Presiding Officer Richard Bogartz called the 734th Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate to order on February 20, 2014 at 3:30 p.m. in Herter Hall, Room 227, and began by reciting the following poem by William Shakespeare:

“Sonnet XCIV”

They that have the power to hurt and will do none,
That do not do the thing they most do show,
Who, moving others, are themselves as stone,
Unmoved, cold, and to temptation slow:
They rightly do inherit heaven’s graces
And husband nature’s riches from expense;
They are the lords and owners of their faces,
Others but stewards of their excellence.
The summer’s flower is to the summer sweet
Though to itself it only live and die,
But if that flower with base infection meet,
The basest weed outbraves his dignity:
For sweetest things turn sourest by their deeds;
Lilies that fester smell far worse than weeds.

A. PRESENTATION BY JULIE BUEHLER, VICE CHANCELLOR FOR INFORMATION SYSTEMS AND STRATEGY AND CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER

“The State of Information Technology: Early Thoughts”

(QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION TO FOLLOW)

Julie Buehler, Vice Chancellor for Information Systems and Strategy and Chief Information Officer, thanked the Senate for the invitation to speak. She presented a very short slideshow that did not contain much text, as her training has indicated that text-ridden slides do not lead to quality retention. However, she understands that there are a lot of people who probably couldn’t make the meeting who are interested in her talking points, so she has prepared a one-page summary to share with all faculty members electronically. Vice Chancellor Buehler hoped to talk about three things. First, she will share the results of her listening tour. She has been on campus for five months and has talked to more than 350 people on campus about IT. She wanted to point out a couple things about these facts. Having been on campus for only five months, she doesn’t know what she doesn’t know. She asked the faculty to keep that in mind. Very quickly, Vice Chancellor Buehler saw some commons themes emerging. Her second talking point is to share those themes. Finally, she is going to share her assessments on the state of IT on this campus, as well as some of OIT’s plans for going forward.

Some common themes:

There is a very high demand for more IT on campus, yet there is no clear path on how to pay for more. That is something that OIT and the Faculty Senate can work on together. There is desire for more IT both from a campus-wide perspective, for things like infrastructure, and from a school-specific perspective. The theme was “more.” No one Vice Chancellor Buehler met with said that IT was exactly where it needed to be for the future aspirations of this campus. That is telling.

Some of the loudest comments spoke to the fact that some of the major IT structures on campus do not work well together. Specifically, there were lots of comments about how difficult it is to get interfaces out of the major systems, or how difficult it is to get good data and analytics out of the major systems.

There is confusion about the future direction of the learning management systems on campus. People are wondering what they mean and where the campus is trying to go. There are differences of opinion about that.

Wireless needs to be better on campus. There are buildings that don’t have the coverage that they need. Today, there is an expectation that wireless work well across campus.

Vice Chancellor Buehler has heard a lot of demand for storage. That is no surprise, because you cannot be an IT leader without hearing that. The volume on this campus is especially loud. At a recent dinner, Vice Chancellor Buehler sat next to a researcher who is new to the campus. He said to her that, at his last campus, he could call up anytime and, as long as he
had funds available, he could get storage on demand. He came here and, when he called the OIT help desk asking for storage, he was told that there was none to be had; he had to find it himself. Vice Chancellor Buehler went back to OIT thinking that that couldn’t be right; it had to be a myth. But, sure enough, OIT did not have storage capacity to offer. That is something that people are very frustrated with.

People have commented that, as the University has evolved, the OIT help desk has become insufficient, particularly in the fact that it is only open Monday through Friday until five o'clock. Throughout the years, staffing has changed. Due to budget cuts, the staffing changed to a model where the phones are mostly answered by students. Many faculty members are not happy with this arrangement. There were also complaints about what happens when you call the service center. People are not happy about the fact that they are asked to give their employee number. Individuals working in IT for specific schools and departments feel that they should not have to call the basic IT help desk with questions. As IT professionals themselves, they have tried the basic fixes and need to talk to a higher level of IT support. This would solve issues more quickly.

There have been many concerns about email. OIT is doing listening tours right now to hear exactly what is wrong and figure out effective remedies.

Vice Chancellor Buehler has heard a lot about the filling of a position in instructional innovation. Many people referred to this job as the “Rich Rogers Position.” Discussions have taken place between Vice Chancellor Buehler, Vice Provost Barr, and the Faculty Senate about the formation of a new position in Instructional Innovation. The formation of this position is consistent with the Strategic Plan for the campus.

There was excitement about high-performance computing, tempered by the acknowledgment that it is in its early stages. We need to keep moving this along.

Many faculty members feel that IT priorities often seem unclear. Some people even referred to the issue as being about whoever yells the loudest. Some in the IT staff felt similarly. This is not optimal in retaining IT talent.

There were many comments about communications, about how OIT gets messages out. This was on many different subjects. It involved IT opportunities, incidents, et cetera. There needs to be more communication.

There is definitely desire for more transparency in IT. This has to do with priorities, opportunities for training, and with having more discussions, including sharing financials in a more broad manner. In her early days on campus, Vice Chancellor Buehler heard many comments about how the OIT website is very surface driven. It described all the available services, but didn’t have information about who to contact with specific problems. Right away, OIT put up photos of its IT leaders and the responsibilities of each person.

A desire for analytic capabilities has been expressed, especially as we look at learning outcomes. There is a desire to do more dashboards there.

Overall, Vice Chancellor Buehler heard that there is inconsistent IT service. It really didn’t matter who was providing the service, if it was central or decentral. People just said that sometimes the service was good and sometimes it was not.

Vice Chancellor Buehler proceeded with her own assessment of IT, noting that if you ask ten people what they think about IT on campus, you are likely to get ten different answers. Vice Chancellor Buehler has significant experience in IT; she has a perspective that may differ from many faculty members. When she looks at IT, she tries to look at it from three perspectives. The strategic perspective asks, “Are we aligned with where we want to be over the next five years in how we offer IT services to the community?” The organizational perspective looks at how central IT and decentral IT work together; it looks at how the University works with its vendors; it asks how IT relates to the faculty, the campus plan, the community, and the national IT picture. That is organization in the broad sense. The final perspective is the operational. This is the nitty-gritty, such as how email is working.

From a strategic perspective, mission alignment is weak right now. Some evidence of that is that, when Vice Chancellor Buehler talks to people working on IT projects, and asks them how what they are doing relates to teaching, learning, research and community service, those people often cannot easily answer her. OIT needs to spend some time looking at the campus plan and looking at where IT resources are being invested to make sure they line up. There is an opportunity right now to engage people working in IT to get excited about the University’s mission. If you want to see the best results possible, people have to be excited about the mission. That is a possibility for us. There has been little multi-year planning in IT. There is no IT Strategic Plan that exists today with a funded plan behind it. That is very different form UMass’ peers. The IT leadership team just went out and did benchmarking with peers. Some peer institutions are on their third
five-year plan with a full funding plan. UMass is lagging behind and needs to catch up. That is not an exclusively IT activity; it is a campus activity.

OIT has funding issues, even outside the Strategic Plan. OIT and the campus need to look at how to pay for new building support, how renewal and replacement will take place, how wireless strategies are thought of, how cellular strategies are thought of—not just from a one-year perspective, but from a five-year perspective. As Vice Chancellor Buehler has learned more about the historical way that accounting has been done on campus, she has seen that the units that get hurt the most by that accounting model are those that change a lot and grow a lot. IT has had some issues with that. Some of the new funding model discussions should be beneficial for IT.

Vice Chancellor Buehler has looked at many indicators and has done a lot of peer reviews. No matter which one she presents, someone always comes up and says, “You know that’s an arguable metric.” She has looked at eight to ten different metrics, and has found that the amount of resources spent on IT at UMass Amherst is much less than at peer institutions. The EduCause Core Data Survey Almanac, compiling information for doctoral institutions, offers one glimpse. The data they have is for 2012, and Vice Chancellor Buehler was comparing it to this campus’ current spending, making the comparison even more conservative. That publication states that 4% of a doctoral institution’s budget should go to central IT. Right now, UMass Amherst is putting 2.16% of its budget into central IT. That publication states that $985 should be spent annually per institutional FTE—that is, per student, faculty, and staff member. UMass Amherst is currently spending $658. It seems like, no matter which way Vice Chancellor Buehler has looked at peer data, UMass is behind its peers. This campus has simply made less of an investment than its peers.

Also from a strategic perspective, this campus has some great opportunities at the moment. One development that Vice Chancellor Buehler is especially excited about is the Massachusetts Green High Performance Computing Center. This entity is uniquely positioned. If someone asked Vice Chancellor Buehler to name one resource that is perfectly aligned with the campus’ future aspirations, she would name this resource. There will likely be bumps along the road, as high performance computing is a difficult endeavor, but this is an exciting development from a strategic perspective.

Vice Chancellor Buehler’s organizational assessment of the campus is that there are many good people working on IT, but IT is very resource and training challenged. She hears many comments about how administrators need to be held more accountable. She believes that administrators must provide great service. However, we also have to look at some of the reasons why service might not be great. She has many employees who are awesome at what they do. One of them is named Jim. He runs the campus’ data center. Jim has the skills to run a modern data center on this campus. He has run very complex data centers in his past, and he loves the mission of this campus. Vice Chancellor Buehler moved to her next slide, showing a raised floor in the campus data center. The data center has gotten into such bad shape that IT is propping cement blocks up under the floors because the machinery is too heavy and the floor is collapsing. Jim, a great IT talent, is forced to figure out weight loads for the floor. And the floor is just one example. There are issues with heating and cooling, monitoring, and more. This needs to be fixed. This is not aligned with where the campus wants to be. Jim comes in every day ready to do a great job, but when he has to worry about issues like the floor, he can’t do the job he wants to do, and that this campus wants to do. Vice Chancellor Buehler knows that this is not a problem unique to IT. Classrooms, offices, et cetera, are in poor shape across campus, but she doesn’t want anyone to think that IT is without these types of issues as well. She shared the photo of the reinforced floor with the Information and Communication Technology Council and was unsure if she should share it. She has many employees who are awesome at what they do. One of them is named Jim. He runs the campus’ data center. Jim has the skills to run a modern data center on this campus. He has run very complex data centers in his past, and he loves the mission of this campus. Vice Chancellor Buehler moved to her next slide, showing a raised floor in the campus data center. The data center has gotten into such bad shape that IT is propping cement blocks up under the floors because the machinery is too heavy and the floor is collapsing. Jim, a great IT talent, is forced to figure out weight loads for the floor. And the floor is just one example. There are issues with heating and cooling, monitoring, and more. This needs to be fixed. This is not aligned with where the campus wants to be. Jim comes in every day ready to do a great job, but when he has to worry about issues like the floor, he can’t do the job he wants to do, and that this campus wants to do. Vice Chancellor Buehler knows that this is not a problem unique to IT. Classrooms, offices, et cetera, are in poor shape across campus, but she doesn’t want anyone to think that IT is without these types of issues as well. She shared the photo of the reinforced floor with the Information and Communication Technology Council and was unsure if she should share it with the Senate, as she thought it might come across as whiny. ICTC encouraged her to show it, as it clearly depicts how IT needs more support on campus.

From an organizational perspective, there are a lot of challenged campus relationships. That has been seen in some of the discussions that have taken place at previous Faculty Senate meetings. There are some trust issues, there are service issues—we need to work through those. If IT is going to have a strong environment that supports the campus’ mission, those need to be corrected.

Additionally in the organizational perspective, Vice Chancellor Buehler is concerned about compliance and information security. These areas are getting more complex, needs in these areas are growing, and this campus is behind. Efforts will be made in these areas. Vendor relations are weak right now. There are about eight to ten vendors that UMass Amherst could work with in much deeper ways. Those relationships could help IT provide better service to the campus. This campus has vendors that are likely to be willing to fund some initiatives with UMass Amherst if joint initiatives were identified. There is a lot of work that IT could do, but it will take time. Vice Chancellor Buehler thinks that there are too many open IT leadership positions. Solely on the OIT leadership team, there are three open positions. When she gets back to her office, finds an email that should be delegated, there is no one to delegate to. OIT is moving forward on filling those positions, but it is a difficult situation.

From an operational perspective, IT is doing way too much firefighting. If you are leading IT for a complex organization, you usually have about four instances each year that are complete surprises, including fires, water damage, unexpected
new buildings that require adjusted workflow, et cetera. IT on this campus is experiencing such events about every ten
days. A few examples since Vice Chancellor Buehler’s arrival on campus include the opening of an Honors College
building without cellular coverage; numerous issues with wireless, some including disruption of grant-funded research
work; new building renovations that don’t have funding plans for IT; data center storage issues; and information security.
We need to figure out what is causing these issues. Many calls are coming into the OIT help desk that should not be
directed there. Reviewing call information, Vice Chancellor Buehler saw that one of the top reasons that people call the
OIT help desk was for transcripts. She wondered why this would be. It turns out that the process to view and order
transcripts was automated a few years ago. That system requires a NetID, and, after people graduate, they forget their
NetIDs. We have to solve wasteful problems like this.

In addition to the floor, there are many other issues surrounding the data center. The good news is that a new shell has
been built and a vendor is working with the University in looking at data center options. Still, Vice Chancellor Buehler is
very concerned about the data center. During her discussions around campus, she noticed that many people have not
stopped to think about what is actually in the University’s data center. The data center is the central heart beat for IT on
this campus. A few examples of what are running in the data center include SPIRE, Learning Management Systems, the
credit cards for dining services, the campus web presence, building management access, and departmental servers. We
cannot tolerate the data center being in poor shape.

There is certainly work to be done on the network. Most network plans entail multi-year efforts. IT business continuity
planning is weak. And the UMass System interactions are challenged right now. While individuals in IT, such as Vice
Chancellor Buehler, are advocating for more IT spending on campus, there are also committees looking at cost savings in
administration trying to get the campus to spend less on IT. Somehow, these conversations must be balanced.

Going forward, IT needs to get to a strategic plan. Looking at UMass Amherst’s peers, there are common areas. There is
an awful lot of work to be done with IT on campus, but if we know where we are headed, and take it piece by piece, we can
get there. Vice Chancellor Buehler wants to start working on an IT plan with the Faculty Senate and administration.
Looking at peer institution’s plans, which could obviously be changed, there is usually a component on teaching and
learning, one on research, one on engagement, one on enterprise systems, and one on infrastructure. This campus needs to
be having discussions about what all of those things will look like over the next five years, and then figure out how to fund
it. All of those items will include analytics, governance, service excellence, and information security as components. IT
needs to be transparent about where multi-year funding is going. At the same time, when IT makes tough decisions—
deciding to invest in one initiative and not another—the campus needs to be supportive of those decisions. From an
organizational perspective, UMass Amherst is reviewing peers, seeing where we are and if we can leverage lessons learned
from other places in order to move forward. IT is revamping communications. Instead of saying, “Four servers just went
live,” we are articulating the impact to students and faculty. Those communications can be used with vendors and help the
community see projects that are going on. Recently, IT wrote up a piece on electronic exams, and the success that
Chemistry was having with them, as IT thinks that there are other departments that could benefit from such initiatives. IT
is working on new vendor relationships and the searches for leadership positions. From an operational perspective, IT is
working on the data center, network upgrades, high performance computing, improving cell coverage, looking at root
causes of problems, and improving information security.

Presiding Officer Bogartz stated that this was the best, most informative, most important presentation he’d ever heard to
the Faculty Senate. He asked Vice Chancellor Buehler, if she had her druthers, what she would like to see the Faculty
Senate do.

Vice Chancellor Buehler said she would want the Senate to get engaged in the Strategic Plan. It will be hard to work on a
realistic Strategic Plan. They can become so dreamy, and the price tag become so big, that they end up staying on a shelf.
She would like people involved in Councils and Committees to have real dialog on some of the subjects. People do not even
need to go to regular meetings, as long as ideas are shared. It is very important to know what issues are most important to
the campus. This initiative should not be driven by IT, but should come up to IT from faculty, staff, and students. Vice
Chancellor Buehler would also love for people to pause when problems arise, and not beat up the hardworking people at
IT so quickly. Watching the Olympics, Vice Chancellor Buehler found herself feeling bad for the IT person. Everything
went well except for one thing—a single ring did not light up during the opening ceremony—yet that was all that the news
coverage talked about. Somewhere behind that, there is an IT person who is being ringed. IT people are people, too, and
they are here because they care. Obviously, finding funding is something else that always needs support.

Ernest May, Secretary of the Faculty Senate, asked Vice Chancellor Buehler to comment on some of the mechanisms that
other institutions use to aid in IT funding and to determine the levels of support for specific areas.

Vice Chancellor Buehler noted that an IT is something that more and more institutions are implementing, and is something
that UMass Amherst should discuss as part of the Strategic Plan. She thinks that it is possible to see more support from the
vendors. Her previous campus had a state-vendor partnership in high performance computing funded at $100 million. There are different ways to bring in funding.

Chancellor Kumble Subbaswamy noted that he has spoken much about the lack of transparency in the University’s budgeting, and the campus is currently engaged in exploring new budgeting systems. One of the things that the campus needs to be aware of is that the tuition and curricular fee confusion that is unique to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts prevents the use the funding mechanisms that are typically used in other states, where there is a technology fee that is monitored. If there is a new initiative, then there is a charge that is very transparent and it pays for particular improvements. UMass Amherst does not have that mechanism. We have tuition and the curricular fee. All of that combined goes into a single pot and, to the best of Chancellor Subbaswamy’s knowledge, IT initiatives have been paid for with money that is left over at the end of the year. Other than some improvements here and there, there has been no systematic funding model. There is a serious problem with how this campus budgets for IT, as well as with the lack of transparency about the budget, starting with the confusion over tuition and the curricular fee, which makes it difficult to track spending.

Senator Monika Schmitter thanked Vice Chancellor Buehler for her great presentation. She had a couple of questions that she believed may be a little naïve. She hoped to be able to bring information back to her colleagues on how to help with the IT situation on campus. First, what is encompassed in IT?

Vice Chancellor Buehler began with some high-level items. She was sure she would miss some, but hoped campus leaders could help fill in some of the gaps. IT includes academic technologies and classroom technologies, the data center, telecommunications, networking, administrative systems, application development, webpages, information technology funding and budget, desktop support, residential life support is big, building support, PC classroom and lab support, helpdesk, CESD, and more. Looking broader, policy, information security, and vendor relations are included.

Senator Schmitter noted that classroom equipment was included.

Vice Chancellor Buehler stated that it does, and underfunding has really hurt that area.

Senator Schmitter asked for more information on the new position related to instructional innovation.

Vice Chancellor Buehler is hoping that the job description will be posted very soon.

Carol Barr, Vice Provost for Undergraduate and Continuing Education, stated that the position will be Associate Provost for Instructional Innovation, and it is a joint report to both Academic Affairs and IT. Although some people referred to the position as the old Rich Rogers position, the position has evolved. It will be dealing with instructional innovation, supporting faculty, new technologies in classrooms, coordinating activities, et cetera. It will join IT with the faculty and unite both groups into a common conversation.

Vice Chancellor Buehler noted that there used to be positions like Director of Academic Technology. It was found that those types of positions were too far removed from the faculty. This position is an attempt to get closer and to get involved in some of the bigger strategic conversations, such as discussing what kind of technologies we want to be using five years from now. Some schools have set up “playgrounds” for faculty in which vendors are often willing to put in seed technologies that can be tested out without having to purchase them.

Senator Schmitter stated that the two-way conversation between IT and faculty is very important.

Vice Chancellor Buehler noted that the Apple Store setup is being found to be very convenient in higher education. People like being able to walk in and try different technologies.

Vice Provost Barr added that the Instructional Innovation position comes directly out of the Strategic Plan. The position was asked for by the faculty and other individuals serving on the Curricular Innovation Subcommittee of the Joint Task Force for Strategic Oversight.

Secretary May followed up by noting that he had dinner recently with some people whose son had worked for Apple for a while. Now he is working as an instructional technologist at MIT. Specifically, he works in the executive MBA program, working on a single course. That course has a lot of razzle dazzle associated with it. If we want to be a leader in IT, we need to be able to do stuff like that. Secretary May doesn’t see how that kind of thing could happen at UMass Amherst, even in selective areas. If a department wants to get into online learning, it will need more than just the basics. A question that ICTC and IT should look at is, What basic level of service is the campus going to provide for every faculty member and unit? What can be the basic expectation? Then, what additional services should the units or faculty members expect to pay
for or provide on their own? These are questions that need to be asked, especially if UMass Amherst wants to be involved as one of the leaders in this field.

**Vice Chancellor Buehler** added that an additional requirement is that the University develop a mechanism to keep those questions fresh. What will be considered basic expectations will change fast.

**Randall Phillis, President of the Massachusetts Society of Professors**, first commented that he loved the picture of the jack stand in the data center, not because he loves jack stands, but because he thinks it is important to talk about the challenges that the University faces. President Phillis thinks of expenditures in IT as falling into two big categories. One is the ongoing services operation budget, which fully and appropriately comes from the operating budget. It seems, however, that IT is a place where there is a lot of capital expense. Building a data center, for instance, is not something that we do every year; it may happen every decade. But that seems like a capital expense. But he doesn’t know if any of the capital budget, in any way, moves to IT to solve those problems.

**Vice Chancellor Buehler** noted that IT does have a small capital project budget. Normally what you would see is an operating budget and a normal capital budget that covers the renewal and replacement of existing things. On top of that, you would usually see something like an IT Strategic Plan budget, which would be for things like data center replacement or a major technology advancement. Currently, this type of budget doesn’t exist at UMass Amherst. A topic of discussion in the meetings of JTFRA has been school-specific funding. IT would like to be able to undertake projects for schools that are willing to help IT fund them.

**Senator MJ Peterson** wanted to point out that, since MIT has more money than God and we don’t, realistic innovation at UMass is not about being the most expensive or the most cutting edge, but about figuring out how to be innovative and cutting edge on a budget that more ordinary people can afford. That makes it much more challenging. However, it is something that UMass needs to be doing if we hope to be pioneers in the public interest.

**Vice Chancellor Buehler** noted that it does make it more challenging to not have a large resource pool. But there is a lot of good that can be done. If faculty and staff are excited about what’s possible, great ideas will come forward. Vice Chancellor Buehler recently spoke with a staff member who works with the tours of prospective students. When asked what is new and different about the current prospective students, as compared to students in the past, that staff member said that she sees grandparents coming on the tours along with the students’ parents. Looking at population data, people are healthier and more engaged with their grandchildren. Around that time, Vice Chancellor Buehler received a message from her Apple representative, who stated that another school had created a program for family members on how to support first generation students through college. The cost of putting that program together was small, but the school has become a leader simply by observing changes around their campus. We need to ask the people around campus what changes they would like. Many of them will have small costs and great benefit.

**Chancellor Subbaswamy** underscored what Vice Chancellor Buehler said, noting that “razzle dazzle” is not just expensive technology. UMass’ OWL program was razzle dazzle, as is team-based learning. It is not so much what technology makes happen, as what is done with that technology. Right now, UMass is testing adaptive learning platforms. Looking around the faculty, there is much use of technology taking place that has an impact on learning and learning outcomes. MIT can have all their money, and we can still get ahead of them. In terms of data centers and so forth, a part of the new Life Sciences Center was dedicated for data space. However, the fit-up of that building, as usual in Massachusetts, started at $5 million, moved to $7 million, and is now somewhere around $17 million. So much information is being stored in the cloud now, and additional conversation needs to take place before the campus can spend triple its original estimate on the project and it is unclear if a data center would be built the same way today as it was planned five years ago. Chancellor Subbaswamy thinks the campus is doing a wise thing by patching things up while thinking about moving forward into the future.

**Vice Chancellor Buehler** had a final thought on how the faculty can help IT. IT is trying to write up case studies about places on campus where innovation is taking place that might be of interest to other units around campus. She urged faculty members to send her an email if they knew of something that IT should study. Taking good ideas from one part of campus and spreading it around is a good way to use resources wisely.

**Senator Steven Brewer, Co-Chair of the Information and Communication Technology Council**, added another point. ICTC has open seats on it. He urged faculty members to look at what seats are open and think of who might serve well in helping the Council guide information and communication technologies on campus.

**Vice Chancellor Buehler** added that there is a student interested in forming a student, faculty and staff subcommittee of the ICTC on green computing.
B. **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

1. **Principal Administrative Officers**

   **Chancellor Kumble Subbaswamy** noted that conversations regarding budgeting systems and centralization similar to those currently going on at the UMass Amherst campus are taking place at the system level. President Caret is fairly new, having served just over two years, and it turns out that, in the previous version of system administration, there were many assessments of campuses and a significant amount of money collected as reserves at the central level. There is a movement now towards allocating that money for particular priorities. This initiative is being called the President's Enhancement Fund. Conversations have been going on about what these funds would constitute and how they will be distributed. Just as we conclude and identify at least a few of our top strategic priorities, there will be some funding available through that mechanism for investing in those priorities. The whole notion of trying to identify priorities through the JTFSO is very critical and will have immediate benefits because we will be able to show that we are investing in strategic priorities. The Chancellor is very excited about the possibility of having some funds immediately to invest.

   **Provost James Staros** updated the Senate on two searches being run by the Provost’s Office. The last of the finalist candidates for the Commonwealth Honors College Dean will be on campus in the coming week. Also on campus soon following the Faculty Senate meeting will be the lead candidate for the Center for Teaching and Faculty Development Director, visiting for the second time. Both of these searches are moving along, and hopefully there will be announcements about them by the next Senate meeting.

   **Michael Malone, Vice Chancellor for Research and Engagement**, stated that the search for a new Director of Technology Transfer, Commercial Ventures, and Intellectual Property Office has concluded. An offer has been made and accepted. Vice Chancellor Malone hoped to be able to announce the name, but some additional paperwork needs to be completed before an announcement can be made. Secondly, the Institute for Applied Life Sciences is off and running even before the fit-out has been completed. Approximately $2 million in new industry grants have been booked in the first six months of the initiative, involving over ten different organizations, all of which are exploratory and are expected to grow in the future.

   **Ernest May, Secretary of the Faculty Senate**, updated the Senate on a couple of ongoing initiatives. The Joint Task Force on Resource Allocation is hard at work. There will be another update on their work at an upcoming Faculty Senate meeting. In 1996, the Trustees adopted a policy about the reviews of Centers and Institutes. During the past year, the campus began implementing that policy. The Rules Committee has been engaged in conversations with Vice Chancellor Malone and Provost Staros about consolidating all of the policies related to Centers and Institutes—which are currently scattered in about five different places—into one document, and then creating the final steps related to the continuation or termination of Centers and Institutes. Centers and Institutes are different than academic programs in that the funding is much more fluid and there are no students or tenure-system faculty within the Centers and Institutes themselves; they are all associated with specific departments. Sometimes faculty members leave, taking the grant that created a given Center or Institute with them, but the Center or Institute still technically exists here. We need to have more streamlined and normal processes for deliberating the results of these reviews.

   **Randall Phillis, President of the Massachusetts Society of Professors**, had a brief comment on the ongoing anti-bullying workshops. They are interesting. They have been met with a reasonable and expected dose of cynicism, but people are leaving the workshops with a different perspective. President Phillis thinks the campus has chosen to take a “change status” approach to this challenge faced on campus. If we don’t change the culture, we’re not going to get anywhere. It may be hard, it may be challenging, but if you walk into these workshops with an open mind and look around at your colleagues, you should be able to appreciate the power that we have if we pull this off correctly.

C. **QUESTION PERIOD**

**Chancellor Subbaswamy** added to President Phillis’ comments on the anti-bullying workshops. The entire Campus Leadership Council, including all of the Deans, have gone through the workshops. They, in fact, were the first to go through the sessions. Chancellor Subbaswamy admitted that he and many other campus leaders were skeptical about what they were going to learn in the session, but they all came out having very thoughtful conversations, rethinking how they behave and how they see others behave. The sessions are very valuable and thought provoking. Chancellor Subbaswamy appreciates the fact that the entire community has decided to go along with this important initiative.
Secretary May noted that the Trustee Committee meetings were interrupted because of a snow storm, so the meetings were consolidated. Somewhere in their agendas was an item addressing a very large allocation of financial aid coming from the President’s Office.

Chancellor Subbaswamy stated that he is trying to get to the bottom of this issue. The news coverage said that there would be $148 million more spent by UMass in financial aid. What he thinks that number is referring to is that, at the Trustee Committee meeting, there was a tracking of all the money that the different campuses spend on financial aid. The total institutional financial aid spent is about $148 million. Next year, that number should be a little bit more, because, if there is a tuition increase, spending will increase by the same amount. Chancellor Subbaswamy has a feeling that some reporter, somewhere, got it wrong and that the spending is being perpetuated as an increase of $148 million. If it is an increase of $148 million, Chancellor Subbaswamy has no idea where that money would come from. He wishes that the system were flush enough to have that kind of money.

Senator W. Curtis Conner, following up on the conversation about bullying, stated that the question he has, and that has come up in those meetings, is: Who is responsible for attempting to correct the bullying? The question for the Faculty Senate is whether or not the Department Personnel Committee allowed to be involved in that? Is the College Personnel Committee to be involved in that? This is a question first for the Chancellor and also for the union, as it is not clear if the union is a part of this or not.

President Phillis stated that there is not any indication in any of the work that the MSP has done on the procedures for dealing with bullying that charge the Departmental Personnel Committees with any task like that.

Senator Conner stated that that sounds like the faculty are supposed to look the other way. If you see it, don’t worry about it.

President Phillis stated that the Department Personnel Committees are not formally charged with that responsibility. There is responsibility for all of us, when we see incidents of bullying going on, to intervene, talk to the people involved, and to make appropriate supervisors aware of the challenge.

Chancellor Subbaswamy stated that the grievance process that the campus is working out has not been fully finalized, but it is getting there. One of the challenges is that the individual that feels that he or she is being bullied may not want that reporting to affect his or her future in the department. As in many harassment issues, how bullying is handled is a very sensitive subject, and is not as direct as referring it to a Personnel Committee. Moreover, faculty discipline issues are not handled at the Personnel Committee levels, but through the chain of command through the Chair to the Associate Provost for Faculty. The Personnel Committee is charged with evaluating academic performance, research performance, and so forth, as opposed to disciplinary issues.

President Phillis seconded Chancellor’s Subbaswamy’s understanding of the issue.

Secretary May agreed with this understanding as well, but noted that this is a matter for what used to be called a Faculty Handbook, which has gone way out of date. Decades ago, there was such a thing. The Senate does have a document somewhere on professional misconduct, but it mainly concerns scientific misconduct, such as misreporting of results or misuse of data. There might be a role for the Senate in either, in collaboration with the administration, coming up with something in a revised Faculty Handbook or perhaps a professional misconduct document.

Senator Conner asked if either the union and/or the administration could vacate attempts to stop bullying. Can the union step in and tell someone they can’t report an instance of bullying?

President Phillis stated that the union could not do that. The union is not an enforcement arm. The union’s role in this whole thing is simply to assure that the procedures that are agreed upon are being properly followed and that, if any discipline or anything else ensues from a complaint, it is meted out in accordance with appropriate procedures. It is not the union’s role to declare who may or may not make a complaint or an observation of bullying occurring.

Senator Conner told President Phillis that he had better check what the union did in November of 2013.

Senator Monika Schmitter had a question coming from a student in the English Department. That student asked why $10 million is being spent on renovating the Blue Wall instead of being spent, for example, on the Bartlett Hall replacement project. Senator Schmitter is sure there is a good reason for this, but would like to be able to tell that student what it is.

James Sheehan, Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance, stated that the reason that the funds are not being spent on Bartlett is because Bartlett is an academic building, while the Blue Wall Café and the Campus Center itself are part of
an auxiliary building. The auxiliaries do the borrowing and repayment of all the debt that is involved in their projects. The Bartlett Hall project is on the board. It’s going to be an addition to the South College renovation. Between Bartlett and the Blue Wall, the money is green and yellow, if you will.

_**Senator Schmitter**_ noted that that was her general sense of it: that there are two separate pots of money that cannot be mixed together.

_Vice Chancellor Sheehan_ said that the campus would not use University money on an auxiliary project, and would not use auxiliary money on an academic project.

_**Senator Schmitter**_ noted that it is easy for a student to think it strange that money would be spent on the Blue Wall and not an academic building.

_Vice Chancellor Sheehan_ said it is not just students who find it strange.

_Chancellor Subbaswamy_ stated that the best way to answer this question is to note that, in order for the restaurant operations that are part of the auxiliaries to be able to continue generating money, they need to have the right ambience. In order to do that, the only source of money they can use is what they borrow and pay back with future earnings. In a similar vein, if Bartlett Hall is falling apart and students start running away from it, we wouldn’t have students coming and paying tuition to keep up the University’s mission. Therefore, either the state pays for it—which is what is happening in the case of Bartlett—but they don’t pay enough, so there is a charge to the students that the University does its best to limit. We could double the size of Bartlett and charge more to the students, but a balance has to be struck.

_**Senator Schmitter**_ clarified that the Blue Wall generates the money that pays for its renovations.

_Chancellor Subbaswamy_ affirmed that understanding.

### D. NEW COURSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>CREDITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;C-ENG 670</td>
<td>“Advanced System Software Design”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 691C</td>
<td>“Adult Learning Theory and Practice”</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the courses E&C-ENG 670 and EDUC 691C, as recommended by the 21-14 Graduate Council.

The motion was adopted.

### E. NEW BUSINESS


MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Establishment of an Ad Hoc Committee on the Organization of the Ombuds Office, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 14-025.

_**Senator Frank Hugus**_ asked if there were any previous Ombudspersons on campus who could be pulled in for consultation on this Ad Hoc Committee.

_**Senator MJ Peterson**_ stated that the Rules Committee had discussions with the current Ombuds Office while developing this proposal, but not any past officials from that Office.

The motion was adopted.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Creation of Concentrations in the Operations and Information Management Major, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 14-026.

The motion was adopted.


MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Certificate in General Business Studies, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 14-027.

The motion was adopted.


MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Amherst Center for Fundamental Interactions (ACFI), as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 14-028.

Senator W. Brian O'Connor asked if the Center should not be called the “UMass Center for Fundamental Interactions,” as opposed to the “Amherst Center.”

Presiding Officer Bogartz noted that he had heard that there was concern that, if it was the “UMass Center,” it may be attributed to the entire system. The motivation was to locate it here at UMass Amherst, and Amherst, apparently amongst those people who know about these sorts of things, was enough to identify it as UMass Amherst.

The motion was adopted.

The 734th Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate stood adjourned at 4:50 p.m. on February 20, 2014.

Respectfully submitted,

Ernest D. May
Secretary of the Faculty Senate