A. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Principal Administrative Officers

**Kumble Subbaswamy, Chancellor:** Thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer. I would like to announce that Dr. Rae Gould of the Department of Anthropology has been appointed as the campus’s first Tribal Liaison. In particular, she will oversee compliance with the federal Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA). For a very long time there has been a great effort to repatriate bones and other things collected from Native American graves and every university in the country has gone through the process of making sure that they are appropriately identified and repatriated. That compliance will still go on and, also, Dr. Gould will be a liaison to the Native American communities in our midst. Dr. Gould has been serving in this role for a few months now. Thank you.

**John McCarthy, Interim Provost and Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs:** My mother was a schoolteacher for many years, teaching second and third grade, and she lived for snow days, although, at that time, it was a full snow day, not half of a snow day. We’re in the middle of the budget process. The Deans have had their college budget meetings. Departments have created their budget plans and requests. Those budget plans and requests, and the Deans’ roll-ups and prioritizations, have then been provided to me, and we’re having meetings with the Deans periodically over the next few weeks to arrive at some decisions about what we can fund for next year.

We’re also in the middle of the AQAD season; we’ve had AQADs so far with the Departments of English, Veterinary & Animal Sciences, and Hospitality & Tourism Management (HTM). These have gone very well under the leadership of Senior Vice Provost Farshid Hajir, who has done a very good job on this. One thing that we’ve done this year is emphasize that, in addition to people who are expert scholars or scientists, we want people who had some kind of experience, say as a department chair or associate dean at a public research university because they can much more quickly understand the context in which we’re operating, and they have been very helpful because of that. I believe that, in the case of HTM, this is combined with reaccreditation, and that’s something, of course, that we do with any of our programs that are accredited. We are also launching an AdQAD, which is the administrative version of an AQAD. We’ve already done one with the International Programs Office. We’re in the process of launching one with the Fine Arts Center and they are updating a self-assessment that they had actually done several years ago but hadn’t cycled in to a full AdQAD.

I noted that, on the agenda for today’s Senate meeting, there is a very long list of graduate certificates and one graduate degree program up for approval; I think that that is a very good sign of how things are working. These, in many cases, will be online programs. It is important, on this campus, that we don’t have completely separate apparatus for online programs and face-to-face programs. We have a unitary approval process so that any program that is approved by the Senate can be offered in either modality without additional approvals, and that’s really important because, I think, it’s one of the guarantees of the quality of our online experience; I’m sure that you’ll hear more about that from Vice Provost John Wells in his section of the meeting. Thank you.

2. The Secretary of the Faculty Senate

**MJ Peterson, Secretary of the Faculty Senate:** The forces that govern the weather worked in our favor; we are here having the meeting and did not have to cancel it and scramble, so thanks to the forces that govern the weather. On April 12th, we will be going forward with an election. We will also be receiving the Annual Report of the Athletic Council. There will also be another set of course and program approvals. The theme
this month seems to be Electrical and Computer Engineering, who, I think, have rewired their entire department: every program, almost every course. That takes a good deal of energy and congratulations to them for bringing those through. Music has also been actively reviewing things. We’re going to see that Languages, Literatures, and Cultures have been doing a lot of thinking, as have many other departments. This is indicative of the willingness of faculty – not only the faculty who review the proposals, but the faculty who come up with the proposals – to think about what is needed in terms of contemporary curriculum and keep us up to date. For that, I want to thank everyone involved.

3. **The Chair of the Rules Committee**

*Senator David Gross, Chair of the Rules Committee:* The Rules Committee met one time by ourselves since the last Senate meeting. In that meeting, we discussed the ongoing effort to staff the Ad Hoc Committee on Language Proficiency (AHCLP) that the Senate created in December; we’re still working on that. Other than routine business, we talked about ways to improve attendance at Senate meetings. One of the ideas was to provide on our agendas a bit more information about what the presentations at the meetings are going to be; that might help senators as well as non-senators decide that they should actually come and listen to those presentations. We also recognize that there are a number of unfilled Senate seats, so we’re thinking of asking the department heads and chairs for those departments and districts where there are vacancies to encourage their faculty to run for those seats and become senators. We met with the administration this past Monday, March 5, and at that meeting Vice Chancellor Andrew Mangels gave us some nice information about the higher education bond bill that was reported in the *Daily Hampshire Gazette* in February. The Provost gave us a couple of updates including the budget planning one that he mentioned here as well as information about faculty hiring and some administrative reviews that are ongoing. The Chancellor discussed international programs that we’ve been involved in, including exchanges and foreign student enrollment on our campus, and he told us about some ongoing efforts toward fundraising.

4. **The Faculty Delegates to the Board of Trustees**

*Senator Marilyn Billings, Associate Delegate to the Board of Trustees:* I’m here on behalf of Delegate David Hoagland, who was unable to be here today, and want to give a quick report on the State of the University address that University President Marty Meehan gave in Boston on March 5. Several dignitaries were there, including the Governor, Lieutenant Governor, and members of the House and Senate. Delegate Hoagland wanted to let you all know that Meehan focused almost exclusively on affordability and related challenges associated with the upcoming downward shift in the eighteen-year-old demographics. He listed five points, which you may have seen, for example, in the *Gazette* the following day: online education, partnerships with non-profits pursuing missions consistent with that of UMass itself, partnerships with industries that employ the most people in Massachusetts and asking them to become more involved with us, a campaign to double the scholarship endowment over the next ten years, and, finally, the vehement advocacy against federal policies that would increase student costs and student debt, and Meehan spoke specifically about some pieces included in the new Higher Education Reauthorization Act. David said that it was a very positive event and a very polished, personal address by Meehan to the audience in a very packed room. Another thing that we’d like to remind you of is that the Board of Trustees itself will be meeting here on campus on the morning of April 6th. I’m not sure about the location yet but that will be coming forward in the near future. Thank you.

5. **The Representative of the Massachusetts Society of Professors**

*Eve Weinbaum, President of the Massachusetts Society of Professors:* Thank you. Following on Associate Delegate Billings’ report on President Meehan’s talk on Monday, I want to let you know of something else that was happening that same day in the Great Hall of the State House: Public Higher Education Advocacy Day. MSP, along with a number of other unions and the students who are involved in the Public Higher Education Network of Massachusetts (PHENOM), had hundreds of people – I think about 700 showed up – to advocate for public higher education, to ask the legislature to fully fund UMass, and also to talk about debt-free higher education. On some of those issues, I think that we’re on the same page as President
Meehan, but, on other things, I think, we have a different vision, which focuses more on UMass as a public institution that’s serving the Commonwealth and should be fully funded by the legislature, rather than thinking of ways to privatize education and find new private sources of funding. A report that just came out this week from the Massachusetts Budget Project showed that Massachusetts used to be in the bottom ten—and this is a good bottom ten to be in—states with the least student debt in the country; we used to be in the ten lowest and in the shortest amount of time Massachusetts has moved to having one of the ten highest ratios of student debt in the United States. That’s something, I know, that people were talking about a lot at Advocacy Day and we’re hoping to work with the legislature and with the Governor’s Office to come up with full funding for UMass as well as the community colleges and the state colleges and universities.

There are a couple of other announcements. On April 30th, the MSP is having our general assembly and all of our members are invited to come to that; that’s where we come up with the budget for the year and have reports on bargaining and some of the political issues, as well. Then, the weekend after that, May 4th and 5th, is the Massachusetts Teachers Association (MTA) annual meeting in Boston; the MTA is MSP’s parent union and MSP has the right to a full slate of delegates. Any of our members, faculty or librarians, are welcome to come. It’s a great chance to see the democratic process in action, put things on the agenda, and vote on the statewide priorities of our parent union, so let me know if you’re interested in participating.

Thanks.

B. QUESTION PERIOD

MJ Peterson, Secretary of the Faculty Senate: I did not go to Boston on Monday but I was watching the live-stream and was quite intrigued when President Meehan announced that we’re going to do a $200 million fundraising effort. I hope that he had let people know about that ahead of time and was wondering what plans our campus in particular had about working on this drive.

Kumble Subbaswamy, Chancellor: I did have a twenty-four-hour preview of the speech, but, to put things in perspective, he said $200 million over ten years, which is $20 million a year for the system as a whole and, say, maybe a third or so is our share, so that is really $80 million over ten years or $8 million a year. We have been raising approximately $40 to $42 million a year and then we will be going into a campaign mode in another year and a half, too, which will have a goal of $500 million or more to be raised over seven years. So, in the scheme of things, honestly, we will be doing a lot more than that as a part of our commitment to students. Of course, there will also be other components such as faculty support and capital improvements and so forth, but the student scholarships part is a big part of it as it was in our last campaign.

Senator Marinos Vouvakis: This is a question of a different nature and concerns the Institute for Applied Life Sciences (IALS) space in the Life Sciences Laboratories. I’ve heard from people that work in the Physical Plant that this building has been commissioned for a year or a year and a half or so and a lot of stuff is falling apart. Certain fixtures need to be redone and things of that sort. That really surprised me. What kind of processes do we have to make sure that the fixtures that we get, for example, won’t have to be changed every year or every other year? It worries me a lot that we spend so much money and then we hear, from people on the ground who are actually fixing this stuff, that it’s falling apart after a year or two.

Chancellor Subbaswamy: I’ll give a general answer and some others perhaps can speak to the specifics. The primary thing that has gone wrong with IALS from the outset has been the animal quarters. There was a significant part of the building dedicated to housing animals that would be used in research and, as things were going forward, it became clear that there were serious inadequacies from the very outset and this now goes back four years or maybe more. There was a lot of controversy between the construction managers at the state Division of Capital Asset Management and Maintenance (DCAMM), the designers, and the builders. Remember, this was a building project that was significantly supported by the state, so the state had control over the construction and supervision of the construction. There was controversy about whether it was design fault, whether the design had been approved by the University, those who would actually be the future users of the facility, or whether it was a construction defect, and that went on for a couple of years. We wanted to go right ahead and fix it rather than debate who did what so we agreed to a settlement of a relatively small portion from the state, and then we took over trying to get it corrected so that, for the
next fifty years, it can be a facility that significantly supports all of the advanced research that we need to do. We’ve now gone through several consulting studies to be sure of what is wrong and how it can be fixed, including a level 2 biosafety lab that’s connected and, therefore, that needs to be properly constructed. All of that work is just beginning to start, so a lot of what people are seeing is not that things fell apart but that the animal quarters were never commissioned because there was fault in the construction and some controversy over who was responsible, who was going to pay for it. Finally, we came to a settlement and it’s now being fixed. If there are other things such as fixtures and things that have gone wrong, we can take that up. Do you know any other things, Vice Chancellor Mangels?

Andrew Mangels, Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance: New construction is covered by warranties and we also have ways to go back to the contractors if there are problems. There are different ways that you can communicate concerns to us; obviously, this is one way but, also, feel free to reach out to Shane Conklin, Associate Vice Chancellor for Facilities, because we are very interested to hear about concerns and we want to make sure that we address them because sometimes the warranty period is a certain period of time and we want to understand what is going on. So, thanks for that information.

C. PRESENTATION: The Online Education Group, John Wells, Provost’s Office

John Wells, Provost’s Office: Thank you. I have a slide with few bullet points to frame out our strategic direction. We’re obviously in the preliminary stages of setting up this organization, but I do want to give you a sense of where we are going. When I met with the Continuing and Professional Education (CPE) group, one of the first comments to me was, “I thought you were telling us that we’re all going to Shrewsbury.” I said, “Quite the contrary; we’re going into the heart of the UMass Amherst campus with our online education strategy.” So, we’ll be starting out with setting up the infrastructure and resources to infuse online learning tools to establish best practices in all online courses. When I met with the Provost to discuss this position, I said that I would like every class to be an online class and what I mean by that is taking every class and leveraging online pedagogy to enhance the student experience to the furthest extent possible, and then, as a byproduct, create an online companion course, if you will, that can be taught concurrently with an instructor’s on-load course. That’s important for a couple of reasons. We’re able now to source more classes. If we’re leveraging Echo capture or other rich media tools, we’re able to deliver that richer experience to online students. Using à la carte compensation, which is something that I’ve discussed with Michael Eagen, Associate Provost for Academic Personnel, and the MSP, it’s taking your already in-load effort and just extending that in a very incremental fashion to be able to offer a wider breadth of courses. So, initially, as you can see, that allows us to really increase the breadth of our undergraduate offerings and especially our University Without Walls (UWW) offerings. It also allows us the opportunity to employ a course designer and instructor delivery model, which is important for course quality; this has already been piloted in the Isenberg School of Management in a couple of our survey classes. This model is particularly advantageous for graduate students who need some teaching experience, and online teaching experience is particularly beneficial in this marketplace, but having to reinvent and redesign the course from the ground up is not overly practical given that they are in the midst of a dissertation or whatever research projects they are involved with. So, having a faculty member dedicated to the overarching quality of that class and able to oversee graduate students deploying them would infuse some much needed quality control measures and allow us to manage the scalability of those offerings. So, as a net result, we want to be able to leverage these additional online courses to be able to meet the increasing demand for online courses and be able to develop innovative programs. As a byproduct of that elevated quality, revenue always follows. So, when people ask me if I am just increasing revenue, I always tell them, “I’m focused on quality and, I can tell you from my experience, that revenue always follows quality.” So, I will open it up to questions.

MJ Peterson, Secretary of the Faculty Senate: You’re speaking in terms of courses, but, if we look at the national discourse about the future of higher education generally and the place of online education in it, a lot of the discussion is not about single courses but about certificate programs, continuing and professional education units, online degree programs. We have some history of doing online degree programs; the Isenberg School is particularly active in that area. Do you see the University becoming active in some of these other types of online education and, if so, how does that relate to our accreditation? How does that relate to our ability to maintain quality?
**John Wells:** Well, I can say that I use a cooking analogy when I discuss the fact that I’m focused on courses initially because those are the ingredients with which we can create some interesting dishes. If you look at something that may be in demand, like a certificate, that’s a great place to start. So, if you have the courses and they are of high quality, and you can use those to assemble a certificate, and then you can stack those certificates to then offer a degree, that’s a virtuous cycle that creates a nice continuous learning pathway for a lot of students. When you ask about accreditation, as long as the faculty are qualified and the pedagogy has been vetted carefully, I feel confident that we’re not going to run into a lot of accreditation problems. Per the Provost’s previous statement, we don’t really differentiate between online and day classes, and what we’re actually doing is taking a really hard step toward blurring that line even more. So, anything that’s good enough for day is good enough for online and vice-versa.

**Senator Steven Brewer:** I’m not familiar with the term “à la carte compensation.” How does that compare with regular compensation?

**John Wells:** Well, say, for instance, that you’ve redesigned your course and it’s now online-ready. The ability to put that course online now requires marginal effort. You’ve created a companion course, but, at this point, only three students enroll. We can compensate you by the student, so the faculty member gets compensated for that additional effort but it is just incremental to their current on-load effort. The nice thing about that is that we don’t have to cancel the class. I think that a frustrating component for a lot of people who go down the online road is that they design a course, they list the course, not enough people enroll in it, and all that effort gets wasted since we have to cancel the course because we can’t generate the necessary revenue to cover the cost. This allows us to scale courses and, to Secretary Peterson’s point, we’re now able to seed some innovative programs that might take a while to reach the market, to be able to build the marketing, to be able to get awareness to the point where it does take off. The à la carte compensation, and this is something that we’re still discussing—I’m not saying that this is set in stone—but I think that it is just an innovative compensation method to start seeding some innovative offerings and to be able to start small and then grow them.

**Senator Brewer:** Do you think we’re likely to see à la carte compensation happen for face-to-face classes?

**Chancellor Subbaswamy:** No.

**Senator Brewer:** OK. When you talk about graduate students “deploying” a class, how is that different from a faculty member teaching the class?

**John Wells:** There’s not much difference other than that we would have to revisit how the compensation works. In some instances, you may pay a faculty member to design the class and then that template gets used by graduate students. There would really be no difference. The graduate student would just be able to take advantage of an already designed class and they would be the day-to-day instructor interacting with the students and doing the grading. It would really be no different than a faculty instructor and what their responsibilities would be if they were to teach the class. We would just have to figure out the compensation for the master course designer in terms of their incentives for keeping that course up to date, maintained, and in good shape for those graduate students who would deploy the class themselves but not have to design it. Really, it’s very convergent with our research mission when you’re talking about Ph.D. programs and freeing those doctoral students from having to design a number of different courses, if that’s what their teaching responsibilities entail. This frees up their bandwidth to pursue their research agenda while earning valuable online teaching experience.

**Senator Brewer:** So, just to be clear, it sounds like the idea is that what a faculty member brings to an online class and what a graduate student would bring to an online class are identical.

**John Wells:** From the instructor’s standpoint. When we create the incentives and the infrastructure in the new online group to have faculty come in and redesign their course to have it be heavily online, to the furthest extent possible, and, let’s say that you start with three students and then you grow to fifteen and
then thirty or forty and it continues to grow, at that point, I assume, the faculty member only has so many hours in the day. Now, you can employ a course-designer model where you can take that template, which is high quality because it’s infused best practices, and then you can farm it out to a graduate student who can take advantage of that high quality course design, but then you can scale and grow that program as you offer multiple sections. So, there’s a difference between course design and course facilitation. In some cases, the designer will be the facilitator, if they are one and the same, but if the graduate student is the course facilitator, they are actually leveraging the prior course design from the professor who designed the course.

**Senator Brewer:** But it sounds like the assumption is that the facilitation that the faculty member provides is not unique or distinctive in any way. Thank you.

**John Wells:** I wouldn’t say that. I think that you’ll have core content and then that facilitator can add a case or some other component to that class that will put their own stamp, their own imprint, on how they want to deploy that. We just want to make sure that the core content remains consistent. For graduate students who want to minimize that and take the playbook that’s been provided by the faculty member, and that frees them up from a time perspective, then that’s advantageous, too. I think that it would just vary based on what that graduate student or instructor who took advantage of a predesigned course wanted to do with it. I’m not insinuating that they are bound by every aspect or attribute of that class. You can modify; it just gives you a kernel, if you will, on which to build.

**Senator Ernest May:** I just wonder whether this extends to graduate programs. Is this an undergraduate initiative mostly?

**John Wells:** I would expect it to extend to graduate programs. Right now, I’m initially focused on the undergraduate side, but I see no reason for these same strategies to not be in play at the graduate level. In fact, in my prior life, I employed many of these strategies in the M.B.A. program in the Isenberg School.

**Senator May:** Right, and the M.B.A. program is very successful, but the ability of the M.B.A. program to generate the kind of positive results that it has is due largely to the fact that you can charge quite a high per-credit-hour charge because of the nature of the clientele that you’re serving, and that doesn’t really apply to much of the rest of the University except for maybe in some selective, high-demand areas. So, I know that one of the arguments for this is the democratization and decentralization of learning, which are great principles, but that can’t be done in all areas of the University at the high per-credit-hour charge that is available in Management for the M.B.A. program in particular.

**John Wells:** Well, in terms of whatever the break-even is, and I don’t want to get into too much business-speak on this, I can say that, going back to the strategy, the new M.S. in Analytics, for instance, is a day program right now that we intend to take online. We can do the captures at the desktop, in the lab; there’s a bunch of analytics exercises that will capture through Echo, and we can start to offer that online. So, if you’re in another graduate program in the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences or in the College of Information and Computer Sciences, you can do this same à la carte compensation to get that off the ground, but if you do end up growing it to the point, the compensation will be there. I know that per-credit rates vary, but they are high enough that, once you get critical mass, they will be sustainable, maybe not the extent of an M.B.A. program, but I can tell you that, in the New England area, we’re actually still rather inexpensive compared to the competition. But, based on the rates that I’ve seen so far, if we can grow it to the levels of demand that I think we can grow it, I think the compensation will be worth the effort.

**Senator May:** Since UMass Lowell has had quite a successful initiative in this area, I wonder, especially with President Meehan’s listing of this as his number one objective of five objectives, if it has some relationship to what Lowell has been somewhat successful in doing, not as successfully as our M.B.A. program, but they have a broader reach.

**John Wells:** Well, I had an initial conversation with Don Kilburn, the CEO of UMassOnline. I think that my read right now is that this market space of, for lack of a better term, commoditized, lower value offerings is being very, very crowded. The flagship program for that right now is Southern New Hampshire University.
Arizona State University has gone very high to scale on this, compressing costs. Students today are looking, more than anything, for academic viability and credibility. So, our emphasis on quality is going to differentiate us. UMass Lowell has not been going as hard in that direction as we are. As long as we pursue this strategy, I think, our differentiation will be there. We may not have the same volume of students but the margin and thus the net revenue that we are able to reinvest into our institution will be much higher.

**Senator David Gross:** I’m fairly well versed in best practices and current pedagogy. One thing in modern pedagogy that’s always emphasized is that activities and efforts in the classroom are backed by evidence. So, on your first point, you’re talking about elevating the quality of the student experience by increasing or integrating more online learning. Given that this is a residential university, what is the evidence that the student experience is going to improve?

**John Wells:** Well, I’ll give you one example: the use of Echo capture. We have a lot of feedback and we go through and read the reviews from our students. In something quantitatively orientated and technical like statistics, the ability to re-watch that lecture over and over again until they get it right has proven valuable. They’ve said, “I love the Echo capture because a lot of times, you know, the first time I heard it, it didn’t sink in so I had to go back on my own terms as many times as I needed to do it.” There is the interactive white board. Students are scrambling to write down everything that a professor says and have no inkling of what the professor said. If this has now been captured digitally and they’re actually listening to that professor and the points they are making, the students’ bandwidth has been shifted from being a scribe to actually absorbing the content and then they can go back a review the content and to supplement what they had heard in class. Those are just two examples. One of the pushbacks I get from the OEG is, “You can’t provide an online student with an hour-and-fifteen-minute lecture. That’s counterproductive. They’re not listening all the time.” I say, “Neither are the day students.” So, this is something where online education may force us to think about how we deliver that. Maybe we could chunk up lectures in more digestible units. That’s something that the instructor and professor works out with the people who are managing pedagogy or providing some online learning tools, the Institute for Teaching Excellence and Faculty Development or my group. Those are the types of best practices and it’s not just limited to technology. There’s pedagogy too and that’s outside of my unit but I do see a collaboration there and I do think that online learning can provide the impetus and insight to infuse some of those best practices.

**Senator Gross:** Just so I’m clear, you’re talking about online efforts and online techniques that are currently used in face-to-face classes and somehow those are going to be morphed into independent online courses. I don’t quite see.

**John Wells:** I wouldn’t say that they’re independent. I’d say, at least with the initial wave of courses we’re identifying, we would like those lecture captures to be able to be consumed asynchronously by not only the day students who maybe miss class that day but the online students who enrolled in the companion class. So, that’s the ability for them to access that content and we’d like that line blurred. If you get a nor’easter like we had yesterday and afternoon classes are cancelled, let the day students go online; you can stay on track and stay on task. That’s the convergence I think we’re going for here.

**Senator Gross:** One more thing is the demand you talked about; you say UWW. Is there some untapped demand that I haven’t heard about?

**John Wells:** I think degree completion is a very hot market, a competitive market. We don’t get a lot of leads from UMassOnline, but the place where we get strong leads is in UWW because there’s nothing else like it in the system. I’ve already had discussions with UWW Director Ingrid Bracey. I think we have some really exciting avenues to take there. It’s already branded for this mode of learning, so I use it as an example. I also like UWW because of the concentrations and how the schools and colleges, through the inherent structure of that program, can elevate their revenue generating efforts and the more that they can leverage my group to get their content online, the more they can offer that in the UWW mode, and then it’s up to me to figure how to market to a point where there’s more awareness and people feel that, for life experience and degree completion, UWW is the program they need to go to.
Senator Marinos Vouvakis: I have two questions. The first one has to do with the first bullet point: providing for structural resources. This is great and I think that we currently are doing that to an extent – maybe we can do it better – but the big question as to why we haven’t become a big player in the online market – other than Isenberg – is that there are no incentives for the majority of the faculty to offer online courses. It’s one thing to say that we will provide infrastructure but faculty are very incentive-based creatures. So, if I have my research and spend most of my time with my grants over the summer, what is my incentive to actually go and spend this up-front time? In order to offer the online course, you need to put in a lot of up-front time and then it will amortize over many years, of course. But what is the incentive for me to do this painful up-front work takes most people out of their routine?

John Wells: I wouldn’t call it painful. Your point is well taken. I would say, if this is an opportunity to get significant infrastructure and resources to help improve your course, higher student evaluations and a better AFR, I think, would be a good opening for faculty; to actually improve their teaching evaluations and student experiences by a significant degree would be one great step in the right direction. One thing, as I’ve walked across campus and talked to various schools, colleges, and departments, is, as you grow your revenue generating programs and those converge with your day programs, you may be looking at simplified preps. So, some research faculty may have two different preps; say they are on a 2:2 load. But, now, if they’ve grown that course within a specific program that has market demand and it’s gone to the point where it’s sustainable as a stand-alone section in terms of the enrollment, now they can offer the day class and the online class, count both on-load, it’s a much more efficient delivery for them, and they have more bandwidth for research, so there’s another benefit on the research side. Now, if you are adjunct or clinical faculty and you would like to make additional compensation, this is a very efficient way to do this; if you’re already teaching the on-load section and you can companion that out to the online realm, that’s a very efficient, high-quality additional compensation. So, on the tenure-track side and the non-tenure-track side, those are just some incentives that I think faculty would find attractive.

Senator Vouvakis: Thanks. The second question has to do with our audience. My understanding is that one of the reasons that this University is trying to move to online is that the demographics for the next five to ten years don’t look good for New England, but I would argue that the demographics for the United States don’t look good either. So, is this a model where our audience would be anywhere in the world? Is this a model that would probably be focused on the United States? Without knowing who your audience is, you cannot sell.

John Wells: That can vary by program; we have some programs that inherently target international markets and some that target a mix. I will say that, based on my experience, we will be going regional, national, international.

Senator Vouvakis: In that order?

John Wells: It will vary by program. You may have a program that’s very niche where you’re going to have to do international just to get the demand in. For something more mainstream, you would start regional and then you could grow it out. Like I said, that would vary by the program. On the marketing end in my group, we’re going to have market research and we’re going to be able to sit down with schools, departments, and program directors and give them insight into what the market dynamics look like, what the student segments look like, and provide guidance as to how to structure their programs in the most attractive manner possible.

D. UPDATE: Strategic Planning and Accreditation, Nancy Cohen, Chief Planning Officer, Chancellor’s Office

Senator Nancy Cohen, Senior Planning Officer: Thank you. Good afternoon. This presentation comes courtesy of the behind-the-scenes work of Bryan Harvey, Steve Goodwin, Bryan Beck, and the Campus Planning and Resource Committee (CPARC). Many CPARC members are in this room and have been working really hard on the strategic planning, and we have the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC) reaccreditation, as well, so I would say that the other half of the room has also been
The strategic plan refresh is an opportunity to take stock of the changes in the last four to five years. About five years ago – thank you to Chancellor Subbaswamy – we undertook a very extensive widespread strategic planning effort and that resulted in the innovation and impact strategic plan report which is very solid guidance, but it is five years old so we wanted to take a look at the current situation and the progress that we've made since then and, so, really answering the question of where we go from here. So, this is a refresh. It's not starting from scratch. We wanted to confirm the priorities that we had at that time and see whether or not there are any changes in direction or focus needed and then this would be an updated campus plan for goals for the next five or ten years. CPARC is the oversight committee and they've been working very hard. CPARC had hoped that they could meet once a month like other committees but, no, they are meeting weekly and doing lots of stuff in between. So, we started off with reviewing the existing plan and the priorities. There was some feedback in some August retreats with deans and administrators and then a variety of campus leaders have taken a situation analysis exercise to understand a little bit more about our situation. Then, we worked through working groups clustered around the areas of the prior strategic plan. Again, many of our working group leaders are here today. They pull together groups in different ways and their charge was to look at the old strategic plan and say, "Does that still seem on target and where do you think it should go in a different direction or what do you think is missing that should be added?"

I think that the hardest part for me was to amass the names of all of the people involved in each of the various working groups. Many Faculty Senate groups were consulted and in some cases the Faculty Senate group was the working group. So, this list is a draft because you may look at these and think that that person isn't on that committee any more. Please let us know. This is a work in progress because there may be plenty that we forgot. So, these slides goes over each of the working groups and who the members were and who were consulted in a various way, shape, or form to inform the process thus far. So, it wasn't able to fit on one slide. CPARC gets their own slide with the deans. Thus far, we've had a lot of input from the working groups and many discussions with some Faculty Senate councils and others. That feedback, along
with feedback from CPARC, has been rolled together into something that we're calling the commentaries. These commentaries are answering those three questions of what's new from the 2013 plan and where does the focus need to shift in the future. Those commentaries themselves are not the plan but they will form the basis for the plan and also inform as we're rolling it into the self-study in whatever relevant parts those might be. The campus plan itself will be a set of high-level priorities that will then drive unit planning in the future. So, the format features two columns: the left-hand column is basically a summary from the 2013 strategic plan and the right-hand column is the commentary for 2018 based on this feedback. You can get that at the strategic planning website, www.umass.edu/planning. Then, you click, on the left, "strategic plan refresh." You should be able then to get to this page which then has some details, information for working groups, instructions, and now those commentaries are hopefully posted on that page if you are interested. In a very short time, we will also be presenting to you the actual plan, so know that that's coming, as well.

These are just some observations, some themes, that at least Bryan and I were considering as we looked at this. One theme is to double-down. To move into the top twenty public research universities, we will need significant further efforts and improvements like those described today. Quality and value, particularly in that student experience, timely progress through the degree program, and career and life preparation are really doubly the focus that they were the last time. As well, the destination of choice, the partner of choice, and the sustainable resource strategy that we laid out last time has to be doubled down in terms of attention to those as well. Another thread that goes through there is acknowledging that we all have a stake in the progress of the university and the success and, so, really there are a lot of places where there is shared accountability and shared responsibility and, so, that's more the expectation. The last one is to be determined, to have the confidence that we've done a lot and really acknowledge how much that we have accomplished through planning and through the systems we continue to have – the annual plan and other systems – and that we are confident that this trajectory that we've set forward can be accomplished despite those challenges facing higher education today.

There are a few things that struck us as some things that we were focused on before but we are providing more focus, some things that will be a new focus, and some that are just a different twist. For example, the destination of choice, student success, career professional development, using evidence, more partnerships, and more aligning of resources were all set in motion in the last plan and we need to do more. Then, more alternative revenues; we've had a solid online program as you've heard today. A new focus is “community of choice,” that we are not only a destination of choice for students but a workplace of choice for faculty and staff, that we all form a community of those who study here, live here, work here, and that's really important, and climate is really an important part of that. Then, some things have shifted. When we started five years ago, we were in the middle of a billion-dollar building boom, and we are reaping that now, but that doesn't seem to be the situation for the future. At least, nobody has promised a billion dollars yet. Really, the focus at this point is adaptive reuse to more efficiently and effectively use the facilities that we do have as well as using analytics to proactively inform some of our actions whether it's the student success collaborative for student pre-interventions or to better allocate space or other ways. So, those are sort of some general themes.

Where are we going from here? The commentaries are out in March. The strategic plan first draft we are hoping to get out to you the week after spring break and then begin a comment period, which will be a time of open meetings and online comments and other types of exposure to get that commentary. Then, we will refine the draft and work with CPARC to finalize the draft and then complete that strategic plan before May, in April. Meanwhile, the work is ongoing in the self-study. There are a lot of pieces coming and going and we are hoping that that can be pulled together in some level of coherence by April 25th to be able to have a comment period on the self-study draft. The self-study work will continue over the summer because there are a lot of details to incorporate in terms of references, statistics, and tables and things like that. We're looking to get that out of the door September 1st because NEASC needs to have it six or eight weeks before the site visit. Then, we will have unit planning and these will be informing unit planning as we continue into the fall. That's the big picture. We're hoping to come back to the Faculty Senate to talk about what we're hearing in the comment periods and what we're going to do to finalize the plan from that point. Thank you.
**Senator Richard Bogartz:** In the CPARC meetings, this question keeps popping into my head, but I don't ask it, so I'll ask it now. What do you see as the mechanics for getting all of these transformations getting down to the level of the individual faculty members. I think that's where the work gets done to produce these additional changes in focus and how it manifests itself as transformations of the University?

**Senior Planning Officer Cohen:** My fellow CPARC members or others can chime in. I think that's part of the distributed and shared responsibility. It's not just up to the faculty, or other faculty, or those faculty, now these faculty. It's really institutional; all areas would need to look at these to say, "How can they be translated into something that will be meaningful for the unit and then, within that unit, meaningful for the faculty to be able to have those concrete actions. So, this isn't going to specify specific faculty actions, but those should come through the unit planning.

**Bryan Harvey, Chancellor’s Staff:** You asked what the mechanism is and, I think, Nancy is describing that well. If you remember, the plan that we came up with five years ago was forty-eight pages long and it tried to do everything in the world. It really went from really high principles down to, in some cases, hire this person and do that thing. That's because it was our first try and we needed to get it done in a hurry. But, this time, I think, what's going on right now is at the top of that pyramid. What are the general directions of the campus? Really, a key part of this will be in the fall and the spring when unit planning occurs because that's the point at which, in colleges and administrative areas, the question will be, "Here's all the things that the campus is trying to accomplish but everybody doesn't do everything, so what is it that my department sees that resonates with where we're trying to go and how are going to fit into the larger puzzle?" So, really, what's going on now is setting directions more than it is answering the question of how an individual plugs in, which is a little bit later on in the process. Does that make sense?

**Chancellor Subbaswamy:** Part of my response is that, as one of the slides said, “the same thing but more so” in that we have been talking about student success repeatedly for the last four or five years at all levels: the campus level, the college level, the department level. The degree of penetration has been different: in some colleges more so, in some departments more so, and with some faculty members more so. So, this will then be a full cycle of saying, “Yes, it’s still the same.” More so, we’ve talked about the fact that our overall graduation rate, for example our six-year graduation rate, is right around 78%. If we look at the top twenty institutions that we are trying to be on par with, they are more like 85% or 90% so there are lots of ways that we still need to do the extra work. We’ve talked about research areas that we have been emphasizing, where there has been alignment with the state and the national priorities; that has led to further investments and, so, again, on that score we are doing more. In terms of looking at alternative sources of revenue to invest, we’ve talked about online education as one avenue we’ve asked the state for more money and this will form the basis for doing that. So, in that sense, none of this is completely new because we have really been talking about this for last five years not only at the overall campus level but at the college level and the department or unit level, as well. So, hopefully, when we do go back to this in the fall, it will be more of the same but more focused.

**Senator Marta Calás:** I’ve been trying to be patient and silent from the moment that I got here today. I came late because I was coming from my class that ends at 3:45, and I was just so excited by the class that I had today because everything that I was teaching was actually in the news. I was teaching international management. Trade is very central to my class and has been in the news. Things that I taught last year I couldn’t teach this year; I had to change the class, and I change it completely almost every year, because the world changes constantly. Therefore, I had this incredible class of students who are totally embedded in things that are happening in the world and I am trying to take it to the academic side of the world so they can process it in a more educated form. Therefore, the idea of being in the classroom for me is completely part of the idea that we are in a university in which we are able to do something that other places in the world that produce widgets are not doing because that’s not their job, that what we do and what we are trying to do is educate people so that, when they come out of here, they are really fantastic because they have learned so much in whatever field and also because they love what they have learned and that is how they are engaged with the rest of the world. I don’t think that any of this can produced from the top down talking about how we are going to make money. All of this online conversation: I have heard it for ten or fifteen or twenty years and it is very much the same even if we may have different technology. I don’t think...
that it can come from the top down or from however many strategic plans we do if we don’t believe that what we are doing here is a special kind of thing. The faculty are the center, the bottom, of this thing because the students leave but we stay and I don’t think that you can start from the top doing these things. I hear these things but, even though I’ve been in this business for many years, I cannot relate anymore. I think that we have to start, at some point, to talk about education and teaching and what we are doing in our research and bring it to the center of the Faculty Senate. Otherwise, what is the point of the faculty being here?

E. 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>ANIMLSCI 256</td>
<td>Equine Management II</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANIMLSCI 402</td>
<td>Equine Rehabilitation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMED-ENG 230</td>
<td>Statistics and Dynamics</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOURNAL 339</td>
<td>Broadcast News Reporting</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOURNAL 495</td>
<td>Social Justice Journalism</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STOCKSCH 268</td>
<td>Small Farm Husbandry: Cows, Sheep and Goats for Meat</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Production</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UWW 377</td>
<td>Child Abuse &amp; Neglect</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTHRO 546</td>
<td>Critical Knowledge Practices: Teaching, Research, Movements</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPSCI 655</td>
<td>Performance Evaluation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINGUIST 631</td>
<td>Teaching English Pronunciation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCH-MGMT 681</td>
<td>Derivative Strategies and Risk Management</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCH-MGMT 682</td>
<td>Hedge Funds</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCH-MGMT 683</td>
<td>Private Equity and Venture Capital</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCH-MGMT 684</td>
<td>Sustainable Finance: Environmental, Social, and Governance Issues on Capital Markets</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCH-MGMT 685</td>
<td>Emerging Markets</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCH-MGMT 686</td>
<td>Real Assets: Real Estate, Infrastructure and Beyond</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCH-MGMT 687</td>
<td>Managing the Managers: Asset Allocation, Funds of Hedge Funds and Due Diligence</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCH-MGMT 711</td>
<td>Strategic Technological Innovation Management</td>
<td>2-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MOTION: That the Faculty Senate approve the courses ANIMLSCI 256, ANIMLSCI 402, BMED-ENG 230, JOURNAL 339, JOURNAL 495, STOCKSCH 268, UWW 377, ANTHRO 546, COMPSCI 655, LINGUIST 631, SCH-MGMT 681, SCH-MGMT 682, SCH-MGMT 683, SCH-MGMT 684, SCH-MGMT 685, SCH-MGMT 686, SCH-MGMT 687, and SCH-MGMT 711, as recommended by the Academic Matters, General Education and Graduate Councils.

The motioned was adopted.

F. NEW BUSINESS

1. Special Report from the Special Nominating Committee for Secretary of the Faculty Senate, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 18-033.

(As stipulated in the Bylaws, this report will be received at this meeting, and a vote will take place at the 777th regular meeting on April 12, 2018.)

The report was received.
CONSENT AGENDA (ITEMS 2-15)

[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.]


The motion was adopted.

The 776th Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate adjourned at 4:49 p.m. on March 8, 2018.