Presiding Officer Richard Bogartz called the 731st Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate to order on November 14, 2013 at 3:30 p.m. in Herter Hall, Room 227. He began the meeting with a few poems by Emily Dickinson. Because the poems are very short, he gave them a preamble:

“AYIN, NOTHINGNESS, is more existent than all the being of the world. But since it is simple, and every simple thing is complex compared with its simplicity, it is called Ayin.”

(From The Kabbalah.)

“Turiya is not that which is conscious of the inner (subjective) world, nor that which is conscious of the outer (objective) world, nor that which is conscious of both, nor that which is a mass of consciousness.

“It is not simple consciousness nor is It unconsciousness. It is unperceived, unrelated, incomprehensible, uninferable, unthinkable, and indescribable. The essence of the Consciousness manifesting as the self (in the three states), It is the cessation of all phenomena; It is all peace, all bliss, and non-dual. This is what is known as the Fourth (Turiya). This is Atman, and this has to be realized.”

(From The Mandukya Upanishad.)

With these ideas in mind, Presiding Officer Bogartz read the following poems of Emily Dickinson:

[1116]
There is another Loneliness
That many die without –
Not want of friend occasions it
Or circumstance of Lot

But nature, sometimes, sometimes thought
And whoso it befall
Is richer than could be revealed
By mortal numeral –

[1309]
The Infinite a sudden Guest
Has been assumed to be –
But how can that stupendous come
Which never went away?

[1512]
All things swept sole away
This – is immensity –

[1695]
There is a solitude of space
A solitude of sea
A solitude of death, but these
Society shall be
Compared with that profounder site
That polar privacy
A soul admitted to itself –
Finite infinity.

Presiding Officer Bogartz then announced that, due to a class conflict of one of the Co-Chairs of the Joint Task Force on Strategic Oversight, that group’s update would follow the Question Period.
A. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Principal Administrative Officers

Chancellor Kumble Subbaswamy informed the Senate that the search committee for the position of Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs and Campus Life has been formed and would be meeting the next week. Invitations to serve on the Provost’s Search Committee have just gone out, so the Committee should soon be finalized. Once finalized, the compositions of both committees will be announced on the Chancellor’s Office’s website. The Joint Task Force on Strategic Oversight will be presenting at this meeting, and the Joint Task Force on Resource Allocation is just getting underway. Many initiatives are working towards completion before the end of the academic year.

Provost James Staros announced that the Commonwealth Honors College Dean search has been launched. The position statement has been posted on the Provost’s Office’s website. The Search Committee is being chaired by Graduate School Dean John McCarthy and the Faculty Senate’s Commonwealth Honors College Council handled what is usually done by a college personnel committee (which the Honors College does not have) in terms of nominating members. The majority of the members of the Search Committee were nominees of the Commonwealth Honors College Council. Additional members represent SGA, GSS, and PSU, all of whom are connected with Commonwealth Honors College. It will be a very productive search. It is being run nationally. The position has been posted in the Chronicle of Higher Education.

Michael Malone, Vice Chancellor for Research and Engagement, announced that a designer had been selected for the Life Science Initiative. The designer is ARC of Cambridge. This is the same firm that did the Sherman Center at UMass Medical School. The firm is going to start meeting this week with the faculty organizing committees in order to get this project underway. This project is expected to be completed much more quickly than a building built from scratch would be. As soon as search committees are finalized, there will be an announcement relating to the search for Director of the Institute for Applied Life Sciences and for a new Director of the University of Massachusetts Press.

Julie Buehler, Vice Chancellor for Information Services and Strategy and Chief Information Officer, noted that she is on week nine of her campus-wide listening tour and shared some quick, early results of the tour. There is a desire around campus for greater communications related to information technology. The newly-formed Information and Communication Technology Council is gathering data about ways in which people want to receive these communications. Vice Chancellor Buehler encouraged the Senators to share any ideas they might have about this with herself or ICTC Co-Chairs MJ Canavan and Steven Brewer. Many people around campus have noted that there has been a problem with transparency in the University’s IT operations. Starting next week, there will be a new photographic organization chart of IT leaders on campus describing their functions. This is just the start of a more transparent operation. Many people have noted that support services—particularly the OIT help desk—are not being received well. A new position has been drafted, Director of User Services, for which a search is underway. This service will be revamped in response to campus concerns. Lastly, there have been concerns raised about campus email. Vice Chancellor Buehler received a resolution from ICTC that Co-Chair Brewer will share.

Senator Steven Brewer, Co-Chair of the Information and Communication Technology Council, read the resolution that the Council presented to Vice Chancellor Buehler after meeting to discuss the issue of campus email’s transition to Microsoft Exchange:

“Whereas the Executive Board of the MSP recommended halting email migration until implementation problems had been addressed and there was a clear roadmap regarding options,

“Be it resolved that the ICTC recommends that OIT evaluate current experience with email migration, develop a plan that makes clear the options academic units have regarding migration, and recruit pilot faculty and staff that are ready to move forward deliberately in light of what is learned.”

Senator Brewer noted that ICTC had a very good discussion about the migration to Exchange. Some of the units that have migrated forward represent good test cases where information has been collected relating to the problems that are being experienced. Once the options for units going forward are better understood, the campus should be able to move forward deliberately.

Vice Chancellor Buehler noted that OIT is thrilled with ICTC’s resolution. It is very important for OIT to listen in order to fully understand exact problem areas and address them. OIT looks forward to hearing the details of what is broken in order to fix them. Vice Chancellor Buehler noted her appreciation for the new Council, which has been so informative to her as a new leader on campus.
**John Kennedy, Vice Chancellor for University Relations**, stated that, after a lengthy review of the University Relations’ marketing, web design, and creative communications areas, the Office has announced a reorganization responsive to the input received from campus clients and from working with consultants to develop a structure and personnel that will be responsive to the needs of the campus. The headline is that Associate Vice Chancellor for University Relations Amy Glynn will now be a dual report: she will work half-time for University Relations and half-time for Student Affairs in order to build communications collaborations across the two vice chancelleries. Some of this information will be posted on *In the Loop* and on the University Relations website, which is being redesigned and rebuilt to have clear, transparent, and easy-to-understand project management processes. Finally, for those who missed the world premier of “The Radical Idea: UMass Amherst and the American Education Revolution,” the documentary about the University’s sesquicentennial narrated by UMass alumnus Bill Pullman on November 10, the film will air again at 8:00 p.m. on December 12 on WGBY.

**Carol Barr, Vice Provost for Undergraduate and Continuing Education**, updated the Senate on student success and the work towards defining what a UMass Amherst educational experience means to undergraduate students. Earlier on the day of the Senate meeting, Vice Provost Barr and Vice Chancellor Enku Gelaye co-led a discussion of numerous representatives from key groups across campus—Academic Affairs, Student Affairs and Campus Life, Residential Life, Assessment, et cetera. The discussion was about how this campus can unite behind a common definition of what is meant by “student success.” What are the key student learning outcomes? What are the University’s goals in terms of preparing students for future professional and personal success? This discussion is ongoing. More and more campus groups will be engaged as we move towards a definition of student success. Our student success initiatives will be geared towards the key pieces that we have identified as a campus. Structures will be put in place, evaluations will be made, students will be listened to, and UMass Amherst will move as a unified whole towards success. This is coming directly out of the Strategic Plan. A lot of energy and involvement is going into this. The Faculty Senate will be informed of all developments.

**John McCarthy, Vice Provost for Graduate Education and Dean of the Graduate School**, encouraged Senators to get word out to their colleagues in the disciplines that are funded by the National Science Foundation. The NSF Graduate Research Fellowship recommendation letters are supposed to be due at 8:00 p.m. on the night of the Senate meeting. Dean McCarthy is happy to learn that that deadline has been delayed until 8:00 p.m. on Monday, November 18. Unfortunately, the NSF did not tell any of the recommenders; only applicants were notified. Dean McCarthy heard it from one of his own students.

2. **The Secretary of the Faculty Senate**

**Ernest May, Secretary of the Faculty Senate**, reported that the Rules Committee met with Vice Chancellor Buehler and the Committee is very impressed with how she is trying to put out fires at the same time as developing strategies for moving forward. There are many obstacles to overcome, but a collaborative approach must be developed. With respect to the Faculty Senate’s online proposal management system, of which there was a preview at the last Senate meeting, Secretary May stated that if you like the paper process, you’ll be able to keep the paper process, at least during the transition period. In other words, if something comes in by paper, it should be possible to be inputted into the system at the Senate Office. Secretary May attended a Board of Trustees meeting on October 23rd. It was a Wednesday in the middle of the sesquicentennial celebration week, when the UMass Amherst ads were all over Boston newspapers and television. This meeting was an annual retreat where President Caret asked each UMass campus chancellor to present some of the highlights of what is in their strategic plans, giving progress reports and noting their biggest challenges and what they need from the Trustees. At UMass Medical School, the decline of federal funding is hitting hard. Federal funding is going down 9.5%, presenting the campus with many challenges at the same time that costs for the healthcare system are problematic. In response, UMass Medical School is thinking of merging, in a limited way, with the healthcare system. That school wants the Trustees to reserve some capital for them; they do not need it now, but might in the future. UMass Lowell is growing rapidly, and Chancellor Marty Meehan can speak very charismatically on the subject. During the week that UMass Amherst was advertising on Boston television, they had full-page ads in the *Boston Globe* and the *New York Times*. The ad asks, “Is College Worth It?” In one ranking, on the pay scale of mid-career salaries for graduates, UMass Lowell is miles ahead of UMass Amherst, tied with Boston College. Graduates of UMass Lowell and Boston College, according to this ranking, earn $95,000 in mid-career. The top college in the ranking was Harvey Mudd, an engineering school that is part of the Claremont Colleges in California, and number two was the United States Naval Academy. Chancellor Meehan has been lauded for increasing the graduation rate at Lowell, and what he is after is an equal apportionment of state funding on a per student basis. Currently, UMass Amherst gets a higher level of funding, per student, than any of the other campuses. There is good reason for this, as Amherst has a bigger research mission and division one athletics. Lowell is claiming that they do research, too, and have some division one athletics. The 50/50 plan, when implemented, will present a challenge to maintaining Amherst’s somewhat privileged status of 49.4% of the state allocation, although State Senator Stan Rosenberg has studies that show that Amherst should be getting something like 54%, comparing UMass Amherst to other state flagship schools. At Dartmouth, essentially, they want an increase in welfare. At Boston, they want dorms. Chancellor Keith Motley presented quite a sermon concerning that campus’ need for dorms. In order to build those dorms, UMass
Boston wants to see its debt-service ratio be allowed to increase above the 8% limit and go to 10%. Chancellor Motley quoted Chancellor Meehan as saying, “If they get dorms, that’s the end of the story.” UMass Amherst Chancellor Subbaswamy presented a number of slides that the Faculty Senate is familiar with and may see some more of. UMass Amherst is in the middle of its strategic planning process. The other campuses are a couple of years into their strategic plans, so their situations are a little different. Secretary May’s impression from these presentations is that UMass Amherst must have a more focused Strategic Plan to present to the Board of Trustees by the June meeting. What the campus has now is a framework. UMass Amherst has many friends among the Trustees. Secretary May is not sure that the set-up of the recent meeting is the best way to get the chancellor to cooperate. Maybe UMass Amherst should have a strategy centered on something simple, like improving the graduation rate to 80%. People can understand that, and, as was made apparent by that meeting, the graduation rate is an important factor of the performance-based measures being applied by Commissioner of Higher Education Richard Freeland. It is so hard to find a standard that can apply to all institutions. The graduation rate seems to be the buzz of the day. As Trustee David Fubini put it, where the Trustees really “have bite” is in the allocation of capital. We are entering the final phase of the allocation of capital for capital projects. UMass Amherst is currently at about 5.6% debt-service-to-operations. It is going up, and 8% is the Trustee cap. UMass Amherst has probably received more than its share of capital in the system, but it is the flagship, and needs to act like the flagship.

3. The Chair of the Rules Committee

Senator MJ Peterson, Chair of the Rules Committee, clarified some issues that came up at the last Faculty Senate meeting. It is true that, when the Chancellor wants advice from bodies of the Faculty Senate, he is supposed to come through the Rules Committee. However, the Athletic Council is a partial exception because it has an existence inside the Faculty Senate and outside the Faculty Senate that is created by the University’s membership in the NCAA. With that said, the issues that came up in the video reported on by the Daily Hampshire Gazette were reevaluated by the Rules Committee and discussed with concerned Senators. Following those discussions, it was determined that it was worth asking the Student Affairs and University Life Council to study the video and give the Rules Committee its sense of whether the activities in the video violate any University policy, including the policy on hazing. Another issue that came up at the last meeting was Senator Hugas’ concern that some amendments to the Bylaws are not going to solve the problem of needing to suspend the rules to make a motion. The Rules Committee is offering a revised amendment that it hopes will settle that problem, remembering that the Bylaws specify that Robert’s Rules of Order prevail except when otherwise specified in the Bylaws.

5. The Representative of the Massachusetts Society of Professors

Randall Phillis, President of the Massachusetts Society of Professors, made three announcements. First, he expressed, on behalf of the MSP, his thanks to the Chancellor and the Provost for their goodwill at their meetings with the MSP. Meetings are held monthly between the Chancellor, Provost, and MSP officers during which ideas and views are exchanged. These meetings are serving the intended purpose of establishing a sense of trust and understanding that both groups are interested in making the University the best it can possibly be. The groups may differ from time to time in how to achieve this laudable goal, but there is clarity that both groups are working with goodwill. Secondly, on December 13th, there will be a Prevention of Workplace Bullying workshop. It is the kickoff event for a series of workshops that will help the University come to understand the issues of workplace bullying, which is a serious issue on this campus, as it is on many worksites across the country. A survey was taken by the Campus Coalition Against Workplace Bullying about a year and a half ago that showed that 37% of UMass employees have experiences workplace bullying. When three in eight members of the University community have experienced workplace bullying, it is troubling. When you look across the literature nationally, that ratio is very standard. UMass is not different than other places, but it can be by devising good ways to prevent and alleviate the problem. That’s what these events are about. This event will be held in the Campus Center, with outside speakers and a series of workshops, and will be followed in the spring by a series of events and trainings about what exactly workplace bullying is, how to deal with it as a bystander, and the like. Finally, the MSP is going to initiate the next round of bargaining, which will start in the middle of January. On November 19th, there will be a fall general assembly meeting, where all members of the MSP are invited to share their ideas at lunch. The main topic of discussion at that meeting will be issues surrounding the collective bargaining agreement. A series of ideas have been arranged by the MSP and will be presented at that meeting with the hope of receiving feedback from MSP members about how best to frame these ideas and move forward in bargaining.

6. The President of the Graduate Student Senate

Ghazah Abbasi, Vice President of the Graduate Student Senate, made two announcements. First, she reported on a motion passed at the last meeting of the Graduate Student Senate. It is a motion in favor of having five student trustees with full voting power on the Board of Trustees. There is a bill in the Massachusetts House and Senate that has not yet been voted on. The GSS decided to pass a resolution voicing its support of these bills. The Student Government Association has likewise drafted a similar bill. Vice President Abbasi read the final two sentence of the GSS resolution:
“Be it resolved that the Graduate Student Senate supports bill H1088 and S580, acts providing full student representation on the University of Massachusetts Board of Trustees. Be it further resolved that the Graduate Student Senate recommends the swift passage of bill H1088 and S580 through the Massachusetts State House to be enacted into law.”

The GSS hopes that this bill is passed so that UMass students have full voting power on the Board of Trustees. Currently, the Board of Trustees is comprised of 22 members, five of them are students, but only two of those five have voting power in any given year. The two voting seats rotate among the five campuses every year.

Secondly, Vice President Abbasi commented on the initiatives that the GSS has taken with respect to the strategic plan. A couple of weeks ago, the GSS held an open forum with Chancellor Subbaswamy, Vice Chancellor Gelaye, and Dean McCarthy. It was an important and useful opportunity for graduate students to come together and speak to the higher levels of the administration about their opinions of the Strategic Plan, critiques they have of it, and ways in which it does not reflect the concerns and contributions of graduate students on this campus. The GSS prepared a long statement, the conclusion of which is as follows:

“UMass Amherst has a long legacy of activist scholarship that pushes back against capitalism and other systems of oppression and exploitation. That legacy must be reflected in the Strategic Plan’s rhetoric and content. The Strategic Plan is so enmeshed in the logic of neo-liberal economics that it has forgotten that our flagship public land-grant University is not a corporation. The state and the University must honor their responsibility to provide quality education to graduate and undergraduate students in the state of Massachusetts.”

The GSS discussion was about how the strategic plan represents the neo-liberalization of UMass. Vice President Abbasi noted she would be happy to further discuss that concern with any interested Senators after the meeting. To summarize the GSS prepared a brief set of minutes, which are as follows:

“The GSS would like to thank the Chancellor, the Dean of the Graduate School, and the Interim Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs and Campus Life for coming in to be part of the conversation about graduate students and the UMass strategic planning process. The open forum saw a frank discussion of the concerns raised by graduate students about the lack of relevance of the strategic planning document to their needs. As a crucial part of the UMass community, students also expressed their reservations about the overall direction the University is headed, as indicated by the language of the Strategic Planning document. They asked for assurances from the assembled campus leadership about preserving the public nature of the University and remaining true to its founding ideals as a land-grant institution. Chancellor Subbaswamy responded with important concerns about the changed nature of the funding and budget situation in Massachusetts and the current weak relationship between the Commonwealth’s government and its public higher education institutions. In this scenario, he pointed out, the University is left with no choice but to turn to private sources of funding in order to meet its operational needs, especially in traditionally expensive research areas in the natural sciences. He dispelled rumors of cuts to programs in the humanities and social sciences and said there had been no decision on any structural changes to those programs. Vice Chancellor Gelaye underscored the difficulties and compromises inherent in the first phase of such a comprehensive strategic planning process and invited graduate students’ participation in the future phases of the process. She also described the work her office does to create a productive environment for all students on campus, including graduate students. Dean McCarthy responded to questions about a lack of resources and funding for graduate students with a list of current programming and initiatives from the Graduate School to address these issues and invited students and the GSS to help the Graduate School set up more such programs to address their academic and professional needs. The GSS thanks Dean McCarthy for staying beyond his scheduled time to continue the conversation, and all the graduate students who showed up to discuss their concerns and who stayed behind to talk about the larger issues of graduate students at UMass.”

Graduate students are very invested in the strategic planning process. There were many graduate students at the event from the humanities, education, and the social sciences, but there were also graduate students from STEM disciplines. It was an important opportunity to develop solidarity among graduate students on this issue and to voice a critique of this very neo-liberal framing of the Strategic Plan.

Presiding Officer Bogartz concluded the announcement period by singing the praises of UMass’ magnificent, undefeated basketball team, which crushed Boston College by an unbelievable difference in scores and totally overwhelmed LSU by two points.
**B. QUESTION PERIOD**

Senator Howard Peelle asked MSP President Phillis if there would be a follow-up survey on bullying to see if the campus improves.

MSP President Phillis stated that a follow-up survey is on the MSP’s list of plans. There are a variety of things in store. Of course, one of the objectives of the upcoming events is to achieve a reduction in the incidence of workplace bullying. That can only be known if the data is continued to be collected.

Senator Monika Schmitter introduced herself as a professor in Art History, which could soon become the Department of the History of Art and Architecture and read the following statement regarding what has been a grave concern to her for some time:

“I came to this University 16 years ago. When I came to campus for the interview, my colleagues were deeply embarrassed by Bartlett Hall, and rightly so. When I went home to my husband to tell him about my visit, I said that the job was a very good fit for me, but the University looked like it was in the Third World. But my colleagues assure me that there were plans, imminent plans, to renovate or replace Bartlett. The building continues to be a problem for attracting and retaining the best graduate students and faculty. Sometimes the best candidates do not come here not because they do not like the faculty, not because they do not like the students, not because this is not a good university, not because they don’t like Amherst, but because they do not want to work in an environment that makes it so difficult, if not impossible, to do their job well and that shows so little respect for what they do. I think the poor impression that Bartlett Hall creates of the University as a whole has been greatly underestimated.

During 14 years after I accepted the job, there was talk now and again about what to do about the problem of Bartlett Hall, which is literally falling apart. Then about 2 years ago, it seemed as if something might truly happen. We were asked about what kind and how many classrooms we would need, with what equipment, how many faculty offices, what kind of communal space. As far as I know at least schematic plans were drawn up for a new building which would involve the renovation of South College with a large addition at the back, tumbling down the hill towards the beautiful, new Band building. This was to house all the departments—offices and classrooms—now in Bartlett Hall. You cannot possibly understand how important this news was to us, what great hope it gave us for ourselves, and more importantly for our students, that we might finally have adequate and well-equipped spaces.

Then last week, information began to leak out from various sources, some of whom were apparently told specifically “not to tell the faculty.” These sources inform us that, after all this building that has been going on on campus, suddenly when it finally comes to build for the Humanities, the money has “dried up.” And plans are now going forth to greatly restructure and curtail the original design. These changes are very significant. They involve the following: the building will now have many fewer classrooms, almost none of which will be suitable for teaching in the humanities--upper level undergraduate courses, discussion sections that complement our huge lecture courses that teach so many students on campus, not to mention graduate seminars. Rooms built for 15-40 students, the sort of rooms that are now in constant use in Bartlett Hall. Second, of the departments now in Bartlett Hall only English and Philosophy are to be housed in the new building. Women, Gender and Sexualities Studies will be ostracized, perhaps to some corner of Machmer, by itself. And the Department of the History of Art and Architecture currently “has no home.” I think it is very significant that these are the two departments that have the largest number of female students. In my department, currently, 93% of our undergraduate majors and 89% of our graduate students are female. I don’t have the numbers for Women, Gender and Sexuality Studies, but I think you can imagine them. While I don’t think this is a case of purposeful gender discrimination, I also do not think it is a coincidence. And I find it unconscionable.

Part of the reason why Art History is becoming its own department is because it is not a fine art, but a discipline of the humanities, with long historical and intellectual ties to the study of literature, philosophy, gender and sexuality (not to mention History, Classics and Languages). As a discipline we also have particular facilities requirements—classrooms that darken completely, have dimmer switch lights, very large projection screens and special projectors to go with them. It will be very difficult and much more expensive to retrofit an old building to accommodate these special needs.

So my questions, which I address to Vice Chancellor Sheehan or Associate Provost Harvey—but I am happy to have comment or answers from others—are these:

1) Is it true that the money for the Bartlett replacement building has dried up and that the building will be severely curtailed with few or no suitable classrooms and will ostracize two key, if small, departments? And a corollary to this—where did the money go?
2) If this is true, is it true that the changes to the plan are being rushed through without consulting the faculty about how to best spend the money to help our students learn in an adequate and respectful environment? Especially after we have spent so much time and energy explaining what we need desperately. Would you tell chemists what size and what equipment they should have in their labs, rather than consult them?

3) Can we slow this process down and really think about what we are doing? Are you planning to do the right things for these students and for the programs, or are you just going to do whatever is convenient for you?

As someone who spends my life analyzing material culture, architectural structures, and built environments, I know how important they are to creating a good impression of the University (making it a “Destination of Choice”), fostering good work, and creating community (attracting, retaining, and graduating students) for generations to come. I hope the day will not come when we look back on our days in Bartlett Hall as the Golden Age.”

Bryan Harvey, Associate Provost for Academic and Resource Planning, spoke to the process of the Bartlett replacement project. He spent much of the day discussing the issue with architects. Bartlett Hall, as was accurately described, has been structurally deteriorating for many years. It is a very high priority to transition out of Bartlett Hall. Quite a bit has been done to make the building safe during this period, but that is not a long-term solution. The process has been exactly as described. There have been many meetings with the individuals housed in Bartlett, as well as studies of the general classrooms in the building—the typical kind of needs assessment that is done when there is any capital project being done. All of that information has been boiled down. There was a three hour conference call involving all of the departments recently that worked on finalizing the program for the various elements of the departments that will need to find a new home once Bartlett is offline. It is not correct to claim that there has ever been a plan to replace Bartlett with an in-kind reproduction attached to South College. It is true that the South College addition will be an extremely important part of a solution to Bartlett, but there will be other parts to that as well. The process is actually just now at the point of accelerating into being, as it is finally going to get under way. It took a long time to get the financing for the project straightened out. It is a UMass Building Authority project, so an owner’s project manager had to be hired. Designers are now engaged, so it is the time at which it will really begin to accelerate. All of the information will be brought together in order to make a decision about what to do going forward. As part of that, the campus has been engaged in a very comprehensive study of classrooms, not only for this project, but to reflect the campus’ needs and supplies once the New Academic Classroom Building opens and other projects are commenced. The New Academic Classroom Building will radically change the way the campus operates and thinks about how it does its teaching. One of the things that that study has revealed is that, when the decision was made some years ago to put the technology packages in, those technology packages were not installed in classrooms outfitted for fewer than 30 students. As everyone knows, as it now stands, if you want to have a classroom with a decent instructional technology package, you have to be in a room that holds more than 30 students—even if you are teaching fewer than that. That will change. Classroom technology packages are going to be installed in all regularly scheduled rooms. That development will also change the way that the campus will be able to be flexible in accommodating needs. Taken together, we have a project that is going to be good news at the end, because it is taking into account all of the needs that have been described by departmental occupants over time. Not every department is going to end up in the new building, and that was never the plan. There will certainly be adequate and improved outcomes for all of the occupants of the current Bartlett building. That is where this project stands right now. Designers are looking at all of the information about what is needed, and those issues will be discussed over the next few months.

Senator Schmitter stated that she has seen the most recent allocation of space for the new building in which her department is not going to be included. Those plans include classrooms that seat 120 students, but only two that seat anything under 60. The new building, as currently planned, is not, in any way, shape or form, a usable building. The current plan is entirely different from what was originally drafted. All of the faculty in Bartlett Hall are extremely upset about this, even those who will be housed in the new building. Senator Schmitter’s department is particularly upset. Associate Provost Harvey’s comments did not address her concerns about gender regarding who is and who is not included in the new building. If all of the departments currently housed in Bartlett are not going to be included in the new building, Senator Schmitter would like to know what is going to happen to those who are left out. Art History has very specific classroom needs. It needs rooms that are dark, that have dimmer switches, that have very large projection screens, that have projectors that can project images very largely. These are all needs that are very hard to retrofit into an old building. It is much less expensive to build from the ground up. She does not understand how this new building is going to serve anybody in Bartlett Hall.

Associate Provost Harvey stated that, concerning issues with classroom space, it is important to consider that the classroom situation on campus is changing entirely as a result of all the new capacities that are being built, as well as the ongoing attempts to upgrade existing capacities. The question becomes: In the core of the campus, with Machmer, Herter, and all the other buildings, what array of classrooms will be a suitable response to the identified needs of the faculty? That is what this classroom study is trying to do. The rooms for each unit vary, so they are not all going to be in one building. Right now, the assumption that is being made—that has not yet been finalized—is that what should be constructed are the things
that don’t currently exist. Those tend to be larger rooms. In the process of creating some of these larger rooms, we free up capacity in other rooms. The point of all of this—and this has been true from the very beginning of the process—is to be as clear as possible. Last year, a survey was conducted on teaching styles. That was one part of the attempt to gather as much information as possible about what is needed on campus and then provide that. How to do that is a design issue, and it involves multiple projects. Regarding Senator Schmitter’s concerns on gender, Associate Provost Harvey stated that there was no consideration of the demographics of the departments in the process of determining future housing. The blocking of the new building was determined on the relative size of the departments. South College is a funny building, so there are a limited number of offices that can be created there. English is the largest single unit currently housed in Bartlett, so they needed to be accommodated in the new addition, as there is nowhere else on campus to house that department. Philosophy is the next largest unit. All of the units that are currently in Bartlett will have their identified needs addressed and they will all be in improved spaces.

Senator Schmitter stated that the people in Bartlett Hall do not feel that that is true. She doesn’t know where the administration is planning to have these departments teach their classes, and she believes it is underestimating the fact that one of the things that works in Bartlett Hall is that faculty members teach near their offices, which creates community. It is key. Students here are at a big university, and they need to feel like they have a home, and Art History has created, in its little corner of Bartlett Hall, a home. Senator Schmitter can step into her office after class with a student. This is not to be underrated. Art History needs classrooms that can teach small groups of people. That is what the humanities are about. Art History teaches huge survey courses, and by doing so provides the University with a huge service, but it also needs to teach students at an upper level. Maybe faculty members will be farmed out somewhere else to teach, but Senator Schmitter doesn’t think that is a good idea. What are those classrooms going to look like? What kind of equipment are they going to have? Faculty members are devastated by the latest plan. Furthermore, the gender issue should be addressed. The administration may feel that it is just a technical matter, but there are also the intellectual matters related to the interconnectedness of these disciplines. Arguably, Art History, with its focus on visual culture, is very much at the core of the humanities. That is one reason why Art History hopes to become a department in the humanities and not remaining part of the Art Department. The University needs to think seriously about what it is doing with this building. The newest plan does not make any sense to anyone who has seen it who is actually in the humanities.

Presiding Officer Bogartz noted that it sounded to him like it might be nice for someone from the administration to meet with the concerned group of faculty and let them know what is going on.

Chancellor Subbaswamy stated that he agreed with Senator Schmitter that more conversations are necessary, and those conversations will take place. He felt that a couple of things were worth mentioning to put some perspective on this issue. The notion that there was an amount of money set aside for this project that was possibly used for something else is simply not true. It is demonstrably not true. This project, like many on campus, is based on borrowed money. It is not money coming from the state. This project is local to UMass Amherst, meaning that the University is borrowing money that is paid back from tuition, fees and so forth. Every project that is undertaken on campus includes an estimate of cost that includes a certain escalation based on inflation. That estimate is presented to the Board of Trustees. The Board of Trustees then approves a certain amount of money to be borrowed for the project. In all projects of this kind, the University has an overrun limit of 10%. The Board of Trustees gets very upset, understandably, if the project goes over its original estimate. The University is often prisoner to that original estimate, as well as to debt limits and the ability of its students to pay for these projects. Every project—in every department, including Chemistry and other sciences—includes compromises. The process of these compromises is referred to as “value engineering.” The Physical Sciences Building’s cost is already overrun and is being brought back to budget in a way that no one thinks is optimal. Chancellor Subbaswamy urged the Senate to understand that no individual department is being put upon. Having said that, if the University is being wrongheaded in terms of the compromises being drawn, that needs to be addressed and alleviated through further conversations.

Secretary May offered a 30,000 foot reflection on this issue. He has been at UMass quite a while, and has been housed in one of the most difficult buildings on campus, the Fine Arts Center. One fact that all faculty members must realize is that the cost of constructing buildings on campus is extraordinarily high, probably around $500 per square foot for normal buildings. For high-tech sciences buildings, it is approaching $1,000 per square foot. This is a very high cost. The administration has to think hard about what it can do and how it can get the most out of the available space. Secretary May agrees with Senator Schmitter that, in many ways, architecture is destiny. No matter what kind of people you have, it is extremely difficult to become a destination of choice if the architectural space in which your program is offered—whether it is sciences or humanities or social sciences or engineering or anything—is inefficient. It is an immense challenge for the campus to balance the extremely high cost of building construction against department needs. This has not even begun to address the value engineering that Chancellor Subbaswamy referred to. Computer Science, for example, left a third of its faculty behind in Lederle when its new building opened. The department is fragmented. The same is true for Chemistry. The main part of the department is in the ISB, but some faculty members remain in Goessmann. The new
Studio Arts Building was value engineered down so that it cannot do everything that it was supposed to do, so some members of the Art faculty are still in the Fine Arts Center. After all the shuffling in that department is done, Secretary May has no idea where all of those faculty members will end up. Value engineering can lead to fragmented programs, which is not the vision of choice for creating a destination of choice. As the Chancellor said, the Trustees are understandable when they balk at a project that has tripled in cost, because they have a plan for what goes on at all the UMass campuses. When something goes awry financially, it doesn’t fit their plans. It is a tough situation that the University is in. At least the new buildings are well built. Other buildings, such as the Library and the Fine Arts Center, are less functional for their sizes. The New Academic Classroom Building looks great. However, it is still a struggle to design buildings within budget that meet academic needs in an optimal way.

**Senator Marta Calas** stated that this conversation is about something much larger than a building or the size of a classroom. It reflects that the Faculty Senate should talk about programs, teaching, learning, curriculum—the knowledge the faculty produces. As the year has gone by, Senator Calas has heard that UMass is a destination of choice—a quality more suited to a resort than a university. She has heard that UMass is in need of funding, so it must submit to the latest idea about how to save money. She has heard that parents, children, and everyone else around has to be made happy. But she has not heard anyone asking the faculty what it is they do and why they do it. Why are we here? The University has lost sight of the fact that all of its employees are here to educate students, and that education is the goal of this institution. Education is what the faculty does. Senator Calas is astounded that the administration could tell the faculty that money that has been allocated one way is suddenly not there for whatever reason, and that as a result the classrooms are going to change, and that that change is going to be determined not by asking someone who teaches a class that must be small, but because there is not money. This is the same question as, “Why do we have poverty in this country?” If we still have poverty in this country, or if we still have uneducated kids, or if we start having trouble producing jobs, we are doing something fundamentally wrong. The education process is important in order to do it right. Senator Calas believes that something has become very topsy-turvy here, and that the Senate has lost sight of why it serves. Senator Schmitter’s concerns should make the Senators ask, “Where have we been?”

**Presiding Officer Bogartz** stated that faculty members discover knowledge and change minds. But the Faculty Senate is not made up of just faculty, even though it is called the Faculty Senate. Administration members are members of the Faculty Senate. While the faculty has an emphasis on what it does and how it does it, in terms of discovering knowledge and changing minds, there is still the issue of money. Money is still around, and the administration has to deal with that, whether we like it or want to think about it or not. Somehow, there has to be a balance in the thinking about what the University is about. It is about what we want it to be: discovering knowledge and changing minds. But it is also about having the resources to do that—both mustering the resources and metering the resources. All of that has to take place.

**Senator Max Page** brought up three quick points. The Public Higher Education Network of Massachusetts (PHENOM) spoke at a hearing about the bills about Trustee representation brought up earlier by GSS Vice President Abbasi. Senator Page urged faculty members to look into that issue and voice their support with their representatives, as it is very important for the advocacy required to get the kind of money from the legislature that the University needs to have full student representation on the Board of Trustees. The reason there are two student votes on the Board of Trustees is that when student representation on the Board began, there were two UMass campuses. Now, there are five campuses, and there should be five voting student members. Secondly, Senator Page asked a question of Vice Chancellor for Research and Engagement Michael Malone. Apparently, excellence hearings are being held by the Higher Education Commission at the State House. In general, the Commission has asked the various campuses to present some excellent work that is being done at their institutions. Usually, UMass Amherst emphasizes its excellent scientific end of the campus. Senator Page hopes that there is also a chance to present some of the work of the social sciences and arts and humanities. Additionally, Senator Page wondered if there was any news about the Funding Commission that is about to undertake work at the State House, particularly if UMass Amherst has weighed in on what that Commission should deal with.

**Michael Malone, Vice Chancellor for Research and Engagement**, stated that, on the BHE topic, UMass Amherst spent some time about a year and a half or two years ago suggesting various types of metrics and input for research-related and discovery-related items. Not much of that got into the final document on excellence. Chancellor Malone was minutes away from a phone call with UMass Amherst’s State Government Relations representatives. UMass Amherst is not currently scheduled to go to the hearings, but Vice Chancellor Malone is scheduled to meet with the Higher Education Caucus, and he is very sensitive to Senator Page’s point about diverse research and scholarship.

**Chancellor Subbaswamy** addressed the question of the joint commission that has also been brought up by MSP President Phillips. There is a particular commission that is considering performance-based funding, which is rampant in the country right now. Every state is talking about it and many states have adopted a performance-based funding model. The commission is being represented by the three sectors of public higher education in Massachusetts: community colleges, state universities, and the UMass system. The representation is coming from the system office, rather than campus-by-
campus. Matt Gorzkowicz is representing UMass on that commission. So far, little has happened. As we learn more, and as we learn how to react and influence the commission, we will certainly be talking about it. PHENOM and other interest groups should also be paying attention. The system office and the Chancellor’s Office here at UMass Amherst are following developments closely.

C. UPDATE ON THE JOINT TASK FORCE ON STRATEGIC OVERSIGHT (JTFSO) AND THE JOINT TASK FORCE ON RESOURCE ALLOCATION (JTFRA)
   BY NANCY COHEN, BRYAN HARVEY AND AMILCAR SHABAZZ, CO-CHAIRS
   (QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION TO FOLLOW)

*Bryan Harvey, Associate Provost for Academic and Resource Planning and Co-Chair of the Joint Task Force on Strategic Oversight, introduced this update from the JTFSO. Much time was spent last year talking about what would happen going forward with strategic planning, and the group has gotten off to a brisk start this semester. Many of the issues that were brought up during the question period have been discussed in the strategic planning process. That trend will likely continue. If there is a single theme to the entire strategic planning process, it would be addressing the wealth of great things people are doing around campus and how they are trying to fit the pieces together in order to do as many as possible. There are tremendous things going on around campus. Resources are always going to be limited, but we are discovering connections that make it possible to accomplish more than ever.

To start this year, JTFSO took the report that came out of the phase one planning process and tried to find every actionable item—every recommendation in the report—and articulate what needs to happen next, in this implementation and action stage. Two early slides in the accompanying PowerPoint presentation show a format for looking at the ideas laid out in the strategic plan. On the left side, the large goals that were articulated in the plan are laid out. In the middle, developmental plans are stated. Finally, on the right, there is a list of the ideas that people had come up with regarding these issues, many of which are in implementation right now. There are about a dozen pages like these that capture everything in the plan.

As we start the semester, JTFSO is looking at some of the larger questions that will guide the later stages of the process. One of the first questions regards how to give diversity its due consideration in all the different parts of the plan, which Senator Shabazz can speak to.

*Senator Amilcar Shabazz, Co-Chair of the Joint Task Force on Strategic Oversight and Faculty Advisor to the Chancellor for Diversity and Excellence, noted that JTFSO has engaged with a number of consultative bodies, from the Faculty Senate, such as the Status of Diversity Council and the Status of Women Council, as well as the Chancellor’s Diversity Advisory Council, and the new Student Diversity Advisory Council. JTFSO and these groups are trying to get an overall view of the University’s efforts for inclusive excellence as they already exist in various sectors of the University and build from that by locating the gaps and challenges in those sectors and determining what is needed to better facilitate the kind of integration and innovation that the campus desires. What is being proposed is a process similar to that going on in Student Affairs, where an outside perspective complements the campus’ view of itself. JTFSO is determining where and if to look for this outside look. Members of the Student Diversity Advisory Council recently organized a teach-in. There are some very strong ideas and serious concerns among students. The campus needs to get down to serious work on diversity because there is a feeling among students that they need to do what was done in previous years: hold a student strike and shut down campus. Senator Shabazz understands this as a tactic that students feel like they need to resort to from time to time. The current concerns are not just about diversity; they are also about the University’s budget model that is predicated on rising tuition and fees. Students are looking at this and wondering who it is that does not believe that they are being fleeced enough. The administration is trying to work harder to find real ways to get to the students, get what is needed from the students, and be responsive to student needs. Direct consultative work with students will be stepped up.

*Associate Provost Harvey continued on to an issue that has been much discussed: What defines the distinctive character of a UMass Amherst education? In other words, why should a student choose UMass Amherst over the many other choices he or she may have? This is a really deep question. To take this on, JTFSO has organized a subcommittee co-chaired by Vice Provost Carol Barr, SGA President Zac Broughton, and a faculty member to be appointed. There will be much more discussion as the bigger campus community engages in thinking about this campus’ unique strengths that represent its values and make UMass Amherst something that students are attracted to. Another issue is building a campus climate that promotes curricular innovation. To do this, we have to consider how to support faculty activities, both adapting to new technologies and understanding how to better support traditional teaching and research. Vice Provost Carol Barr is leading a conversation about how to organize this activity. The Office of Information Technology is involved in that, and it will be a big part of what the University can do. A challenge for the University has been balancing instructional supply and demand, due to such factors as increasing enrollment, students changing majors, et cetera. Several ongoing projects are attempting to keep that in balance and get ahead of what needs to happen in order to provide the resources that the
students need. As Vice Provost Barr mentioned earlier, she and Vice Chancellor Enku Gelaye are working quickly and hard on establishing a unified strategy for student success. How do we marshal all the resources of academic affairs, student affairs, and the rest of the campus to make advising and support operations more efficient? Another somewhat technical question involves the enrollment management plan. The University now has four years of experience in trying to look at an increase in out-of-state enrollment and other issues and can ask what has been learned and how it should go forward. The Chancellor has addressed decentralized resource allocation systems in the past. How do we have a better way of understanding what our priorities are and how we put our resources in those directions? There were two areas that the plan metaphorically punt on because JTFSO did not know exactly what to say. One was the question of outreach, which Senator Cohen can address.

**Senator Nancy Cohen, Co-Chair of the Joint Task Force on Strategic Oversight**, stated that it was heard loud and clear throughout the draft process how important the land-grand university mission, including strong outreach, is. One recommendation was to create a specific outreach plan. The University does not have an outreach unit, as it once did. Therefore, a plan needs to identify where the University wants to be, and how it will be supported. Civic engagement and civic learning is very important to the faculty, staff and students at UMass Amherst, as well as to the Board of Higher Education. There is not a singular office or person in charge of this. The Faculty Senate’s University Service, Public Service and Outreach Council is the most singularly focused unit on campus addressing this issue. JTFSO is hoping to establish a subcommittee on outreach in order to determine what needs to happen and how those plans can be implemented so that JTFSO can make recommendations to move very swiftly in this area.

**Associate Provost Harvey** moved to the final area of discussion, instructional technology and research support. There is an obvious need for comprehensive strategies in information technology. During the drafting of the plan, the search for a CIO was ongoing. Julie Buehler has now begun in that position, and she is organizing the Strategic Plan in the information technology area.

Although there are many topics, they are quite interrelated. JTFSO is focusing on the big questions that need conclusions right now because, over the course of the year, it wants clarity and specificity about what the University wants to do at a campus-wide level. Having this information, it will be possible to engage the campus with different types of overarching ideas. The group on student success will be hosting conversations, the group defining a UMass education will be tapping into various perspectives, et cetera. Moving into the spring, JTFSO will be able to think about what will be happening next year in terms of how planning can transition to the schools and colleges and their many academic departments. By establishing the larger framework, we can see how everything fits in and identify specific goals. That is the general outline for the year. It is extremely ambitious, but there is much activity already begun and many of the issues are closely connected to each other. It’s hard to talk about an admissions strategy for enrollment if we haven’t determined what it is that UMass Amherst does and expressed that to prospective students. It’s hard to talk about how the University supports its priorities on campus without thinking about how the resources can be generated and mobilized to make that happen. One of the watch words of this process is keeping those connections in mind and having discussions about those connections.

The Joint Task Force on Resource Allocation is a group that the Senate and administration have put together for the purpose of exploring different ways of thinking about alternatives to the current budgeting system, which works on an incremental basis that says, “you get this year what you got last year plus or minus x amount.” Apointments to the group have been made, with some revisions pending approval later in the meeting. Timothy Anderson, Dean of Engineering, and Elizabeth Chilton, Professor of Anthropology and Associate Dean for Research in SBS, have agreed to serve as co-chairs. It is a terrific group for a big job. The first piece of the Task Force’s charge is to try to get the campus conversation going in order to let everyone know what the choices are. Even just a few months ago, Associate Provost Harvey didn’t know what a lot of these choices were. It takes a lot of education, dialog, and conversation to see what these choices are.

**Senator Cohen** noted that the co-chairs of the Joint Task Force on Strategic Oversight are to be added to the membership of the Joint Task Force on Resource Allocation to better integrate the work of JTFCRA with the strategic planning process. The RCM budget model is not something that should be off by itself; it is one way of providing funding and incentives to make the goals and objectives of the strategic planning process possible.

**Ernest May, Secretary of the Faculty Senate**, first had a question for Senator Shabazz. He wondered if there is a strategic goal, or a succinct way of measuring what would be successful, in terms of diversity enrollment. It is hard to gauge campus climate, but there are certain ratios that can be met in terms of college-bound students in Massachusetts or faculty representation. Secondly, he had a question for Associate Provost Harvey. He wondered if the aspirational peers of UMass, such as the Universities of Virginia or North Carolina, have a single distinctive quality. Northeastern has been successful with such an endeavor.
**Senator Shabazz** identified Secretary May’s question as one regarding compositional diversity. Under the presidency of Bill Clinton, the way to think about compositional diversity was to have institutions look like the country. That was as specific as it was articulated, but that could be parsed out to say that there was a way to talk about various subgroups in the census. President Obama has used language that is much more transcendental and lofty—and perhaps not even there. As Senator Shabazz talks with more and more people, he has gotten the sense that the issue is less about trying to declare a compositional diversity goal, and more about thinking in terms of, and creating, relationships to the various communities of color, income diversity, every other level of the state, the nation, and the planet. Thinking in this way, certain language goes out the window, such as talking about the third world. When Senator Shabazz came to UMass, although he never would have wondered if he was in the third world, New Africa House was a substandard building for a top research institution. In the course of improvements, his department lost space. The W.E.B. Du Bois Department of Afro-American Studies has not, to this day, been allocated the space that an external review deemed necessary to operate fully. It is still waiting on stimulus funds that ran out in order to renovate the basement for use. Senator Shabazz empathizes with Art History and Women, Gender, Sexuality Studies. Those departments are exactly where Afro-Am was when stimulus money was announced for a number of shovel-ready projects. Then, Senator Shabazz began meeting often with Associate Provost Harvey and facilities representatives on campus. But those people are operating from a different metric than the departments: they are looking at the whole picture, that of the entire campus. It is important for them to listen to the concerns of individual departments in order to get the buildings done right. Back to Secretary May’s question, the issue is about how to build a long-term, community-engaged strategy that links the University with the Native American communities in Massachusetts so that they can see UMass, and know UMass, and see how UMass cares and is involved in their communities and histories, in the preservation of their cultures and languages—that is how you begin to see members of various communities say, “That is where I want my grandchild to go; that is where I want my children to go.” Then you see individuals make sure they study hard to go to a great university like UMass Amherst. UMass has to be in the African-American communities, and the Latino communities. It has to be engaged in the international community in a way that is not about headhunting for tuition. UMass Amherst does not do that; it is not going down that neo-liberal path. The Chancellor has stated a commitment to that. That is not how UMass views internationalization. At all these levels of diversity, rather than just doing the easy thing and say, “We want a campus that mirrors the population of the world,” or, “We want a campus that mirrors the population of Massachusetts, since we are the state flagship university.” More importantly, UMass has to think about what it is in terms of community engagement and how it draws together its campus community from that engagement. At the faculty level, it is a different issue, and there are various goals and statements coming from groups like the Status of Diversity Council and the Status of Women Council that get at the best ways of thinking. UMass can clearly do better in terms of having a diverse faculty and that is being addressed through those groups.

**Presiding Officer Bogartz** asked if veterans enter into the picture of diversity.

**Senator Shabazz** said that they do. There was an event for veterans on campus recently that Senator Shabazz was unable to make. Veterans are speaking to their needs on campus and their desires to be recognized and to find a place in the campus community. JTFSO will endeavor to get them at the table and hear from them in this planning process.

**Senator Max Page** asked about the Responsibility Centered Management (RCM) budgeting model. He understands that there is a lot of work to be done, there is a large committee working things out, but a big decision has already been made: that UMass is going towards an RCM model.

**Associate Provost Harvey** said that that is not true. The University has not made any decisions regarding RCM.

**Senator Page** noted that everyone on campus is saying RCM all the time. He wondered what the biggest worries there are surrounding RCM. What are the biggest problems if the campus does not do it right?

**Associate Provost Harvey** said that one of the greatest things about having this conversation now is that other people have been having it for 25 years. The Chancellor knows a lot about this, having worked at some universities using an RCM model. There is much literature evaluating RCM models. The issues that seem to come up include creating a mechanical monster that causes the campus to lose sight of what it hopes to accomplish. In other words, it becomes a tax code game instead of a conversation about goals and values. That is one huge thing to look out for. Another concern is that common goals will be cast aside. UMass Amherst does a lot of different things, but we need to keep sight on common themes. This speaks to the question of what defines a UMass Amherst education. You have to have enough centralized direction to balance the entrepreneurship and innovation taking place in the separate units. Those are the things that other institutions and the literature would tell you to watch out for. Make sure that a holistic sense of the institution is maintained and not superseded by its fragmented parts. Make sure that the conversation does not turn into an argument about splitting hairs in a tax code; keep university values at the center of the conversation.
Senator Cohen noted that the Joint Task Force on Resource Allocation has not met yet. The primer book that the Task Force has looked at emphasized the importance of communication. That is central to the conversation. Thinking about RCM is new to UMass. It needs to meet the University’s goals, and that needs to be transparent. As the plans unfold, everyone needs to understand their implications.

Chancellor Subbaswamy reiterated that no decision has been made on how the University will divide its budget. He then urged the Senators, before criticizing any imagined budget system, to ask if they knew how the current budget works. Why does Art History have however much money is currently assigned to it. If you know that, and can present a good rationale for the current model, then the discussion could end. There is no rationale. The whole process of going through and understanding the budget at a time when 75% of operations come from self-generated funds is very healthy for the University. Once we have a clear understanding of what goes on, we can decide how our values are reflected in budget decisions. Having a better understanding of how to create rationale is healthy, particularly in an environment that has many competing ideas about higher education funding.

Associate Provost Harvey noted that his analogy for this is an inherited house. You walk through the house, past all the peeling wallpaper and old furniture, and you have to ask yourself how much you want to keep. UMass is in the process of looking at a house that no one has looked at in 150 years. UMass has inherited a budgeting system that no one knows much about. Regarding Secretary May’s earlier question about defining qualities of universities, most institutions are struggling with this right now. They are asking what their distinctive strengths are. Some answers shade off into the theme park/amenities side of the equation. The smart ones, in Associate Provost Harvey’s opinion, are focusing deeply on what it is that the people in their campus community believe and can speak passionately about. Associate Provost Harvey has been here 40 years and is still struggling with it. There is something about our institution—about its values, its commitment to social responsibility, its standing as a place where students can make something unexpected of themselves—that forms a story that needs to be told. If we are not good at telling it, we will still be able to say, “We are a comprehensive institution where people can come and get a lot of good things.” But hopefully we can get closer to a defining character. It is definitely not about some jingle claiming we’re the university of whatever.

GSS Vice President Ghazah Abbasi had one comment and two questions. Senator Shabazz began his part of the presentation by referencing the teach-in that was organized by students. Both undergraduate and graduate students are angry about many issues. From a graduate student perspective, Vice President Abbasi could speak to some of the nitty gritty issues. Graduate students are upset about the decline of funding for graduate students in the Social Sciences and Humanities & Fine Arts. They are concerned about space; at the first GSS meeting of the year, before senators were even elected, the main concerns expressed were about space, in particular the state of Bartlett Hall. Students are angry about and very critical of the neo-liberal language of the strategic plan. More specifically, there is an ethos of privatization that underlies the strategic plan. The plan identifies the primary stakeholders as those people giving the University money, which is largely conceptualized as private entities. Faculty members are not even included in the list of stakeholders on page two. Neither are graduate students. Undergraduate students are only figured into the list of stakeholders insofar as they are coupled with their parents, who provide money to the University. Students are very angry about that. That is not how students conceptualize a place of learning. The neo-liberalization of the University is actualized in the running of the University on the logic of capitalism, as opposed to pedagogy or other educational interests. Vice President Abbasi would be uncomfortable with any faculty member appropriating student struggles in order to justify an austerity model. Vice President Abbasi’s first question addressed the RCM budgeting model. As was just heard, UMass has not decided on an RCM model. She wondered what other budgeting models were under consideration. Her second question addressed diversity. A key value in the Strategic Plan is excellence: performing at a high level, achieving high rankings, et cetera. Performance of this sort is not objective. It is a classed, gendered, and raced concept. At the same time, JTFSO seems committed to the idea of making UMass a more diverse campus. Is the emphasis on excellence in contradiction to the goal of diversifying the campus? Looking at public high schools, those in rich, white neighborhoods perform much better on the standardized tests that are used in gauging this type of performance excellence.

Senator Shabazz began addressing the latter question by talking about the Amherst Regional Public School District. Amherst Regional has among the highest per-pupil expenditure in the state, alongside Brookline and other affluent areas. Yet, within that very excellent, well-funded system, African-American and Latino students have performed below the state average in English Language Arts for the past three years, according to MCAS examinations. This average is on a downward trajectory. Amherst is not yet turning it around. Senator Shabazz has been trying to tell his colleagues on the School Committee and the superintendent that this is unacceptable. You can have wonderful, well-funded, well-heeled school systems that reveal, within them, problems that will affect the diversity of UMass and affect the efforts to create a campus of inclusive excellence. The thinking that JTFSO is coming to is one of engagement at the community level, from pre-K to 12. This is a concept sometimes discussed as a pipeline or a bridge connecting a university to the crisis in education. UMass cannot simply wait to see what is coming out of the schools of Massachusetts and think that it can pick off the cream that can make an SAT score of 1200 or higher. That is a stupid strategy that is not going to work.
Vice President Abbasi finds this argument odd. This is a strategic plan for UMass Amherst, not for the public school system.

Senator Shabazz stated that this speaks to the relationship of diversity and excellence. UMass Amherst cannot create an inclusive, diverse campus predicated on a model that assumes it can attract a higher performing, diverse entering class by taking what the broken school system gives it. Currently, only 11% of UMass’ student body is comprised of underrepresented groups. If we want to double that—or, if we want to look like America, quadruple it—we cannot depend on what the broken school system is providing. To address the problem of inclusive excellence, we have to get deeper and more thoughtful in order to engage at a community level with a strategic plan that considers the objective realities.

Senator Frank Hugus called for a point of order, stating that the Senate had strayed far from the purpose of the presentation. He suggested that the Senate return to the orders of the day.

Vice President Abbasi stated that she had questions directly related to the presentation. As a graduate student representative to this body, she believes she has the right to speak and have her voice heard. She concluded by remarking that it appears that what UMass can control, it doesn’t want to. UMass can control the measures that are used to recruit, but instead of that, it is making an intervention in the community. That intervention is valid and desirable, but the University should also pay attention to its recruitment measures and other things it can control, such as mentioned in the charge of the JTFSO.

Senator Shabazz stated that there are discussions about how to better integrate the University’s efforts. There are ongoing recruitment efforts in Student Affairs that include engagement with diverse communities. There are efforts in Admissions, as well. This is all part of an administrative process or structure that can better integrate the on-campus efforts.

Senator Steven Brewer closed by referring back to Associate Provost Harvey’s analogy of an old house. Riffing on something that the Chancellor said, Senator Brewer believes that what has been inherited is an old folks’ home. This home is full of people. When you see people walking around with clipboards, looking at things and making notices about them, they need to remember that the house is full of people and they are key to the equation.

Presiding Officer Bogartz noted that his basic premise that boredom is the enemy of the Senate still holds, but he does not know exactly what to do in this sort of situation. He doesn’t like cutting people off, he has liked the discussion, but there is limited time and business to consider.

D. ANNUAL REPORTS


Julian Tyson, Chair of the Commonwealth Honors College Council, noted that CHCC is a relatively new council—and among one of the hardest working. Its mission is to support excellence in undergraduate education. He urged the Senators to look at the number of action items that the Council and its subcommittee worked through, which includes many hundreds of student proposals. Many members of the Council were present at the Faculty Senate meeting, and were willing to answer any questions.

The report was received.


Judith Holmes, Associate Director of Junior Year Writing and Member of the University Writing Committee, noted that the annual report for 2012-2013 is relatively short. The Committee was focused on two things. A couple of workshops were held for Junior Year Writing instructors, one on plagiarism and one on information literacy in writing assignments. The workshops are important ways to build a sense of community among Junior Year Writing instructors around campus, many of whom are isolated in their departments. They are also good chances to swap strategies that seem to work in the classroom. The other thing that the Writing Committee has been working on is, along with the Center for Educational Software Development, the creation of an online system for Junior Year Writing courses. There are two parts to this: the first is for the creation of new courses and the second is to establish a system to process the newly-implemented quinquennial review of all Junior Year Writing syllabi. The latter initiative is a large process that is piggybacking on the Gen Ed online quinquennial review system. It is proving cumbersome, but will hopefully be implemented soon.
Senator W. Curt Conner noted that there was no mention of technical writing in the report. Technical writing seems to be disappearing from the University.

Professor Holmes noted that the Junior Year Writing course is delegated to its department. Each department is supposed to be designing a Junior Year Writing course that addresses the writing needs of that discipline. More scientific disciplines that need technical writing would address that in their Junior Year Writing course. Junior Year Writing is a very decentralized program that is supposed to be focused on writing within a particular discipline.

Secretary May noted that there is still a Technical Writing Program in the English Department. John Nelson, who ran that program for years, was replaced by David Toomey. Secretary May has read some of Professor Toomey’s work, and it is really quite amazing.

The report was received.


Senator Mzamo Mangaliso, Co-Chair of the Status of Diversity Council, stated that the Status of Diversity Council met regularly throughout the year, dealing primarily with three issues. The first was the strategic plan. The Council worked closely with the co-chairs of JTFSo and had input in that process in concert with the Status of Women Council and the Chancellor’s Diversity Advisory Council. The second issue was SRTI. These student evaluations seem to negatively impact women faculty members and faculty members of color disproportionately. A Joint Provost, Faculty Senate, and MSP committee has been formed to improve the evaluation of teaching campus wide. This initiative transcends and goes beyond the SRTI itself. In due course, a report and action should come out of that committee. Finally, the Status of Diversity Council has examined its fundamental identity. The Council is called the Status of Diversity Council, but if you asked Senator Mangaliso what the status of diversity of the various campus units was, he would admit that he didn’t know. The whole concept of measuring diversity is unclear. It is known that there are consequences when diverse individuals are not considered. It is also known that the University is attempting to educate its students in ways that allows them to work and operate in a diverse world. Creating a diverse campus atmosphere—with members of diverse communities constituting the student body, the faculty, and the administration—puts UMass students in an advantageous position at the outset of their interactions with the world. It would be great to be able to say that this is a post-racial society, a post-sexist society, et cetera, but that is not the case. The Status of Diversity Council has suggested a system of metrics in order to measure the status of diversity, so that you can identify units on campus that welcome diversity. To do that, a small pilot program has been launched, beginning with small focus groups that will identify metrics for success. For example, as brought up in earlier discussions, how does excellence translate to the ALANA minority? Do minority students progress in their degree programs? Do they have the GPAs required to get into Ph.D. programs? If UMass graduates minority students that are unable to be competitive for graduate programs, it is doing a disservice. When people walk into a unit, do they see a welcoming environment? These are some of the initial questions. A pilot is being launched in two or three departments. Hopefully, at the end of the year, the Council will be able to come to the Faculty Senate with a recommendation for what UMass needs to have in order to measure the status of diversity at this campus.

The report was received.

E. BYLAW CHANGES


MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Bylaw Changes, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 14-005A. 03-14

(Inasmuch as these are changes to the Senate’s Bylaws, this is the second of three readings of this motion. It will be read again at the 732nd regular meeting of the Faculty Senate. The motion may be debated and amended at all three meetings.)

F. NEW COURSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>CREDITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BIOLOGY 109</td>
<td>“Evolution Explained”</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOLOGY 422</td>
<td>“Experimental Methods in Ecology”</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM 315</td>
<td>“Critical Folklore Studies”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM 319</td>
<td>“Health Communication”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM 332</td>
<td>“Convergent Media and Activism”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMM 415  “Humor and Public Culture”  3
COMM 435  “Latina/o Media & Cultural Production”  4
KIN 346  “Clinical and Public Health Implications of Obesity”  3
SPANISH 324  “Introduction to Latino/a Literature”  3

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the courses BIOLOGY 109 and 422, COMM 315, 319, 332, 415 and 435, KIN 346 and SPANISH 324, as recommended by the Academic Matters Council.

The motion was adopted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>CREDITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHEM-ENG 575</td>
<td>“Tissue Engineering”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHEM-ENG 576</td>
<td>“Biotechnology Process Engineering Laboratory”</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 503</td>
<td>“Sheltered English Immersion: Access to Academics for PK-12 English Language Learners”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the courses CHEM-ENG 575 and 576 and EDUC 503, as recommended by the Academic Matters and Graduate Councils.

The motion was adopted.

G. NEW BUSINESS

1. Special Report of the Academic Priorities, Graduate and Program and Budget Councils concerning a Revision to the M.Ed. in Educational Leadership, as presented in Sen. Doc. No 14-014 with Motion No. 10-14.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Revision to the M.Ed. in Educational Leadership, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 14-014.

The motion was adopted.


MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Graduate Certificate in Nursing Education, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 14-015.

The motion was adopted.


MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Management Concentration in Sustainable Business Practice, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 14-016.

The motion was adopted.

H. OLD BUSINESS


MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Amendment to the Special Report of the Rules Committee concerning a Revision of the Faculty Senate Election Districts, as presented in Sen. Doc. No 13-062A.

Senator David Gross noted that, under the new districting, he would be a Senator from District 16. There are three districts that are oversubscribed; District 16 is one of them. As he reads the document, it states, “The regularization of the size of the districts will happen by attrition.” There are two Senators from District 16 whose terms will expire next year. Senator
Gross is one; Senator Howard Stidham is the other. Senator Gross wondered if he and Senator Stidham will have to compete for the seat, or if they will be grandfathered in.

Secretary May stated that it says that, over time, the number of people will be aligned with the number of slots. How that occurs will vary. Some people may decide not to run again. Secretary May acknowledged that the entire process of redistricting will have to happen again, as there are departments breaking up and moving around. The Rules Committee has decided to go forth with this redistricting now, but the process will have to be redone in the spring or next fall.

The motion was adopted as amended.


MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Amendment to the Special Report of the Committee on Committees concerning Nominations to Faculty Senate Councils and Committees, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 13-063C.

The motion was adopted as amended.

3. Amendment to the Special Report of the Rules Committee concerning the Establishment of an Ad Hoc Committee to be named the Joint Task Force on Resource Allocation (JTFRA), as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 14-010B with Motion No. 07-14.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Amendment to the Establishment of an Ad Hoc Committee to be named the Joint Task Force on Resource Allocation (JTFRA), as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 14-010B.

The motion was adopted as amended.

The 731st Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate stood adjourned at 5:40 p.m. on November 14, 2013.

Respectfully submitted,

Ernest D. May
Secretary of the Faculty Senate