ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Principal Administrative Officers

Kumble Subbaswamy, Chancellor: We are coming to the end of the semester. On Monday, we had a visit from the Chair of our New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC) accreditation site visit committee, President Susan Hunter from the University of Maine. It was a preliminary visit and she got to know all of the people who are working on our self-study and strategic plan oversight and so forth; Provost McCarthy, I think, will be saying something about this. Then, there is the agreement with Mount Ida College that keeps many journalists occupied and, frankly, we’re focused on students and we’re focused on programs; I’m letting journalists and the politicians do their thing and I’ll do my thing. Thank you.

John McCarthy, Interim Provost and Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs: Good afternoon. As you know, Dean Mark Fuller of the Isenberg School of Management (ISOM) has been appointed by the Chancellor as the Vice Chancellor for Development and Alumni Relations. Senate Document 90-029C, which I recall from my time as Chair of the Rules Committee, describes the process for appointment of interim deans. It requires that the Provost consult with the school or college personnel committee and the school or college heads and chairs. I sent out an email three minutes before this meeting to the ISOM heads and chairs and the personnel committee asking them for their input. I asked them to get it to me by May 7th. That’s a really short timeline but we really need to get moving on this. Of course, anyone else is free to send me their suggestions or thoughts on an Interim Dean including, of course, the other ISOM Faculty. Yesterday, I made a visit to Mount Ida College and was accompanied by Associate Provost Deborah Gould, Associate Provost Michael Eagen, and Senior Vice Provost Carol Barr; the four of us went there and spent the entire day meeting with the faculty in Veterinary Technology as well as about one hundred of their students in that program. More may be said about this later when the motion is brought forth by the Rules Committee. It was a really interesting experience to see faculty who are so dedicated to their students, so attached to them, and also students who are so committed to that profession. Thank you.

Kumble Subbaswamy, Chancellor: I do apologize; actually, I should have been the one to announce the appointment of the Vice Chancellor, so I do apologize. This goes to show where my mind is these days. This is a very important appointment and I do want to say a couple of things about it. Lately, major universities have been going on this somewhat unusual route in which deans, particularly business deans, have been tapped for the vice chancellor of development jobs. The most recent one was the University of Wisconsin, a really major powerhouse in public university fundraising. Prior to that, my own alma mater Indiana University went to the same model and it has been a very successful model. They bring, among other things, a great deal of knowledge of the donor base but also the dean’s perspective because, honestly, all of the fundraising, in spite of however we think of it, is done at the dean’s level or chair’s level, so having a dean’s perspective coming into that job is also extremely useful. Of course, they have to be completely supported by a group of professionals in the Development staff and we do have a great team. As we come to the next fundraising campaign, which we will be announcing in probably a year or a year and a half’s time, we do need what I’ll call a cracker-jack team of the Vice Chancellor and the Development staff. So, I’m extremely pleased that Mark Fuller agreed to take this job and I think that the University will be very well served by his taking on that job. Thank you.

Andrew Mangel, Vice Chancellor: I’ve mentioned the Human Resources business partners, four new positions that we are funding as part of our initiative, some of which emanated from the Joint Subcommittee on Administrative Costs and Services (JSACS) recommendation to address some communication issues and different process issues that we have in Human Resources. We are very excited that we’ve got four offers out to four very qualified candidates, one who is an internal candidate and three who have labor union and employee relations and overall compensation backgrounds. We’re very excited to announce that we hope to have them onboard in about a month or so. We also have an offer out to a person coming from the City of Springfield who is going to be helping us with our labor relations functions. As many of you are aware, Nick Marshall retired recently and the new person is going to be a great addition to the labor and employee relations functions. Lastly, I just wanted to mention that we had a really fun event at the College of Nursing
where Jeff Hescock and Ann Becker and Dr. George Corey and Dean Stephen Cavanagh gave out pins to all of the juniors and seniors in our Nursing program for their help on the vaccination clinics and the great work that they did both for meningitis and for flu. They’ve just been absolutely key in helping us immunize over 7,000 students on campus during the last year. So, that was a really neat event and it was something that the students really found to be rewarding. Thank you.

**Martina Nieswandt, Associate Vice Chancellor for Research and Engagement:** I have a couple of announcements from the Office of Research and Engagement. First of all, over the summer, we will implement a new electronic administration system for pre- and post-award processes that will make them more efficient. The second part is parallel; we are doing some internal restructuring and reorganization and improvement of processes. Let me give you an example: one of the things that we are currently doing is discussing different kinds of deadlines for proposals because our peer universities already have these implemented and we want to be more efficient in our work with you and the faculty in general and the research administrative support staff across the colleges, schools, and departments. We are looking, for example, at defining different deadlines for single-PI proposals and more complex proposals. We are currently in the process of having focus groups with faculty and we invite all of you to participate in some of these focus groups. I have some dates here to pass on: May 1st, 2nd, and 17th, at different times of the day, so I hope that we’ll see you there and get your input on what kinds of processes we should implement over the next months. Thank you.

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

**MJ Peterson, Secretary of the Faculty Senate:** The Bylaws specify three elections that must occur at the first meeting of the Senate in the fall. They further specify that the Senate needs to be notified about those elections at the last meeting in the spring. So, pursuant to those prescriptions in the Bylaws, I want to inform you that, at the first meeting in September, we will be proceeding to elect an associate delegate to the Board of Trustees. Senator Marilyn Billings who has been serving in that office with great distinction for many years now is not running for re-election, so it is an open seat. We will also be proceeding to the election of one at-large member of the Rules Committee. Senator David Gross, who has also been serving with great distinction, including as Chair of the Rules Committee, now comes to the end of three consecutive years of service on the Rules Committee and, under the Bylaws, gets to step down and someone else gets a turn. Then, finally, as we do every year, we will need to elect, from among the five at-large members of the Rules Committee, a Chair of the Rules Committee. Now, the four continuing at-large members are Bruce Baird, Rebecca Spencer, Marinos Vouvakis, and Wilmore Webley, but it is possible that whoever is elected in the fall could also be elected Chair. The Bylaws further specify that those interested in putting themselves in nomination or recommending someone else for nomination should communicate to the Faculty Senate Office between now and the beginning of September, most conveniently by email to secretary@senate.umass.edu. Thank you.

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

**Senator David Gross, Chair of the Rules Committee:** The Rules Committee met twice since our last Senate meeting. At the first of those meetings, aside from routine business, we met with John Wells to discuss in a bit more detail the move to the Online Education Group that he presented to the Senate on March 8th. At the second of the two meetings, we discussed the potential candidates that we might ask to assume roles on the Rules Committee as well as the Mount Ida Veterinary Technology program that will come before you today. In addition, at that meeting, we met with representatives from the Professional Staff Union (PSU) and the United Staff Association (USA) at their request. Then, the Rules Committee met with the administration on April 23rd. There, we discussed the Mount Ida purchase, particularly the Vet Tech program and our commitment to the students who are in the Vet Tech program. We heard about the undergraduate mood on campus and the impact of the “Hate Has No Home” initiative. Then, finally, we met with the University of Maine President Susan Hunter, who, as the Chancellor told you, will be chairing the NEASC site visit team that are coming to campus in October.

4. **The President of the Student Government Association**

**Timmy Sullivan, President of the Student Government Association:** Hey, everyone. I am the newly elected President of the Student Government Association (SGA). I just donated blood, so I hope that I don’t pass out in front of you all here, but, if I do, don’t be alarmed; I’ll be fine in a few minutes. I just want to introduce myself. I don’t really have much to report out to you but I would like to take this opportunity as an introduction. I’m a sophomore studying Political Science, Spanish, and History. I’ve sat on some of your committees through my capacity at the SGA before, so it’s great to see those of you I know and, to those that I don’t know, I would like to meet you at some point, so please reach out to me. My Vice President Nathalie Amazan and I ran on a platform for students of affordability, sustainability,
restorative justice, and supporting marginalized students on campus. These campaign promises and values that we hold have been manifesting through the various projects that we’ve worked on already in our two years on this campus, some projects that we’ve outlined for our two remaining years on campus, and then some longer-term plans that we hope continue on with the students that inherit our legacy. What we’re most excited about though is the University’s commitment to shared governance which manifests through the Wellman Document and is the reason that we have a lot of students sitting on these committees and councils with you, so we’re excited to work in partnership with you all to make sure that we’re supporting students and serving students to the best of our abilities and meeting all of those needs. So, thank you for allowing me to take this time. If you all have any questions or collaborative opportunities or would just like to get coffee and say hello, my email address is sgapresident@umass.edu and Nathalie’s email is sgavicepresident@umass.edu. Thanks.

B. QUESTION PERIOD

Senator Marinos Vouvakis: I would like to ask the Provost or the Chancellor, if they know, whether the vacancy in the Isenberg’s Dean position will be filled with an outside search soon. What are the plans? I would imagine that this might be a perfect time to have an outside search, an open search; with the new addition to the Isenberg building, it’s really easy to advertise Isenberg these days.

John McCarthy, Interim Provost and Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs: As I said in my remarks earlier, we will have to have an interim dean because the position vacancy is going to occur so soon; there’s not enough time to conduct an outside search. It has been the practice on this campus for some time, I believe, for decanal vacancies to be filled by national searches and I would expect that to continue in this case.

Senator Vouvakis: I understood that aspect. If we will have an open search, when would that be? Would we have to wait for four or five years or would it be half a year?

Provost McCarthy: No. Actually, Faculty Senate Document 90-029C – and I know this because I wrote it, collaborating with Susan Pearson, when I was Chair of the Rules Committee – makes it very difficult for the Provost to maintain a protracted interim dean situation. In fact, it is basically impossible to do it for more than two years. The Provost would have to be called before the Senate to explain the reasons for the delay.

Senator Vouvakis: So, are your plans to wait and have an interim dean for two years? What’s the earliest time that we will be looking for a new dean?

Provost McCarthy: I intend to conduct a search during the coming academic year.

Senator Vouvakis: Thank you.

C. ELECTION

PRESIDING OFFICER OF THE FACULTY SENATE

NOMINEE: Frank Hugus, German & Scandinavian Studies

President Officer Hugus yielded the chair to Secretary Peterson for the purpose of conducting the election for Presiding Officer. There were no additional nominations. Frank Hugus was elected by acclamation.

D. ASSUMING OF THE TEACH-OUT OBLIGATION REGARDING THE VETERINARY TECHNOLOGY PROGRAMS AT MOUNT IDA COLLEGE

MOTION: That the Faculty Senate approve the Assuming of the Teach-Out Obligation Regarding the Veterinary Technology Programs at Mount Ida College, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 18-060.

John McCarthy, Interim Provost and Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs: Yesterday, as I mentioned, several colleagues and I went to Mount Ida College to meet with the faculty there and the students, as well. These students are the largest group of students that have been left high and dry as a result of the impending closure of Mount Ida College. Mount Ida is not financially viable, it will not be able to continue, and these students are not currently able to continue their education there. Those students had very limited options that were available to them, particularly
because most of them are Bachelor’s students rather than Associate’s students and most of the Veterinary Technology programs in the state are at community colleges. The only other four-year institution with such a Bachelor’s degree is Becker College, a small college in Worcester County that wouldn’t be a good fit and doesn’t have much capacity. There is a connection between veterinary technology as a profession, and as an area of study, and our land grant mission. The best practices for instruction in veterinary technology were actually developed at Purdue University and they still have a program there. Another major land grant university with a vet tech program is Michigan State University and you can find several others that have this kind of program, as well. As you know, we have a Department of Veterinary and Animal Sciences and it is not a typical land grant animal science program as it is not so much about dairy cow husbandry and things like that but much more about biotechnology and pre-veterinary studies. Some of those pre-vet students are attracted by the possibility of veterinary technology – there are currently obstacles to them becoming veterinary technicians – so we’re thinking about this possibly for the long term, as well. I just got an email from our legislative liaison Chris Dunn who said that the Massachusetts Biotechnology Council is really interested in maintaining this vet tech program because their member companies employ so many veterinary technicians and technologists. We, of course, employ them ourselves in our animal care facility; they don’t just work in veterinarians’ offices. Mainly, our point right now is to ensure the teach-out of these students. They have very fine, dedicated faculty; several of them are veterinarians and there is a veterinary technologist with advanced degrees. We think that this is an appropriate thing for us to do. Those students will be taught out on the Mount Ida campus using the excellent facility that they have there that was built specifically for this purpose. The students will be taught by that faculty. We will also provide those students with some general education courses and we’re working on developing a housing and meal option for them since so many of them come from out of state or are too distant from Mount Ida to commute to it. Does anyone have any questions or concerns about the program?

*Senator David Gross, Chair of the Rules Committee:* Can you say a word about the Mount Ida faculty who will be teaching? I’m curious about their status over the course of the next three years and then subsequent to the three years.

*Provost McCarthy:* We are offering those faculty positions for two years; these will be visiting positions. At some time at the end of the first year or the beginning of the second year, we will have to make a decision as to whether we want to continue this program long-term. If we do that then, those faculty that we need and those that are qualified will be given longer-term positions. I haven’t seen every curriculum vitae, but, because they’re in an institution with a four-and-four load, most of them have not accumulated a record of research that would be typical of tenure-system faculty on our campus, but they would be well-qualified as lecturers, senior lecturers, and other titles that would be appropriate to them. That would be a decision for the faculty in Veterinary and Animal Sciences to make if we decide to continue the program long-term, so they would then be fully integrated into our faculty and into the bargaining unit though with a work location on that campus.

The motion was adopted.

E. **CALENDAR**

*Senator Marinos Vouvakis:* I had prepared a document that I asked the Senate to distribute. My understanding is that is wasn’t up there; I hope that it will be in the Secretary’s Notes this afternoon. So, this document basically reflects that I don’t want to amend anything on this motion; I want to basically jump-start a discussion on the curriculum. I did spend a couple of evenings doing some research and you will see the results of that research that I have on that document; I found out that a lot of the things that we’ve been told might not be based on facts. Also, in that document, you will see that I have done extensive comparative studies of other schools, when their semesters start, when their semesters end, and how long they are. The conclusion is that we are the only public university on the Eastern seaboard that has a thirteen-week semester except for the University of Rhode Island. I also looked at the major public universities in the Midwest and in the West and, again, came to the same conclusion. I feel that a thirteen-week semester does not promote student learning. I do feel that, and I have some research there to show how I drew this conclusion, especially when it comes to hierarchical curricula, like curricula in the STEM and professional fields in which you have to take this course to go on to the next one and so on, there is a cumulative effect that basically lets students down. I feel that this has a potential, in the long run, of damaging our University’s reputation, but I think that it probably does help our operating budget. Interestingly, this change happened during a major economical downturn. My research indicated, and I was looking at documents from the Faculty Senate Office, that the last time that we had a fourteen-week semester was Academic Year 2008-2009. Before that, some years we might have had a fourteen-week semester for one semester but not the other. Some years we might have had a fourteen-week or thirteen-week semester depending on the day the particular class was taught, whether it was on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays, or on Tuesdays and Thursdays and so forth. I also want to come back to the issue of the Five College Consortium; I looked into that and I would like to
thank the Registrar for actually providing me with the documents and guidelines. There is no agreement; if there was an agreement, it should have been ratified by this body. It is a guideline and I think that guidelines are guidelines. There is no need for renegotiations or anything like that.

**Frank Hugus, Presiding Officer of the Faculty Senate:** Senator, do you have a comment specifically relevant to this particular motion?

**Senator Vouvakis:** Yes, my comment would be that I can actually make a motion to amend this calendar, but I don’t want to do that. I would like to make my presentation. If not, I will move to amend and we’ll have a vote.

**Presiding Officer Hugus:** An amendment would be appropriate at this point.

**Senator Vouvakis:** The amendment would be that we go to a fourteen-week semester for 2020-2021. I don’t want to do that, but don’t push me; that is what I am trying to say. This is an issue that I know is very dear to many of you, especially for us in the STEM area and in Engineering, so I want to start this discussion. My hope is that the next calendar that we will draft, which will be the calendar for 2021-2022, would be a calendar that is appropriate for the caliber of University that we are. Thank you.

**Senator Marta Calás:** There are many things that I could say about what just happened but I won’t. I just want to ask a question about the calendar. One calendar issue, for this particular year, is that we are going to start the break on the Wednesday before Thanksgiving, which would be a change from having the whole week off. Is this change only for this calendar or is this going to be the practice from now on?

**Patrick Sullivan, University Registrar:** Thank you. For the calendar that we have here, it is not a philosophical change; it’s a practical change. We have to get sixty-five days in after Labor Day, so, speaking for the Calendar Committee, I intend that this change is only for this year. The reason that this happened is that Labor Day is as late as it can possibly be in 2020.

**Senator Calás:** In fact, when we had this discussion before, about whether it was a good idea to have the complete week-long break or have the break start later in the week of Thanksgiving, my thought was that, actually, in certain years we could have the whole week off and in other years we could not have the whole week off and that that would solve the problem; that’s why I asked the question. That makes a lot of sense at least from my point of view.

**Senator Monika Schmitter:** First of all, I want to say that I’m really happy about the movement to the later withdrawal deadline; I think that that’s a great thing. To return to the business about the semester being thirteen weeks or fourteen weeks, I think that it’s fine to look at it, and we just haven’t seen the data in all of that, but I would be cautious about making sure that we consult everybody on the faculty because I feel that thirteen weeks is already a long time for our students; I don’t really feel that another week would be helpful and I feel strongly that we should abide by the Five College calendar. So, I do think that these are debatable things that should not be changed just because one person or one set of fields believes so, but I’m perfectly open to the idea that we should look at the data.

**Senator Vouvakis:** I have a comment on that point. There is a Faculty Senate document, numbered 17-030, which outlines the principles for creating academic calendars. The first principle is that there shall be a provision for sufficient class meetings that will meet the Carnegie definition of an academic unit. The Carnegie definition of an academic unit is derived from 120 hours of contact time with an instructor, which reduce to credit hours, and I’m quoting from the Carnegie document, “a typical three-credit course, for example, that meets three times per week for a fifteen-week semester.”

**MOTION:** That the Faculty Senate approve the 2020-2021 Academic Calendar, as presented in Sen. Doc. 26-18 No. 18-061.

The motion was adopted.

F. CAMPUS PLANNING AND BUDGETING

**Professor Jennifer Normanly, Chair of the Campus Planning and Resource Committee:** I’ll give a brief overview of the report that we submitted last week. The NEASC self-study involved a strategic plan refresh which the Campus Planning and Resource Committee (CPARC) was involved in; we extensively and regularly reviewed the drafts that
were organized primarily by our Senior Planning Officer Nancy Cohen, who is going to present the strategic plan to you shortly, along with Bryan Harvey and, more recently, Deputy Chancellor Steve Goodwin. There were many working groups, many opportunities for campus input, student groups, Faculty Senate councils, deans, department heads; Nancy organized all of that and kept it on track, so I wanted to acknowledge that effort on her part. Our budget planning process: we basically focused on a survey of heads and chairs about the budget process as it has been unfolding this year. What it revealed to us was that heads and chairs used the information provided by the Office of Institutional Research to varying degrees. Part of the ongoing CPARC activities will be a conversation about what’s the best evidence to use, what’s most useful to departments, deans, and administrators as far as developing budgets and strategic plans. Lastly, the Joint Subcommittee on Administrative Costs and Services (JSACS) didn’t formally meet last year—it’s been rolled into CPARC activities— but, as Vice Chancellor Mangels mentioned, there was quite a bit of activity that was informed by previous years of JSACS activities, especially around Human Resources processes, so they were very busy and they made a lot of substantive changes. So, next year, when we aren’t doing a strategic plan refresh, we’ll focus on the budget process and the administrative costs and services efficiencies. Thank you.

**MJ Peterson, Secretary of the Faculty Senate:** This has been a very heavy-lift year for CPARC because of the confluence of the NEASC self-study, which will now be our prompt for periodically taking a look at our strategic plan. It works out nicely; we get reaccredited for a ten-year period and NEASC requires a kind of midterm review in the middle of that, so every five years we’ll be prompted by this need to prepare documentation for an outside body to do this planning. I want to acknowledge the very large number of people who worked on this but also the very large amount of activity done by the members of CPARC as it was monitoring the planning process, doing this work on the budget, and essentially taking on what is one of its heavier loads in a working year.

The report was received.

**G. SPECIAL REPORT OF THE CAMPUS PLANNING AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE (CPARC)**

**Professor Nancy Cohen, Senior Planning Officer:** You all have the revised strategic plan on the Faculty Senate website. Basically, what you see is different from the initial version. Although the overall format is pretty much the same, there are a lot of subtle differences based on the feedback. We got about 120 comments. We did about seventeen forums and visits to hear back from all sorts of campus stakeholders in live format. So, we’ve made many changes to the document. Some of the changes were just to clarify wording while others were to be more inclusive, so there were several places where we were more inclusive of the populations we serve or the fact that we do a great deal in our local area as well as globally. We also expanded some of the descriptions that we have for our graduate students as well as some of the work that we do in outreach and engagement. Also, we sought to be much more inclusive of the work that we do in fields outside of the STEM fields, so hopefully you see that in the revised version. As MJ said, this has been the product of a lot of individuals and a lot of groups, particularly the working group leaders, who really put in a lot of effort from the beginning starting last semester. I want to acknowledge Andy Mangels, Mike Malone, Martina Nieswandt, Carol Barr, Enku Gelaye, Barbara Krauthamer, and Anna Branch; they’ve been working throughout and we appreciate that. Of course, CPARC did a lot of heavy lifting and met many more times than they bargained for in September; we really appreciate that and all of the efforts of Jennifer Normanly and the rest of the group. Also, I want to acknowledge the work of Bryan Harvey, Steve Goodwin, and Bryan Beck. This really is an excellent foundation. When you do end up seeing the self-study, which may be out next week, you will see that there’s a lot of language, that the projection of almost every section comes from the strategic plan or the strategic plan’s working groups. So, it’s been very useful and informative for our self-study document.

**MOTION: 27-18**

That the Faculty Senate receive the Special Report of the Campus Planning and Resources Committee on the Campus Strategic Plan 2018-2023 with thanks for the work of its coordinators and the contributions of the members of its workgroups, and the others who contributed to its formulation. The Faculty Senate supports the goals and commitments set out in the Campus Strategic Plan 2018-2023, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 18-063.

The motion was adopted. The report was received.

**H. ANNUAL REPORT**

Senator Maria Tymoczko, Co-Chair of the University Press Committee: You’ve got the report. Once again, we’ve published a lot of good books. We had a bumpy year at times and we are moving forward at the moment. There are a number of us here who can help answer questions if you like.

MJ Peterson, Secretary of the Faculty Senate: I’m delighted to see that your financial calculations turned out to be exceeded and that the Press is doing better than you expected. I’m curious about two things. You pointed to the importance of the Press’s ability to be able to do short digital press runs, to do printing on demand, as an element of staying financially viable. You also pointed to the rising share of revenue now coming in from electronic copies of the books and you mentioned membership in something called the University Press Content Consortium. I wonder if you could explain how these work and why it is that they are contributing to the good results.

Mary Dougherty, Director of the University Press: Essentially, what you’re asking about is the revenue mix. Short-run digital printing allows us to print only enough copies so that we don’t have excessive stock, which ultimately costs us money in warehousing and, unfortunately, if it doesn’t sell, it costs us money to pulp the book, so we don’t print exactly on demand. We print about three-hundred books when a book first comes out and then, if we exceed that, we can fulfill the orders easily. But, every book that we do, and this is part of the XML workflow that Vice Chancellor supported when I first arrived in 2014, every book that we publish is now available as a print book. They’re also available as hardcover library books; the hardcover provides durability. And, then, all of our books are available as two kinds of e-books: they’re available as PDF e-books for research libraries and public libraries and, recently, they’re also swiftly becoming available on your Amazon Kindle or your iPad. So, when we contribute books to the University Press Content Consortium, which name I should have updated to Project Muse, then they’re available just like items in JSTOR, so our books are available to libraries across the world. In fact, I was just at a Muse meeting yesterday. It’s a wonderful resource.

Professor James Smethurst, Co-Chair of the University Press Committee: I might add that it’s a very important advance, I think, because all of us who work in book disciplines, especially in this current period, have had the problem of publishing a book and it’s available in hard-cover for $110 or $140 and even the paperback is exorbitant. We want actual people to read our books and that doesn’t happen; then the book is only in libraries and that’s not optimal for us as scholars or for the Press economically.

The report was received.

I. 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>CHEM 103</td>
<td>Science of Craft</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 431</td>
<td>Explicit Instruction Math Methods</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC 494DI</td>
<td>Making Sense of Educational Data</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGIN 100</td>
<td>Introduction to Engineering</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HISTORY 364</td>
<td>Gender &amp; Race in US Social Policy History</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HONORS 323H</td>
<td>Junior Year Common Experience</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAPANESE 436</td>
<td>Contemporary Japanese I</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAPANESE 437</td>
<td>Contemporary Japanese II</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOREAN 115</td>
<td>Beginning Korean I</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOREAN 125</td>
<td>Beginning Korean II</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOREAN 235</td>
<td>Intermediate Korean I</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOREAN 245</td>
<td>Intermediate Korean II</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEGAL 394DI</td>
<td>American Courtroom Dramas</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLISC 364</td>
<td>Gender &amp; Race in US Social Policy History</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBHLTH 340</td>
<td>LGBTQ Health</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBHLTH 465</td>
<td>Global Perspectives on Women’s Health</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOCIOL 218</td>
<td>The Law, Logic, and Social Science of Courtroom</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPANISH 474</td>
<td>Caribbean Spanish</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STOCKSCH 269</td>
<td>Small Farm Husbandry: Pigs and Poultry</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANTHRO 603  Community-Based Research and Practice  4
ANTHRO 653  Indigenous Research: Theories & Methods  3
ART-HIST 729  Problems in American Art  3
COMP-LIT 552  Medical Interpreting Online  3
ECON 568  The Practice of Development Policy and International Cooperation  3
ECON 767  African Economic Development  3
LLC 501  Translation and Interpreting Ethics and Standards  3
LLC 502  Interpreting Skills Development  3
LLC 510  Legal Interpreting  3
LLC 511  Interpreting in Mental Health  2
LLC 512  Simultaneous Interpreting  3
LLC 520  Introduction to Applied Linguistics  3
LLC 521  TESOL Methods  3
MATH 718  Lie Algebras  3
NATSCI 620  Genetics in the Science Classroom  3
NURSING 742  Capstone 1: Defining Evidence-Based Problems  3
SCH-MGMT 621  Fraud Investigation  3

MOTION: That the Faculty Senate approve the courses ANTHRO 236, CHEM 103, EDUC 431, EDUC 494DI, ENGIN 100, HISTORY 364, HONORS 323H, JAPANESE 436, JAPANESE 437, KOREAN 115, KOREAN 125, KOREAN 235, KOREAN 245, LEGAL 394DI, POLISCI 364, PUBH 465, SOCIO 218, SPANISH 474, STOCKSCH 269, ANTHRO 603, ANTHRO 653, ART-HIST 729, COMP-LIT 552, ECON 568, ECON 767, LLC 501, LLC 502, LLC 510, LLC 511, LLC 512, LLC 520, LLC 521, MATH 718, NATSCI 620, NURSING 742 and SCH-MGMT 621, as recommended by the Academic Matters, General Education and Graduate Councils.

The motion was adopted.

J. NEW BUSINESS

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.]


2. Special Report of the Academic Matters and Graduate Councils concerning the Creation of an Accelerated Masters Program in Industrial Engineering, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 18-066.


MOTION: That the Faculty Senate approve 1) the Creation of an Accelerated Masters Program in Mechanical Engineering, 2) the Creation of an Accelerated Masters Program in Industrial Engineering, 3) the Creation of a Concentration in the Anthropology Major: Archaeology and Cultural Heritage, 4) the Creation of a Concentration in the Anthropology Major: Medical Anthropology and Global Health, 5) the Creation of a Concentration in the Anthropology Major: Evolutionary Anthropology, 6) the Creation of a Concentration in the Anthropology Major: Cultural Anthropology, 7) a Revision to “Literature and a Related Discipline” Subplan in the Comparative Literature Major, 8) a Revision to the Minor in Comparative Literature, 9) a Revision to the History Major, 10) the Creation of a Minor in Theater, 11) a Revision to Degree Program: Environmental Conservation, 12) a Revision to Degree Program: Biomedical Engineering, and 13) a Revision to Degree Program: Philosophy, as presented in Sen. Doc. Nos. 18-065, 18-066, 18-067, 18-068, 18-069, 18-070, 18-071, 18-072, 18-073, 18-074, 18-075, 18-076, and 18-077, respectively.

The motion was adopted.

K. OLD BUSINESS


Senator Marta Calás: Professor Jennifer Merton is the Chair of the Council and she couldn’t be here today, so she asked me to say a few words on the report; I’m going to read basically what she told me to say, not my words but her words. The Council continued to reflect on its mission and to develop an agenda for action going forward. Three key areas of concern emerged from the conversations they had during the year. The main focus was on the problem of sexual harassment and, specifically on that issue, the Council has already planned some collaboration with the Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity to educate the community about the available resources to address sexual harassment, to facilitate training across campus on sexual harassment issues specifically and diversity and inclusion more generally, and to engage in listening sessions next year as part of a review of the current policy with an eye toward making changes if necessary. They would like to take a leadership role in the efforts to enhance the campus climate and hope that they can work collaboratively toward that end. A kick-off event focused on continuing the conversation about sexual harassment is planned for the fall and they will continue through the semester with a series of listening events around this area. The Council has two other areas of concern that are in the report, including an area of ongoing concern and interest among the members of the Council, the issue of child and family care. Some proposals have been developed in this regard and the Council will facilitate both the exploration of the feasibility of those proposals and possible implementation. Additionally, they have been thinking about other possible projects on this issue including, for instance, sponsoring a university-wide contest in which competitors develop various plans for meeting particular needs and the teams would have a chance to present their ideas in front of a panel of judges, which would include members of the Council along with administrators, faculty, staff, and students. In addition, the Council has long been a proponent of providing lactation rooms throughout campus. In light of the Massachusetts Pregnant Workers Fairness Act, which will take effect in April, 2018, it seems appropriate to revisit this issue, to review the current facilities, and to make recommendations about improvements that might need to be made in order to be in compliance with the act. Professor Merton adds that, if there are issues relevant to the Council mission that Senators think should be addressed, please contact her and she will be happy to place those items on their agenda for a future meeting. Thank you.
MJ Peterson, Secretary of the Faculty Senate: This may be ambushing you a bit, so I don’t expect you to fully answer, but I just want to lay the concern out there. I think that it is wonderful that the Council is trying to think about how to provide childcare during events, evening conferences, evening lectures. One thing that I do know, even though I have no children myself, is that childcare is a highly regulated area of endeavor. I know that when I go to my professional meeting, the American Political Science Association, it’s in a big hotel; they do have childcare but it is provided by a contractor who works for the hotel and is certified as a childcare provider in the jurisdiction where the conference is meeting. So, I’m wondering whether there are going to be some regulatory barriers that some of these ideas might come up against and whether we have begun to think about how we’re going to satisfy or get exemption from those regulations, keeping in mind our primary responsibility to assure the safety of any minor who is on the campus for any reason.

Senator Calás: Yes, thank you. I will convey that concern to Professor Merton and the Council. I will say that I’m pretty sure that it will be well taken care of given the fact that Professor Merton is a lawyer and you can see in the report itself that some things have already been addressed such as the legal aspects of the issue of having lactation rooms. I know, from faculty who have small children, that the question of childcare is a real issue as there are insufficient childcare options in the vicinity and on campus and the concern is widespread in the community. I will make sure that they hear those concerns. Thank you.

The report was received.

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.]

2. Changes to Academic Calendars


MOTION: That the Faculty Senate approve the revisions to a) the 2018-2019 Academic Calendar, and b) the 2019-2020 Academic Calendar, as presented in Sen. Doc. Nos. 16-037B and 17-031A, respectively.

The motion was adopted.

The 778th Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate adjourned at 4:40 p.m. on April 26, 2018.

Respectfully submitted,

MJ Peterson,
Secretary of the Faculty Senate