Presiding Officer Richard Bogartz called the 729th Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate to order on September 12, 2013 at 3:30 p.m. in Herter Hall, Room 227. He explained that a slideshow of pictures identifying Faculty Senators and other individuals associated with the Faculty Senate would be displayed before meetings. He created the slideshow to learn everyone’s name before beginning his service as Presiding Officer and thought that, if he could be here for years without knowing everyone’s name, it might be helpful for others. He also decided that Faculty Senate meetings should begin with a poem. He solicited requests for poems for subsequent meetings from all those present. Presiding Officer Bogartz then read “Psalm,” a poem by Wisława Szymborska:

“Psalm”

Oh, the leaky boundaries of man-made states!
How many clouds float past them with impunity;
how much desert sand shifts from one land to another;
how many mountain pebbles tumble onto foreign soil
in provocative hops!

Need I mention every single bird that flies in the face of frontiers
or alights on the roadblock at the border?
A humble robin – still, its tail resides abroad
while its beak stays home. If that weren’t enough, it won’t stop bobbing!

Among innumerable insects, I’ll single out only the ant
between the border guard’s left and right boots
blithely ignoring the questions “Where from?” and “Where to?”

Oh, to register in detail, at a glance, the chaos
prevailing on every continent!
Isn’t that a privet on the far bank
smuggling its hundred-thousandth leaf across the river?
And who but the octopus, with impudent long arms,
would disrupt the sacred bounds of territorial waters?

And how can we talk of order overall
when the very placement of the stars
leaves us doubting just what shines for whom?

Not to speak of the fog’s reprehensible drifting!
And dust blowing all over the steppes
as if they hadn’t been partitioned!
And the voices coasting on obliging airwaves,
that conspiratorial squeaking, those indecipherable mutters!

Only what is human can truly be foreign.
The rest is mixed vegetation, subversive moles, and wind.

(Tr. Stanisława Barańczak and Clare Cavanagh)

A. WELCOME AND COMMENTS BY CHANCELLOR KUMBLE SUBBASWAMY
   (QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION TO FOLLOW)

The PowerPoint presented with this address is accessible at:

Chancellor Kumble Subbaswamy noted that he would be presenting a more formal state of the University address at the Faculty Convocation in October and, therefore, in concert with Faculty Senate Secretary Ernest May and Interim Rules Committee Chair MJ Peterson, decided to use this address to the Faculty Senate to discuss the faculty and administration’s collective work-in-progress, the Strategic Plan. Much has been done over the last year, and there is more to unfold this year.
The Phase One strategic planning document is in place. Chancellor Subbaswamy hopes that all the Faculty Senators have had a chance to take a look at this document. It should be a matter of pride that this institution, in an inclusive way, created this collective document that expresses the state of affairs in higher education and situates this campus in that terrain, discussing the kinds of issues that must be grappled with in the years to come. The Phase One document was about setting the agenda for ongoing planning. It strongly shaped the fifth-year report to NEASC. That report was one contributing factor to the document’s timeline. The Phase One document can be accessed at umass.edu/provost/strategic-planning. It is a living document and an important document in terms of telling the world what it is that UMass Amherst is trying to do to address some of the biggest challenges facing higher education today.

There are two important premises mentioned in the beginning of the document. First, we must become more effective at demonstrating value to those who hold a stake in our success. Second, we must learn to operate effectively in a new and much more challenging resource environment.

What has happened since this document was written? Noting that emulation is a great form of flattery, Chancellor Subbaswamy reported that some important people have used similar language. In late August, President Obama gave an important speech at SUNY-Buffalo unveiling his plan titled “A Better Bargain for the Middle Class.” At the White House’s website, plans are laid out, including, first, a proposal to pay colleges and students for performance, including imperatives to develop a new college rating system for comparing value among schools and tie aid to it, to challenge states to fund public colleges based on performance, and to hold students and colleges receiving student aid responsible for making progress toward a degree; and, second, a call to promote innovation that cuts costs and improves quality, calling on colleges to offer students a greater range of affordable and high-quality options, to award credits based on learning as opposed to seat time, and promote dual enrollment. Loan debt is often mentioned as a major political and economic issue. Going back to the Phase One document, you will see references to all these issues.

In the meantime, the General Assembly of Massachusetts, which was so generous to UMass in reversing the decline in state appropriation that has long been occurring, has established a commission on higher education as a way to grant funds to the public higher education system. That commission’s charge states: “The Commission shall seek to define the requirements of a high quality system of public higher education that meets the needs of the students in the Commonwealth and to define a sustainable model of financing such a system and the appropriate relative contributions of students and families, the Commonwealth, and all other sources, including federal grants.” The charge refers specifically to leveraging current deficiencies and reforms, including performance incentive grants and so on. Whether at the federal level, the state level, or with the general public, the notion that institutes of higher education need to be held more accountable is ubiquitous. UMass Amherst anticipated this development by including it in the Phase One document last October.

Putting the principles of the Phase One document into action is what the University is going to engage in this fall. This will continue into the spring and, at the college level, next fall.

For Phase Two, the administration has been in conversation with the Rules Committee. The collaborative approach that was effective for the Phase One document will be repeated here. Phase Two will focus on the big ideas that were expressed in the Phase One document, flesh out goals and ideas, and put ideas into action. Some of this work, of course, is already underway. Many of the principles articulated in the document have been part of the University’s work for years.

The Phase One document set an agenda stating that UMass Amherst would be established as a destination of choice for the best and brightest students, employees, faculty members, and so on. Relatedly, the second agenda item is to establish UMass Amherst as an investment of choice, whether from parents, state agencies, federal agencies, private philanthropy, industry, and so forth. In order to achieve these goals, the third agenda item is to mobilize for success. UMass must look at all its operations and see how to set things up in order to maximize the probability of success. On page 20 of the Phase One document, there is a placeholder about the common characteristics of a UMass graduate from any of the colleges. It is a placeholder because, although the University has a general idea of what its graduates look like, it has not been precisely articulated. The question, then, is how to go from that placeholder to something that the University—as a collective—adopts as a way to describe its graduates. The only way to do this is to engage the campus in a systematic discussion of all the distinctive characteristics of its graduates. The Joint Task Force on Strategic Oversight, along with the Provost’s Office, will lead this discussion in a similar way to that in which it led the strategic planning process. In the near future, this component will be circulated. There will be suggestions, meetings, and, fairly quickly, something that has been collectively developed will be brought to the Faculty Senate for campus-wide adoption.

There have been about nine major developmental plans regarding this issue, as well as many ways to think about how to functionalize it. One characteristic of our graduates that has been noted is civic engagement. If that is a characteristic that
the University wants to pursue for articulation, there is an item indicating to study civic engagement and service learning. This study will be led through the office of Associate Vice Provost for Undergraduate and Continuing Education Carol Barr. It will be her responsibility to engage the appropriate governance committees to conduct that discussion.

Likewise, one of the items in the major development plans was balancing instructional supply and demand. That issue is being highlighted because it quickly speaks to resource allocation issues. UMass has grown its enrollment by about 22% in the past ten years. While the increase was planned and deliberate, where the students go on campus is not. Many of them went into the sciences, others did not. Faculty growth has not necessarily followed the student growth. How the University handles faculty growth along with enrollment management is an important issue. It is an element that was missing from an earlier draft and later identified. The administration has been talking to deans and department chairs regarding issues such as this.

Looking at the investment of choice component, one major item going forward is aligning research priorities with state, national, and other priorities. There has been mention of developing a process for systematic and regular reviews of federal funding trends and projections. The development of this component will be assigned to the Vice Chancellor for Research and Engagement and appropriate faculty governance bodies such as the Research Council. There are many other issues on the table, such as expanding campus engagement with state-level stakeholders and decision makers as well as the University system office. That initiative is being headed by Vice Chancellors Michael Malone and John Kennedy in the context of the Springfield Initiative and so forth. Tasks have been specifically assigned, timelines will be developed, and consultation with appropriate bodies will take place.

Turning to another illustration of mobilizing for success, there was a specific developmental plan speaking to more intentional resource allocation. Even if the State’s 50/50 plan comes through, it only applies to the academic side of the University. The total University budget will still be only 25% covered by the state; 75% of it will be generated by the University’s own resources: curricular fees, research dollars, auxiliary enterprises, et cetera. How do we emphasize the common good and align resources with institutional priorities in that climate? The majority of the University will still be self-generated, and, therefore, the University, while continuing to increase its state allotment, must make sure that the self-generated resources are robust.

Some of the most important ideas in all of the sections are, of course, closely related. Asking what kind of education needs to be offered to make UMass Amherst a destination of choice—the variety of programs, active learning, so forth—determines, and, in some ways, is determined by, the University’s position in the admissions marketplace. We have to ask how to make the changes that we want while still attracting high-quality students. Doing the right things here will improve the University’s standing in the admissions marketplace, attracting the best, most highly-prepared students from all backgrounds. Resources must be aligned for success. If all of the students are studying physics and all the faculty lines are in music, there is a problem in serving the needs of the students.

UMass Amherst is not sitting idle. UMass has joined the Student Success Collaborative, a group of major universities developing better tools to guide, track, and support student progress. There is a great deal of information being gathered. How do we take that information and learn useful things that can be applied to the benefit of students? This can be done much more quickly and dynamically now than ever before. A fundamental reexamination has been launched regarding how and where we teach, including a faculty survey to help inform the classroom planning process. Much of what the University does is case-based, team-based, flipped, blended, et cetera, so it is important to find the appropriate outlets for all these developments. Having the New Academic Classroom Building in play next year will create a great opportunity to engage in this discussion.

Of course, new support for faculty innovators is being put into place at the Center for Teaching and Faculty Development, OIT, and various other offices.

In meetings with chairs and deans, the administration is trying to define instructional stress. Is it simply student credit hours per faculty member? Or is it other issues such as the type of class, the size of the class, experience, outcomes, et cetera? Information has been shared regarding overall faculty participation in teaching that suggests that the University is not, in every single case, being as productive as it was, say, ten years ago, or compared to peer groups in the Delaware Study. These are all good discussions to have in a transparent manner, so that when asked about these issues, there will be answers, as the University has asked these questions of itself.

UMass is participating in the American Council on Education Internationalization Lab. Internationalization is a critical element to being a destination of choice for students in this state, as well as for faculty wanting to do collaborative research across the globe. The University is engaged in developing an internationalization strategic plan under the leadership of a faculty group chaired by Mzamo Mangaliso of the Isenberg School of Management and Joseph Berger of the College of
Some of the University’s research interests have been aligned with the interests of the Mass Life Sciences Center, which brought in a $95 million grant, as well as the Mass Tech Transfer Center, which is working to more closely connect UMass researchers with Massachusetts businesses, particularly in the life sciences. The University is also working to stimulate research and scholarship in areas with more modest external funding opportunities, such as the social sciences and humanities, through institutes like the Interdisciplinary Studies Institute, the Institute for Social Science Research, and the Renaissance Center.

Exploration of a new budget model is already underway. Discussions are being planned with the Rules Committee for setting up the process of a campus-wide discussion of pertinent issues. When 75% of the University’s annual budget is coming from internal sources, much thought has to be given to where the money is coming from and where it is going. In a completely incremental budgeting system—in which we say, “Next year’s budget is plus or minus x-amount of whatever it was last year, which was plus or minus x-amount of whatever it was the year before”—it is difficult to compose a rational budget. There are many good examples of processes for how to go about this task. The Joint Task Force for Strategic Oversight will remain a key coordinating body and parallel tracks will be followed. The Chancellor will visit all of the Faculty Senate councils to field questions and address specific issues. Open forums and a planning website will be in place similarly to how they were utilized in the drafting of the strategic plan. In the meantime, the administration will be engaged with academic and administrative units around campus. Feedback is being solicited from departments by chairs and deans. The communication is going to be as open as possible, and the process is going to be as inclusive as can be set up.

In the spring, there will be a full update of the progress of the campus-level plans. Guidelines will be developed for what the unit-level plan alignment will look like. At the Faculty Convocation, Chancellor Subbaswamy will give a progress report regarding the developments of the last year, and also address broader issues in faculty engagement in bringing about changes and helping shape the future of higher education in the context of the UMass Amherst campus.

**Senator Curt Conner** stated that the faculty was not listed in many places where the Chancellor noted that input was solicited. Many administrators were listed. He wonders if the Chancellor is promoting a top-down plan.

**Senator Subbaswamy** noted that there were parallel tracks in developing the strategic plan, one of which was the Joint Task Force on Strategic Oversight, which was made up of people appointed by the administration and the Rules Committee and submitted to the Senate for approval. Once the draft was developed, a group of approximately 150 students, staff and faculty representatives reviewed and made recommendations on it. That draft was circulated openly and, moreover, directly submitted to all the departments on campus.

**Senator Conner** stated that the faculty input was only solicited after the document was drafted.

**Chancellor Subbaswamy** stated that the draft document was the work of the Joint Task Force. If he had written his own strategic plan, it would have been much shorter and somewhat different.

**Ernest May, Secretary of the Faculty Senate**, noted that the process in developing this strategic plan has been more open than any, probably, in the campus’ history. That doesn’t mean that every page of every planning document has been voted on by the faculty. In the past, Chancellors have promulgated strategic plans to which the faculty simply reacted. There has been a lot of interaction on this plan. Obviously, with over 1,000 tenure-track faculty, almost 1,500 total faculty, and a faculty and staff of over 5,000, it is impossible to have direct dialogue on every point. It is a representative document. The Chancellor has made it a point to share the document, as well as incremental progress of the planning, on the web. On the A & F website, there is a consultant’s report called the Buck Report. An outside consultant came to campus to address a very significant problem on campus having to do with the hiring and promotion of staff. The report is published for everyone to read. That is unusual in the history of this institution. Similarly, Chancellor Subbaswamy has posted every version of the draft online. That doesn’t mean that everyone has read it or reacted to it, but it’s there. Secretary May applauded Chancellor Subbaswamy for taking this attitude. Most of the faculty, however, are highly occupied in their work, so they don’t always notice these things. In his Secretary’s Notes and other communications, Secretary May disseminates this information to Senators and the faculty at large. He encouraged the Senate to suggest more ways to become involved with the task forces and sub-groups that will be looking at individual issues. This is an enormous task that will have to be broken down into parts. This year, there will be much focus on various units around campus: departments,
colleges and schools. There will be broad faculty participation there, as well. JTFSO will have fewer subcommittees this year because of departmental involvement. The collaborative approach of Chancellor Subbaswamy is very appreciated. When Secretary May began his tenure with the Faculty Senate, there was no such thing as a joint task force. Then, the administration did whatever work it was doing, which was then submitted to the Faculty Senate. The Faculty Senate reacted to it, sometimes positively, sometimes not. And then reconciliation took place. The General Education program and developments in online education were the first instances when, in order to craft the proposal, a joint task force was created at the outset, so there was an attempt to get everyone in the room and create a proposal that didn’t have to be battled out later; it had broad input at the beginning. Chancellor Subbaswamy seems to like that approach better. Secretary May believes it to be more efficient and that it can, certainly, as in the cases of online education and Gen Ed, have better outcomes. There are currently other initiatives taking place in this manner. There is a Joint Task Force on Accountability trying to respond to the multiple requests that the University gets to try to be accountable, a very problematic area. This is the approach the Chancellor is taking, and he should be applauded for it. If there are areas that are not being addressed collaboratively enough, Secretary May urged the faculty to let him know. He will try to work on it.

Senator Marinos Vouvakis asked the Chancellor what he considers the cornerstone idea of the strategic plan, what issue the Chancellor considers the most important, the idea he wants to build his chancellorship around.

Chancellor Subbaswamy stated that, last year, as the strategic planning document was drafted, he traveled extensively, gathering information about the campus and how it is perceived in the Commonwealth and beyond. He had many conversations with legislators, board members, alumni, parents, and so forth. In the process, what became clear is that the quality of UMass Amherst is not understood in the Commonwealth, and that it is not getting the following that most state flagship schools take for granted. In a very rapidly changing higher education environment, how does UMass Amherst not only position itself as a nationally-competitive institution, but change its perception within the Commonwealth to reflect the quality of the University and its value as an asset to the Commonwealth, positioning itself as a destination and investment of choice? That idea defined the strategic planning document. In other words, this campus wants to change both the quality and perception of the quality of this institution as a leading research university.

Senator Vouvakis asked the Chancellor how he felt the University should go about achieving these goals.

Chancellor Subbaswamy stated that there are many issues treated within the strategic planning document, and the ideas that are mentioned in the document addressing those issues are going to be implemented. The question of transformation is not one for Chancellor Subbaswamy individually; it is a collective concern that is laid out in the strategic planning document. Chancellor Subbaswamy stated that if Senator Vouvakis has read the document and has specific concerns, he would be happy to have a substantive discussion on the issues that he might believe to be wrongheaded.

Senator Max Page stated that he believes that the communication aspect of the strategic planning process, in which the University shows the Commonwealth and its stakeholders its qualities, values, and improvements, is one of its most important components. He is very concerned, however, about the pay-for-performance model that has been discussed. Just because President Obama mentions it, or because it is the latest corporate fad going around, does not necessarily make it good. Senator Page believes the embrace of pay-for-performance to be one of the most dangerous developments in education. Massachusetts already has a similar model, the Division Project, put out by the Commissioner of Higher Education. In Senator Page’s program, Architecture, the proxy for quality of the education provided is how many students pass licensure exams. Because they need to compare it between all fifty states, because they needed to draw it down to a single number, this became the complete proxy. And you can see what happens: money goes towards getting more people licensed and not towards what we think is appropriate research and teaching at the University. There is a real danger. Many Senators have children in the Amherst Public Schools. There, we don’t say that if you don’t get your graduation rates up, we will take money away. That is absolutely, perversely upside down. There is a real danger in embracing pay-for-performance, so Senator Page hopes UMass is cautious about moving down that road.

Chancellor Subbaswamy acknowledged that there is no question that pay-for-performance presents dangers. It is not a simple issue, and it is fraught with the kinds of dangers Senator Page has mentioned. In his position, Chancellor Subbaswamy has to do one of two things. The first is, wherever there is an opportunity, to intervene and try to stop the state from going down that path. The second, more likely option, is to engage in such a way that UMass can help decide what the measures of quality are and what the outcomes ought to be. That is what the Chancellor and the University are trying to do: to get ahead of the issue before being legislatively told how performance will be measured. The University is presenting a thoughtful process that takes everything that the University values into consideration and stops measurements, such as salaries after graduation, that it knows to be terrible ways to view the full development of the citizen-student-professional. Chancellor Subbaswamy’s own reading, which he shares with many administrators, is that by trying to define and shape the in-house conversation between administrators, faculty and community members, the University can get ahead of the issue—especially in a progressive state like Massachusetts. The legislature will, he believes,
accept a reasonable approach. In fact, President Caret has attempted to do this by implementing system-level metrics that don’t measure licensure successes alone. There has to be a reasoned, wise approach, and Chancellor Subbaswamy expects to count on faculty members such as Senator Page to help mount the battle.

Secretary May added to the Chancellor’s response by noting that the Joint Task Force on Accountability has been working on these issues for the past four or five years. There is much expertise on the campus, but more input is needed to fight the dearth of measures which can demonstrate adequately to the University’s constituency—the citizens of Massachusetts and their legislators—the value that the University is adding to the lives of the students who pay tuition to come here and its graduates. It is extremely difficult. That is why MCAS took place at the secondary level. Many people want to extend it to higher education. Because there are so many undergraduate majors that are so diverse and have so many unique outcomes, this is very difficult. There are many success stories around the campus, but moving beyond anecdotes and aggregating the data is almost impossible except by measures like graduation rates, which seem to promote institutions that take in the highly-qualified students that naturally graduate at a higher rate than less-qualified students. Undoubtedly, there is more expertise on campus than what is currently assembled on the JTFA. If there are people who can contribute to this conversation in a positive way, Secretary May encouraged their participation. The faculty are very smart, and here is a situation where expertise could advance the national conversation and the conversation on campus. If UMass can develop some verifiable data set that describes the value of what it does, it would be remarkably helpful.

Senator Page noted that everything that Secretary May mentioned is very important, but that it was stated as if it was accepted fact. The fact of data having to be counted is one of the principles that is resisted in such a nuanced environment as a university.

Secretary May noted that making statements about how good the University is, and how much better it is than any other place, is taken by the populace as, simply, self-interested promotion. There has to be some objective way of saying, “We’re in the top quartile, or the top 10% on this measure, but we’re in the lower half on that other measure.”

Senator Maria Tymoczko stated that a good deal of what is done at the University is quite subjective. To say that there is nothing to turn to but data, or that there are no arguments to be made about subjective measures, is bad for the University. She believes that, if Secretary May really believes that objective data is necessary for communicating the value of the University, he is not doing a good job of representing faculty or student interest.

Chancellor Subbaswamy noted that the term that is always used, very carefully, is “meaningful assessment.” Who decides what meaningful assessment is? The University does it collectively and, in a bigger picture, it is defined by higher education across the country. We are fortunate to live in a progressive state. If the University does the right things, and convinces the legislature that it is taking accountability seriously, we will be fine. What will not work is to simply say that this cannot be measured at all, and, therefore, we’re not going to do anything. If just for our own sake, that is not justifiable. Meaningful assessment is what we talk about, and we have to collectively create that meaning.

Presiding Officer Bogartz stated that he was in a bit of a procedural predicament. Robert’s Rules of Order states that speakers cannot address other speakers. He is inclined to let conversation happen, but if anyone is offended by that, that person may raise a point of order and he will put an end to it.

Ghazah Abbasi, Vice President of the Graduate Student Senate, raised questions pertaining to two inter-related issues. Since one of the central themes of the strategic planning document is adding value, she wondered what kind of value the University sees graduate students as having on campus beyond teaching undergraduate courses. She wondered how the value of graduate research figured into the strategic plan. Ms. Abbasi echoed the concerns of multiple Senators about measuring outcomes and quantifying them. The idea that everything needs to be rationalized is problematic. Much is implicit in the assertion that, for instance, department budgets need to be rationalized. What is implicit there is that there is an agreed upon consensus according to which budgets need to be rationalized. Part of what we mean by rationality is complicity with what the market wants. How do we measure the value of graduate research that cannot be patented and sold?

Chancellor Subbaswamy stated that the strategic plan begins its section on research by discussing graduate education. Graduate education is what makes a research university. Without graduate education, UMass would be a research institution, not a university. There are very specific issues addressed in the plan, such as time to degree, quality improvement, research excellence, and so on. These concerns are at the forefront of the strategic planning. The destination of choice component of the plan applies both the undergraduate and graduate students. In terms of rationalizing budgets, the rationality must be contained. The issue is that if you make decisions that inadvertently result in the reduction of—bluntly—tuition revenue, if there is a reduction in total funding because we emotionally decided to put resources into a pocket that is not generating any funds, then, gradually, there won’t be enough money to do anything. An awareness of
where the 75% of funds is coming from is incredibly important. We have to pay attention to that and marshal resources in order to keep that revenue coming. To do otherwise would not be good financial management. If we did not pay attention to that revenue, we could not be able to support high-quality graduate and undergraduate education. Doing it mindlessly could wipe out high-quality graduate programs. This is not a process where you turn it over to a machine, turn a crank, and determine how much money any one unit gets. At the same time, it cannot be done exclusively on a historic basis, because things have changed a great deal and we need to take account of that. There was a time when most of the money came from the state. The state money is the only funding that comes as a block grant. Everything else comes in particular pockets, and you have to pay attention to nurturing those pockets. The University has less and less state money that it can use to express its priorities.

Senator Marta Calas noted that much of what has been said is related to a larger picture of what place UMass occupies in the context of global education. Many of the things that have been said at the meeting or mentioned in the strategic planning document occupy a place that is encased in a particular kind of language. This is even clearer now than it was last semester. It is totally managerialist and economistic-oriented. That language makes us think in a particular way. It doesn’t allow us to think beyond the principles that it supports, for example, emphasis on rational choice. It comes with a certain kind of disciplinary orientations of will. Therefore, we are tending towards being what, in the larger picture, is called a neo-liberal university. It is almost contradictory to the idea that we are living in changing times. What we are doing, in reality, is limiting what we are able to pay attention to. The changing times view the world as being in process, and create a process-oriented campus that encourages change, rather than bureaucratizing it. These documents and speeches act as though they are neutral, that what is stated in them is not politically-oriented, that it doesn’t have to do with anything outside of the document itself. This is not true. For instance, rankings are not neutral, and the question of ranking itself is being debated right now in global education. The assumption that faculty will participate because the process will go down through the departments is predicated on the belief that the administration of each department allows for faculty participation. Much of what has been said is great, but a door has been opened for a lot of questions that need to be asked collectively.

Chancellor Subbaswamy couldn’t agree more. Hard questions are being asked. As far as how the pie is divided up, if, at the end of the open discussion, it is decided that no changes should be made, then that is a collective choice. Chancellor Subbaswamy is not coming to this with a preconceived notion that the University must change, or that it must adopt a particular way to do things. He will continue to point out, however, the dangers of going forward in this process without paying attention to where the money is coming from. You have to make sure those revenues keep coming. Unlike the funds from the state, where we simply march on the legislature demanding the rest of the money, the rest of the University’s funds come from individual efforts. If you don’t apply for research grants, that money won’t come in. Taking care of all the various things the University does, whether it is the Library, OIT infrastructure, et cetera—all of the funds to do those things come from the commonly-earned resources. Part of the Chancellor’s job is to worry about that—not to mention the $65 million a year mortgage payment the University has.

Senator Howard Peelle stated that there exist a great number of studies and methods for qualitative research. It seems that it might be appropriate to consider some of these, perhaps even asking students about their own perception of the education they receive.

Chancellor Subbaswamy stated that the University does this. There are graduating senior surveys, focus groups, NSSE national data collection, et cetera. There is a rich set of information that the University is trying to get, not merely numerical data. There is obviously more to do. Ideally, the University would have the addresses of all graduating seniors to contact them five years down the road. We always make the claim that the value of education is not realized for a few years. There are a lot of efforts to get that information.

B. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Principal Administrative Officers

Chancellor Subbaswamy was pleased to introduce to the Faculty Senate the new Chief Information Officer and Vice Chancellor for Information Systems and Strategy, Julie Buehler, who has come to UMass after a number of years at the University of Rochester.

Provost James Staros spoke to the Commonwealth Honors College. When Priscilla Clarkson went on medical leave, Provost Staros appointed Dan Gordon as Acting Dean. Since her death, Provost Staros has had appropriate consultations and announced Dan Gordon as Interim Dean of Commonwealth Honors College for the current academic year. In the next few weeks, the University will be launching a national search for Dean of the Commonwealth Honors College. By launching a national search, Provost Staros is not saying that there are not qualified candidates on campus who could be Dean of the
Commonwealth Honors College. Rather, this is a time, with the new Commonwealth Honors College Complex, when launching a national search will give UMass visibility in the national honors community. Provost Staros will act in consultation with the Commonwealth Honors College Council, which will act in an equivalent role as a college personnel committee for nominating faculty members for the search committee.

*Michael Malone, Vice Chancellor for Research and Engagement,* spoke to the funding of the Massachusetts Life Sciences Center. To put it in context, that was the last large investment that was called for in the legislation that enhanced the life sciences at UMass. It brings the total life sciences investment in the UMass system to almost $250 million since 2008. Just after the $95 million for the Amherst campus was approved, the system convened a Life Science Task Force to revisit the issue of a system-wide life sciences strategy. The strategy was developed in 2007 and published in 2008 and, arguably, led to lots of the funding success that UMass Amherst has had in the first several years of the Life Sciences Center. There will be a town hall meeting on campus in late September or early October to get input from the community on the next five to seven years of life sciences strategy for the UMass system. The articulated strategy was an important component in communicating with the state and it will be important going forward. There will be announcements forthcoming.

*Julie Buehler, Chief Information Officer and Vice Chancellor for Information Systems and Strategy,* noted that she had been in town for two weeks and only on the job on campus for four days. It was a pleasure to recognize some faces at the meeting after such a short time.

*James Sheehan, Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance,* mentioned that in *The Boston Globe* there was a recent, wonderful article about the UMass Dining and Food Services, focusing in particular on the new Hampshire Dining Commons. It brought great coverage to Food Services and great exposure to UMass. On a lighter note, regarding the broken gas main north of the Library, the gas has been shut off, so it is safe to go to the north side of campus. Vice Chancellor Sheehan is thankful that UMass has become a smoke-free campus.

*Enku Gelaye, Interim Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs and Campus Life,* noted that the last time she was at the Senate there was a discussion of UMatter @ UMass. There was a great discussion about working together to create a caring, compassionate community that really reflects and engages in active bystandership. That program rolled out soon after that conversation. Faculty members should have received a maroon folder on the subject. Vice Chancellor Gelaye asked the Senators to please encourage staff and faculty in their areas to use it actively. It is a tool to give community members the language and approach to work with students in crisis. Other pieces of the program, including active bystandership training for faculty and staff, will begin rolling out at the end of the fall semester.

*Chancellor Subbaswamy* realized that he had not introduced the new Interim Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs and Campus Life, Enku Gelaye, and remedied that oversight.

*John Kennedy, Vice Chancellor for University Relations,* updated the Senate on some of the communications and marketing activities on campus. The campus live shot TV studio is up and running. There have been a couple dozen live shots from outlets as varied as Al Jazeera to CNN to Fox TV. The Thomas Herndon analysis of Reinhart and Rogoff showed up pretty much all over the world. UMass had hits from Fox, CNN, and CTV. In print, UMass is doing pretty well, also. In addition to the coverage of that story in the *New York Times,* *Washington Post,* et cetera, there has been wonderful columns in the *Gazette* by Presiding Officer Bogartz. Vice Chancellor Kennedy wanted to knock on wood in acknowledging that UMass has had a good run with *The Boston Globe* as well. Starting back in the spring, when the paper ran its magazine on UMass’ sesquicentennial, there was a wonderful op-ed on commencement day, there was coverage of the New Student Week fruit salad, there was an editorial Monday, and a campus dining piece. Another area that is potentially going to bear fruit for the campus is the UMass Poll; the Political Science Department’s polling unit has entered into an informal partnership with *The Globe.* There was a poll on Labor Day weekend related to the Boston mayoral race. It is really great for UMass’ visibility, and the campus will continue to work to solidify that partnership. This weekend, there will be a piece in *The Globe* on the Commonwealth Honors College. Regarding the campus’ branding and marketing efforts, in mid-October, an advertising push will begin in the Boston area that highlights UMass Amherst’s status as the flagship University and relies heavily on the goals in the strategic plan of creating this campus as a destination of choice and an investment of choice by highlighting the impact this campus has in the Commonwealth and beyond, highlighting the value of UMass research, highlighting the service that is given to students. It will be a TV, radio, print, online, social media, et cetera initiative. Finally, October 25th will be Stand for UMass Day in Boston. There will be an exclusive breakfast between business leaders and campus leadership featuring research on the campus and other programs. There will be a parade from the Statehouse down to Faneuil Hall Marketplace with the Marching Band, during which dignitaries will say nice things about the campus. Then there will be a concert at Symphony Hall featuring a number of musical performances by UMass groups.

*Carol Barr, Vice Provost for Undergraduate and Continuing Education,* welcomed the Senate back. She hopes that everyone has seen the wonderful progress that has been made on the New Academic Classroom Building. She had the pleasure of
tours the building a couple of weeks ago. It recalled the Christmas movie “Bells of St. Mary,” where a new classroom building is being constructed across from the parish. Walking through, a Sister states she could envision the children learning in these new classrooms. That is how Vice Provost Barr felt touring the New Academic Classroom Building. She could envision the student teaching and student learning taking place. She has been providing information on the type of classrooms in the NACB to department heads and chairs. There are team-based learning rooms, tier-lecture rooms, multi-purpose viewing rooms. Vice Provost Barr encouraged all faculty members to think about the kind of teaching that can be done in these classrooms. In addition, the opening of the NACB is allowing UMass the opportunity to, hopefully, put in place a new course scheduling matrix. Since 2009, the administration has known that there has been a crisis on the campus in terms of scheduling 75-minute classroom teaching. Because the campus was facility constrained, there was excess demand from faculty wanting to teach 75-minute, twice-a-week courses. The campus could not accommodate that demand. The Registrar’s Office put in policies in terms of scheduling and curriculum and how it was delivered, et cetera. The administration is proposing a new course scheduling matrix to take effect in the fall of 2014. It will put 75-minute time blocks in place on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday afternoons. This information has been shared with department heads and chairs and asked that they share it with faculty. Over the summer, a joint Senate council and committee meeting discussed the issue. Vice Provost Barr will soon be meeting with the Student Government Association. Five Colleges have also been notified. If there are no glaring issues, this matrix will be officially put into place and the fall 2014 schedule will be based around it. The fall 2014 schedule is created this fall. Information will be disseminated from the Registrar’s Office to scheduling representatives, department heads and chairs, faculty, et cetera.

2. The Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Ernest May, Secretary of the Faculty Senate, welcomed the Senate back from the summer. Among the notable happenings since the last Senate meeting are the adoption of the first installment of the state’s 50/50 plan, the commitment of a majority of State Senators to the eventual election of UMass alumnus Stanley Rosenberg as the next President of the State Senate, the opening of the Life Sciences Building, the $95 million funding of the Life Sciences Initiative, and the opening of the Commonwealth Honors College Complex. This is a lot to absorb.

Secretary May asked the Senate to stand for a moment of silence for Dean Priscilla Clarkson and Associate Athletic Director Elaine Sortino, both of whom dedicated much of their lives to this institution and were instrumental in building highly successful flagship programs in their respective fields.

Following the moment of silence, Secretary May expressed the Senate’s sincere appreciation to a retiring member of the Rules Committee, D. Anthony Butterfield. As a longtime member and Chair of the Graduate Council, member of the Program and Budget Council, faculty member, director of the Ph.D. program, and Dean of the Isenberg School of Management, Senator Butterfield has made monumental contributions to the work of the faculty and students at UMass Amherst. On the Rules Committee, he has brought wisdom and clear-headed common sense to the issues of the last three years.

As stipulated in the Bylaws, “no at-large member of the Rules Committee shall serve more than three consecutive years on the Rules Committee,” so Senator Butterfield cannot succeed himself at this time.

Senator Stephen Brewer is also completing a partial term on the Rules Committee created by a member’s resignation last year. The Senate thanks him for his thoughtful insights and helpful service, as well. Since Senator Brewer has not yet served for three consecutive years, he is eligible for election and has been nominated for a full term on the Rules Committee.

There are now well over 1,000 tenure-track faculty on this campus, and a healthy number of additional searches are being approved for this coming year.

The Board of Trustees will be meeting in Amherst on September 17th and 18th. The backup materials for the committees that lead into the Trustee meeting are well over 1,000 pages long. They are continuing to authorize many new buildings. Some time, the Senate will have to get Chancellor Subbaswamy to explain how we will pay the debt service, operating expenses, and mandatory set asides on all these new buildings. The campus is going forward; it has no choice but to rebuild the buildings that need rebuilding.

Chancellor Subbaswamy is now entering his second year, brimming with optimism, ideas and projects. He is an extremely collaborative Chancellor, and the continued support of the work of the Senate makes this collaboration possible, and is greatly appreciated. UMass is really a collective University, and Chancellor Subbaswamy believes himself to be the leading representative, not just someone pushing his ideas and agenda on a reluctant faculty.
4. The Faculty Delegates to the Board of Trustees

James Kurose, Faculty Delegate to the Board of Trustees, updated the Senate on the Board of Trustees. The first meeting of the year will be held at UMass Amherst on September 18th. Preceding each Board meeting, there are two sets of half-day meetings. The one held the first week of September included a discussion of the effects of sequestration on research expenditures. After several years of steady growth in research expenditures, it looks like it will now be flat or even slightly negative for the coming year. That highlights the importance of UMass’ position as a partner of choice—that it has diversification outside of federal funds. Another item discussed at length was Fisher v. The University of Texas, the Supreme Court case regarding Affirmative Action policies at the University of Texas in Austin. As an observer, Senator Kurose could clearly see that admissions officers at UMass have been thinking ahead of the curve on this issue and have been taking action in anticipation of this ruling.

5. The Representative of the Massachusetts Society of Professors

Randall Phillis, President of the Massachusetts Society of Professors, noted that this is a bargaining year for the MSP. The contract is up, and the MSP will be engaged in bargaining for the coming three-year contract. Formerly, MSP bargained for compensation, benefits, and working conditions; but the MSP has a long tradition of championing the broad values of a quality academic institution, so it bargains for things that extend well beyond those three components. Many of those issues were the topic of conversation that came up earlier, like how to value aesthetics, wisdom, teamwork, etc. That valuation is, in fact, what the MSP does, and there are a number of things it would like to propose to the administration that come from the faculty to improve the quality of productivity and working conditions so that people cannot only get their work done well, but that they can do so with a satisfying professional experience. In that vein, the MSP is going around for departmental visits. Ideally, an MSP board member will visit the first department faculty meetings of the semester to describe what the MSP has been thinking and, most importantly, be eager to hear ideas from the faculty about what might enhance and improve their working lives at the University that could be translated into contract proposals. The MSP contract, like the Faculty Senate, will be a place where the voices of the faculty members are heard.

President Phillis was glad to see on the agenda a motion to appreciate the leaders of the Commonwealth for the funding increase that public education enjoyed here in the State of Massachusetts during the last budget round. UMass President Caret and his office need to be acknowledged for the work they did to push the 50/50 plan, as does the UMass Amherst administration for its efforts. This work was well aligned with the campus unions. Importantly, President Phillis wanted to appreciate two groups. First, the MSP got faculty members to handwrite letters describing the good work they are doing and how continued support for that good work could be a benefit to the Commonwealth, and certainly the students that are being educated. Hundreds of those letters were generated and sent to legislators. They were incredibly persuasive. Even more, CEPA, the Center for Education Policy and Advocacy, a student group, organized, with help from the MSP, a student, handwritten letter campaign. Nearly 1,000 letters, written by students, by hand, in their own voice, expressed what it is that being at UMass Amherst means and how they are taking advantage of it. These were powerful letters about what good things they are getting here. What is more, many of those students argued very persuasively about the impact of student debt burden on themselves and their families. That, coupled with the Trustees’ efforts to freeze fees, was part of the legislative persuasion that went into really getting a better budget for this year. This group effort, where we were all on the same page, but playing complementing roles, was a powerful approach. In that regard, the MSP does one other thing: it has a grants program that offers grants to faculty members to do work that is consistent with the work of the faculty and librarian union. There are a couple grants to highlight. One is a grant that went to Michael Ash and his colleagues about a Supreme Court case regarding Affirmative Action policies at the University of Texas in Austin. As an observer, Senator Kurose could clearly see that admissions officers at UMass have been thinking ahead of the curve on this issue and have been taking action in anticipation of this ruling.

6. The President of the Graduate Student Senate

Ghazah Abbasi, Vice President of the Graduate Student Senate, noted that she had been appointed by the President of the GSS to attend the Faculty Senate meetings and introduced herself. Vice President Abbasi is a graduate student in Sociology. This year, the GSS is looking to work collaboratively with the Faculty Senate, as there are issues that are of interest to graduate students as well as faculty.
C. QUESTION PERIOD

Presiding Officer Bogartz noted, entering the Question Period, that the Rules Committee had discussed the ten-minute limit that it has historically had. The Rules Committee agreed with Presiding Officer Bogartz that, one, that limit is not enforced, and, two, that the enemy of the Faculty Senate is boredom, and the most interesting parts of the meetings should not be limited in deference to unanimous passing of motions. Therefore, there will no longer be a time limit on the Question Period.

Senator Curt Conner spoke on the issue of going to 75-minute classes. Pedantically, it is horrendous. People learn in a 40-minute class. After 40 minutes, half the class is asleep. The 75-minute class is great if you are a faculty member and you want to take a long weekend. That’s what the big push is. In terms of teaching, three 45-minute periods are better than two 75-minute periods.

Vice Provost Barr stated that the team-based learning faculty fellows that have been studying and practicing team-based learning instruction overwhelmingly requested 75-minute periods—at a minimum. Other faculty have discussed interest based on their pedagogy and delivery for 75-minute periods. However, the administration knows that some faculty prefer, and the curriculum is better-suited for, smaller time frames. Those courses will be preserved. The new matrix is trying to accommodate as many faculty, with how they like to deliver their curriculum, as possible. Currently, the overwhelming demand, including information from the faculty survey from last spring, is for 75-minute periods. This matrix is trying to address that and see how it works out. The campus will be flexible along the way.

Secretary May noted that the course scheduling matrix is, indeed, a big deal, and that there is such a wide divergence of needs across the campus. The administration is trying to get it right. There are multiple possibilities to continue with three 50-minute periods each week. The new matrix has been distributed to all departments, and it underwent some revision this summer as a result of the joint meeting. However, it still needs to get out to everybody. Department chairs have the matrix and it will be posted on the Faculty Senate website.

Vice Provost Barr noted that the communication to the department heads and chairs requested them to share the information with all their faculty, talk to the faculty, and express any concerns related to specific curricula. Her office has heard from some departments expressing concerns that it has tried to work out.

Secretary May encouraged any faculty with concerns about the matrix to contact him. Because of the need to schedule the new classroom building, this process has had to be fast-tracked.

Senator Arthur Kinney asked if there were any plans for memorial services for Coach Sortino and Dean Clarkson.

Provost James Staros could not speak for events for Coach Sortino, but stated that there will be a celebration of life for Dean Clarkson. She asked that there not be a memorial, and that term will not be used, but there will be a celebration that is being organized in the Commonwealth Honors College with the support of the administration that will be held on October 3rd at 3:00 p.m. in the Commonwealth Honors College Hall.

Chancellor Subbaswamy stated that there is also a memorial service in the works for Coach Sortino on October 13th in the Mullins Center at 1:00 p.m., after the Alumni Game.

Amilecar Shabazz, Faculty Advisor for Diversity and Excellence, stated that the question he is posing as we enter this year is for the faculty to really think and apply themselves toward addressing the matter of diversity, inclusion, inclusive excellence on this campus. UMass is endeavoring to spotlight a number of wonderful opportunities. The administration is working with faculty who are proposing programs and developing programs in order to better spotlight them so that everyone can take advantage of them. This initiative is being referred to as the Old Chapel Sesquincentennial Series, and the first event is on September 25th at 7:00 p.m. in Thompson 104. It is being organized by Professor Sut Jhally and supported by the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences and the Communication Department. It involves a Western Massachusetts premier screening of the film “White Like Me.” Often when we discuss questions of inclusive excellence and diversity, a different kind of coloring picture emerges, but this film should draw in those of us with interest in matters of whiteness, like what it means to be a white person. Professor Shabazz knows that perhaps the whitest person in the Senate has written columns saying there is no such thing as race, but he encouraged the Senate to come and see what this film has to say about it.

The post-screening discussion with Tim Wise, who is the central figure of the film, will be especially intriguing. A number of UMass-associated individuals are in the film including Nilanjana Dasgupta from the Psychology Department and John Bracey from the Du Bois Department of Afro-American Studies along with scholars from other institutions such as Harvard and Princeton. It is a wonderful film and it marks the beginning of a series of discussions, including one organized by Jack Ahern and IPO about what international education means at UMass and another that Dan Gordon and...
the Commonwealth Honors College are organizing on the Fisher v. University of Texas case. These events will be spotlitoned online to encourage the campus community—especially faculty—to look at some of the research and ideas going on in this area of the University’s work.

Presiding Officer Bogartz noted that it would be inappropriate for the Presiding Officer to respond to Professor Shabazz’ comments on the existence of race by stating that he has science on his side, so he won’t.

D. MOTION OF APPRECIATION TO THE LEADERS OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate express its deep gratitude to the State Legislature and the Governor for adopting for the first installment of the 50-50 Budget Plan, thereby renewing and expanding the Commonwealth’s commitment to maintaining excellence and affordability in public higher education. By stepping in to provide needed resources that otherwise would have been raised through another increase in tuition and fees, the leaders of the Commonwealth have provided much-needed relief to the students and families who have been shouldering an increasing share of the cost of attending college in recent years.

As faculty at the Commonwealth’s flagship campus, we are acutely aware of the many demands on limited state funds in these challenging economic times and therefore realize the significance of the Legislature’s and Governor’s decision to invest in the future of the Commonwealth by supporting public higher education. We are grateful for this support and remain fully committed to fulfilling the historic promise and maximum potential of this great public land-grant research university.

Senator MJ Peterson moved to amend the motion to correct a small grammatical error in the second line of the motion.

The amendment was seconded and adopted.

The motion was unanimously adopted as amended.

E. ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, ON BEHALF OF THE FACULTY SENATE, OVER THE SUMMER 2013. APPROVAL OF THE FOLLOWING:

1. MANAGMNT 214 “New Venture Creation” 3 credits, as recommended by the Academic Matters Council.


MOVED: That the Faculty Senate affirm the actions taken by the Rules Committee, on behalf of the Faculty Senate, over the Summer 2013, as listed on this agenda, Item E.

Senator Marta Calas noted that her attention was caught by the fact that these items are referred to as routine business that the Rules Committee handles during the summer, and that, therefore, they are not big issues that need discussion. However, not all of the items on this list are equally non-controversial. Of course, there are new courses and small changes of curriculum, et cetera. But she wonders how non-controversial a certain certificate may be in regard to the contemporary situation in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; that is, the Online Certificate in Casino Management. That item in itself is interesting. Often times, certain certificates are not immediately approved. Senator Calas does not have anything for or against that certificate in principle, but she believes that calling certain things equally non-controversial or simply routine is not appropriate.

The motion was adopted.

F. ELECTIONS (10 Minutes)

One Associate Delegate to the Board of Trustees

Nominee: Marilyn Billings, Library

(Further nominations will be accepted from the floor.)

No further nominations were made and Marilyn Billings was elected by acclamation.

Three At-Large Members of the Rules Committee

Nominees: Steven Brewer, College of Natural Sciences - Biology

http://www.bio.umass.edu/biology/about/directories/faculty/steven-d-brewer

Nancy Cohen, School of Public Health and Health Sciences – Nutrition


Aura Ganz, College of Engineering - Electrical and Computer Engineering

http://ece.umass.edu/faculty/aura-ganz

(Further nominations will be accepted from the floor.)

No further nominations were made and Steven Brewer, Nancy Cohen, and Aura Ganz were elected by acclamation.

Chair of the Rules Committee

Nominee: MJ Peterson, Political Science

(Further nominations will be accepted from the floor.)

No further nominations were made and MJ Peterson was elected by acclamation.

The 729th Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate stood adjourned at 5:23 p.m. on September 12, 2013.

Respectfully submitted,

Ernest D. May
Secretary of the Faculty Senate