A. ELECTION

SECRETARY OF THE FACULTY SENATE

NOMINEE: MJ Peterson, Political Science

There were no additional nominations. MJ Peterson was elected by acclamation.

B. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Principal Administrative Officers

Kumble Subbaswamy, Chancellor: Everyone knows that about 80% of the population of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts lives in the greater Boston metro area. Probably everyone also knows that 83% of the Massachusetts gross domestic product is generated within the greater Boston metro area and that 70% of our in-state undergraduate students come from the greater Boston metro area. You probably know that most of them find their employment also in the greater Boston metro area. I’m sure, as faculty members and staff, you know that more and more employers are asking for experiential education and some internship types of experiences as a part of recruitment. Students lacking some form of experiential education have a disadvantage in getting into the job market. So, for some time, as part of our strategic plan of being seen as a destination of choice, in terms of making sure that our students have the advantage of being work-ready, I’ve always had in mind that we needed to provide greater opportunities for our experiential education in the 128 corridor for our students, whether it’s high tech, finance, non-profit, government, in all of these sectors. There was what looked like a possibility to pursue in 2014 that was just sort of a passing chance that didn’t go anywhere. Not being in the real estate business, I was not actively pursuing but just keeping my eyes and ears open because a lot of small colleges are in fact struggling financially; there has been a series of stories written in the national and regional media about many colleges on the verge of closing. So, when Mount Ida College approached our campus specifically and asked about whether it would be interested in taking over their campus so that that site, after they closed, would continue to have an educational mission rather than turning into a strip mall or something like that, we were very interested, but had to ask what does that mean?

We explored further with full permission from the UMass system President and from the Board of Trustees Chair; a few other members of the Board were looking at this. As a real estate deal alone, it was very clear that it was a very good deal because, as we received the detailed numbers and when they come out, you’ll see that the underlying real estate assessment is quite high compared to the debts and other things that we would need to assume, so it just made fundamental sense. It is, in fact, a campus that has residence halls, dining halls, recreation centers, a football field, a conference center, 760 parking spaces and what not. It is clearly something that we could use for all kinds of educational and research purposes to make sure that our influence, our impact, on the Commonwealth was more greatly felt. Our faculty would have opportunities to interact with the high-tech sector, the business sector and others in greater Boston.

So, we pursued this, but you have to remember, that from our perspective, it was strictly a real estate deal. Real estate deals are covered by nondisclosure agreements. In fact, the only way Mount Ida would share with us their financials and so forth so we could understand what our obligations would be if we assumed all their debt obligations and liabilities and acquired the physical assets of the campus was if we were completely covered by nondisclosure agreements because, if the deal fell through, they would have to go elsewhere. In fact, they had a nondisclosure agreement with Lasell College before they came to us as the Boston Globe has reported and the effort to merge with Lasell fell through. They came to us and we went through our examination under a nondisclosure agreement. In fact, there is a statutory exemption to the Board of Trustees
meetings when it comes to real estate transactions and things of that nature that can be discussed only in executive session. And, so, that’s exactly what happened. When the Board was here meeting, this was discussed in executive session.

The Board heard both what the deal was and how we would pay for it; let me explain that. This whole thing is structured in a way where we will assume long-term debt obligations in the range as reported, somewhere between $50 to $70 million. The reason it is a range rather than a figure is that once all the details are known, including severance and these kinds of things for the closing, we have options as a public entity to have some restructuring, renegotiations, that would reduce the total obligation. So, under the best-case scenario, it may be $50 million and under the worst-case scenario it may be $70 million; it’s somewhere in that range and we’re in the process of trying to figure all of that out. So, that will be long-term debt and we have a business plan that increases our revenue stream both by using that campus – we’ll call it the extension center, let’s say – for students in their junior or senior years being involved in semester- or year-long internship experiences and so forth, and that would allow us to admit some number of additional undergraduates on this campus. So, no first-year students would be directly admitted to that campus; it would be strictly an extension center. But, then, we could also look at graduate and professional Master’s degrees, evening/weekend programs, executive education opportunities, and those sorts of opportunities that we really lack where we are currently because that’s where, as I said, 83% of the GDP is generated, and all of those kinds of things. So, we came up with a plan working with the Provost and the Deans in a quick process of thinking about what they thought their operations might be – none of this is written in stone – but trying to see if this can work. The answer is yes, it can work. We can generate, under conservative assumptions, enough revenue to pay off the debt service and expenses and actually have a positive margin. So, we presented this case to the Board and the Board was convinced given our astute management over the last however many years; in fact, in the last five years alone, despite all of the cuts and everything else, we’ve maintained a positive operating margin of about 3.6% against the Board’s requirement of 2%, so our campus has a golden reputation for managing our finances appropriately.

In sum, there’s not a penny from the system office, not even a penny from this campus’s reserves, going into this acquisition. It’s really our ability to generate revenue and pay off the debt that is behind this acquisition. The Board was convinced; they’ve approved it. We thought we had gotten all of the approvals and so forth that had to be done from our end and I still believe that to be true. Nonetheless, the Boston campus – at least some people on the Boston campus – believe that this is somehow – I can’t remember the word the Globe used – an insult to them or something like that. I specifically asked, “What is it about this extension center that you think negatively effects the Boston campus or its plans?” There’s been no answer; the response has been that it’s the optics. With all due respect, I can’t help the timing. The timing is bad in terms of the optics but I didn’t create this opportunity. In fact, I didn’t go after this, but when this opportunity presented itself, as the Chancellor of this campus, looking out for the long-term interest of our students, our faculty, our campus – and the Commonwealth, for that matter, because we are the largest producer of the workforce in this Commonwealth – I felt that it was my obligation to do what’s in the best interest of this campus and the Commonwealth when presented with this opportunity. Yes, there is a lot of concern being expressed in the Boston area and we are trying our best to manage that. Whether we were going to acquire the Mount Ida campus or not, after the Lasell deal fell through, Mount Ida was going to close regardless. The people who were employees there would have lost their jobs regardless. The students would be stranded and, in fact, UMass Dartmouth quickly rose to the occasion, because they have capacity, of course, but the UMass Dartmouth faculty voted, within 75 minutes, I think, of being asked, to accept all of the credits of the students in the pipeline in Mount Ida for those programs that were appropriate for transfer to UMass Dartmouth and allow them to complete their degrees by only filling in the remaining credit hours; that was an extraordinary gesture on the part of the faculty at UMass Dartmouth. This is why Dartmouth was the campus that undertook to be the first point of stop, so all of the Mount Ida students in good standing are automatically admitted to UMass Dartmouth. The UMass Dartmouth Chancellor made an incredible, reassuring statement to all of the students and parents on that campus when he met with them last Monday. So, I think some of that anxiety is dying down. There are three specialized programs – veterinary technology, dental technology, and funeral science – which we don’t quite know how to make happen yet but we are in conversations, even though it’s not our obligation, with some private colleges that have shown an interest in
helping those students finish out their degrees. So, when all is said and you take all the noise out and the dust settles, I think that UMass Amherst, the students and faculty here, will have an outstanding opportunity to engage more in the 128 corridor where all the action is and I think that the Commonwealth will be better served. That is my announcement.

**John McCarthy, Interim Provost and Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs:** I thought that I would also say a few words about the Mount Ida campus. It is an amazing facility. It’s about 74 acres. It has a pond. It has some brand new buildings including a brand new student center with a small theater in it. One of the dormitories is brand new; it’s called New Hall inspiringly. It is a wonderful place to walk around. It also has a historic mansion that was built by Robert Gould Shaw II, who was the nephew of Robert Gould Shaw, the commander of the 54th Massachusetts Regiment during the Civil War. Having the campus will be an amazing opportunity for our students. We will see lots of opportunities for internships for our students in the Boston area as a result of their ability to live there with a short shuttle ride from the Green Line. We think that the opportunities for these internships will be all across the campus: in STEM disciplines, in the Social Sciences, in the Humanities and in the Arts. I think that we will see these opportunities everywhere on the campus. Of course, in Business, as well, we would expect that. That’s going to be a wonderful aspect for our students.

We’re also going to be able to do more with our graduate programs on that campus. Our ability to do certain graduate and professional programs on this campus is somewhat hindered by the low population of this area and the distance from the population center; that’s why we’ve mainly focused on online education in that area. With the Mount Ida campus, we’ll be able to do much more in the way of face-to-face and hybrid programs with those facilities on that campus. This will be what the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC) technically calls an additional instructional location; I know that’s an inspiring phrase. It’s called that because it is not a satellite campus. A satellite campus, or something like a branch campus, has its own personnel, its own budget; it’s a separate thing from the main campus. The Mount Ida location will be a place where you could earn a degree – not an undergraduate degree all the way through but a graduate degree – but it will not have its own faculty or other personnel. It will not have budgetary autonomy. So, it will be what NEASC calls an additional instructional location. I know that there’s been some concern about current Mount Ida students, particularly those who are in the majors that are not obvious matches at UMass Dartmouth, and I’ve been following that quite closely because it’s a matter of concern, I think, to all of us. I believe that within the next couple of weeks arrangements will have been made for all of those students; there will be a reasonable place they can go. It won’t be five miles from home; it might be fifty miles from home like UMass Dartmouth but it will be a reasonable choice for them, not extreme, and it will be reasonably affordable to them, as well. So, our hope is that, within the next couple of weeks, arrangements will be clear, and will be announced, for all of those remaining majors. Thank you.

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

**MJ Peterson, Secretary of the Faculty Senate:** I thank you for renewal of my mandate and, as I said three years ago at approximately this time, I pledge to constantly make my best efforts to do the best job that I can and also to strive to continuously improve.

We’ve been having a busy year. As far as I can see now, we will be able to have our last Senate meeting of the year on April 26th. It may go a little long but the reward is that you won’t have to come to a Faculty Senate meeting in May. You see on the agenda a fairly long list of courses to be approved. You saw a long list last month and there will be another one. Here, I want to pause and acknowledge the work of the people who do the detailed review of these course proposals and, in particular, the Academic Matters Council Course Subcommittee because they do the undergraduate courses which have been by far the largest number. So, I want to thank Jennifer Heuer, Laura Francis, Sharon Domier, Bill Brown, Mark Guerber and David Morin. As we’re coming to the end of the year, there are also a number of programs that are coming through. There will be a couple of policy changes; these are not mammoth policy changes. There’s a change to the academic grievance policy to make it more consistent with what we actually do. There are changes to a few other policies.

Some of you are probably wondering, “Wait a minute – didn’t Senate elections end last night?” Yes. I will announce the results first to elected Senators through the after-meeting notes and then we will post
a new roster of the Senate. We will see a number of familiar faces returning, but, in the fall, we will also be welcoming some new faces. Thank you.

3. The Chair of the Rules Committee

**Senator David Gross, Chair of the Rules Committee:** Since our last Senate meeting, the Rules Committee met three times, twice by ourselves and once with the administration. At one of our regular meetings, we discussed this space and, I think, the general consensus was that it could have some improvements. The good news is that we have a tentative plan with the scheduling office to move to a nice space in the Integrated Learning Center (ILC) that will fit us well, but it will be two years from now, so we’ll have to put up with this one for another year. We also discussed meeting with John Wells to follow up on some things after his presentation here about the Online Education Group (OEG); we’ve scheduled a meeting with him. We have also scheduled a meeting with Martha Stassen and Gabriela Weaver who co-chair a working group on modes of evaluation of instruction; we’ll be meeting with them in another couple of weeks. And, in response to a query from the Intercampus Faculty Council (IFC), we had a special meeting with Professor Joya Misra to discuss her data on inequity in faculty service expectations and loads.

When we met with the administration on April 2nd, the Chancellor briefed us on a possible move to buy a campus in the metro Boston area and he didn’t name the campus or provide specifics at the time. Given that the details hadn’t yet been worked out, he asked us to hold off from disclosing that information until it was officially announced, so we did; this is the announcement that we had actually heard about it beforehand. In other matters at that meeting, the Chancellor talked about the billion dollars or so of deferred maintenance on this campus and the fact that the stadium represents a substantial portion of that, and he told us about a couple of possible public/private and/or large donor solutions to some of those stadium maintenance issues. Other items that we discussed at that meeting included a preview of the NEASC accreditation site visit, which will be coming up in October, changes to the software package that is used to track faculty outreach and engagement, and the administration’s plans to roll out unit-specific responses to the campus climate survey.

4. The Faculty Delegates to the Board of Trustees

**Senator David Hoagland, Delegate to the Board of Trustees:** I attended various committee meetings associated with the Board of Trustees meeting last week and will mention some things that the Chancellor did not. The Trustees’ Administration and Finance Committee had considerable discussion of the difficulty the system was having in handling the collective bargaining situation and, I think, they made the difficulty of their position pretty clear in that the parameters come from the state and the state doesn’t necessarily provide the funds to fund the parameters that are designated, so the system has some difficulties that distress many of us. Another thing that happened at that meeting was the first vote on the Student Union renovation, so I guess that that’s looking good going forward. At the Board of Trustees meeting – of course, I was not at the executive session – we did meet afterwards with a trustee who, besides holding a full-time job, is also pursuing a graduate degree at UMass Boston; he looked a little unhappy at that time about what happened but he understood how the event happened and didn’t express great opposition. In the course of some of those discussions, I did ask Chancellor Subbaswamy about what the immediate impacts on the faculty here might be from that acquisition and he said that the exact impacts are not known but he didn’t anticipate anything significant for the current faculty.

Lastly, as was mentioned by Senator Gross, the UMass Boston Faculty Senate has been trying to spearhead some action about service activities so they made a presentation at the Intercampus Faculty Council, a meeting of faculty leaders from all five campuses that is held after the Board of Trustees meeting, to amplify their concerns. They had surveyed their faculty and got a pretty good response rate and concluded that there are gender, racial, and rank inequities in the way that faculty are providing service to their departments, that this inequity was causing difficulties in promotion for particularly women and, so, that’s one explanation for slow progress towards promotion to full professor. The rank inequity showed up with very large service loads for associate professors and they showed statistics that were striking on inequities
between genders in service contributions, with female faculty members providing almost twice as much service to departments as their male counterparts, which is something that they would like to have addressed. They also said that service is not well defined and that there’s an unclear message about service, at least on their campus, that it is to be weighted much less than research and teaching, and they would like for service to be rewarded better. So, in conclusion, they’ve asked faculty on all of the campuses to do a similar survey on their campuses about service loads according to gender, race, and rank, and determine how much inequity we have, and perhaps come to some common understanding about how we can address these inequities.

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

**Eve Weinbaum, President of the Massachusetts Society of Professors:** Thanks. I know you’re all wondering, “How many days have we been working without a contract?” So, I will tell you; it’s been 285 days. We’ve been negotiating for 18 months and we’re getting a little tired but we are optimistic. We’ve talked with the administration about separating two kinds of items. There are items that are really salary that are not controlled by this campus but are dependent on the President’s Office and the state to come up with parameters and figure out how that’s going to work for everybody. Then, there are issues that are controlled on this campus that, we think, we have a lot more leeway to discuss. So, we’re very optimistic that we’ll be able to make some movement in the near future. We talked about April 15th being our goal to wrap things up in terms of the local issues because we need some time to talk to the faculty and librarians about whatever we come up with and make sure that it’s working for people and we want to be able to do that before the end of the semester. We just had a productive meeting with the Chancellor and the Provost and the Vice Chancellor and the Associate Provost. We talked about a lot of issues including Mount Ida. We’ve heard a lot of concerns from faculty on our campus mainly about the economic impact before the revenue starts coming in, what the impact will be of assuming the debt service, and we’re going to be watching and seeing what happens with that. With 1,000 new students, we think that it’s going to put a lot of new impetus behind our old demand for 250 new faculty and that’s going to be a high priority moving forward, to lobby the state and also to work with the administration to figure out how we can increase the faculty and staff to really do a good job serving our students. Thank you.

C. **QUESTION PERIOD**

**Senator Richard Bogartz:** This is for the Chancellor or his designee. So, about this Mount Ida thing, what can go wrong? In particular, how might what could go wrong affect our operating budget if it does go wrong?

**Kumble Subbaswamy, Chancellor:** From a fiscal perspective, as I said, there is a business plan that involves offering various programs and so forth. I think one thing that could go wrong could be, “Is the ramp-up fast enough?” Another could be, “Do you even get to where you want to get to?” But the bottom line that I want everyone to remember is that the underlying asset value of that property is somewhere around $100 million – there is a net asset value – so, if we walked away from it and sold it, we would walk away with a profit. Even leaving that aside, I think that it is a very safe bet because I think that this institution has enough demand for its programs and activities that we’re going to generate value and be there for the next several centuries if not longer. This is why the Trustees were not particularly worried about this deal.

**Senator Marinos Vouvakis:** I usually am very critical of the administration and the moves that it makes oftentimes but, in this case, I would like to actually say that I’m very pleased; I think that this was a very smart move and I just would like to point out that, for that amount, we can barely build a decent building here. Life Science Laboratory (LSL) cost us much more than that. So, basically, we bought a campus for a low cost. But, this is Question Period so I would like to ask a question just for the sake of asking a question. How would the Senate and faculty be involved as you’re now formulating a more formal, strategic plan about how to use Mount Ida?

**Chancellor Subbaswamy:** First and foremost, every academic program and any changes in academic programs are subject to the standard approval processes because they’re our programs from this campus. So, all of the normal undergraduate and graduate councils and college and department councils, and all of those
Faculty Senate approval processes would be needed along with, when necessary, the Board of Trustees, Board of Higher Education, and NEASC approvals. So, in that sense, really there’s nothing extraordinary, as the Provost described it. In that sense, we did the real estate piece, but for everything else, if we were making some significant changes in the academic program or offering new programs, we’d have to go through all of the normal processes in the control of the faculty. The other types of activities, such as whether we have outreach activities and interactions with industry leaders and any entertainment that we might have, any lectures, symposia, or those kinds of things that we might hold, are in the auxiliary class and wouldn’t need any formal approvals. We would always look at the financial implications for putting on such events. I don’t know if I’m answering your question, but, otherwise, there would be normal processes.

Mr. Presiding Officer, could I ask a point of privilege and just add something to what I just now said? In regard to some of the points that are being raised, I do want to register being somewhat offended by the way our campus has been represented in the newspapers and I hope that faculty take offense and also try to respond. One point is somehow that this campus is for rich, white kids and other campuses are for others. I want to point to some statistics and say how I offended I am on behalf of our students that this is how this is being portrayed. 25% of our students are first-generation college-goers. 30% of our students are students of color. 22% of our students are Pell Grant recipients. To somehow lump them all together and say that they are all well-to-do students that don’t need internships, that they have plenty of opportunities, and that such opportunities are only needed on the Boston campus, or any other campus, is an offense that we should not just let go. There were columns in the Globe written in this spirit, some casting differences in divisive ways that we object to when certain politicians on the national stage say similar things; I think that we ought to object when a reporter writes these kinds of offensive characterizations of our student body and what we care about on this campus. Thank you.

D. UPDATE: Strategic Planning and Accreditation, Nancy Cohen, Senior Planning Officer

**Nancy Cohen, Senior Planning Officer**: October 21\(^{st}\) to the 24\(^{th}\) is the site visit. However, next week, Dr. Susan Hunter, the President of the University of Maine, who is the head of the site review team will be here on a preliminary visit, so we are well into the site visit process. We are just completing the feedback phase of the strategic plan development. I hope that you all have seen the draft plan and the website and the feedback box. So, I just want to let you know what we’ve done and received so far as far as feedback. We’ve had two open forums. We have presented the strategic plan draft to many Faculty Senate councils: the Program and Budget Council, Research Council, Graduate Council, Council on Public Engagement and Outreach, Undergraduate Education Council, and Academic Matters Council. We’ve also met with several of the student advisory councils. The vice chancellors all meet regularly with student advisory boards and we met with the Student Affairs and Campus Life, Academic Affairs, Administration and Finance, and University Relations student advisory boards to discuss the draft plan. We also met with the Student Government Association and the Graduate Student Senate. Then, some external constituents, the Amherst Campus Council, and we’ll soon be meeting with the Alumni Association Board. So, we’ve been able to get some oral feedback there as well as written feedback from the website. Thus far, we’ve categorized 118 comments from the many people who participated and, at this point, are reviewing the responses and editing the draft based on these comments. We felt that some of the comments were already included in some way, some were more specific to particular areas of campus more appropriate to unit plans, and some were on things, including identification of specific metrics, that we’re not able to address until we have further discussion on the metrics. We hope that you will regard the next draft that you see as improved. We’ll be reviewing the changes with the Campus Planning and Resource Committee (CPARC) tomorrow and also loop back to the working groups and administration and hopefully have an actual plan that can come forward to this body in a couple of weeks.

E. ANNUAL REPORTS


**Senator Pat Vitum, Co-Chair of the Athletic Council**: Good afternoon, I’m the Co-Chair of the Athletic Council with Professor Sam Hazen from Biology. Sam can’t be here this afternoon because he’s hosting an out-of-town visiting scholar at a Biology Department seminar. I just want to make a couple of comments about the Council and then I’m guessing that there might be a few questions. The Council meets once a month, three or four times each semester. We have six subcommittees that do a lot of the work of the Council; each Council member serves on at least two of those subcommittees. Just to refresh your memories, and it’s all in the report, we have: Academic Services, Compliance, Equity and Diversity, Facilities, Student-Athlete Health and Welfare, and Finance. The Annual Report includes reports from each of those committees. So, it’s a fairly thorough report to let you know what we really are all about. My guess is that
most of you have questions that relate to finances so we’ve taken the liberty of asking Athletic Director Ryan Bamford and his associates to be here to handle some of those questions because he has a better sense of it than I do. So, that’s all I have to say. I’ll stand by for any other questions that you might have.

**Senator Richard Bogartz:** Sometime back, when some of us rabble-rousers were trying to stir up trouble about football and injuries due to football, the Chancellor suggested that the Faculty Senate floor was not the best place to discuss those matters and that we had already in existence places and events at which such discussions should more appropriately take place. I believe he mentioned the Athletic Council as one of those places. I would like to know whether, during the past year, you have considered football injuries in general, and, in particular, Chronic Traumatic Encephalopathy (CTE). We’ve recently heard that Ann McKee inspected 111 deceased professional football players and found that CTE was present in 110 of those 111. She also concluded that it didn’t take concussions to produce CTE, that repeated hits to the head are enough to produce CTE. What, if anything, has the Athletic Council done in considering this matter?

**Ryan Bamford, Director of Athletics:** In our report, there’s reference to one of our council meetings that we had in March of last year, that we had a very robust discussion; we had Lynn Carlson, our neurologist who works with our student-athletes and our medical staff, and she addressed CTE, she addressed concussions, she addressed a whole number of health things that we address every day with our young people and that are germane to athletics participation on a college campus. In terms of the CTE studies, one of the things that we’re really keeping an eye on, and, I think, is relative to what’s in the news, for the most part, is that public opinion is ahead of science right now. I say that because the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) and the U.S. Department of Defense have put together a $30 million grant package to study this specifically along with all the things that the National Football League (NFL) did along the lines of CTE. And, while there’s a lot of anecdotal information – you referenced the report of 110 out of 111 of those deceased players – there’s science behind that that still has to be done and that’s one of the things that we are obviously very interested in. I can tell you that nothing has changed from last year in terms of our regard for our student-athletes and their welfare. We are very proactive in our charge not just in regard to brain injuries. We had a young man this year who arrived as a transfer from the University of Maryland and we did a heart-screen – we’re one of less than a hundred institutions in this country that does it for any incoming new student-athlete – and we found a heart issue. He played at the University of Maryland for the last two years. That heart issue disqualified him from participation and that honestly may have saved his life. That’s not necessarily on the lines of what you asked about CTE but, in terms of student-athlete welfare, I’m proud to say that we’re on the front lines and being proactive to make sure that, when our kids are participating in college athletics at the University of Massachusetts, they have the best chance to succeed and they’re doing it in a healthy way.

**Senator MarinusVousvakis:** I would like to add something. I am a member of the Council. You know that we had this discussion in the Rules Committee last year. I’m also a member of the Rules Committee, so I forwarded that information about Ann McKee to the Council. The Council considered it. In fact, the Council told me that they had invited her and she had been on campus two years ago. It came down to finances. At that point, the Council tried to find a way to find the money by talking with the Senate and I think that the consensus was that, for that amount of money, we felt that it wasn’t something from which we would learn anything new beyond what we could have read online in reports or what we had heard a year before.

**SenatorBogartz:** So, you say that you’re on the forefront of care for our student-athletes. Has there been any change in how football players are treated in their situation? And, also, would you elaborate on what you mean when you say that there needs to be more science? Isn’t 110 out of 111, based on autopsies, a lot of science?

**DirectorBamford:** A lot of the studies that you’ve seen are related to NFL participation and those don’t have grounding on college athletes right now; we don’t have a lot of science on that and the repetitive head injuries is something that’s really pertinent to what we’re dealing with. Right now, the NCAA, as a leader, is starting to study youth football, saying, “What’s the occurrence in youth football before they even get to college?” What’s the effect in high school? What’s the effect in college? And, then, for those that are going on to the NFL, what’s the effect that that has? A lot of the stories that we’ve read in the newspaper are stories of NFL players and those that have passed and have donated their bodies to science. There are the cases and then there’s the science to say exactly what has impacted CTE in those cases. That’s what we’re still trying to learn. To your earlier question, your first question, on what we’re doing and how we’re changing, when I say that we are on the forefront, we were one of the first ten institutions to use Guardian, a protective layer of padding that goes over the helmets, and we use those every day in practice. We do baseline testing for concussions and for a lot of things; that helps inform us if we do have any injury, whether it be brain-related or any other injury, making sure that we use that information to guide a decision on how we’re diagnosing an injury and then going through medical care and eventually, if possible, returning to sporting activity. We’re investing a lot in it because obviously this is paramount to us, the health and safety of our young people.
Senator Rebecca Spencer, Faculty Athletic Representative: Interestingly enough the Athletic Council’s role is bigger than just Athletics; we also have Campus Recreation and Intramural Sports under us, as well. I actually lead the Student-Athlete Health and Welfare Subcommittee, which was created in response to the concerns of the Ad Hoc Committee. Some of our concerns about football were bigger than just the budget so we wanted to think about that. So, when we created that Subcommittee and we started talking about concussions, we realized that they’re also actually occurring in our intramural sports. And, so, the conversation has been thorough and complete; Athletic Director Bamford can speak to what Athletics is doing but we also brought in people from Campus Recreation to ask about what we do for students who are just picking up and playing club rugby, one of the dangerous sports as far as concussions go. So, this is an ongoing conversation but I do believe that we’ve been as thorough as possible in, at least, right now, acquiring information, learning information, and seeing what we can do. When it comes to being safer in club sports, that’s even more challenging; what do we do when we can’t do all of the protocols and pretesting that Athletics does? What can we do for intramural athletes who may be less prepared athletes who participate in some of these sports. We’re always happy to hear your advice.

Senator Anthony Paik: This is not necessarily a question about the science but more about long-term budget implications. I am just wondering if there is anyone looking at the potential liability if there is a link between football and concussions?

Director Bamford: That’s a great question. That’s something that you’ve seen. We’ve seen some settlements for lawsuits that have already happened. The NCAA settled one. The NFL obviously settled cases that relate to that. I think that, anytime you’re in higher education in any setting and certainly in college athletics, this is appropriate and you obviously want to mitigate risk. But, obviously, we want to make sure, with regard to the long-term effects, independent of the dollars, that we’re putting our best foot forward, being proactive to make sure that the sporting environment we’ve created is helpful. As an institution, our Chancellor and I have spoken at length about this; I’ve spoken with our system President, as well. We’re keeping our eye on this. This is honestly one of the most important topics that we discuss among the coaching staff and in the Athletic Council throughout the year. So, I can tell you that we’ll continue down that path in terms of being aware and proactive and making sure that we’re doing the right things for this University.

MJ Peterson, Secretary of the Faculty Senate: I was reading through the report and I’ve been watching the national discussions of the power conferences versus everybody else and various other things like FBI raids that I won’t go into. I was concerned with a discussion of the NCAA rules. There was a part of the report discussing NCAA rules and it talked about the Power Five having certain rules; sometimes these rules seem to expand out to other conferences and sometimes they did not. There was a distinction between something called “passed legislation” and something called “autonomous legislation.” These sound like mechanisms through which either the Power Five are the tail wagging the entire dog or maybe there’s an insulator in here so that the Power Five can’t wag the entire dog. I’m just wondering what’s going on because the Power Five are so oriented toward making money that it’s really skewing all of college athletics.

Director Bamford: That’s a great question. So, the autonomy conferences, which are the Power Five conferences, have voting where they can vote on certain legislation and, if it passes as autonomy legislation, the other conferences outside of the Power Five have the ability to adopt it if they like. There are about 30 or 31 conferences and, as you can imagine, with that many delegates, they were making decisions that then the Power Five institutions had to basically enact. So, the Power Five schools, being smart and controlling a lot of the financial ingredients involved in the NCAA asked, “Why are we letting all of these smaller conferences dictate what we’re doing in sports like football that they may not even have?” And, so, they created this autonomy legislation to have an opt-in effect for institutions like UMass Amherst. What that means for us is that we’re making decisions now on what a Power Five institution like Boston College, right down the road, may do and we may choose, along with the University of Connecticut and others, to adopt that legislation as our own or we may choose not to. I will tell you that, in a lot of cases where there are major fiscal ramifications, we’re probably not adopting a lot of those things. But there are a lot of little things that we’re doing. I’ll give you a good example. We had a lot of health, safety, and welfare issues that we’re dealing with that have passed legislation; we’re adopting a lot of those things. Honestly, for the most part, when you see the autonomy legislation passed, there are some that are just outliers for the Power Five, and you can tell that they’re outliers, and there are some that every other institution in Division I will accept and then those are the ones that generally are getting full membership approval. So, we haven’t seen it become a majorly dichotomous landscape yet, but, to your question, there is a divide now. So, I think that you’re going to see some things in the future that potentially create opportunities for them to go out on their own, so to speak, as the legislation will dictate. With regard to paying for student-athletes’ parents to go to postseason championships, the Final Four in men’s basketball was a couple of weeks ago and one of the autonomy legislation measures that came up was that any school can pay for a parent to go; so, you can adopt that as an institution or as a conference or you can decide not to. For the most part, I think that all of the conferences decided that they’re going to adopt it for their participants and they’ve chosen to do that, I think, because it benefits the student-athletes.
The report was received.


*Senator Anthony Paik, Chair of the Program and Budget Council:* So, briefly, the Program and Budget Council meets monthly. We have an upcoming meeting next Wednesday. We have two subcommittees. The Program Subcommittee is the committee that handles program review, approves new degrees, modifications to degrees, and so forth. Then, we also have the Budget Subcommittee which generally meets with the administration to discuss budgetary issues that face UMass. Both subcommittees meet monthly. Then, last year, in terms of the work that we did for the Faculty Senate, a lot of our work focused on the addition of the thesis requirement in the Commonwealth Honors College and then the second large piece of work that we did concerned the Global Education requirement in the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences.

The report was received.


*Carol Booth, University Ombudsperson:* Thank you. The Ombuds Office had a wonderful FY 17. We’ve expanded our office; we were able to hire a third ombuds which is going to allow us to increase our services considerably in FY 18. Our numbers did go down a little bit in FY 17; we had one staff member who went to a forty-three-week contract and there was a proportional drop. But, we did expand a lot of services. We gave a lot more presentations and trainings. We began developing a strategic plan which we’ve now finished in FY 18. I’m going to skip around; I’ve got one minute and since I’m not going to talk about Mount Ida College, I think that I will be able to comply with that one minute. We’ve continued to move closer and closer to the standards of practice, code of ethics, and reporting categories of our national organization, the International Ombudsman Association. This means that the new reporting categories that we’re using are contained in this report. We also took a step that is within the ambit of what an ombuds office ought to do, which is to try to identify some trends that we’ve seen over the course of a year or over a period of time and make some recommendations if we feel that we have anything to recommend. This past year, FY 17, we did notice a trend upwards in incivility complaints and those were reflecting in the statistics. Also, it didn’t mean that every incivility complaint was only about that but that something was included about the climate or respect within the department or area; so, we did devote some of our report this year to those recommendations. This is, or will be, on our website.

*MJ Peterson, Secretary of the Faculty Senate:* I like the idea that you’re trying to see if there are trends and think about whether there are recommendations that you can make. I also like the greater level of activity in terms of doing trainings and presentations. You’ve noticed what you’re identifying as an up-tick in complaints about incivility. I’m wondering, because this is always a question that gets asked, is that an artifact of actual up-tick or is that an artifact of people now understanding better that the Ombuds Office is a place where they can bring those concerns?

*Ombudsperson Booth:* I hope it’s definitely the latter, but I think it’s actually a bit of both. Given the national climate, I think that it would not be surprising if we were actually seeing an increase in some aspects of what is generally called incivility. I think that we have done a better job and I hope that our annual report last year contributed to people understanding better what we do and how we do it and the importance of confidentiality and neutrality. The Ombuds Office is a place that reassures people that they can come and talk to us about anything and that we will help them and keep it as private as they would like to keep it. I also think that people feel a little more emboldened; I look at the Me Too movement and other things. I think that people, in general, are feeling that they can and should come forward to report what is happening to them, and what they see and what the impact is, so I think that it is a combination. Thank you.

The report was received.


(The Annual Report of the Status of Women Council was Postponed until the 778th Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate, April 26, 2018)

Daniel Gerber, Associate Dean of the School of Public Health and Health Sciences: I’ve been the head of the Council for about ten years. We were really happy when the Chancellor reached out to us to get the Council’s input into the strategic plan. Quite a bit of our writing got cut-and-pasted; we really appreciated that part. So, last year we decided that we’d go back and look at the strategic plan to see how we’re doing; we identified something that really bothered us and that basically involved the comprehensive data plan to keep the Carnegie classification. We were the first in the system to get it and they all got it after us. If we lost it, it would be a real embarrassment, so we went to Vice Chancellor Malone and the Provost and they said, yes, we need to move forward with some kind of comprehensive database and I heard earlier on that people are talking about it, so we’re hoping that this actually does get into place because we have to keep the Carnegie classification and this is a key part. Outside of that, I met with CPARC and talked about the exact same thing that I talked about today. We also recommended to the Provost distinguished outreach and engagement teaching and research awards. We participated in determining who got the public service endowment. And, then, finally, after ten years, I stepped down, and Dr. Elena Carbone and Dr. Lorraine Cordeiro stepped up, so I appreciate that.

The report was received.


Senator Mzamo Mangaliso, Co-Chair of the Status of Diversity Council: My fellow Co-Chair Ernie Washington is not here as he had to go to New York on some family business. So, I’m just going to run through the report itself. You’ve seen it and read it. Like other councils, the Status of Diversity Council (SODC) meets four times in the fall and three times in the spring or vice-versa. We also had two special council meetings: one looked at President Trump’s order to restrict travel for people from predominantly Muslim countries. That committee met a couple of times; we invited students from that population on campus to come and testify in front of the Council. We had very engaging discussions. We also invited the then-Dean of the Graduate School, John McCarthy, to come and address us about the trends and the impact that that order had on international graduate students and scholars. We also had Vice Provost Jim Roche come and inform us about the undergraduate component of that. All of those discussions were very engaging and gave the people to whom we were listening a sense of belonging to UMass and a sense of the fact that UMass was reaching out to them and being with them that created that family environment. The other special subcommittee that we had looked at the General Education diversity requirements. These dates are overlapping because we were looking at them two years ago; that one went on for quite a while discussing issues of the readiness of the faculty who will be teaching this General Education requirement, in terms of handling the material that they’ll be delivering in those classes, particularly as it impinges on the underrepresented minorities in those classes. There were questions about that, and we were not very certain about it, but they were subsequently addressed in some of the deliberations here in the Faculty Senate and we ended up agreeing to go along with the finally approved General Education requirement, which was great. In general, we felt that that year was a very good year because we had a few things going for us starting with the strategic plan for diversity that the Chancellor had urged us to go along with for a long time in previous years and that was very good because what it did was set up a situation where most of the colleges – I’m not sure if it’s all of the colleges at this time – ended up with either a faculty director for diversity or associate dean for diversity; this puts us in a position to be able to apply and implement some of the recommendations from the strategic plan. As far as implementation is concerned, the SODC was sort of working at that time with the Chancellor’s Diversity Advisory Council to come up with some kind of plan to have a scorecard that monitors the progress that is being achieved on the way towards accomplishing this diversity because the belief that we had was that that which is not measured never gets done. So, as of this year, we’re looking forward to that next step. Of course, the other big thing that came through during the year that we’re reporting on was the campus climate survey that revealed a lot of details about what needs to be done on campus. So, given those two very important breakthroughs, we look forward that, in subsequent years, we just have to put the shoulder to the wheel and get moving on the diversity front.

MJ Peterson, Secretary of the Faculty Senate: The climate survey, as you know, has led to a roll-out of meetings, forums, focus groups, various things at both the college and departmental levels which seem to be working on a lot of these same questions and the same question that you were talking about in regard to the new diversity requirement has come up there too. How are people going to be expected to maintain a better classroom environment? How are faculty going to be assisted in understanding how to do that given the various challenges? So, what do you see as the relation between the work that the Council is doing and the work that various others are doing in reacting and developing programs in reaction to the climate survey?

Senator Mangaliso: Good question. You serve on the SODC and know what kinds of discussions we have there. A grouse that we have in the Council is the marginalization that the Council gets in some of these discussions. The General Education Council had a special meeting to discuss those requirements and there was no formal invitation to the SODC to seek our advice or seek our participation as a Council. Individuals were picked up and I know that that’s how our participation came in. Right now, there’s talk about the strategic plan being rolled and many councils were consulted, but...
we heard the councils that were mentioned; the SODC wasn’t mentioned and it makes us wonder where our role is in this thing. And, so, a lot of what we’ve been discussing here is us banding together and finding out a way that we can reach out to these important decision-making bodies so that our feelings and perspectives as a group can be heard because, among ourselves, there are a lot of issues that we deal with. We help each other and say that things will be alright, but it would be nice if those issues were shared broadly because, in order for diversity to go forward, we cannot carry the struggles on our own; we need allies on the other side. In most cases where diversity is successful, the struggle is taken over by the mainstream people, whether it’s color or gender or what have you. Until and unless you can master that kind of buy-in, our efforts are not going to go over. If you talk alone and don’t consult the diverse community through their bodies, you may end up cheering yourself and thinking that we’ve gone a long way and we’re diverse but you have to tap into the bodies that represent these people. That SODC is one of the first ones that you go to. Thanks.

The report was received.

F. 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>ART 234</td>
<td>Art &amp; Code</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP-LIT 337</td>
<td>International History of Animation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP-LIT 339</td>
<td>International Crime, Mystery and Detective Fiction</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;C-ENG 201</td>
<td>Analytical Tools for ECE</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;C-ENG 202</td>
<td>Computational Tools for ECE</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;C-ENG 210</td>
<td>Circuits and Electronics I</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;C-ENG 213</td>
<td>Continuous-Time Signals and Systems</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;C-ENG 214</td>
<td>Probability and Statistics</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;C-ENG 231</td>
<td>Introduction to Embedded Systems</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;C-ENG 241</td>
<td>Advanced Programming I</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;C-ENG 244</td>
<td>Modern Physics and Materials for EE</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;C-ENG 304</td>
<td>ECE Junior Design Project</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;C-ENG 310</td>
<td>Circuits and Electronics II</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;C-ENG 315</td>
<td>Signal Processing Methods</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;C-ENG 322</td>
<td>Systems Software &amp; Networking I</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;C-ENG 333</td>
<td>Fields and Waves I</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;C-ENG 344</td>
<td>Fundamentals of Semiconductor Devices</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E&amp;C-ENG 371</td>
<td>Introduction to Security Engineering</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HISTORY 281</td>
<td>Global History of Soccer</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUDAIC 389</td>
<td>Topics in Judaic Studies (JYW)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEGAL 228</td>
<td>Weighing the Evidence: Reasoning Under Uncertainty</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEGAL 394AC</td>
<td>Race, Citizenship and the US Constitution</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEGAL 365</td>
<td>Makin’ It &amp; Fakin’ It: Legal Fictions</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEGAL 373</td>
<td>Justice in Diverse Democracies</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEGAL 384</td>
<td>Terrorism, War and Democracy</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLC 401</td>
<td>Introduction to Translation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLC 402</td>
<td>Fundamentals of Interpreting</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;I-EMG 344</td>
<td>Modeling and Analysis of Dynamic Systems</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIDEAST 389</td>
<td>Topics in Middle East Studies (JYW)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATSCI 489SH</td>
<td>Integrative Science Senior Exposition Seminar</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURSE 603</td>
<td>Theoretical Components of Nursing Practice</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURSE 707</td>
<td>Neuropsychopharmacology</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NURSE 840</td>
<td>Capstone IV: DNP Project Implementation &amp; Monitoring</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCH-MGMT 620</td>
<td>Introduction to Forensic Accounting</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCH-MGMT 706</td>
<td>Financial Management of Nonprofit Organizations</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCH-MGMT 709</td>
<td>Advanced Audit</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MOTION: That the Faculty Senate approve the courses ART 234, COMP-LIT 337, COMP-LIT 339, E&C-ENG 201, E&C-ENG 202, E&C-ENG 210, E&C-ENG 213, E&C-ENG 214, E&C-ENG 231, E&C-ENG 241, E&C-ENG 244, E&C-ENG 304, E&C-ENG 310, E&C-ENG 315, E&C-ENG 322, E&C-ENG 333, E&C-ENG 344, E&C-ENG 371, HISTORY 281, JUDAIC 389, LEGAL 228, LEGAL 394AC, LEGAL 365, LEGAL 373, LEGAL 384, LLC 401, LLC 402, M&I-EMG 344, MIDEAST 389, NATSCI 489SH, NURSE 603, NURSE 707, NURSE 840, SCH-MGMT 620, SCH-MGMT 706, and SCH-MGMT 709, as recommended by the Academic Matters, General Education and Graduate Councils.

The motion was adopted.

G. 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.]


MOTION: That the Faculty Senate approve 1) a Revision of a Degree Program: Biostatistics and Epidemiology Public Health (PhD), 2) the Creation of a BS Program in Informatics in the College of Information and Computer Sciences, 3) the Creation of a Certificate in Political Economy, 4) a Revision to the BA in Astronomy, and 5) a Revision to the “Nutrition in a Global Society” Track in the Nutrition Major, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 18-054, 18-055, 18-056, 18-057, and 18-058, respectively.

The motion was adopted.

6. Special Report of the Nominating Committee concerning Nominations to Faculty Senate Councils and Committees, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 18-059.

MOTION: That the Faculty Senate approve the Nominations to Faculty Senate Councils and Committees, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 18-059.

The motion was adopted.

The 777th Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate adjourned at 4:45 p.m. on April 12, 2018.

Respectfully submitted,

MJ Peterson,
Secretary of the Faculty Senate