Presiding Officer Richard Bogartz called the 733rd Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate to order on January 30, 2014 at 3:30 p.m. in Herter Hall, Room 227. The meeting began with the recitation of a poem by Pablo Neruda. Senator Marta Calas read the poem in its original Spanish and Presiding Officer Bogartz followed with the English translation:

“La Poesía”

Y fue a esa edad…Llegó la poesía
a buscarme. No sé, no sé de dónde
salió, de invierno o río.
No sé cómo ni cuándo,
no no eran voces, no eran
palabras, ni silencio,
pero desde una calle me llamaba,
desde las ramas de la noche,
de pronto entre los otros,
entre fuegos vilentos
o regresando solo,
allí estaba sin rostro
y me tocaba.

Yo no sabía qué decir, mi boca
no sabía
nombrar,
mis ojos eran ciegos,
y algo golpeaba en mi alma,
fiebre o alas perdidas,
y me fui hacienda solo,
descifrando
aquella quemadura,
y escribí la primera línea vaga,
vaga, sin cuerpo, pura
tontería,
pura sabiduría
del que no sabe nada,
y vi de pronto
el cielo
desgranado
y abierto,
planetas,
plantaciones palpitantes,
la sombra perforada,
acribillada
por flechas, fuego y flores,
la noche arrolladora, el universo.

Y yo, mínimo ser,
ebrión del gran vacío
constelado,
a semejanza, a imagen
del misterio,
me sentí parte pura
del abismo,
rodé con las estrellas,
mi corazón se desató en el viento.
“Poetry”

And it was at that age...Poetry arrived
in search of me. I don't know, I don't know where
it came from, from winter or a river.
I don't know how or when,
no they were not voices, they were not
words, nor silence,
but from a street I was summoned,
from the branches of night,
abruptly from the others,
among violent fires
or returning alone,
there I was without a face
and it touched me.

I did not know what to say, my mouth
had no way
with names,
my eyes were blind,
and something started in my soul,
fever or forgotten wings,
and I made my own way,
deciphering
that fire,
and I wrote the first faint line,
faint, without substance, pure
nonsense,
pure wisdom
of someone who knows nothing,
and suddenly I saw
the heavens
unfastened
and open,
planets,
palpitating plantations,
shadow perforated,
riddled
with arrows, fire and flowers,
the winding night, the universe.

And I, infinitesimal being,
drunk with the great starry
void,
likeness, image of
mystery,
felt myself a pure part
of the abyss,
I wheeled with the stars,
my heart broke loose on the wind.

Presiding Officer Bogartz moved to suspend the rules in order to allow an address by Massachusetts State Senator Stanley Rosenberg. To accommodate this, the presentation regarding information technology by Vice Chancellor for Information Systems and Strategy and Chief Information Officer Julie Buehler will be postponed until the February 20 meeting.

The motion to suspend the rules in order to make these changes to the agenda was seconded and adopted.
This presentation will be made at the 734th Faculty Senate meeting on February 20, 2013.

B. UPDATE ON THE JOINT TASK FORCE ON RESOURCE ALLOCATION (JTFRA)
ELIZABETH CHILTON AND TIMOTHY ANDERSON, CO-CHAIRS
(QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION TO FOLLOW)

Elizabeth Chilton, Co-Chair of the Joint Task Force on Resource Allocation and Professor of Anthropology, introduced fellow JTFRA Co-Chair Timothy Anderson, as well as the representatives from the Huron Consulting Group, which JTFRA has been working with since November: John Curry, Glenn McLoren, and Maggie Burger. They are on hand to answer any questions about the model specifics that they have been helping the JTFRA look at.

The Joint Task Force on Resource Allocation emerged from the Phase One report of the strategic planning process. One of the overarching goals of the Phase One report was promoting a culture of evidence in all aspects of campus decision making and setting high standards of transparency, rationality and fairness as the University tackles difficult choices. The report defines three expectations to guide a more intentional system of resource allocation. Quoting the Phase One report: “1) The common good must be clear and well defined; 2) It should be easily and immediately clear how the budget system rewards efforts that meet or exceed institutional goals; and 3) Decision making should be informed and accountable. This argues for clear articulation of purposes, development of relevant metrics, and also transparent evaluation of outcomes.”

More specifically, the PowerPoint accompanying the presentation shows the explicit charges to the Joint Task force on Resource Allocation. For example, educating and engaging the campus community. JTFRA takes educating and engaging the community to include educating the committee members themselves. There are 22 members on the JTFRA, and, at every single meeting, the members are learning a lot about both how the current resource allocation system works and where the roadblocks are, and also about what other possibilities are out there in terms of national models for resource allocation. Secondly, the JTFRA is charged with identifying key characteristics of UMass’ current system of resource allocation, specifically, how it aligns with the University’s strategic values as well as how it does not align with those values and how the portions that are not working as well can be better aligned. Finally, the JTFRA has been charged with proposing specific changes for consideration by the campus community. A report will be finalized by the first of April. Feedback from the campus community regarding the working report will be solicited in March.

The JTFRA has been working since mid-December. The Co-Chairs have met with the Huron consultants numerous times. A meeting was held earlier on January 30. Dean Anderson will speak to the various resource allocation models that have been considered and those that the Task Force has asked Huron to explore in a little more depth. The Task Force has asked Huron what the campus resources would look like under various models. It is an iterative process. Huron is helping the University explore what outcomes would result from various changes in the system. At the beginning of March, the model options will be shared with the campus community.

Various constituencies have been engaged both by Huron and the JTFRA itself. Initially, Huron met with the groups represented on the left column of slide 4, including Deans, Faculty Senate Councils, Academic Affairs, et cetera. Huron has continued to engage with the groups on the right column, including the current meeting. Open campus forums will be held at key points during the decision-making process. Professor Chilton and Dean Anderson will be presenting at SGA and GSS meetings, as well. There are a number of opportunities for the campus to engage in this process, including the website and blog.

The first step in thinking about what is working with the current financial model and what could work better is to identify the guiding the principles of what any resource allocation model should be on this campus. This process started with the Strategic Plan, which identifies as campus values as a whole and values that the campus would like to see embedded in any new financial system. These guiding principles are on slide 5. Many of these principles came directly out of the Strategic Plan. Some important principles include transparency, the ability to promote innovation, collaboration, and taking a holistic view of the University. From the values, the task force came up with a series of guiding principles. Huron asked for 6-8, or even 10, guiding principles in order to review how the current financial model is addressing these principles.

Timothy Anderson, Co-Chair of the Joint Task Force on Resource Allocation and Dean of the College of Engineering, introduced some potential resource allocation models and how UMass Amherst fits with them. Dean Anderson noted that, when he was asked to serve on the JTFRA, he wondered why he would be a good fit. He has only been at UMass ten
months, he doesn’t really know the budgeting process here, he spent 35 years at another university that went through a budget reexamination that it is still working on, and he is from the College of Engineering, which has a high cost of education, as it consists primarily of upper-division courses with labs. Furthermore, Engineering does a lot of research, which has a lot of common good, but doesn’t always recover its full costs. Taking all of these considerations as a whole, that is why he is on the Task Force. He likely takes a different approach to budgeting than many on campus.

There is no single right answer to budgeting. There is no single model that will work for every university. What there is, however, is a range of models that have been tried to varying degrees of success. One task of JTFRA was to review these models along the full spectrum and attempt to determine the pros and cons of the various models. One way of cutting this pie—pun intended, maybe—is to identify the budget models according to the degree of centralization or decentralization that they entail. Are the decisions being made centrally, or are they being made by individual units, at the department level, for example? A graph of these models is on slide 6. Each of these models has its pros and cons. Centralized models have decisions made at a high level. These models are focused on expenses. More decentralized models focus on growing the pie, finding incentives and investments that can increase their budgets. These models try to align the cost of these investments with their revenue. The models vary in terms of performance measures. Centralized models tend to be more short term. The performance measures tend to get pushed down to the levels where they can be better optimized. The different models are constrained by different factors. Centralized models are limited by academic authority. They sometimes have less of an impact at the academic level. The more decentralized models have to accommodate the common good, such as the library. They do this by taxing, taking a portion of their revenues out to create a subvention pool. There is no single model. There is no A vs. B situation. There is a continuum of models that need to be explored in able to determine what could be a better model than the current system. The job of the Task Force is to take the values and principles outlined by Professor Chilton and see which models—and which aspects of specific models—best line up with those principles. Huron has been around to a variety of the public institutions that have made budget inquiries, gaining a lot of experience. The JTFRA is in the process of sorting out what components are most effective and important for maintaining our principles.

The current budget model at UMass, which can be called incremental budgeting, is very centralized. Moving across the spectrum, there are formula-based budgets, that run on set formulas; performance-based funding, which is based on how well units do, primarily in the short term. On the decentralized extreme, there is ET0B, or “Every Tub on its Own Bottom,” in which every unit has its own budget. In this model, of which Harvard University is the poster child, every unit has its own budget, and lives and dies by its revenue sources and ability to minimize cost.

UMass is in the process of focusing on customized models. When Huron came to campus, it was decided that a customized model was the first choice to explore. This model will focus on the common good investments that are important to the University. It is particularly important that there is a parallel Task Force, the Joint Task Force on Strategic Oversight (JTFSO), looking at the Strategic Plan. Dean Anderson has been on a lot of strategic planning operations where there is a great plan, but no resources to make the changes happen. It is important to align the Strategic Plan with the budget process.

The JTFRA and Huron laid out the principles that the custom budget model will work to establish and maintain on slide 9. The alignment of responsibility and authority is important. About a year and a half ago, a program to seek more out-of-state undergraduates was put in place, and revenue was shared. This initiative is a clear example of alignment between strategy, responsibility, and resources, as a University policy was implemented by the units that then benefited from it. It is important to not mistake simplicity for accuracy, as likely happened at Dean Anderson’s previous institution. Simplicity allows you to see the big picture, to see how the funds flow. The flow of funds at UMass has been examined. It is a very complex flow, and it is very difficult to understand what the true costs or benefits of any one action will be. It makes it difficult to make decisions at all levels. Finally, it is important to maintain transparency and make data-informed decisions. There is a lot of good data on this campus, but it is very difficult to get. Systems need to communicate better. Often, many resources need to be drawn from in order to get the whole picture about what’s happening on campus. Transparency makes better decisions. Professor Chilton offered a good anecdote about this. As a Department Chair, she was trying to decide whether or not to add a new section of a course. To do that, she would need to employ another TA. She had a lot of difficulty determining what that TA would cost, how many students would enroll, and what the ultimate costs and benefits would be. There was no definitive answer to this seemingly simple question. With the right data, knowing what the budget model is, having total transparency, would make that decision much easier.

Professor Chilton added that the PowerPoint they presented, which goes into great detail, would be posted on the JTFRA website (https://www.umass.edu/provost estratégica-planning/joint-taskforce-resource-allocation). It goes into great detail about what each of these funding models is and what attributes each has. JTFRA has asked Huron to explore in more detail the customized model of a more decentralized budget system. On the spectrum, it is next to RCM, or Responsibility-Centered Management. Professor Chilton knows that RCM makes some people’s hair stand on end, but she likes the R of
the acronym; she likes that there is responsibility that is associated with costs and also with distribution of resources. In early versions of RCM, universities were so decentralized that it was often difficult to get the whole university to be working towards the same strategic plan. It became clear early on that, at UMass, we want to all be swimming in the same direction. There has to be a balance between decentralization and wise, transparent use of resources and central oversight that makes sure the University is in line with the Strategic Plan. That is sort of the bottom line of why the JTFRA has asked Huron to explore a budget model that is more decentralized than what is currently in use, but is not all the way to the side of decentralization, where you risk anarchy and competition between units on campus.

Dean Anderson noted that he and Professor Chilton were at the meeting, primarily, to get input. Outside of the Faculty Senate meeting, there are a number of outlets for providing input. The JTFRA has a website that is accessible through the Strategic Planning website hosted by the Provost’s Office (https://www.umass.edu/provost/strategic-planning/joint-taskforce-resource-allocation), a blog (https://blogs.umass.edu/jtfra/), and an email address (jtfra@provost.umass.edu).

Senator Howard Peelle noted that he appreciates the opportunity to provide feedback on the Task Force’s efforts. He wondered if the Task Force planned to build a feedback loop into the budget model.

Dean Anderson stated that the JTFRA is definitely planning to build in a feedback loop. Huron has been working with the people that have all the budget data on campus and is going to run budget scenarios in order to determine where issues might arise. There is going to be a constant looping back on that. Implementing any new model will entail starting a shadow budget and following it to see if it makes sense. Historically, it takes a couple of fiscal cycles to improve any budget model. It is a constant process. The budgetary environment in academics is constantly changing.

Professor Chilton noted that the JTFRA keeps using the word “iterative.” There is an iteration taking place this spring. The JTFRA report will definitely outline a process by which the campus community can continue to reassess how it is working and moving forward.

Senator Marinos Vouvakis spoke to the nationwide trend of the division between the upper and lower classes. Translated into the university setting, we see a divide between an administration that makes a lot of money and a lot of other units that do not—a bloated administration. This is seen in companies as well, as management versus the rest of the workforce. He wondered how these budget models deal with the explosion of administration and management costs.

Chancellor Kumble Subbaswamy noted that he never walks away from a difficult question. Senator Vouvakis’ question is fair and the concerns are important to be dealing with. Chancellor Subbaswamy identified the issue as the following: in a model in which there is greater transparency and greater accountability, there are certainly questions to ask about costs and benefits. There are many other players involved in UMass’ budget other than the Chancellor and the JTFRA. For instance, imagine that you convince the Trustees to cut the compensation of UMass Chancellors by 50%. In that circumstance, Chancellor Subbaswamy would leave. So you then have to evaluate the cost and benefit of losing him. You may find someone much better for half the price, and that would be fine. There is always a balancing act between costs and benefits. Some of those decisions are made at a higher level. The Trustees consider national norms for administrator salaries, just like it is done for professors, comparing against national benchmarks and so forth. A system that is more transparent—and therefore more accountable—encourages discussions that explain the reasoning for decisions such as administrative costs.

Senator Vouvakis agreed that UMass is in an open market. However, he is not talking about the hiring or salary of a Provost or Chancellor, but the explosion of Vice Chancellors, Vice Provosts, Vice Deans, Vice everything. How do these models deal with things like that?

Professor Chilton noted that, nationally, state universities have had to put a lot more emphasis on administration as less and less of their funding comes from the states. UMass is looking at generating over 50% of its revenues, and that has led to putting a lot of attention into finding funding from outside sources, which requires more administrative work. The models that are being explored allow transparency so that the campus can see what these costs are at every level: Provost’s Office, Deans’ Offices, central services, et cetera. The campus is attempting to look at things in a way that it has not been able to before. As the Chancellor pointed out, more transparency in the system will allow the University as a whole and the individual units to make better decisions about resource allocation. Additionally, it makes UMass more accountable, as it demonstrates that the University is using its state resources responsibly.

Dean Anderson added that, under these potential models, there would be more assessment and evaluation taking place. The data will be there. It will be more transparent. UMass will be able to compare itself to peer institutions and see where it stands in terms of administrative costs.
Randall Phillis, President of the Massachusetts Society of Professors, noted that the fourth principle on slide 9 says, “Transparency and data-informed decision making through the development of a budget model at the school and college level.” Does that mean that the Deans will be provided data and there will be transparency to them for their planning? Or does it mean that the Deans shall provide data and have transparency to their faculty so that the faculty may participate in the budget planning correctly?

Dean Anderson stated that, in a simplistic model, you have the university-level unit (administration), colleges, and departments. The question is: How far do you push down? Speaking of his own College, Dean Anderson stated that, in a simple model, funding is driven by enrollment. Enrollment fluctuates, and it fluctuates from one discipline to another at a time constant that is shorter than the time constant of the tenure of a faculty member. Therefore, you cannot adjust that quickly.

President Phillis asked how far the transparency extends and when things get opaque. Is it the Deans that get to know, or are the faculty members in on the budget process as well?

Professor Chilton stated that the hope, to some extent, is all of the above. This was discussed by the JTFRA earlier. At one campus that Huron associate John Curry was working with, there was transparency at the college level, but beyond that, it was completely opaque. Department chairs didn’t know what was going on at the college level. The wording of the fourth principle was debated to the last minute. Some Schools and Colleges are bigger than others, and they may want to divide up into smaller units. A level of transparency that makes sense needs to be determined so that Department Chairs, Program Directors and others will be able to make data-informed decisions in collaboration with their Deans. The example that Dean Anderson was discussing speaks to these types of decisions. If you are a Department Chair deciding whether or not to add another section, you can look and see, using some online systems of information, and be able to determine some of the costs, such as hiring a TA versus hiring a lecturer, et cetera. Then the Department Chair can bring that information to the Dean and discuss if adding that section is in alignment with the mission of the College and the entire University. That is a data-informed conversation. Department Chairs and Program Directors need to have that information so that they can share it with their faculty. The JTFRA has not designed a model yet. Models are still being explored as it looks at the various scenarios that may come up. Input is being sought. There is not a model in mind regarding the level of transparency necessary. Transparency is a major campus value.

John Curry, Huron Consulting Group, followed Dean Anderson’s conversation about enrollments going up in one department within a college while simultaneously going down in another. If you have an incentive system that tries to move money to where enrollments are growing, sometimes you cannot do that quickly, because many costs are fixed. However, having the conversation about how the overall enrollments are trending, and what might be driving students from one department to another, is an aspect of transparency that can be very useful. Additionally, insofar as there is more engagement between faculty members and chairs, there is more knowledge about things that can be done to enhance programs and attract resources. Very often, faculty members know much more than central administrators do because they are closer to their own disciplines and professions. On the transparency issue, Mr. Curry has been working with a university that is transitioning into a decentralized system with a goal of transparency. At that institution, everyone said that the sun is blinding from the President to the Provost to the Deans. Beyond that level, there were seven black boxes called schools. There was a uniform view from the faculty members there that the Deans did not share any information with them, and that the data was not understood. Transparency, where it mattered to the faculty members, was worse than opacity, because there was no way to interpret it. While transparency often begets conversation about things people see and misinterpret, you can at least engage the conversation around what they see and bring it to a factual basis. In the absence of real data, people will make up stories about what is going on that are far more ugly than the facts would support. Mr. Curry likes the idea of transparency reaching fairly far into the organization. Engagement around real data should be a common activity.

Presiding Officer Bogartz agreed with Mr. Curry’s remarks. He added that maximal transparency is desirable. Not everything can be transparent. But what can be transparent is what’s not transparent. So one of the aspects of transparency that should be included is the acknowledgment of the type of information that is going to be transparent, and the type of information that is not, along with the reasons that that information will not be public.

Professor Chilton agreed absolutely. There has been quite a bit of discussion about the qualitative values of the campus and things that are not measureable and the fact that there are academic leaders—Deans, Department Chairs, et cetera—that are going to be making strategic decisions for the University. There is a subcommittee on the JTFRA talking about the intangible aspects of the University, where decisions about them will be made, and how to make sure that they align with campus values.
Alex Phillips, Chair of the Budget Subcommittee of the Program and Budget Council, had a procedural question about the timeline. The first step listed is to outline a set of model options and select an option to explore further, concluding at the end of January. That was not as transparent a process as it might have been. There was not a chance for the faculty to weigh in on which model would be best to explore. This is an extremely aggressive timeline, which makes it seem like there is limited time to explore various models. Professor Phillips is sure that there will be information made public about why the Task Force went with the customized model as the one to explore, but he wondered if there would be more regular and robust updates in the future.

Professor Chilton wanted to make it clear that the JTFRA is not a voting body. It has been asked to make a report and, potentially, offer recommendations to the campus and the Chancellor. It is not up to the JTFRA to make a final determination of a model. The Task Force asked Huron to explore this customized model because it felt like that was necessary in order to be in a good position to present to the campus over the course of the next month what would happen if UMass changes certain attributes of its financial system. This is a process of learning, discovery and iteration. Based on the very intense meetings over the past month, and Huron’s interviews with various campus constituencies, the JTFRA thinks that it is very important to study what would actually happen if a new budget model were to be implemented. The JTFRA and Huron have heard—from all over campus—that more transparency and more decentralization are desired. Now the Task Force is working on seeing what a budget model that fits these desires would look like, as well as determining what some of the results and consequences of such a model would be. At the end of April, the JTFRA is going to say, “This is what we’ve learned about our current financial system. This is what we’ve learned about how it aligns or does not align with the current guiding principles of the University. And this is what we recommend for next steps.” It is unclear how detailed that report will be. There is a month of intensive work ahead. A model has not been chosen. The JTFRA has asked Huron to explore a model to see how it will work.

Chancellor Subbaswamy stated that the premise that a model has been chosen is incorrect. The customized model has not been customized yet. At one end of the dial, there is the completely centralized model; at the other end, there is a completely decentralized budgetary automatron. The Task Force and Huron are now going to struggle to see what happens when the dial is moved around. A budget model has not been chosen. A framework has been laid for moving forward.

Dean Anderson stated that the JTFRA went through a process in which it took the campus’ values, such as transparency and informed decision-making, and looked at the flow of funds in the current process. The group then identified areas where the University was doing well, areas where improvement could be helpful, and other areas where the University was really not doing a very good job. That information was used to test potential models. All of this data, along with model productions, will be put on the JTFRA’s website.

Professor Chilton noted that no campus fits squarely in any one of the boxes on the graph. Furthermore, there is a lot of variation within RCM models, as there is in incremental budgets, et cetera. The JTFRA identified UMass as using a budgeting system that is primarily incremental, but there are funding aspects that fall into the incentive-based models on the right. Continuing and Professional Education is one of these programs, as is the out-of-state student enrollment. They are very similar to RCM systems. UMass does not have one solid model now. By saying we are going with a customized system, one thing that the Task Force is saying is that there are aspects of the current budget model that align very well with campus priorities, and those aspects should not be changed. We don’t want to change the things that are working, but we do want to look at the things that are not working as well as they could and figure out how they can improve.

Senator Vouvakis stated that, about a year ago, at a Faculty Senate meeting, he asked Provost Staros how resources are allocated, and the Provost described what sounded like a customized model. Senator Vouvakis wondered what the difference is between this customized model and the customized model UMass had a year ago. According to what the Provost said, UMass did not have an incremental model.

Professor Chilton stated that the models were included in the slide as nominal variables for illustration. There are not hard boundaries between budget models. All campuses have hybrid versions of these.

Provost James Staros stated that the base budgets at UMass are in an incremental model. On top of the base budgets, there is a customized piece that has incentives such as increased out-of-state student enrollment, increased graduate enrollment and so forth. It is a hybrid right now. What the Task Force is talking about now is taking the pieces that have been added on top of the base budgets and making those much more general for the overall budgeting process.

Senator Maria Tymoczko noted that a major advantage of the incremental model is that, considering that the Massachusetts Legislature can be so abysmally late in passing its budget, it gives Deans some sense of what they are going to be able to work with. The RCM or even a customized model strikes Senator Tymoczko as being more difficult to foresee and therefore difficult to plan with.
Professor Chilton stated that, under any budget model, there will be a base allocation. That will not change under any of the systems that are being explored.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR STANLEY ROSENBERG (D-AMHERST)

Stanley Rosenberg, Massachusetts Senate Majority Leader, thanked the Senate for the opportunity to speak. He began with a few opening comments.

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts is continuing to see a slow, gradual improvement in the economy. The only weak link at the moment is that, for the first time in the five-year duration of this recession, Massachusetts is above the national average for unemployment, though not by much. The Legislature is working hard and not fretting too much about it, as it appears to be very temporary, as Massachusetts is heading in the right direction. As a result of changes in policy over the last 30 years or so, Massachusetts does not enter recessions early and come out late. But to come in late and get out early: that is encouraging and very positive. It is being demonstrated by the growth in state revenues, which has resulted in revenue estimates, for the past two years, that were more optimistic than the previous three or four years. The Governor, Speaker, Senate President and two Ways and Means Chairs have agreed to a revenue growth figure that allowed the Governor to come in with a budget (that was just filed) providing strategic increases, including the second year installment of the so-called 50/50 plan created by UMass President Caret and the Chancellors in the UMass system and was then embraced for the whole higher education system. The Governor’s budget reflects the commitment he made to go through with the plan two years in a row so that, by the end of fiscal year 2015, a higher education structure will be in place in which students pay 50% and the Commonwealth pays 50%. There is some difference of opinion as to whether the number in the Governor’s budget actually reflects 50/50, but the principle is there and, as we go through the process, we have to make sure the numbers align with the goal and the end point is reached. Senator Rosenberg recalled times, when he was chair of Ways and Means, when there were differences of opinion between parts of higher education, the Ways and Means Committees, and the Governor’s Office as to what the exact number should be, but it usually gets worked out reasonably well and to the satisfaction of most, if not all, by the end of the process. Now that the Governor has released his budget, the Legislature is moving into the period of public hearings. There is going to be one at UMass Amherst, one at Greenfield Community College, and eight or nine others across the Commonwealth. Following that, the House will come out with its budget, usually in mid-April; the Senate budget will come out about a month later. Then the two bodies will go into conference and, in most recent years, a budget can be on the Governor’s desk before July 1st or very close thereafter. With his having a few days to review it, issue vetoes and sign it, it is usually within the first week of July that the Commonwealth knows where it stands. Then, of course, if there are overrides that the Legislature wants to take up, those will be handled in the weeks and—sometimes—months that follow. Senator Rosenberg is feeling optimistic about the Commonwealth’s ability to get to the 50/50 plan this year. His second law of politics is “All’s well that ends well,” so he urged the Senate not to fret if things don’t look exactly as they ought to be at each stage of the process. It’s the end result that matters, and he is hopeful about the end result.

Ernest May, Secretary of the Faculty Senate, asked what the 50/50 plan means to Senator Rosenberg.

Senator Rosenberg stated that it means progress, but not enough. He wants to go back to the Carnegie model, which is two-thirds of the funding for universities and state colleges and three-fourths of the funding for community colleges coming from the state. If Massachusetts can get there, Senator Rosenberg will be happy and ready to retire.

Secretary May asked Senator Rosenberg to comment on the progress of plans for accountability and improvement in higher education. There was a successful effort for K-12 education in the 1990s, and now that mindset is being applied, in some quarters, to higher ed. Maybe this is good, maybe it is difficult.

Senator Rosenberg noted that this has been a national trend in higher education for quite a while. Massachusetts tested the waters in the mid-1990s. Some work was done then, including requiring UMass to issue a report every year or two measuring its performance in relation to aspiration. Now the state is in a new phase of this thinking, with the Department of Higher Education intensifying that work, particularly with the state universities and community colleges. The UMass system is pretty much left to its own to pursue its own path in doing this. UMass has been tightening up these efforts under President Caret, trying to make accountability efforts more transparent and intelligible to the public in order to make the information more useful in helping people understand the progress-against-aspiration that is being made in the system. This is all part of the grand bargain between the Legislature, Governor and University system extending to the public in exchange for increased support. It is useful; it is being internally driven, which is generally good, as there is less imposition from uninformed sources; but the direction is broadly set through the Legislature and the public. The University system and DHE have been working on developing appropriate approaches from within in the hopes of collecting accurate information.
Randall Phillis, President of the Massachusetts Society of Professors, noted his excitement at the progression of the 50/50 plan. He noticed that there is money in the Governor’s budget for a collective bargaining reserve. The goal of the 50/50 plan can only be met if there is an adequate and sufficient collective bargaining reserve. Without that reserve, money would either have to be moved from the base budget or raised through fee increases. President Phillis wondered if the State Senate was likely, as the Governor did, to include an adequate and sufficient collective bargaining reserve.

Senator Rosenberg noted that he is not the Chair of the Ways and Means Committee, so he cannot say what the Ways and Means Committee will recommend. The traditional pattern is that a collective bargaining reserve is set up when there is a collective bargaining agreement that has been funded, but the first year of it hasn’t been delivered. That is the way that the money is put into the budget, and from that fund, or reserve, it goes into the budgets of the campuses. Starting with the second year of the contract, you annualize into the base what you moved from the reserve into the budget, and then the budget, reflected in your line-item, contains the funding necessary to fund the collective bargaining agreement for the second year, and then the same thing happens in the third year. There have been exceptions to this pattern, usually in recessions. The 50/50 plan is not honored if collective bargaining is not funding along with the other costs associated with running the institutions.

Secretary May noted that sometimes University leaders hear about the state’s workforce. As Senator Rosenberg is in touch with many business leaders in the state, Secretary May wondered what those leaders are looking to UMass to supply to the economy of Massachusetts, as the University supplies graduates that work all over the state, especially in the Boston area.

Senator Rosenberg stated that, in general, the business leaders that he speaks to understand that the UMass system, particularly the Amherst campus, is a major feeder of highly-educated, highly-trained individuals into the workforce. In some industries, the largest proportion of people at the executive level and middle management level are coming out of the public higher education system, particularly the UMass system, and, within that system, the Amherst campus. UMass Lowell has started to gain traction because of the number of engineers being graduated from that campus. Senator Rosenberg talks with a lot of business leaders who state that UMass Amherst is critical to the success of their companies because of the people they hire. He hopes that translates into contributions and contracts and other things along the way.

Senator MJ Peterson noted that Senator Rosenberg mentioned unemployment being higher in Massachusetts than it has been, but there is confidence that will not turn into a trend. What are the elements that are building confidence that, in the medium- to long-term, the Commonwealth’s economy is healthy.

Senator Rosenberg noted that Massachusetts’ five largest industries are education, health care, financial services, technology, and tourism. Four of those industries are reliant upon a very well educated workforce. Massachusetts has the largest collection of public and private institutions of higher education per capita in the country. The strategic initiatives that the Legislature has been taking in terms of building the Massachusetts economy are taking off very well and very significantly. Two examples would be the growth in green technology and life sciences. Massachusetts is among the top states in the nation in terms of the number of businesses and jobs being created in the field of green technology and alternative energy. Senator Rosenberg attended a recent briefing on life sciences. California and Massachusetts are the top two states in the country in relation to employment in the life sciences. Interestingly, Massachusetts has about 24,000 people employed in the research and development arm of life sciences—from pharmacy to medical technology, equipment, et cetera—and about 8,500 employees in manufacturing. That is a ratio of 3:1 in terms of research to manufacturing. California is the reverse, number one in manufacturing and number two in research. Once again, the bookends of the United States, California and Massachusetts, are leading the way. These two states continue to be bell weather states, creating the economies of the future. The average salary of the 24,000 workers engaged in life science research and development is over $100,000 a year. Massachusetts maintains its standing as the third highest per-capita income state, which has been going on for a number of decades. There has been really good strategic focus in how the state uses and brings together the major industries it has: higher education, health care, finance, and technology. Massachusetts is educating the doctors and the researchers; the finance people are finding the venture capital to take what is being developed in life science and technology labs. All these elements are feeding off of each other. Finally, the state has tourism, which allows us to do fun things when we're not working.

Senator Steven Brewer noted that there is a Governor’s race this year. He wondered if Senator Rosenberg had a forecast on the race.

Senator Rosenberg jokingly predicted that the person who gets the most votes in November would be the next Governor. At this point, there is a nice collection of candidates on the Democratic side: two constitutional officers who have succeeded admirably in their current positions, Treasurer Steve Grossman and Attorney General Martha Coakley; and three very energetic people with varying experience outside of elected office, each of whom has a portfolio demonstrating that they could contribute something significant to the Commonwealth: Dr. Joseph Avellone, Dr. Donald Berwick, and Dr. Juliette...
Kayyem. It is a very energetic field. On the other side, there is one candidate who is known to Massachusetts voters, Charlie Baker. Senator Rosenberg noted that he did not have his orange tie on, which would indicate his allegiance in the race.

Presiding Officer Bogartz wondered if Senator Rosenberg was really who he said he is, as Presiding Officer Bogartz remembers a Senator Stanley Rosenberg who always had some gloom to share with the Faculty Senate.

Senator Rosenberg joked that he took another course, where they said he was doing it wrong: even if it's gloomy, tell them there's sunshine. He returned to the issue of the Gubernatorial election, urging the Faculty Senate to pay close attention to the election. Virtually all of the constitutional officers are going to turn over because four of the six officers are running for other positions. There are some very, very important decisions to be made. Additionally, there are a number of ballot questions to be decided, including one that would roll back the inflation on the transportation money (i.e., the gas tax). The Legislature wanted $1 billion for transportation, and the public prepared for that, and then the Governor asked for $1.9 billion in order to include education. Because it was a complicated plan that nearly doubled in size, the whole plan melted down and the Legislature only got $800 million, $160 million of which was lost as a result of the repeal of the software tax. It is not nearly enough to handle transportation, so that creates more pressure on the rest of the budget, making it difficult to take on other initiatives. He urged the Senators to be mindful that, although the state is doing well, Massachusetts has the largest gap between high and low earners. Income inequality is in an exaggerated form in this state. We need leaders and policies that address that issue. Senator Rosenberg stated he would be happy to come back with graphs and charts, but it seems clear that this is a widely acknowledged problem that is causing economic harm and social disintegration in parts of the Commonwealth. Part of getting a handle on the issue is electing the right leaders, and part of it is about what Massachusetts does with its tax policy. There will be at least the one tax policy issue to vote on in November.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Principal Administrative Officers

Chancellor Kumble Subbaswamy offered a piece of good news. NEASC accepted UMass Amherst’s five-year report. Chancellor Subbaswamy thanked the hard work of Associate Provost Bryan Harvey and the Joint Task Force on Strategic Oversight. There was a lot of work in a short period of time. It was a very inclusive process, and NEASC praised the inclusive process leading to the Strategic Plan. We are in the clear until 2018. The processes that have been implemented will hopefully make the strategic planning and assessment cycle more natural.

Searches for the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs and Campus Life and the Provost positions are underway in early stages. Candidates should be brought to campus in the March timeframe. Search committees are posted on the Chancellor’s website. The searches will be very transparent processes.

Provost James Staros stated that the first finalist for Dean of the Commonwealth Honors College would be visiting campus on February 3rd. The announcement is on the Provost’s Office website. On the site, there is a link to the candidate’s CV. Each candidate will be posted, and a link will be provided to each candidate’s CV. An open session will be held with each candidate. It is very important to get feedback from the whole campus community.

Julie Buehler, Vice Chancellor for Information Systems and Strategy and Chief Information Officer, had two quick announcements. OIT is collecting feedback on the Exchange email project and email preferences. She hopes everyone got the email about time and locations, but in case anyone didn’t there are two more: one on February 11 at 1:00 to 2:15 and one on February 27 from 2:30 to 3:45, both in the Campus Center, Room 904-08. If you have suggestions but can’t make a meeting, email it-suggestions@umass.edu. This is in response to concerns raised at the Faculty Senate about email.

Secondly, there is free training from Apple to help IT support people use Apple products. OIT is trying to contact all support people throughout the campus, but there is currently no list of who these individuals are within various departments. The sessions are on February 10 from 1:00 to 4:00 and February 11 from 9:00 to noon.

Carol Barr, Vice Provost for Undergraduate and Continuing Education, stated that the Registrar’s Office is working very hard on the Fall 2014 schedule, which will be using the new course schedule matrix. Also new for the fall semester is what used to be called the New Academic Classroom Building, which will now be called the Integrative Learning Center, or ILC. In that building, there are five team-based learning rooms. Faculty will soon be receiving email communication from the Center for Teaching and Faculty Development, which will be holding a number of workshops, talks, and opportunities for faculty to develop team-based learning courses. These courses can be very low tech. TBL Faculty Fellows are contributing their time to help spread the word on team-based learning. The Center for Teaching and Faculty Development is also emphasizing active learning, broadly defined to really engage the students in the learning process, and they are going to have a number of workshops, what they call Active Learning Institutes. There is a lot of activity in this area. Vice Provost
Barr encouraged faculty to get involved in these initiatives as UMass moves more of its curriculum and approaches to student learning into the active learning model.

James Sheehan, Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance, noted that his office sent out an email with a Human Resource survey attached. The survey is being issued in conjunction with the Buck Group, a consulting firm that UMass hired to help sort things out in HR. The survey is lengthy, but Vice Chancellor Sheehan encouraged participation. It is very important for A & F to know how faculty feel about the HR process in order to move it forward and make improvements that will benefit everyone. Secondly, Vice Chancellor Sheehan sent a letter to the Follett Company informing them that the University was going to look at new models of issuing textbooks and course materials to students. The intent is to look for a virtual textbook distribution model. There will be more to come about this. A & F will be in touch with a lot of groups on campus to make sure it gets everything right.

Chancellor Subbaswamy noted that the University was a little past the middle point of the UMass Rising campaign. The campaign goal is $300 million. As of January, the campus is at approximately $234 million, about 77% towards the goal. Things are going well, but sometimes those last dollars are the hardest to get.

2. The Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Ernest May, Secretary of the Faculty Senate, noted that the Senate was hoping to hear a presentation from Vice Chancellor Julie Buehler, who is very articulate on the subject of technology and what it can do for the campus. The opening session of the next meeting, on February 20, will be dedicated to that. It will be great to hear her reflections on her first three-quarters of a year here by the time of that meeting.

In terms of the added costs that Senator Vouvakis brought up earlier, 25 years ago, the campus did not have the cost of IT or many other amenities that students require now. There are many things that the University is doing that are, unfortunately, supported by administrators. While Secretary May agrees that the campus needs to keep an eye on what it is spending in administrative costs, according to Vice Chancellor Buehler, UMass’ spending on IT is about half of peer institutions.

During their presentation, the Co-Chairs of the JTFRA stuck to issues that have been decided, but Secretary May wanted to note some directions that are being taken, while keeping in mind that no big decisions have been made. Secretary May thinks that the University is moving towards an all funds model. Right now, UMass’ funds are divided up in very complicated ways. If you collect everything into an all funds model, there is greater simplification. The other piece that is not addressed by RCM is benchmarking. Electrical Engineering needs to be benchmarked against other electrical engineering departments, not against the Music Department. Services need to be benchmarked similarly against other operations at similar institutions. The unit of responsibility is going to be the School or College, not the individual departments, at least for the foreseeable future. The level of transparency should increase in terms of what Deans are doing within their colleges. Secretary May encourages a robust discussion. Being a Department Chair for a long time, he knows that faculty members were very frustrated because he could only say yes to them about 30% of the time. That is probably a similar percentage for most administrators. Fund flows are often complicated and erratic. You do the best with the money you have and then it’s gone. Again, Secretary May encouraged broad discussion, though he acknowledged that, ultimately, this decision is up to the Chancellor, as he is the person on campus responsible for high-level allocations, as well as approving and supporting the process of transparency to the degree that is helpful to the institution. These decisions are being made, but implementation will not be happening immediately.

3. The Chair of the Rules Committee

MJ Peterson, Chair of the Rules Committee, expressed her appreciation for the robust discussion surrounding the work of the JTFRA, and she urged Senators to communicate with and encourage their constituents to participate in this conversation. As for business coming up for the Senate, there has been a campus-wide review of Centers and Institutes. Some of the reviews are going well. Some Centers are inactive, and the question of whether they should continue is going to arise. There is a campus procedure for terminating Centers, but it is part of a larger procedure for academic units, and the procedure is a bit too unwieldy for your average Center. One thing that the Rules Committee is working on is a modification of that procedure that would be focused on Centers that do not have the problem of having to accommodate students, have relatively small staff, and don’t have too many post-docs. Something will be brought forth to the Senate, which can decide if the Rules Committee is making things too easy, or whether it is doing it right. That will probably be coming in March.
4. The Faculty Delegates to the Board of Trustees

Marilyn Billings, Associate Delegate to the Board of Trustees, noted that there is nothing particularly important coming out of the Board of Trustees right now because their business was reported on at the last Faculty Senate meeting and the next BOT meetings are not until February. However, Senator Billings wanted to bring to the Senate’s attention that, when she and Faculty Delegate James Kurose where reviewing the agendas for the upcoming committee meetings, they noticed that there was no meeting of the Science, Technology and Research Committee. They then found out that that Committee had been disbanded. They were surprised and dismayed to see that the Board of Trustees no longer has this Committee. The Rules Committee, working with faculty colleagues at the other UMass campuses, is working on a statement to share with the Board of Trustees speaking to the fact that science, technology and research are critical facets to the campuses, and that the faculty hope the BOT is exploring other options to disseminate and support science, technology and research.

5. The Representative of the Massachusetts Society of Professors

Randall Phillis, President of the Massachusetts Society of Professors, thanked the Chancellor for his “Welcome Back to Campus” video message. The MSP especially wanted to recognize the Chancellor’s encouragement for faculty, staff and students to more fully engage in Lobby Day. That has long been spearheaded by the unions on campus, and it’s wonderful to see that the administration is more fully engaged and working with the unions towards that end. Lobby Day is a very important event. Failure to produce a good crowd on Lobby Day is a huge mistake.

The MSP is about to enter into bargaining for the next collective bargaining agreement for the faculty and librarians on campus. That will commence soon. The current contract runs out at the end of June. The MSP’s role—and goal—is to achieve the best possible working environment for the faculty and librarians on this campus. The better we can make our worksite, the better we can do our work. One of the things the MSP is interested in is more fully engaging all the people who teach in the CPE unit. Currently, about half of them are not covered by the collective bargaining agreement, and therefore have very different floors and no benefits and the like, although they are doing the delivery of credit earning instruction on campus, frequently teaching the very same instruction that their MSP member colleagues are doing for a considerably higher wage. The MSP is eager to see them more fully included in the collective bargaining unit.

Finally, through a years-long effort, training is getting underway for the anti-workplace bullying efforts that are being engaged. This is a very important set of workshops that is going on, and the entire campus is going through them. They are being run by a very talented individual, Fran Sepler. President Phillis admitted that he was a little skeptical until he went through one of her workshops. She is incredibly persuasive and works well towards achieving the goal of having everyone understand a common definition of bullying and what procedures are in place to address it. As these workshops occur, we are likely to see longstanding bullying issues bubble up in ways that they never have. It is important that the campus is prepared to follow procedures that are now being put in place to deal with those types of issues and follow a fair and reasonable process so that those things can be resolved. The MSP is looking forward to that, but it will be an interesting transition from ignoring bullying on this campus to engaging it and addressing it.

6. The President of the Graduate Student Senate

Samantha Sterba, Vice President of the Graduate Student Senate, noted that she came to the Faculty Senate meeting directly from the first full GSS meeting of the semester. She placed a small packet of information detailing one resolution passed by the GSS in response to a campus safety alert issued over the preceding weekend. The GSS is looking for a dialogue with the UMPD, which has been invited to the next GSS meeting. The GSS is asking the Faculty Senate for any support of this resolution that the Senate thinks is appropriate.

D. QUESTION PERIOD

Senator W. Brian O’Connor commented on the disbanding of the Science, Technology and Research Committee of the Board of Trustees. Senator O’Connor was the Faculty Delegate to the Board of Trustees when this Committee was implemented. It was founded by former Chancellor John Lombardi and former Trustee John Armstrong. It was the most effective Committee that the Board of Trustees had. The presentations that were given by this Committee generated more enthusiasm than any of the other committees. Senator O’Connor is saddened, disillusioned and puzzled as to why, when, as Senator Rosenberg pointed out, Massachusetts is at the forefront of national research in so many fields, the Trustees would disband this Committee. He applauds the Rules Committee for taking this on; he applauds Secretary May for taking it before the Intercampus Faculty Council, whose members will hopefully all be on the same page about this. He thinks it’s a tragedy.
E. NEW COURSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>CREDITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CE-ENGIN 629</td>
<td>“Clay Minerals and Micro/Nano Characterization”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HISTORY 626</td>
<td>“Comparative Memory”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HISTORY 664</td>
<td>“Digital History”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the courses CE-ENGIN 629 and HISTORY 626 and 664, as 18-14 recommended by the Graduate Council.

The motion was adopted.

F. NEW BUSINESS


MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Name Change for the Center for Rural Massachusetts (CRM) 19-14 to the Center for Resilient Metro-regions, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 14-023.

The motion was adopted.


MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Changes to the Master of Arts Degree in Chinese, as presented in 20-14 Sen. Doc. No. 14-024.

The motion was adopted.

G. OLD BUSINESS

Amendment to the Special Report of the Committee on Committees concerning Nominations to the Academic Honesty Board, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 14-021A with Motion No. 17-14.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Amendment to the Special Report of the Committee on 17-14 Committees concerning Nominations to the Academic Honesty Board, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 14-021A.

The motion was adopted as amended.

The 733rd Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate stood adjourned at 5:15 p.m. on January 30, 2014.

Respectfully submitted,

Ernest D. May
Secretary of the Faculty Senate