, there are endless options, but Professor Clawson suggested two. Using half of that $8 million, the University could have a lottery for graduating seniors in which the student loan debt of 325 students would be eliminated. With the other $4 million, a lottery could be held for departments, in which four departments would be granted $1 million to be spent unrestrictedly in the department. Those departments could fund faculty travel, bring in outside speakers, have awards for students, etc. This would not be a one-time event, as the money allocated for football now is spent every year. The University is making a decision. Which would be more likely to produce a better University? A University that would attract more attention and more enthusiasm on campus, among students, among faculty and departments? Which would strengthen the University more? There may be people who believe that football is the best way to go, but that is hard for Professor Clawson to imagine.

Senator Richard Bogartz agrees with everything in the report and everything that has been said so far. He is struck that even Professor Baird—a faculty member in Asian Languages and Literatures—would reference actuarial issues regarding lawsuits over injuries. Senator Bogartz has been opposed to football for quite some time. The budget numbers capture one’s attention. They stand out. The Chancellor can be transparent and provide all the numbers; we can take the numbers and add them to get new numbers that are bigger. That is wonderful information that is easy to see. It is not so easy to see the brains that get bounced around inside the skulls of young men on the football field. We don’t see the addition of the damage that happens every time a brain gets bounced around—whether it gets called a concussion or not. Little by little and, lately, lots by lots, information is coming out from numerous sources about how much damage is being done to people—some of them our students—by playing this sport. We can do without it. Famous universities do without it. We don’t need it and we can do better.

Senator Audrey Altstadt began by noting her appreciation of the report and the collegial way in which it was approached and discussed. She was pleased to see it coupled with the report on strategic planning and the emphasis of UMass as a major public research university. There is a clear dichotomy between the two images of UMass Amherst. Senator Altstadt likes football. She believes sports have an important place in university life. She was an undergraduate at the University of Illinois, a Big Ten school and a fine academic university. There is no causal relationship between the athletic and academic quality of Big Ten schools such as Illinois, Wisconsin, Ohio State, or the other schools. As a student, Senator Altstadt realized that Illinois had a very gradual buildup both of athletics and academics. She does not believe that anyone at the meeting believes there to be a causal relationship between great football and a great university, but she is fearful that some association existed in the minds of people who, in the past and through an opaque process, decided to move UMass into FBS football. Many great universities have no football or very low-level football. The context of the football option must be stressed. Senator Altstadt has been at UMass for over 20 years. For more than the past ten years, the University has seen shrinking allocations of state support. This year, the University will be facing mid-year 9C cuts. Given all this, even if the University wanted to move football up, it is not the context to do so. Much has been said about what the University can do with $8 million. A lottery aside, there are some very concrete choices. Senator Altstadt offered some examples from the past year. Last year, Senator Altstadt was director of graduate admissions for the History Department. The Department would have admitted more graduate students, but it is not allocated enough money to provide support for graduate students, which means that, even though the Department is encouraged to expand its graduate program, it must remain smaller than desired. Graduate fellowships are especially important if the University hopes to diversify its graduate pool. Without diversifying the graduate pool, we cannot diversify the next generation of potential hires for the faculty. At a smaller scale, Senator Altstadt offered to teach a Gen Ed course with 120 students in the spring semester. She was told that there was no money to provide TA support for that class. A TA costs less than $20,000 a year in the History Department. Recently, she reached for her office phone to call a colleague and it was gone. The Department decided to remove all the phones from its offices as a cost-cutting measure. Finally, a number of students in Senator Altstadt’s classes in Herter Hall have noted how disgusting the bathrooms in that building are. The University does not seem to have enough money for custodial support, but it has $8 million for football. There is not $20,000 to hire a TA, but there is $8 million for football. The graduate program in History doesn’t have enough money to expand, but there is $8 million for football. The current Chancellor has filled Senator Altstadt and many others with optimism. He inherited a difficult situation and is doing an outstanding job addressing the various concerns. There is no criticism of him, of sports in general or football in particular, but a question of priorities. As an academic institution that strives to be better than it was yesterday, and as a public research university, UMass’ top priority needs to be its academic programs. Even if UMass could have a winning football team, it is preferable to be known for academic accomplishments.
**Senator Frank Hugus** moved to suspend the rules in order to introduce a motion calling on the University administration to immediately consider reversing the decision to move to FBS football and direct the Rules Committee and the Ad Hoc Committee on FBS Football to work with the Chancellor and President to develop a plan for withdrawal from FBS football to be presented to the full Faculty Senate at its first spring semester meeting, on January 31, 2013.

The motion was seconded but failed to garner the necessary two-thirds majority by a vote of 25 in favor to 18 opposed.

**Senator MJ Peterson, At-Large Member of the Rules Committee,** commented not on the vote to suspend the rules, but on the football situation in general. There is much more ongoing discussion going on and we have to think of what to do next. The University was put into a situation and coming out of it involves dealing with a lot of contracts and agreements and expectations among other parties. There are also a number of different courses of action, although in the Senate there is much support for one particular course of action: to eliminate football altogether. How that then affects the rest of the Athletic Department, Senator Peterson does not know. She hopes that the Ad Hoc Committee on FBS Football will figure out what it would cost the University to get out of the FBS at a particular time and figure out what the alternatives would cost while taking into account the effects on the Athletic Department and the University as a whole. We have started a very good, data-informed decision process and it should be continued.

**Senator Joseph Bartolomeo, Chair of the Rules Committee,** noted that the Rules Committee did not put the motion regarding FBS football on the regular agenda. Senator Peterson described the rationale of the Rules Committee’s decision very well. The Rules Committee felt that a committee has been established and there is considerably more work to be done gathering the necessary information to make an informed decision. Senator Bartolomeo has grave reservations about the current football program. He also feels that the University got into it abruptly, without due diligence and consideration. If we are going to get out of it—or stay in it—the decision should be made with due consideration of all the alternatives. Secretary May mentioned earlier, but Senator Bartolomeo wished to reiterate more formally, what the Rules Committee has done. The Rules Committee has charged the Athletic Council, the Academic Priorities Council, the Ad Hoc Committee on FBS Football, the Program and Budget Council, the Joint Task Force on Strategic Oversight’s Committee on Resources, the Student Government Association and the Alumni Association to study the Interim Report of the Ad Hoc Committee with attention to the following issues: overall cost of institutional support for athletics compared to peers, cost and benefits of continuing FBS football, costs and benefits of withdrawing from FBS football and the Mid-American Conference, options for the future of football not at the FBS level (such as FCS, Division III, or dropping football altogether, how the various options for football and the athletic program overall will impact the campus’ ability to attract a highly-qualified student body and provide a high quality education at a reasonable cost with particular attention to concerns about high levels of student debt, and which option or options appear to be in the best long-term interests of UMass Amherst. The Rules Committee has charged these various committees to look into these questions. The conversation is obviously going to continue. The Rules Committee wants it to continue in the most informed way possible, with the most complete and accurate information to assess the progress of the football program and what needs to be done in the future.

**Senator Max Page** noted that it was very disturbing that a motion put forth by about 15% of the Senate could not be put forward for a discussion and vote. In any other organization that Senator Page has been a part of, if an issue is on the table for discussion, members of the body are able to bring forth motions on that topic. The argument that UMass has to “give it a chance” regarding football keeps coming up. That argument states that it is impossible to know the true success of the program after one season. There was never a university-wide discussion on football. This transition was thrust upon the University, and those who would have been opposed then are being told that they need to endure it. That makes no sense. Furthermore, Senator Page doesn’t gamble away half his salary at a casino; he knows that is bad. He doesn’t smoke cigars; he knows that is bad. There is data from all over the country that shows that football is a risky and costly endeavor. Very few teams actually turn a profit, and only a small number of schools lower their university subsidy by moving into FBS. The urgency of taking action on this issue is in a number that Senator Altstadt brought up. The costs are much higher than what were thought. Moreover, the performance of the team and fan attendance were so far below expectations that they prove that college football culture is not appropriate for New England. Cuts are coming at the University. We have to take $2 million out of the budget right now. Who knows what’s going to happen in the coming year’s budget. Finally, the construction to renovate McGuirk Stadium has not begun. Contracts have allegedly been awarded, but the construction has not begun. Right now is a moment when we could admit that we sunk some money into football, it was a mistake, and good money should not be thrown after bad. That is a classic mistake. Senator Page’s colleagues in the School of Management know this well. The idea of sunk cost is not “I spent $8 million, therefore, I should spend another $8 million because I feel bad about spending the first $8 million.” The opposite is true. You are supposed to not escalate your commitments, but admit that you made a mistake and reverse course. The University has the opportunity right now to reverse course and decide to do something different with this money. It is legitimate to have that debate and make that decision now.

**Senator Marta Calas** spoke on the concept of escalating commitment that Senator Page acknowledged. There is 35 years of research in her field, management, on escalating commitment. Now, there are new meta-analysis processes studying that
accumulated data. There is much known now about the variables affecting escalating commitment. Put simply, escalating commitment is when an individual or organization makes a decision that—although they hoped it would succeed—fails. Then, instead of making the decision to admit failure and recant, the individual or organization gives more time to and invests more money in the failed endeavor. One of the things that this research shows is that the more money you put into a failed decision, the more likely it is that you will continue doing so, making it less and less likely that the course of the decision will be changed. An example given in a recent article was the Big Dig highway project in Boston. The article asked how the Big Dig was such a failure and why so much money was continually sunk into it. It occurred to Senator Calas, as she was listening to the preceding discussion, that UMass should do a self-study to see how football commitments are escalated going forward. UMass is a research university, and should be able to study itself. By doing this, it would be more likely that a good decision be made and that involved parties will be able to identify why they made the decisions they did. Moreover, a useful publication may come of it. Senator Calas encouraged the entire faculty to participate.

Professor Rod Warnick, Member of the Athletic Council, noted that he had been beaten up at the Faculty Senate before and asked Senator Page a couple of questions. He asked Senator Page if the ACFBS report was voted on in the Committee. It was not. There was no full discussion of the report. He then asked if there are minutes for the ACFBS available, as it would be important to know about all the other things that were discussed. He asked if Senator Page had attended any of the football games at Gillette Stadium. Senator Page had not. He asked if Senator Page had talked to anyone from the Alumni Association. Senator Page had talked to the head of the Association. On November 13, 2012, Professor Warnick and Senator Page attended a webinar. He asked Senator Page what that webinar was about. Senator Page asked members of the Athletic Council to attend the webinar, which was put on by REM Associates of Amherst. It looked at the economic benefits of college football. There were a lot of things said at that webinar. Professor Warnick wondered why that information was not shared with the Faculty Senate. It was part of what the Committee did. The report presented at that webinar was substantial and part of what the Committee did. That was not communicated to the Faculty Senate.

Secretary May noted that he would not be able to respond to all of Professor Warnick’s questions. The fact that there are still so many unanswered questions is why the Rules Committee decided that further study is required before a motion should be brought before the Faculty Senate.

Professor Warnick agreed with Secretary May, stating that he hopes that those questions are addressed. The report that was released and discussed at the webinar had very significant findings in it in terms of the impact of college football. That report has not been discussed or brought forward to the Faculty Senate and Professor Warnick is concerned about that.

Secretary May noted that there are many concerns on both sides of the issue that need further study.

Professor Warnick noted that the report presented at the webinar was done by professors at the University of California-Berkeley and reported to the National Bureau of Economic Research in Cambridge. The results were pretty significant.

Secretary May stated that a lot of quantitative information had been condensed and reduced in the Committee’s report. However, the qualitative discussion is intended to go forward in the future.

Professor Warnick stated that the Committee was invited to participate in activities with outcomes and information not being reported on by the Committee. He is concerned that things aren’t being fully reported.

Secretary May reiterated that the Rules Committee is referring this report, along with the broad-ranging questions stated by Senator Bartolomeo, to many councils and committees, as well as the SGA and Alumni Association. When responses come back from those entities, there will be much more complete information. Personally, Secretary May believes that the alumni are key to this discussion. There is an old saying that universities are about parking for the faculty, you-know-what for the students, and football for the alumni. So the alumni are key to the football discussion. However, the attendance by the alumni at Gillette Stadium was very disappointing. They voted with their feet, and the silence was deafening.

Jennifer Fronc, Associate Professor of History, spoke to her experience as a junior faculty member at UMass as it pertains to the ongoing budget woes. Like Senator Altstadt, Professor Fronc attended the University of Illinois. As a roller derby player, Professor Fronc is no stranger to traumatic brain injury and helmets. There are good arguments about monetary issues, but the larger issue is taking on the argument that having a better football team will help UMass recruit and retain better students. Based on her day-to-day life as an instructor at UMass, Professor Fronc does not believe this will be the case. UMass students often work 20-40 hours a week. She frequently has to lend copies of textbooks because they cannot afford them. Many students leave UMass with over $50,000 in student loan debt, which is not what Professor Fronc would expect from Massachusetts’ flagship public university. UMass is doing students a disservice by continuing to invest in the fiction and fantasy that a football team will enable UMass to recruit and retain more and, somehow better undergraduates. Experience at other universities has not proven this to be the case. As a member of the humanities faculty, Professor Fronc noted that as
little as $5,000 could make a world of difference to her academic career. However, this year, she was told that she would not be able to attend two academic conferences at which she was supposed to present because her dean did not have the money. She also had a $4,000 research proposal turned down because she had neglected to name the library and there were simply not enough funds to permit her to travel to two cities and write the final chapter of a book in progress. When we talk about things like what our students are spending on tuition and books, the fact that they often pay their own rent and food bills; when we think about the fact that the elevator in Herter Hall was broken all semester; that the History Department chose to give up its phones to save $16,000; when we look at these smaller pieces, we can see how UMass is throwing good money after bad in the effort to ramp up its profile through a football team. Professor Fronc echoed Senator Altstadt in stating that she would rather have UMass be known for its amazing History Department, its amazing Sociology Department, a University with academic departments to be proud of. That is where the University should be investing its time, money and human resources. Finally, like what our students are spending on tuition and books, the fact that they often pay their own rent and food bills; when we also had a $4,000 research proposal turned down because she had neglected to name the library and there were simply not able to attend two academic conferences at which she was supposed to present because her dean did not have the money. She may stick with the MSP in terms of departments to be proud of. That is where the University should be investing its time, money and human resources. Finally, Professor Fronc noted that this was her first visit to the Faculty Senate and she is disappointed to see that administrators that hold faculty positions are able to vote in such a way as to dampen faculty voices. She may stick with the MSP in terms of faculty governance.

Senator Curt Conner stated that the issue is not just about football, it’s about the marching band, as well. Anyone who doesn’t recognize that has not come to the right university. The band has more alumni than the football team. Those alumni come back to the University—and they give to the University—because of the band. By moving the games to Gillette Stadium, Senator Conner has not been able to see the band as much as usual. He would usually go to the games at halftime to see the band, and stay for the rest of the game. It should be understood that there are more factors than the football team affecting decisions about football. Senator Conner does not believe that the University should get rid of contact sports. He was an athlete in school and valued that time very much. If we tried to protect our students by not allowing them to be in contact sports, we would be doing a grave disservice to the student body.

Akshay Kapoor, SGA President, thanked the Faculty Senate for wanting to include the student body in this discussion. He believes that students can best answer questions regarding their tuitions and other issues. Recently, a number of individuals from UMass were able to sit down at dinner and talk to Robert Kraft. He presented a number of valuable insights, one of which involved his decisions with the New England Patriots. At one time, the Patriots were terrible. There was even a possibility of the team leaving the Boston area. Mr. Kraft said that everyone thought he was crazy when he bought the Patriots. Within a year of the purchase, he was offered multiple times to sell the team for a profit. At the time, he said that letting the Patriots go would be a disservice to the Boston fans. Likewise, if UMass abandons its football team—or all athletics—it would be a big disservice to the students and the University. It’s not all about money. This has to do with school pride. President Kapoor stresses this. The football team may not be great right now, but it’s brand new. Everything was brand new at one point. If we give it a little bit of time—acknowledging that economic resources will be put into it—then it may produce outcomes that you cannot put a monetary value on. President Kapoor looks forward to seeing how other students feel. He acknowledged that some in the Senate may not like his opinions, but as a student, he holds administrators and faculty members to hold themselves to a standard as high as the SGA does at its meetings.

Senator Steven Brewer wished for a moment to cross-examine Senator Page. Did the founding motion of the Ad Hoc Committee on FBS Football state that the Faculty Senate establish a broadly representative ad hoc committee appointed by the Rules Committee and approved by the full Faculty Senate to monitor and evaluate the costs and financial impacts of FBS football, reporting back at least once each semester to the full Faculty Senate? It was. Is this the final report of the Committee? It is not. Was it a best faith effort to represent the work of the Committee thus far? It was.

MSP President Phillis wished to reinforce something said by Professor Clawson. Four hundred and nine of Professor Phillis’ closest friends recently took a final exam in introductory biology. There are another 1,023 of their closest friends also taking that course. It is the major’s course in biology, and therefore relatively popular. This fall, for the first time, the department gave up the laboratory section of that class and replaced it with discussion because the laboratory section is expensive and could not be properly sustained given the other needs in the Biology Department. If Biology won Professor Clawson’s million dollar lottery, it could buy the equipment, supplies, and resources necessary to educate its students better. Students in the life sciences should have hands-on experiences with living things. Right now, Professor Phillis and the TAs that run the discussion section are the only living things they see. There are many other kinds of living things. Professor Phillis has a great time watching the Patriots. He is pleased that Robert Kraft has turned the team around. Professor Phillis loves NFL football. If Robert Kraft could make all his money on NFL football, Professor Phillis would be thrilled. He does not understand why Robert Kraft is making any money from UMass. He does not understand why UMass is dumping money into football that should be used to educate its students in different ways. He is troubled by that, especially given the fact that we could have a parade of faculty telling stories about how they are ill-equipped to provide the best possible education for the UMass students that are coming here and paying a hell of a lot of money for their education but are receiving, perhaps, a modified version of what they could receive if the University had the proper resources. Professor Phillis added a comment on the process of the Faculty Senate, which may reinforce some earlier comments. Professor Phillis thinks of the Faculty Senate as an elected body. When you stand for election, your colleagues vote you in or not. If you are voted in, you have the ability to render your opinion
about policy, and that opinion is then advisory for the administration. Except for in academic affairs—strict academic affairs—the Faculty Senate only has an advisory role. We can recommend that football’s stupid. That is a possibility. The administration may or may not follow the Faculty Senate’s advice. Professor Phillis does not understand why administrators who are serving at the pleasure of their administrative superior, and are not elected members of the Faculty Senate, get to influence the decisions of the body. The administrators already have plenty of say.

Steve Goodwin, Dean of the College of Natural Sciences, noted that he and Professor Phillis go back a long way. He has a lot of respect for the work Professor Phillis does teaching biology, and is looking to put as many resources as possible into that program. However, Dean Goodwin believes Professor Phillis overstepped slightly at the end of his remarks. There are two numbers that disturb Dean Goodwin greatly: 73 and 43. That there are only 73 voting members of the Faculty Senate—there should be 120 voting members; that there are only 43 people here today in a position to vote on issues of the level of importance that are being discussed should not be acceptable. It should not be acceptable to the faculty. It should not be acceptable to the administration. If we are going to have shared governance, we need better participation than we currently have.

Secretary May seconded Dean Goodwin’s remarks. There are 95 available positions in the Faculty Senate, distributed among the various districts. Only 57 of those are filled. The remainder are not filled simply because no one volunteers or no one nominates another faculty member. That needs to be changed. Secondly, in the recent Boston Globe article on UMass football, Chancellor Subbaswamy is quoted as saying, “We will under no circumstances sacrifice academics for the sake of moving up in football.”

Professor Jenny Spencer moved to suspend the rules in order to move agenda item H (motion number 25-13) ahead of all remaining business. The motion had already been supported by the administration, and present parties that are not Faculty Senators may want to join the discussion.

The motion to suspend the rules passed by a vote of 36 in favor to 0 opposed.

H. Motion from Senators David Gross and Steven Brewer:

WHEREAS changing the selection of a Learning Management System profoundly impacts the ability of Teaching faculty to accomplish their academic goals, and

WHEREAS the Learning Management System Advisory Committee, in a short time and with minimal Teaching faculty input, has recommended that the University of Massachusetts Amherst switch from Moodle to Blackboard Learn, and

WHEREAS a previous, year-long study, that included input from all of campus, had identified Moodle as the best fit for the campus,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty Senate (1) charge the Academic Priorities Council, the Academic Matters Council, and the University Computer and Electronic Communications Committee to review the findings of the Learning Management System Advisory Committee and to present a report to the full Faculty Senate at its first spring semester meeting on January 31, 2013; and (2) recommend that the University of Massachusetts Amherst postpone action on switching Learning Management Systems until these reports have been received so that the impacts on teaching can be understood.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the motion to (1) charge the Academic Priorities Council, the Academic Matters Council, and the University Computer and Electronic Communications Committee to review the findings of the Learning Management System Advisory Committee and to present a report to the full Faculty Senate at its first spring semester meeting on January 31, 2013; and (2) recommend that the University of Massachusetts Amherst postpone action on switching Learning Management Systems until these reports have been received so that the impacts on teaching can be understood, as presented on the agenda of the 722nd Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate.

The motion was seconded and adopted.
E. ANNUAL REPORT


The report was received.

Professor Judith Holmes, Chair of the University Writing Committee, stated that the primary work of the Writing Committee for 2011-2012 was reviewing the University Writing Center. This Center is located in the Learning Commons at the Library and is a place where any member of the University community—undergraduate students, graduate students, faculty, administrators—can work with trained tutors on any writing concerns that they may have. The Committee decided to report on the Writing Center separately from the quinquennial review of the First Year Writing Program because of the vast changes in the Writing Center over the past five to eight years. The Writing Center started, literally, as a classroom where graduate student TAs could work with their students in the First Year Writing Program, and it morphed into a very important part of the Learning Commons. The Committee interviewed the Director, Assistant Directors, some student tutors, and data. The Committee’s conclusion is that the Writing Center is doing an excellent job meeting a critical need on campus. In 2011, the Writing Center was open approximately 50 hours per week with a staff of over 40, mostly trained undergraduate tutors. There are daytime and evening hours. Between 2001 and 2011, the Learning Commons experienced a sevenfold increase in the number of tutoring sessions, from 430 to 3,095. The Committee commends the Provost’s Office for authorizing the hire of a tenure-track assistant professor in English to serve as the Director of the Writing Program in addition to teaching duties. With the success that the Writing Center has found in the Learning Commons comes new challenges. The biggest is the need for more space. The Writing Committee understands that the body overseeing the Learning Commons is working on expanding the space available for the Writing Center. The Committee was pleased to hear that the Writing Center was piloting, last spring, a project for online tutoring using Skype and Google Docs. The Committee recommended that they pursue that initiative, and this year it is in full-time use for distance learners. This means that students both on and off campus have access to the Writing Center and the tutoring services it provides. The other thing that the Writing Committee has been involved in is working to develop an online process for submitting Junior Year Writing course syllabi and getting approval from the Writing Committee. That should be launched in the spring semester. As soon as that happens, the Writing Committee will be notifying and contacting deans and chairs about the new processes and procedures that they will need to start following for their Junior Year Writing courses. There are also workshops for Junior Year Writing instructors. The Committee has been effective and hard-working.

Senator Curt Conner wondered if the Writing Committee looked into teaching about plagiarism.

Professor Holmes stated that the Writing Committee recently held a workshop in the Teaching Commons of the Library on pedagogical tools to use for teaching about plagiarism. It is a topic that has been discussed in the Committee.

Senator Joseph Bartolomeo offered a comment, commending his colleagues who have recently served as Director of the Writing Center: Haivan Hoang, Donna LeCourt, and, most recently, Rebecca Lorimer Leonard. They have done tremendous work as the Center has grown and developed. He reiterated the Writing Committee’s comment thanking the Provost. The Provost and the English Department worked together, and the Department was delighted to have his support in creating a tenure-stream position for the Director of the Writing Center, which will enable both the Writing Center, the Writing Program, and the graduate concentration in rhetoric and composition to continue to thrive.

Senator Bruce Baird stated that he recently asked a senior colleague what to do with students who have remedial writing skills. The senior colleague said that he should make a requirement for them to go to the Writing Center. Senator Baird did this with a couple students and the Writing Center emailed him saying that he was not allowed to do that.

Professor Holmes began by clarifying that she is on the Writing Committee and has nothing to do, specifically, with the Writing Center. Her understanding is that if an individual professor feels that his or her students need specific assistance, it is best to have the professor communicate with the Writing Center and determine how to provide that. The Writing Center has a limited number of slots for tutoring and working with students. If professors start mandating that the 40 students in their class have to go to the Writing Center, the Center needs a heads-up to figure out how to plan for that.

F. NEW COURSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>CREDITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NRC 576</td>
<td>“Water Resources Management”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRC 578</td>
<td>“Watershed Science and management”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the courses NRC 576 and 578, 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>CMPSCI 688</td>
<td>“Probabilistic Graphical Models”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM 600</td>
<td>“Media Literacy: Principles and Practices”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM 601</td>
<td>“Media Literacy: Theory and Research”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECO 675</td>
<td>“Ecological Economics and Sustainability”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECO 678</td>
<td>“Advanced Watershed Science and Management”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 601A</td>
<td>“Foundations of Higher Education”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 621A</td>
<td>“Higher Education Finance Policy”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 632A</td>
<td>“Educational Policy, Research and Administration: Fundamentals of Test Construction”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 652</td>
<td>“Mixed Methods Research”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 749</td>
<td>“Multilingualism &amp; Society”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 751</td>
<td>“Scaling Methods for the Behavioral Science”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 753</td>
<td>“Professional Seminar in Educational Research and Evaluation Methods”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 756</td>
<td>“Advanced Measurement Seminar”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 773</td>
<td>“Planning for Policy Success”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 777</td>
<td>“Advanced Principles and Methods of Teaching in Middle and High School”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the courses CMPSCI 688, COMM 600 and 601, ECO 675 and 678, EDUC 601A, 612A, 632A, 652, 749, 751, 753, 756, 773 and 777, as recommended by the Graduate Council.

The motion was seconded and adopted.

G. NEW BUSINESS


MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Changes to the Undergraduate Major in English, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 13-019.

The motion was seconded and adopted.


MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Changes to the Structure of Requirements in the Journalism Program, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 13-020.

The motion was seconded and adopted.


MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Increase in Credits for the M.S. in Sport Management, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 13-021.

Senator Marta Calas wondered if the newly required research course was one of the research courses that currently exist for the Ph.D. program.
Senator D. Anthony Butterfield stated that it is not one of the research courses from the Ph.D. program, but that the course has been on the books for a while. This change makes the course a requirement.

The motion was seconded and adopted.

4. Special Report of the Academic Priorities, Program and Budget and Research Councils concerning the establishment of a School of Computer Science at the University of Massachusetts Amherst, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 13-022 with Motion No. 18-13.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the establishment of a School of Computer Science at the University of Massachusetts Amherst, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 13-022.

Senator Frank Hugus noticed that the report states that no new resources would be necessary. He finds that difficult to believe if the Computer Science Department is being asked to service the entire University.

Senator Bogartz stated that they are claiming to have the resources. His sense of the motion is that it is primarily a branding move. Computer Science looks more substantial when it is a school rather than just a department. It may come to pass that they need more resources later, but their claim is that right now they do not.

Provost James Staros noted that this motion falls under the legislation passed in last year’s Faculty Senate for schools within colleges. This proposal is for Computer Science to become a school within a college, and that explains why no new resources are needed. It will not be a dean-led entity. It will have a director and continue to be part of CNS.

The motion was seconded and adopted.


MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Graduate Certificate in Higher Education Leadership, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 13-023.

The motion was seconded and adopted.


MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Master in Business Administration (MBA) with a Focus in Entrepreneurship, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 13-024.

Senator Calas noticed that this program is made primarily of requirements for the standard MBA. Courses specific to entrepreneurship occur later in the program. The regular MBA courses are primarily about understanding the processes of big business. She wondered if there should not be more courses specific to entrepreneurship offered earlier in the program.

Senator Butterfield noted that this is not the first concentration within the MBA program to be brought before the Faculty Senate. The concentrations make it possible for a student to choose his or her electives within a specific area in order to claim some extra expertise in that area. There are concentrations already in areas such as finance. The concentrations allow graduates to distinguish themselves and differentiate themselves with a specific focus. No additional courses are required within the core MBA requirements.

Senator Calas noted that was her understanding as well, and what led to her question. She wonders if the core should be more specifically focused on entrepreneurship, as that is a different animal than business administration generally.

Senator Butterfield stated that the proposed program is an MBA with a focus in entrepreneurship, not a separate master’s degree in entrepreneurship.

Senator Bogartz noted that there is no such thing as a focus. This proposal is for a concentration. However, historically, the Isenberg School calls a concentration a focus. As Senator Butterfield noted, this proposal is for a concentration, not a separate
degree. If it were a separate degree, then all of Senator Calas’ concerns would be right on. ISOM is claiming this to be simply a focus; a little extra in a particular area.

The motion was seconded and adopted.


MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Five College Queer and Sexuality Studies Certificate, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 13-025.

The motion was seconded and adopted.


MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Changes in the Core Requirements of the Engineering Management Degree Program, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 13-026.

The motion was seconded and adopted.


MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Dual Degree – Master of Public Policy and Administration (MPPA)/Master of Regional Planning (MRP), as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 13-027.

The motion was seconded and adopted.


MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Nominations to Faculty Senate Councils and Committees, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 13-028.

Senator Arthur Kinney moved to amend the motion to add Doris Bargen of Languages, Literatures, & Cultures be appointed to the Commonwealth Honors College Council.

The motion was seconded and adopted as amended.

The 722nd Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate stood adjourned at 5:50 p.m. on December 11, 2012.

Respectfully submitted,

Ernest D. May
Secretary of the Faculty Senate