ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Principal Administrative Officers

Kumble Subbaswamy, Chancellor: I want to comment on the series of bias incidents, expressions of hate, bigotry, some even construed as efforts of intimidation, that have gone on throughout the semester. First, I want to say that, unfortunately, it is not unique to our campus; this thing has been on an upswing and this semester it has really up-ticked a great deal. First, people generally ask, beyond these condemnations and our offers of support, what else are we doing? I just want to be very clear that we have had a very clear path of building a more inclusive campus climate that goes back at least four years when we developed a campus diversity strategic plan and we have been following the steps systematically. These are complex things. We did a climate assessment and identified important issues for particular groups, among faculty, staff, undergraduate students, and graduate students, and there are lots of efforts going on in terms of trying to change the conversation. A lot of these things, especially views about race and gender expressions and so forth, are things that take time for people to sort through. So, Building Bridges and other efforts are continuing efforts; there are efforts going on at the college, department, and local levels as well. We have a diversity webpage, so if anyone ever asks you what’s going on other than these condemnations, please direct them to that website.

One other thing that I want to say along these lines is that once you send these campus-wide condemnations it sort of becomes an expectation at one level. So, when do you send? When do you not send? When do you stop? Sending it out can in some way encourage the people who are perpetrating this as well. For example, Amherst College, at the beginning of the semester, adopted the policy that they would not send out individual responses about each incident that occurs. When we did that for one of them, immediately we were told that we were trying to hide an incident. That has never been the case. There is always a police report, which is public information, but also we have created a subpage on the diversity webpage that will list every incident, so we will direct people to that website to show that we are actually being very open about what is going on on the campus and what the climate is like. Beyond that, again, if people have ideas about something that we should be doing, but, for example, when it comes to things like additional police patrolling and so forth, there are pros and cons. The same targeted communities will tell you that they do not want more policing near their dorms, and that is completely understandable, so it is a very complex matter. We are dealing with these incidents with an eye toward best practices in the country, so we do not do this in isolation, and constantly re-examining everything that we do. It is very painful. There is no question that it is painful for the community at large, but it is especially painful for the targeted communities, and it causes anguish, and it makes the workplace a hostile workplace, and this is what we are trying to get over.

So, I think that, unfortunately, with the combination of what is going on nationally and what is going on on campuses, it will take some time to subside; it is not going to be immediate, unfortunately. If we do find the perpetrators, they will be dealt with with all available means including the criminal justice system and our own Student Code of Conduct if a student has perpetrated these kinds of things. I just want you to be aware that there is a lot of thought behind this in the sense that we do not want to deviate from our overall goal of creating an inclusive community as directed by our own strategic plan with information gleaned from our climate survey, which we will administer again in a couple of years and so on. If you have any thoughts on what we can do better, I certainly welcome you to send either me or Associate Chancellor Anna Branch an email and I made the same invitation to our student leaders as well. I want to say that I am really almost getting depressed by the current climate and if you have thoughts on how we could handle it better, I am open to suggestions.

John McCarthy, Provost and Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs: I am going to update you on the various leadership searches that are underway. For the Isenberg School of Management Dean, we have the third
of four candidates visiting the campus right now. The fourth candidate will come in the week after Thanksgiving and then we will try to move as quickly as possible to secure a new Dean of the Isenberg School. I think that the four people on the list now are really excellent in every case. There are three women and one man. They are very accomplished. The Director of the Fine Arts Center search is now in the phase in which they have identified the candidates who will get airport interviews, which will take place in the first week of December. I have seen the airport interview list. Again, they are a highly accomplished group of people, some from venues that you would immediately recognize, and also a very diverse group. So, I am looking forward to that and hoping to bring them to campus sometime in January. The Dean of the College of Engineering search is moving along. They have not yet identified the airport interview list but will do so soon and have blocked out a time in January for the airport interviews with the campus visits to follow shortly thereafter. The School of Public Health and Health Sciences Dean search is not nearly as far along as these – it was announced later – but it is moving along as well. They have had a meeting, they are working on the position profile, and they will immediately then start developing a list of candidates to start presenting to the search committee. I am pleased to announce the selection of interim deans for the School of Public Health and Health Sciences and for the College of Engineering. Nancy Cohen has agreed to be the Interim Dean of the School of Public Health and Health Sciences. Nancy has served as Interim Dean there before, about ten years ago, and has worked at the University as long as I have, since 1984-1985. Christopher Hollot will be the Interim Dean of the College of Engineering. Chris has also served at the University for a very long time and was previously Interim Dean of the College of Engineering before Dean Tim Anderson joined us.

Also, I am pleased to announce that we have a bumper crop of women who will be attending the HERS Institute with the University’s support. Please bear with me as I tell you all of them. Some of them are faculty and some are staff; all can easily benefit from the HERS Institute. From HFA, we have Rebecca Dingo from English and Marla Miller from History. From SBS, we have Sonya Atalay from Anthropology and Melissa Wooten from Sociology. From CICS, we have Donna Falcetti, who I believe is the Business Manager. From Isenberg, we have Traci Hess from OIM. From CNS, we have Associate Dean Elizabeth Connor from Biology, and Lynne McLandsborough from Food Science. From Engineering, we have Cheryl Brooks, who directs the career center in Engineering. From my office, we have Deb Gould. From Student Affairs, we have Melissa Rotkiewicz from the Center for Counseling and Psychological Health and Shelly Perdomo from Student Affairs itself. From Research and Engagement, we have Jen Donais and from Information Technology, we have Teri Delude. So, I am very pleased to be able to make this announcement and am very grateful to Vice Provost Michelle Budig for the work that she has done on this. We’re still working on identifying placements for some applicants for the Chancellor’s Leadership Fellows and I’m sure that I’ll be able to announce them at the next meeting of the Senate in December. Thank you.

**Michael Malone, Vice Chancellor for Research and Engagement:** As a reminder and update, my office is working with Administration and Finance and UMass IT on implementing a new electronic research administration system called Kuali Research. This will replace SmartGrant, formerly known as GAMS, for processing proposals and awards, and will also replace a system called eProtocol, which is used if you do research involving human subjects or animals. We are also taking this opportunity with my staff and with relevant administrators from various schools and colleges to review our business practices as we set up a new system to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of our research administration. Pilot testing and initial training will begin in early spring and that will involve central and college and school administrators and then a second installment will involve other staff and faculty later in the spring. We hope that the faculty training that is needed will be minimal due to the system that we selected. We are targeting early next fiscal year to go live for proposals and awards and we should know in January whether we can also finish the research subjects protocol system for the start of the fiscal year. We do have a webpage for updates and as soon as we have enough questions we will post frequently asked questions, but we don’t have any questions yet, so we don’t have any answers to them. Thank you.

**Andrew Mangels, Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance:** I am pleased to announce that we have hired three new professionals in our Talent Acquisition Office in Whitmore. It used to be called the Employment Office but Talent Acquisition is a more up-to-date term. These individuals will complement our four Human Resources Business Partners that are working and serving the campus in regard to hiring practices and facilitating
new hires for staff, so we are really excited about that and we will have a welcoming event for them coming up. That will provide a lot of relief. There has been some turnover in that office and I apologize for some of the delays that that has caused in some quarters, but we should expect to have that alleviated soon.

2. The Secretary of the Faculty Senate

MJ Peterson, Secretary of the Faculty Senate: To deal with various vacancies, we held an additional two special elections to the Faculty Senate. I am pleased to introduce two newly elected Faculty Senators, both of whom are here. The first is Paulina Borrego from the Libraries. She is a Science and Engineering Librarian, but the subject matter groups that she works with most closely include coastal and marine sciences, environmental conservation, food science, natural resources and conservation, so she is very much on the sustainability, ecological side of things. Our second newly elected Senator from District 20 is Razvan Sibii from Communication. Razvan grew up in Romania under the Ceaușescus? It was a very different culture than here. He got some of his education at the American University of Bulgaria then came here for more. He is a freelance journalist, but he also teaches on international journalism, on reporting about issues of social justice, journalistic ethics, and basic journalism courses in the Journalism Department. So, welcome to our new Senators.

We are not having any presentations today. This will give us a little more time to think about and ask questions of our reporting councils. You may have noticed something of a slowdown in proposals for new programs. That is a lull. That does not mean that there are no new ideas for new programs out there. It is just that they are not quite far enough along to be presented to the Senate. I expect that we are going to be dealing with a number of those proposals starting very soon and through the spring; a number of them are going to add new things to our curriculum while others are going to reinforce the curriculum and the Senate and its Councils will be paying its usual attention to making sure that they are the types of programs that we want in this land-grant Research- One university that we call home. Thank you.

3. The Chair of the Rules Committee

Senator Bruce Baird, Chair of the Rules Committee: We had one meeting since I saw you all last. We had two huge topics. One was discussion of policy for approval for online courses and we will be continuing that conversation and perhaps getting a taskforce together to think about the specific issues regarding approval of online courses. This is particularly in light of the Chancellor’s talk about having a unified faculty in this University Without Walls. We also had a discussion about appointment and review of associate deans because we feel that there is no standard review process across all colleges for review of associate deans. Thank you.

4. The Representative of the Massachusetts Society of Professors

Senator Steven Brewer: I’m standing in for Eve Weinbaum who sent me a note this morning that I will read. Our contracts have been fully approved by the legislature and the Governor’s Office, so we are waiting to get our money. We’ve asked Human Resources when we can expect to see the raises in our paychecks and we will let our members know as soon as they tell us. The Massachusetts Society of Professors (MSP) and the administration have four joint committees working already on issues: Title IX sexual harassment policy, gender equity, new anomaly pay equity process, and research and extension faculty. Another two committees will start work in January on SERTIs and holistic teaching evaluations, and on the teaching professor pilot. The statewide Massachusetts Teachers Association (MTA) statewide is announcing a major yearlong campaign, Fund Our Future, filing legislation that would fully fund K-12 schools and also provide $500 million for public higher education, which would mean more than $100 million per year for UMass Amherst. This is what we would need to get back to our per-student funding level from 2001. Stay tuned as we will need everyone’s help once the legislature reconvenes in January. Tomorrow evening, at 6:00 p.m. in the Cape Cod Lounge, we’re cosponsoring a forum on student debt: causes, responses, policies, and action plans. Our newly elected legislators will be there and we are looking forward to talking about plans for debt-free higher education. Our general assembly is on Tuesday, December 11th. Join us for lunch; all members are welcome. We will talk about plans for the Spring semester and we want to hear from you about what’s happening in your program or department. Thank you.
B. QUESTION PERIOD

Senator Richard Bogartz: This is in response to the Chancellor’s remarks. I think that we can be very proud of the efforts that have been made here over that period of time that you were talking about. We are tens of thousands of people here. It only takes one person to make an incident. All they need is a marker pen or whatever it is they use. I like the idea of a goal of no incidents, but there are going to be incidents and I’m a little saddened to hear that you’re depressed because I feel that you have much to be proud of.

Senator Marinos Vouvakis: I would like to speak on the same issue and would say that you should not be depressed. For this particular issue, I know that all of us, at one point in our lives or careers, have been recipients of hate. But, I would like to say that at least now we know who hates us. I think that, maybe, ten years ago, a lot of people hated people but they would keep it inside. So, I would rather know who is out there and what they are thinking rather than not know as people are keeping it inside and releasing that and trying to backstab us in our community and our democracy.

MJ Peterson, Secretary of the Faculty Senate: I know that Provost McCarthy will answer this question. The person who has all of the super detailed information is Senior Vice Provost Tilman Wolf, but he had to get out of town early because he needs to get to Arizona before the storm comes in. What I want to ask about are the plans regarding the additional activities with Shorelight that are underway.

John McCarthy, Provost and Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs: The system-wide Shorelight that the Secretary of the Senate just referred to is somewhat different from the one that we have here on campus. The one that we have here on campus involves distance learning by students located currently in China – eventually perhaps in other countries – in two programs, one in Computer Engineering and the other in Teaching English as a Second Language (TESOL). The distance learning component for some of those Computer Engineering students then transitions into an on-campus learning component for the second year of their M.S. program. The system-wide Shorelight is now in a rather early state as it has not yet been approved and it has not yet received NEASC/NECHE accreditation and so on, but the idea behind it is that the distance learners located in their home country will take courses offered by some collection of the faculty from the four campuses. In our case, we will be opting out and will not be involved in that part, so it will be the three campuses of Lowell, Boston, and Dartmouth. The students will receive credit for some kind of certificate for their participation in those courses and, if they do well enough, they will receive an invitation to come to one of the campuses to complete the degree program. That will be entirely up to each campus, which will follow its usual admissions standards for Masters students, but, of course, in this case, they will have a lot more information about the performance of these students than you have in typical applications because they will have seen how the students fared taking courses from UMass faculty at the other campuses. Any campus can decide whether they want to opt in or opt out of this; it is not a requirement. Vice Provost Wolf has taken the lead in working on the curriculum because he is most familiar with Shorelight and how it works, so he has worked with his counterparts on the other three non-medical campuses, but there still remains a ways to go. Governance processes on each of those campuses will need to be involved as is appropriate to what they are doing and we believe that some kind of approval from the accreditor will also be necessary.

May I be recognized for a question, not to myself but to the Chair of the Rules Committee? The Chair mentioned that the Rules Committee was looking at the approval of online courses. I wanted to note that, in my view, one of the great strengths of our campus is that we do not have a distinct approval for online courses; we approve courses regardless of the modality by which they are taught. I would like to quote from Senate Document 08-003: “All UMass Amherst courses and programs, including those offered through Continuing and Professional Education (CPE), regardless of their SPIRE classification,” and that refers to whether they are face-to-face, hybrid, or online; “…should continue to be subject to same policies and procedures to include administration, assessment, evaluation, faculty selection, course development, and overall quality.” So, will we have a distinct approval system for online courses or will we continue to maintain what I think is a very important factor in thinking about our course approval processes?
Chair Baird: Without going to deeply into the weeds, I think that our concern was precisely this question about whether there is going to be continued faculty oversight over the approval of all courses or not. If your understanding is that there will be, I think that we think that that is good.

Provost McCarthy: The faculty owns the curriculum.

Senator Vouvakis: I think that there is also a discussion that some of the current form questions on the Course and Curriculum Management System (CCMS) might be a bit outdated and we are also thinking of how we can bring the approval process up to speed. So, it was not so much about treating online courses differently than others but more about updating the approval process to be more holistic.

Chair Baird: If I can say one more thing, one of the topics of discussion was that, in theory, a face-to-face course would not need new approval to be turned into an online iteration although there was concern about whether there would need to be some oversight so that the online implementation would meet the standards of a face-to-face course. So, these are things that we imagine that we will need to talk our way through, as we continue to get these hybrid courses and courses that faculty members are trying to transition from a face-to-face course to online course, and these are questions that were kind of being thrown around.

Secretary Peterson: A lot of this was starting with the doctrine that, yes, a course is a course, but we know that what you can do with face-to-face delivery, what you can do with a hybrid delivery, and what you can do with an online delivery are going to differ somewhat. A similar question comes up with face-to-face courses because we have a number of departments that teach a common course in five or six sections with different instructors. Then, the question becomes one of whether the experiences of the students in the different course sections are similar. So, some of us see this, in a way, as the early twenty-first-century complications of what has long been an academic problem, a balance between each instructor being able to take advantage of their own special talents, own abilities to organize different kinds of assignments, versus the need to assure the rest of the faculty that, if a transcript says that the student has taken a particular course, that the student has managed to master the basic content of the course. That is part of where this all comes in.

Provost McCarthy: I want to point out that the commitment to the quality of the online courses that Senator Baird discussed is shared very much by me, by the Chancellor, and by Senior Vice Provost Wells, who is the Director of Online Education. We are making significant, additional investments in support for faculty to help them to do the best job possible using the online technology that is available. I think that that is critical for us going forward. It’s critical to our ability to compete with other sources of online education and it’s critical to the success of the students, those in online and hybrid courses and other kinds of courses that use the online material, so that is a shared goal.

Senator Gonen Dori-Hacohen: Since we are on the topic of online courses, I have a policy question. What happens when a faculty member who taught an online course retires? Does the course belong to the department or to the faculty member? What happens with that?

Provost McCarthy: This was a topic of bargaining with the MSP and the result of that bargaining, and I think that it is the appropriate result, is that the faculty retain their intellectual property rights even if they have received a course development fee. The faculty member does continue to have first refusal rights to teach the course after that first time and, if the faculty member elects not to teach it, it can be assigned to another instructor and the faculty member would receive a royalty, a licensing fee, basically, to continue it. It’s highly unlikely that a course would live long beyond the career of a faculty member simply because we want high quality courses that are fresh. I think that the contact includes a course refresh fee after it’s been taught for three or four years or something like that.

C. ANNUAL REPORTS

Charles Schweik, Chair of the Research Library Council: Thanks for having me. I was not entirely clear about how many senators knew what this council does or the makeup so I thought that I would start with the membership. We have fifteen faculty members, at least one from each school and college and one professional library staff member. We then have nine ex-officio members: the Chair of the Research Council, the Provost, the Dean of the Libraries, the Vice Chancellor for Research and Engagement, the Dean of the Graduate School, the Secretary of the Faculty Senate, the President of the Graduate Student Senate, and the President of the Student Government Association. That’s the council. I have got to say that we have a terrific council. They are a great group of people participating this year and in past years. In our meetings, we generally do three things. They are an opportunity for council members to bring issues about the libraries to the Dean of the Libraries and the staff who are in those meetings. Second, it is a time for the Dean of the Libraries and the staff to report on what is going on there; topics are collections, facilities, finance, staffing, and services. Third, it is often an opportunity for some of the staff to present programming that they’re working on. That’s kind of the overview of the council. We have a three-page report on what happened last year. I’m just pulling out a couple of the highlights. On the collections front, there was a major Elsevier license negotiation and the outcome of that was a one-title list with Elsevier that was merged from three separate lists across the three UMass campuses. The result of that was really a more maximized content that all of the campuses got. On facilities, many of you have probably noticed that there’s been a modest improvement in the Du Bois Library lobby when you walk in. There’s a two-phased refresh of the Learning Commons that’s going on; that began last year and it’s continuing. The Graduate Commons space on the fifth floor opened last year. On staffing, there was a staff reorganization. There were two associate dean positions created and staffed, one for information resource management and one for library technology. For programming, it was the 150th birthday anniversary of W. E. B. Du Bois, so there were events celebrating that throughout the year with one in the State House. They’ve been undertaking some studies, one of database search usability, so the usability of the online searching functions, and they’re currently tracking the Class of 2021, looking at the services that they are using through the Libraries and trying to measure some of the outcomes that come out of that. So, that is a sample of some of things that came out last year. In closing, I just want to say a personal thing about this. I have been on this council for at least six years and it is a remarkable council; it’s a pleasure to go to it and I’m constantly amazed at the quality of the services that go on in the Libraries and the staff. It’s kind of under the radar – you don’t hear a lot about it – but they’re working hard, they’re doing great stuff, and I’m really proud of the Libraries. Thank you.

MJ Peterson, Secretary of the Faculty Senate: Immediately after your report mentioned the negotiation with Elsevier, which must have been a major effort because I know exactly how difficult those negotiations must be, you made mention of a price increase by the Royal Society of Chemistry. Now, they sound to me like a scholarly association. I associate predatory price behavior with big publishers. Are we going to start seeing predatory price behavior out of scholarly associations too?

Senator Paulina Borrego: I was actually the one who cancelled that. It kept me up many nights, because it’s hard to cancel things that people want, but they wanted an 8% increase every year for three years, a 24% increase over three years, so that was incredible. I did give a presentation to the Research Library Council and I remember ending my presentation with a slide, to your point, that showed the income and outcome of the Royal Society of Chemistry. I asked: are they a scholarly society or are they a publishing society? So, I leave you with that.

The report was received.

2. Annual Report of the University Writing Committee AY 2017-18, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 19-006. (Postponed from the 780th Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate on October 18, 2018)

Laura Hartenberger, Chair of the University Writing Committee: We oversee the Writing Program, which includes three components: the First-Year Writing courses, the Junior-Year Writing (JYW) courses, and the Writing Center. Last year, one of the main things that we did in the fall was complete our review of the JYW program. One of the recommendations that came out of that concerned the need for increased opportunities for connections among JYW faculty who are often kind of isolated in their departments. Maybe they haven’t taught writing before; they are content experts in their discipline. So we have been trying to find ways to bring faculty who are teaching these courses together. One of the ways that we have done that is by creating a mutual mentoring group with the support of a Teaching Excellence and Faculty Development (TEFD) mutual mentoring
grant, so there’s a group of ten JYW faculty who have been meeting on a monthly basis and kind of sharing ideas and bringing in speakers who are experts on writing pedagogy. We’re planning to find a way to share those resources with other instructors as well. We also offer a series of workshops throughout the year to support writing instruction. We changed the model of that last year to more of a conversation or colloquium style to encourage communication that faculty were asking for. We’ve also been investigating the idea of some kind of a teaching award to recognize excellent instruction. The other thing that we started to do last year was put together our First-Year program review; we’ve decided to do it as an external review, bringing in consultants from the Council of Writing Program Administrators. The reason for doing that is that it has been a while since the curriculum was updated and we want to see how our curriculum compares to other institutions nationally, how our labor conditions compare nationally, so the consultants will help us do that.

**Secretary Peterson:** You do mention the external reviewers by name. I’m familiar with a number of external review bodies and they vary. One important thing is whether the people doing the external review are reasonably familiar with the type of university being reviewed. I know of some departments at various places that have gotten bitten because they had the equivalent of an AQAD but most of the reviewers came from a small liberal arts college and there were misunderstandings. So, will the people coming for the external review be familiar with large public universities and the different problems they face than those that would be faced by, say, Earlham College?

**Chair Hartenberger:** Yes, they will be comparing us to other institutions of similar size.

**Secretary Peterson:** But do their backgrounds involve having taught at or being very familiar with public universities?

**Chair Hartenberger:** I don’t know. I can look into that.

**Senator Richard Bogartz:** In the Department of Psychological and Brain Sciences, I teach a seminar called “Consciousness” that is almost completely occupied by seniors and they don’t know what a paragraph is, they don’t know how to write a paragraph, they don’t know to transition from one paragraph to the next to have a feeling of flow in the papers that they write. I’ve invented devices to teach them these things, but it seems to me that, by the time that they are seniors at an outstanding University like this, they ought to know these basic things. So, something that should be happening, I suspect, isn’t happening.

**Chair Hartenberger:** One of the conversations that we’re having as well is to try to think of ways to support student writing, not only in the freshman and junior years, but also in the intermediate years and, especially in the sciences, sometimes the only writing courses that the students have are these required, writing-intensive classes. So, we’re thinking about ways and trying to come up with ideas for ways to reach those students who may have missed the boat.

The report was received.


**Senator Richard Bogartz, Chair of the Academic Priorities Council:** The Academic Priorities Council (APC) does two sorts of things. It receives proposals for things like certificates, concentrations, and occasionally new courses, and helps to make them better. It doesn’t do anything in the way of really prioritizing anything unless some proposal or suggestion comes along that has to do with doing away with a program or consolidating some programs in which case it does kind of get into a different kind of act; it meets with deans, and department chairs, and faculty, and so on, so it does maybe get into the process of prioritizing or at least suggesting that we really do need this – don’t do away with it – and so on. We have an experienced group of about fifteen people, many of whom have been on the council for many years, me being one of them. We are still in the throes of trying to understand how we might fulfill the responsibility of reporting on the AQADs. We’re awaiting some information about the AQADs that’s supposed to come to us from the Provost’s Office; in the meantime, we’ve been talking about it and that’s been going on for a few years now. We’ve had talks with Vice Provost Farshid Hajir and Provost McCarthy and that’s where that is. Any questions?
Secretary Peterson: When the APC is looking at a proposed certificate or proposed program, what criteria does it think through in terms how it distinguishes a strong proposal from a proposal that is rather weak and needs a lot of improvement?

Chair Bogartz: You’re talking about programs. There isn’t something like that written down. Over a period of time, listening to the various contributors, we form a judgment. It’s not that there is a list of criteria, that they have to satisfy this and they better satisfy that. That’s not the way the process goes and there haven’t been that many of those for anything in the way of a list of rules to evolve.

Secretary Peterson: You don’t have written rules but I’m asking about what sort of considerations are going through members’ heads as they look at these just to help people understand the process a little better.

Chair Bogartz: I’m not sure that I know how to answer that question. I could maybe answer a question about what’s going through my head. What I do is sort of evaluate the information that’s coming to me, information having to do with demand, having to do with the quality of the faculty there, the sorts of things that pretty much anybody, I would think, would think about. It’s very specific to particular situations and it’s hard to generalize. In terms of things like certificates and concentrations, it’s easy because there is a list of questions that the proposers are confronted with and we can look at the answers and see whether the answers are answers to the questions that were asked or answers to some other questions that were not asked. There it is easier. We almost never totally reject a certificate or concentration or course proposal but rather we give feedback to the proposer who we require to be present or send a designee on their behalf; we let them know our concerns and they adjust and make changes and eventually, sooner or later, each of these proposals gets approved. I can’t remember one where we finally said, no, this just doesn’t cut it and there’s no way to improve it.

Secretary Peterson: Thank you. This is very helpful in spreading understanding of how these processes proceed because they are central to faculty control of the curriculum and I thank the APC for taking on and maintaining that central role.

Senator David Gross: I’m curious if the APC has taken up something that was discussed earlier, namely online courses, and how they might be different from face-to-face courses. Does the APC see a need for any kind of new thoughts or process in evaluating online courses?

Chair Bogartz: The APC hasn’t taken this up so I can’t speak for the council. Our functioning is reactive in the sense that proposals come to us. If we were asked to answer that question, I’m sure that we’d have lots of interesting discussion of it, and we might want to invite certain people to come and illuminate further us on it, and then we’d take a position, but that hasn’t happened yet. My personal view is I like the stance that a course is a course and when courses are proposed and if there’s an indication of the modality that’s being used, we would take that into account of our considerations of it.

The report was received.


Kimberly Tremblay, Chair of the Commonwealth Honors College Council: This is my first full year as Chair. I’ve been on this council or its previous iteration for maybe five, six, or seven years. I’m also the Honors Program Director in Veterinary and Animal Sciences. So, one of the major things that we finally got through in this year was reinstating the requirement of the Honors Thesis which was passed by the Faculty Senate last year and now has been instated for the entering class of 2018. One of the concerns facing us is that there are a large number of Commonwealth Honors College (CHC) students in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM), particularly in the College of Natural Sciences (CNS). There was a lot of concern in several departments in CNS that they would be overwhelmed by having to honor that by having students in their labs, which, I can tell you, is a very time consuming process, and I tried to remind those departments that this was a reinstatement of the Honors Thesis, which we discontinued as a requirement for CHC students maybe four years ago, so we’ve done it before as a faculty. In response, Dean of the Commonwealth Honors College Gretchen Gerzina and the Council issued a call for proposals, which actually just went out earlier this semester,
aimed at STEM faculty and providing a financial incentive for them to create thesis seminars which could generally take the place of individual theses. It’s generally less than twelve students with a single faculty. I initiated an active conversation about the rising number of students in CHC because the resources had not changed, so the quality of advising and other resources that CHC has was effectively lowered. We think that the implementation of the Honors Thesis as a requirement will actually help to temper the numbers in CHC, which wasn’t our intention, but that’s what came out of that change. Also, a couple of years ago, I was involved, with the Academic Standards Committee, in implementing new due dates for all of our Honors Independent Study and Honors Thesis proposals, which had previously had been due at the end of the add/drop period, so our Academic Standards Committee had to review hundreds of proposals that were very complicated within two days in order to get them all in on time and there was very little time to go back and forth with students. So, now we have implemented a due date that is in the semester prior to them starting their thesis or independent study and the great thing there is that, this year, of the close to 800 Honors Thesis proposals that we reviewed and a few hundred of the independent study proposals that we reviewed, 95% of them got to the Registrar’s Office on time, while our previous rates had been around 45%. And, the quality of the proposals has gone way up, which is really gratifying to see because we’re able to have more back and forth with the students. That’s all that I wanted to say. I’m happy to take questions.

Senator Marinos Vouvakis: Did I understand this correctly that in certain departments we can now bypass the Honors Thesis and have an Honors Seminar?

Chair Tremblay: Yes, that’s actually always been the case, but there haven’t been as many of those. They’re equally as rigorous as an Honors Thesis and, as a faculty member, I’m not sure that I would want to take that on because it’s onerous in the sense that you are now responsible not just for the two students in your lab doing an Honors Thesis but for twelve students and being their advisor. But, in many cases, that has been effective, and it’s often that the topics are limited to those that are within the professor’s knowledge base, and there is a semester that is group readings, and then the next semester would be each student delving into their topic and writing their thesis.

Senator Vouvakis: May I make a comment? I understand that we have a lot more students than we expected originally to be in the Honors College but I think that, probably, instead of watering it down with the whole idea of not having an Honors Thesis with the one-on-one interaction with advisors doing actual research, I think that, probably, in certain departments we should be more selective in the Honors program.

Chair Tremblay: As the Honors Program Director for my department, I can say that individual Honors Program Directors are responsible for admitting students into the Departmental Honors program, so we do have that control already.

Senator Vouvakis: I understand that but we do require a certain GPA, a 3.7, I think.

Chair Tremblay: 3.4

Senator Vouvakis: 3.4… to me, everybody can get 3.4 in the United States. So, we can be much more selective. That way we can take away the pressure and every student will have the complete experience of the Honors curriculum.

Chair Tremblay: It is under the discretion of departments. They can set whatever limits they want on GPA for their honors students. You might ask all students in departmental honors to have already have selected and been approved by a faculty member for an individual thesis. There are lots of ways. Individual departments can do that.

The report was received.

Senator Elena Carbone, Chair of the Council on Public Engagement and Outreach: This is a council that is charged with monitoring and reviewing campus-level activities and policies related to outreach and engagement taskforce and administration. We’re made up of faculty, staff, student representation, as well as a community member. Last year was a busy one and I’ll give you some of the highlights of what we worked on. In addition to contributing to the development of community engagement sections of the UMass Amherst Strategic Plan, we also participated in the Office of Research and Engagement’s broader impact networking sessions as well as in the civic engagement and service learning strategic planning sessions. We also spent quite a bit of time talking about evaluation and engagement activities on campus in formalizing the process that would capture the statistics on faculty, staff, and student involvement in engagement. Finally, we were coordinating the overview, selection, and awarding of annual UMass engagement awards in research and teaching. Importantly, we reestablished, thanks to the Provost, the Community Award for Engagement. And, one of the things that we’ll be focusing on next year, in addition to some of these same things, is defining metrics and also, in communication, having a visual presence so that we can not only define engagement and outreach across campus, but also, really publicizing all of the efforts that we’re already doing.

Secretary Peterson: I was reading the report with a lot interest, particularly in regard to focus on tracking the activity, publicizing the activity, and some thoughts about how we would better evaluate faculty contributions in these areas that came up. The terminology then becomes more important and I found it somewhat hard to track what was what. I came up with four categories that were floating around. The first one was outreach, and basically, it says, outreach is what land-grant universities do. Then, there was a type of engagement that was defined as mutually beneficial relations between the University or other groups with which members of the University are involved with something together; that’s not an exact quote but it’s pretty close. So, does this cover things like what some scholars call community-engaged research where you go to research a problem that the community is interested in but you’re recruiting community members to help with getting information, you’re interviewing them very extensively, and that kind of thing?

Chair Carbone: Community-engaged research actually goes beyond that. One of the principles and practices of community-engaged research is not just bringing them in at the tail end but actually involving communities to identify their priorities, how they would define a project, how they would research it, how they would evaluate it, and then how they, along with us as academics, communicate that back to their community members. So, the answer is yes and more.

Secretary Peterson: Alright, so this comes to what I was thinking of as a second version of engagement regarding creation, integration, application, and transmission of knowledge for the benefit of off-campus community. So, perhaps from what you just said, this would not be designing the projects with the community but you have knowledge that you think, and they agree, is useful and so you go and you share that with them. And, then, finally, there was a phrase “engaged scholarship,” and I had no idea what that meant at all.

Chair Carbone: So, I think the key for numbers two and three is “mutually beneficial” because oftentimes the traditional view of research is top-down: researchers decide that there’s a problem, we get money hopefully, we investigate that problem, and then we tell the community, “This is what we’ve done for you.” That is certainly beneficial to us as academics as we move forward. It certainly has some benefit for the community, but they don’t have ownership over that and, once our research is done, the research ends and it doesn’t have a life beyond that. So, the “mutually beneficial” part, which is key, is to be able to make sure that, once we academics leave, the benefit carries on and quite frankly can enhance the capability of what is being done regarding a health problem or whatever problem they identify. So, those are the things that are key for the definitions. As far as “engaged scholars,” I agree. One of things that we are talking about for this next year is what is engagement and how do we define it because people define it in different ways. There’s public engagement, there’s outreach, there’s engaged research. So, we are examining consistency of language and making sure that when we communicate – and part of that is what I was saying in terms of having a visibility – we are making sure that everyone understands what engagement means and it is a little different in different disciplines.

Secretary Peterson: The only reason that I’m asking so much about this is that, if this is going to become part of the service component of evaluating faculty performance, there are a range of things that faculty do. There are a number of people, in my department for instance, who comment extensively on public affairs. They are not going out into a particular community asking, “What are your problems?” or, “Let’s design a project together.” That’s
not what they’re doing. They’re commenting in the national press. They’re giving informative talks to community groups. I just want to make sure that this kind of thing, which also has its value – it’s a different value than the community engagement – doesn’t get lost in the shuffle.

Chair Carbone: That is public engagement and, yes, absolutely, it is important that we identify what engagement means to different disciplines and then be able to have some reference to actually process that. Thank you.

The report was received.


Senator Ernest Washington, Chair of the Status of Diversity Council: Good afternoon. For the last ten years or so, I have been Co-Chair of the Status of Diversity Council (SODC). I am representing Mzamo Mangaliso, who is travelling today and could not be available to come and give the report to you, but I would like to start off by telling you what the SODC actually does. Mzamo is very fond of starting off our first meeting of the year with a statement about our charge. Our charge is to make recommendations on all matters affecting the status of diverse populations and underrepresented communities on the campus, including such matters as faculty, librarian and staff recruitment, retention, promotion and salaries, admissions and retention of undergraduate and graduate students, granting of financial aid, development of programs, any and all things that reflect upon the needs of our diverse community.

We have roughly thirty people on our council. They span everyone: they are administrators, faculty, graduate students, undergraduates: a range of people are engaged on the council and, for the most part, they’re eager and want to be involved in the programs that are being put forward to kind of solve the problems that the Chancellor mentioned earlier on, namely the racism that’s a part of our campus. Now, we take for granted that racism is a continuing issue on our campus and will be for the foreseeable future. Now, of course, we recognize that that doesn’t distinguish us from any of the other universities of our size and aspirations. Everybody seems to report the same set of calamitous events that we’re all undergoing and we all worry, as you must too, about what it is that we can do to actually make a difference. It is not clear at all right now that what we’re doing, in fact, does make a difference. These issues are the same ones that we’ve been tracking now for the last ten years and as far as I can see, I haven’t seen anything that’s going to make a difference in the way that things are sort of working out.

Last year, we took up four issues that I’d like to talk to you about. First, we’re sort of an informal sounding board for issues that people have on campus. Typically, people will come to us and they will present their issues to us; we will listen to them and very often refer them to the appropriate faculty, administrators, or whoever on campus. Last year, the issue, of course, centered around Moslem students and we spent about half the year trying to be supportive of our students here on campus. At the end of the day, we didn’t really accomplish very much. The issue kind of subsided and, like most other issues, it just sort of faded away without any real resolution.

We took up three other issues that we spent a lot of time on. One was the change to the language requirements in the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences; we were a part of the process over much of the year and we emphasized what we thought to be the importance of languages, which we considered as central to a diverse community. We spent a good amount of time discussing this with different faculty and administrators around the campus.

Then, we were interested in the issue of the campus climate survey that was done. Now, as all of you do remember, the one thing that came through clearly in the survey is that our minority students, staff, and faculty feel as if they live in a population apart. That suggests that there are serious issues here in terms of whether or not the campus is, for many of these people, a welcoming place. For example, one of the things that happened the year before last was that we lost a candidate for Dean because she didn’t think this to be an appropriate place to raise a minority kid. So, this is not an unusual event; these kinds of events are rather commonplace. We hear about them but they never quite get into the matrix of the machinery of the University.

The third issue that we work on and have been working on over the last couple of years has been the student response to instruction, that is, the evaluation process that we use for evaluating faculty teaching. We have had a
continuing set of discussions, for example, with Associate Provost Martha Stassen about these issues and they center around the issue of “Where is the data?” It turns out that Associate Provost Stassen assures that there are no differences between the ways in which our white students evaluate our white faculty and faculty of color. Now, if you believe that, I have a bridge for you in Brooklyn. Of course, there are differences. I have not met one minority faculty member here at the University in all my too many years that would tell me that they thought that there were no differences with regard to the way in which our students evaluate them and their white colleagues. This remains a continuing concern for us because we think that openness and fairness in evaluation is a hallmark of a great university. Thank you. Are there any questions?

**Secretary Peterson:** On the SERTI, that debate has been going on for a long time. I think that debate about faculty evaluation is going to get a little more complicated now – we heard from MSP and they are very happy about this – that we’re rolling toward a sort of multifactor way of evaluating that does not rely solely on the SERTI. Do you foresee any concerns about any of the other ways of evaluating what might come up?

**Chair Washington:** We don’t know what we have not seen, so we’ll have to wait and see. Our view is that, currently, the SERTI is the de facto instrument, so we may in fact disown it in some kind of way, but, for the most part, for 90% of the faculty and the departments, it’s the way in which judgments are being made. So, it’s still there, and it’s still being used, and we still don’t know what the norms are.

**Secretary Peterson:** I think that, if you read the latest Provost guidance on tenure and promotion, there’s a major push to make sure that departments do not use the SERTI only.

**Chair Washington:** I understand that and I do appreciate the effort.

**Senator Bogartz:** I was at an event at the Cape Cod Lounge a few weeks ago and there were a large number of students and other people there, many of color. A number of them made remarks to the effect that it was so hard to get the administration to move on any of these issues having to do with racism and, if they weren’t going to be moved, they had to be pushed. This seemed to me to be so far from my experience with the administration, in particular with the Chancellor. I was just wondering what the SODC and you in particular think about that. Do those remarks sound like they make sense or are they as strange to you as they are to me?

**Chair Washington:** No, they’re not strange to me at all. If you talk to undergraduates or graduate students and hear people and you hear people talk about issues of racism on campus, it’s not surprising; it’s commonplace. The university is simply, in many ways, a reflection of the larger society and, at this point in our history, you well recognize that there has been an unleashing of racism upon the land. We have to recognize it. It’s not a surprise to anyone, I think. Indeed, for example, there has been an increasing number of anti-Semitic attacks over the last several years and, I would suspect, if you took a reasonable census of racism and attacks and this sort of thing, they too are on the uptick. This is a very difficult time; we all recognize it and we all need to, I think, fully come to grips with it. That is, racism is not something that is foreign to our community; it’s a part of it. Our students struggle, many of them, with trying to find a place for themselves and I think that we ought to recognize it more fully.

**Senator Bogartz:** I didn’t make myself clear. I wasn’t attempting to make some remarks to the effect that racism doesn’t exist or of that sort. What I was perplexed by were the responses of the students to the effect that the administration of the University was somehow resistant to doing anything about this. That didn’t sound like the administration that I knew.

**Chair Washington:** I’m sorry. I misunderstood you. The reason that I really take great pride in this University is that, when I look around the country and think of universities where I might be, I think that this is the place to be. We can get that out of the way. But, I think also that the notion that we can begin to change things by doing the same old things that everybody else has done is mistaken. I think that the students recognize that it’s very difficult to actually create the kinds of environments that would be more supportive for them. You can’t do it the easy way. I think, for the most part, over the last few years, we’ve been under the impression that if we add a staff member here or do a little bit of this and a little bit of that, that this will somehow change the dynamic on the campus. I don’t think so. I do think, for example, that I find our administrators to be perfectly open people
and interested in really trying to make the University a welcoming place, but I think that people, by-and-large, totally underestimate the kind of effort that it would take to really be different.

_Senator Bogartz:_ Do you have any suggestions along those lines?

_Chair Washington:_ Everybody has different issues. For example, I mentioned one of our dean candidates and those kinds of things. We have to look carefully at the circumstances for each of the groups. We’re talking about undergraduates, graduate students, faculty, staff; each one of them has a very different set of priorities and issues and I think that we have to start with them. I think that we’ve tended to think that somehow things will filter from the top down. I don’t think that that is working. I think that we have to begin working it from the bottom up. For example, I was talking earlier about our Moslem students here on campus. They’re pretty much in the same situation that they were in two years ago. Nothing much has changed for them. We don’t have the kind of histrionics or that kind of thing from the White House anymore, but their status is still as uncertain as it was two years ago and they worry about their lives and what’s going to happen next and all of these things. But, we kind of drift away and begin thinking that somehow these top-down measures will suffice. I think that we’ve got to switch it around a bit.

The report was received.

D. **NEW COURSES (CONSENT AGENDA)**

[A consent agenda may be presented by the Presiding Officer at the beginning of a meeting. Items may be removed from the consent agenda on the request of any one member. Items not removed may be adopted by general consent without debate. Removed items may be taken up either immediately after the consent agenda or placed later on the agenda.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>CREDITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANTHRO 236</td>
<td>Games and Culture</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMED-ENG 275</td>
<td>Musculoskeletal Biomechanics</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM 286</td>
<td>Race, Inequality, and Representation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM 494XI</td>
<td>Media and Prejudice</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP-LIT 170</td>
<td>Introduction to Film Analysis: Cinematic Time Travel</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP-LIT 285</td>
<td>Global Cultures</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUDAIC 386</td>
<td>Jewish Art</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLC 320</td>
<td>Foundations of Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLC 321</td>
<td>The Practice of Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLC 322</td>
<td>Teaching ESL Writing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLC 323</td>
<td>Technology for TESOL</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURSING 202</td>
<td>Issues of Aging in a Global Society</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLSCI 372</td>
<td>Black Political Thought</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBHLTH 372</td>
<td>Maternal &amp; Child Health in the Developing World</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPP 203</td>
<td>Economics and Public Policy</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HPP 566</td>
<td>Public Health and Childhood Obesity</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MOTION:** That the Faculty Senate approve the courses ANTHRO 236, BMED-ENG 275, COMM 286, 07-19, COMM 494XI, COMP-LIT 170, COMP-LIT 285, JUDAIC 386, LLC 320, LLC 321, LLC 322, LLC 323, NURSING 202, POLSCI 372 PUBHLTH 372, SPP 203, and HPP 566, as recommended by the Academic Matters, General Education and Graduate Councils.

The motion was adopted.
E. OLD BUSINESS


(Postponed from the 780th Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate on October 18, 2018)

MOTION: That the Faculty Senate approve a Revision of the First Year Seminar Policy, as presented in Sen. 08-19 Doc. No. 19-010.

_Senator Gonen Dori-Hacohen:_ I gave you a long speech last time and it seems to be about the same thing today. I want to thank the Academic Matters Council for this report. However, I have major concerns about this proposal and therefore I urge us not to adopt this at the current stage. I want to start as I did last time: I had a student come to me saying that the high school system is rigged to pass the SAT. Basically, this First Year Seminar (FYS) is a similar thing. We want to get classes with less than 19 students so our ranking in the _U.S. News and World Report_ gets higher and – don’t get me wrong – I’m very much in favor of UMass being a Top 20 public school, but I think that this should not be achieved mechanically by meeting a ranking rubric, but by actually giving a meaningful education.

The proposal as it stands right now has two major problems from my perspective. One is them is the equity problem. Some students will get the experience of the FYS while others will get it with Teaching Associates (TOs). I think that we cannot compare faculty-led FYS with a TO FYS unless we think that TO and faculty work is the same. If a faculty job is equal to a TO job, then why do we have both? It is either cheapening the faculty’s job or demanding too much out of TO’s; personally, I believe that it is the second.

On top of the equity problem, we should discuss the quality problem or the academic problem. Looking at the goals of the FYS, I see few academic elements in them. Element A talks about engagement but does not state what is being engaged. The complement is missing here. It is unclear what resources and opportunities are for which engagement. Are social life resources for engaging spouses? Universities are known to find couples. If it is academic engagement, then it should be stated and then some relevant resources should also be stated. In Element B, again, the vague language leaves much room for speculation. Who are the others with whom students will be connected? Do we really need an academic course to explain the move from high school? Is this an academic goal? Similarly, is explaining core values an academic goal and, if so, can we at least mention these values, which are missing from the proposal? As for Element C, I do not think that instructing students on how to learn should be a central goal of a seminar. This element is actually detailed, but time management, study skills, and abilities are all important as an aside in an academic course, but not at its core. Element 4 includes “identifying and securing information about a substantive topic.” This is the only element that suggests that these courses will have actual substance to them.

This proposal creates a double-edged problem, one of quality and one of equity. It creates a two-tiered FYS: one of them is a real seminar and one is an informational course with little academic substance to it. One is run by a faculty member while the other is run by a TO. The resources for these courses are not equal, as far as I know, but we did not hear about the budget for this sweeping new mandate. Some, probably a minority of students, will receive an academic experience while others, a majority, may end up having fifty minutes a week of some loosely structured advice course led by a TO who may have entered UMass at the same time as the first-year students and is about as knowledgeable as they are. I checked and TOs can be first-year graduate students. There is no policy that suggests that TOs must be advanced graduate students. If we are to give an academic seminar for the first-year students, it should be taught by a faculty with academic substance and goals. We should aspire to have critical thinking, informed citizenry, enhanced writing, production of research, promotion of knowledge, and similar goals; these are all missing from the FYS. These may be hard to achieve in weekly, fifty-minute meetings with TOs in loosely structured meetings, but, I believe, these are the goals of the faculty-led seminars. So, if we are to create a real academic seminar, promoting education and academic rigor, I believe that we need to eliminate the TO-led FYS. So, for now, I urge us not to adopt this proposed plan and to rethink this entire endeavor to see how we can create an experience that elevates students’ knowledge and experience and not only our ranking. Thank you.
**John McCarthy, Provost and Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs:** Senior Vice Provost Carol Barr would be here to discuss this – she’s far more knowledgeable about this whole program than I am – but she was called away because of a death in the family, so I am filling in. The Senator has raised a couple of issues. One of them is about the curriculum itself. The description of it in the proposal before the Senate is not intended to be an exhaustive description of every FYS. It is intended to describe the elements that should be common to all FYS, but, in addition to those, there is the substantive material that comes from the discipline in which the FYS is being offered. So, the faculty member or the TO is also providing content from their discipline, often in a rather focused way looking at a very particular topic. As for the quality of the instruction by the TOs, the TOs are actually receiving a great deal of training in preparation to teach these FYS. For example, the TOs who work in the College of Engineering, the College of Information and Computer Sciences, and the College of Natural Sciences are all provided training by the Graduate School and the Center for the Integration of Research, Teaching, and Learning (CIRTL) program working through Vice Provost Wolf and Beth Jakob, who is an Associate Dean of the Graduate School. They work with these TOs on teaching, on course design, on syllabi, and things like that. These are actually really high quality programs that are being offered. Regarding the material about transitioning from high school to college and that kind of thing, that is common to all FYS whether they are taught by faculty or TOs. It is required of all proposals for faculty-led FYS. Otherwise, that proposal will not be approved by Vice Provost Barr and the faculty member will not be able to teach a FYS. So, that is actually a common feature of all them; you’re not going to eliminate that by only having faculty-taught FYS. As for the cost, the cost has always been born out of the central budget. The cost of Faculty FYS comes directly from the central budget. The cost of the TO-taught FYS was made part of the budgets of the colleges and is augmented whenever there is a raise with the Graduate Employee Organization or whenever there is a shift of enrollment that requires the offering of more of these and so on. So, this has been funded from day one and it is not even a mandate; it is not a required course, but 90% of students do choose to take it and our experience is that they are really benefiting from it.

**MJ Peterson, Secretary of the Faculty Senate:** I am speaking here more as an individual senator rather than as the Secretary. I do recall, a few years ago, when I was a member of the Academic Matters Council, that we had a long discussion and I remember that the Faculty Senate Rules Committee also had a long discussion about the fact that students needed some explicit training in study skills and, as I recall, Senator Bogartz was a major proponent of this, and it was on the grounds that students come from very uneven high schools and come by different ways. So, some students may not need this as much but there are students who do. I would say that the students who need it the most are ones coming from families who do not have collective experience yet in higher education. We call these students first-generation students. They didn’t grow up with the same kind of assumption that they would go to college, or the same kind of encouragement, and some of them are breaking away from their families to go to college. They don’t know everything that they need to know. We also know that, in the United States, there are a number of weaknesses in high school education that we do have to spend a bit of time repairing. Beyond that, explicit attention to study skills while you’re in engaged in looking at a specific topic, because the study skill discussions are going to be oriented around the topic, does bring things to bear for the students in a way in which they can apply those study skills immediately and really incorporate them. I do want to reiterate what Provost McCarthy said, that this is a framework, not a definition of each individual seminar. What this does is allocate authority to approve the different individual seminars either to a college or to the Provost’s Office.

**Senator Steven Brewer:** I share many of the concerns that have been raised and I have always been skeptical of the idea of trying to explicitly teach people study skills. It seems to me that all of those kinds of things need to be grounded within a particular discipline, which they may or may not be in these seminars; it sounds like they are intended to be in any case. It sounds to me like there are enough concerns here that it’s probably worth taking a longer look at this. So, I move to refer this back to the Academic Matters Council (AMC).

The motion was seconded. The question now before the Senate was whether to refer the proposal to the Academic Matters Council.

**Senator Gonen Hacohen:** I would like for it to go back to the AMC to have more substantive values added to the courses and to actually ensure that there are academic values inserted into this overall umbrella – and I
accept that such an umbrella should be exhaustive and include everything – but I think that we should have language as, I think, as a University, we have some values that can be reached throughout all FYS that should be included.

Provost McCarthy: To the Senator’s point, these courses have to work across fifty departments. We have seventy-five undergraduate majors, I think. So, the framework has to be sufficiently general to accommodate that wide range of things, so that’s why it has these compulsory elements and then the rest of it is filled in by the department, by the faculty members or TOs who are teaching the courses.

Senator Dori-Hacohen: May I ask, then, if there is language that the entire University can stand behind and is inclusive for all departments because, if we do not have such values across the University, I wonder what makes this University a whole university if we cannot find such language and values?

Senator Wilmore Webley: I think this feels as if we are trying to legislate content before the course actually gets to the people who are going to teach it. With that in mind, I think that we should go forward with the main motion and not send it back to the council. Again, we’re trying now to put specific language for each college and each department into a proposal framework where specific individuals will now decide to teach a specific course, a specific seminar course, with specific content that is generated by an individual who thinks that this is of value from a departmental and subject matter perspective. I think that we would never reach a consensus as to what should actually go into this. The second part of this is that we can put anything that we want in a proposal and we can make it look fancy on paper, but as for what is actually being taught and conveyed to the students, I am of the opinion that each department and each individual teaching these seminars will believe in the quality of the UMass education system so strongly that we won’t go into the classroom with watered-down content but actually will do due diligence for the students who truly do need it.

Senator Bogartz called the question.

The motion to refer was defeated.

David Morin, Graduate Student: I’m not a Senator, but could I be recognized? Thank you. I am a member of the Graduate Council and the Graduate Assistant for the Faculty Senate. I’ll only speak on my own behalf here as a graduate student. The Graduate Council did talk about this at our meeting yesterday in the context of tension arising between faculty and graduate students, which is in our charge. We didn’t come to any resolution on it, but I just wanted to say that this is a really excellent opportunity for graduate students and something that I think should be taken a little bit more seriously in the sense that graduate students are teaching three-credit, two-hundred-level literature courses in the English Department, for example. Graduate students are teaching all over the University. Also, I know that I personally have a good sense of resources that are available and, while I don’t claim to speak on behalf of the graduate student community, I think that this is something that graduate students are capable of doing and will be beneficial to all of us. Thank you.

The motion was adopted.

The 781st Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate was adjourned at 5:15 p.m. on November 15, 2018.

Respectfully submitted,

MJ Peterson, 
Secretary of the Faculty Senate