

UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST
OFFICE OF THE FACULTY SENATE

Presiding Officer Robert Wilson called the General Faculty Meeting to order on June 21, 2007 at 11:17 a.m. in the Campus Center, Room 101.

I. An update on developments since the May 24, 2007 Session.

Professor Ralph Whitehead, Journalism/Communication – Dan Georgianna of the Dartmouth Campus is with us and he has to get back to Dartmouth, but he came all the way out here to join the press conference. It is evident that Dartmouth understands the problems within the system. If it's OK, we could just acknowledge him and thank him for coming so he can go when he has to. (Applause)

Ernest May, Secretary of the Faculty Senate – I wanted to give you a brief update. I am trying to review what I view as the structural events that have taken place. Since the first session of this General Faculty Meeting on May 24, there have been many developments. What has become clear is that the Tocco/Wilson administration was attempting to implement a massive centralization through management by “fait accompli.” It was then intended that the “fait accompli” would be ratified by a Tocco-appointed task force as the Vision for One UMass or some such plan. This campaign has been thwarted, at least temporarily. The motions adopted at our last meeting have had some very serious impact.

First: The faculty's 214-1 no-confidence vote in the Board of Trustees and the President resulted in President Wilson's public withdrawal of the plan for the President and Chancellor to become the same person, Wilson, presiding over the University at Amherst on a three-day-per-week schedule and the system on a two-day-per-week schedule. That was a huge structural victory for the faculty.

Second: The no-confidence vote by the Faculty Council at UMass Boston, based on the secret reorg plan, reinforced that the uproar was not confined to those “strange, out-of-touch tree-huggers in Amherst,” but had the support in the system beyond Amherst, because they do depict us that way. They depict us as the strange people out in Amherst who are way beyond Rt. 495. They marginalize us – one of their tactics is to marginalize people who are thinking differently than them, isolate them and then cut them off.

Third: The resolutions of the Intercampus Faculty Council adopted on June 18 further demonstrated that a serious level of discontent with governance is present in at least four of the five universities in the system.

Fourth: The second structural victory came yesterday with the Governor's announcement that the Governor's Readiness Project would replace the Tocco-appointed University task force headed by Richard Freeland which had been announced in an editorial in the *Boston Globe* and was originally on the agenda for today's meeting of the Board of Trustees. In item VI on today's agenda, we were prepared to vote no-confidence in such a task force, but that is a moot point now and we will move to amend item VI by deletion. However, we must remain vigilant to insure that the composition of the Readiness Project group includes many highly-qualified individuals who meet our specifications.

Fifth: The second motion passed at the General Faculty meeting of May 24th insisted that the Trustees take no action at its June 21st meeting on announced and unannounced but planned changes for the Amherst campus including but not limited to changes in campus leadership, centralized admissions, and centralized fundraising. Such actions were not taken at today's meeting as we insisted, but all those issues remain in play. There was another failed “fait accompli” attempt which would have been the first step in an initiative to centralize the General Education curriculum without any faculty participation whatsoever, but that was postponed by the President's Office in response to a strongly-worded communication from the Intercampus Faculty Council on this subject.

Sixth: The third motion passed by the General Faculty on May 24 insisted to adherence to procedure in the consideration of reorg and the appointment of presidents and chancellors. The problem here is that there are those in positions of power who have found ways to manipulate the spirit of these procedures – honest merit-based

searches for example – while appearing to comply with the letter of the procedures in the Wellman document. A motion dealing with this issue, already adopted by the Intercampus Faculty Council, is on the agenda for further endorsement by this body today.

In the spirit of eternal vigilance, the fourth motion from May 24th required the reconvening of the General Faculty Meeting which is being held now. It is proposed in the final motion on today's agenda that this meeting of the General Faculty reconvene for at least one additional session at a time to be determined by whatever circumstances present themselves. It's a hammer which we are holding over them, and, believe me, they are aware of it. At last night's cocktail party, I was not invited, but I was chastised for not being there by Trustee Carlin. How can I communicate when you don't invite me to your parties? Brian (O'Connor) was there and Chair Tocco asked Brian if we would have really voted no-confidence today if they had put that on the agenda and he replied "absolutely." So, they are very aware of our actions. We are holding that hammer ready to strike if it needs to be struck.

Another point is that the Faculty Senate has established a very broad-based Executive Advisory Council consisting of the Rules Committee, the MSP Executive Board, the Chairs of all the Faculty Senate Councils and Committees, at-large members, staff, student reps, union reps, legislators and other stakeholders to continue meeting and monitoring the situation over the summer. It has about 50 people, but naturally in the summer, we are not going to get full attendance; but we had good attendance of 30 or so at the first two meetings. It approved one document which is on today's agenda; that's the Plan for UMass.

It's important to note that the UMA Foundation Board has been extremely active over the past month. The Board is extremely concerned that the Capital Campaign for \$350 million for UMass Amherst, now in the advanced stages of preparation, not be injured or aborted. Obviously, this is involved with the campus leadership and with the whole development effort. All in all, it has been a very active month. I have learned to focus on the structural issues and actions where we have largely succeeded and not to get overly distracted by the setbacks and noise which the faculty point of view frequently seems to encounter in the press. The press is all over the place. Sometimes, they are supportive of us, but frequently they are skeptical or just negative and we have to recognize that the President's Office has some extremely effective press relations people. This has developed into a campaign.

We are now proposing some initiatives on today's agenda. The motions concerning interim appointments of presidents and chancellors and the formation of the Ad Hoc Committee on System Performance and System Governance are especially important. This last item is intended to supply expertise, factual information and considered opinions and options to the Governor's Readiness Project, certainly not to compete with it. It is planned that this group would report at least two months before the Governor's group is supposed to report on March 31st. Thank you for your attention and support. It has been a very active month. It has actually also been historic. I think this is, literally, the only time that this faculty has voted no-confidence in the Board and the President, a very unfortunate situation which we did not initiate, for sure, but was brought on by actions of the Board.

Professor Randall Phillis, Biology – I just wanted to reinforce the idea that we should remain vigilant and pay attention and not think that any given action is the end. I have this morning's *Boston Globe* and there is an article "Wilson confident on plans for UMass." It goes on to say 'Wilson, 61, is confident, despite the UMass-Amherst faculty's recent no-confidence vote.' "I feel even more determined to see these things through. There are always difficult issues that many people will try to avoid, but sometimes there's a benefit to confronting them. I don't run away from the tough ones." So, if you think we're done, we're not.

Professor Max Page, President of the Massachusetts Society of Professors – I just wanted to underscore what Ernie is saying. A lot of people on the Board of Trustees did not hear a thing, and they are not willing to apologize for anything, so clearly, they are not trustworthy. We achieved a great victory. Having the Chair of the Board of Trustees create his own task force, name a chairperson for it, and then have it killed by the Governor – that is huge, and that is exactly what happened. It was killed by the Governor because of what we did and what our allies in the legislature did. It doesn't mean we're done and we've solved everything, but they heard our voices. We

we were able to communicate to the Governor's Office and they knew the faculty was unified – all the faculty as well as other unions and student groups. We did that because we've been able to stand unified. The faculty now on this Executive Advisory Council includes all the major groups on campus. By inviting in these groups, Ernie and the Rules Committee have done a great thing.

Senator Richard Bogartz, Psychology – I'm just a little concerned, with all the emphasis on process and all the statements that we make involving process, that we're forgetting about the fact that they're swiping our Chancellor and I think that, if we continue to speak only to process and not address that specific event that is going on, then we're going to miss the boat and lose some of the effectiveness that we could have in keeping the Chancellor.

Senator Marta Calas, Management – The question of process is exactly right as you said just now and I was, in fact, thinking about that when we were hearing the conversation about process. There are issues of content here that are extraordinarily important, one of which is definitely the question of the Chancellor; but the other one is in terms of appointment by whatever committee or commission we are going to have to evaluate these issues. One thing that seems to be happening constantly and that's where the conversation ends is that the people who get appointed to these positions often times are seen as "respectable business people." Coming from where I come from, I would say, first of all, there are very few respectable business people. Secondly, what that means, even in the most respectable of form, has a particular attachment to a formal thinking about changing the world, that as far as it is possible to many of the things we consider important including the question are we doing the university as something that is valuable to the university as often. The Board of Trustees' actions and Wilson's actions are really good examples of precisely that type of being respectable business people. I think the one thing we have to be very careful of, in terms of content of whoever gets into that commission, is what mode of thinking prevails in the people that get together. I think that we, in this country, are very concerned when we say business, it's almost like we don't want to talk about it anymore. A lot of big businesses are completely mismanaged. Otherwise, we would have the best corporations in the world and we don't. So we have to think about that. In many ways, that kind of thinking is not necessarily progressive thinking. Business people are almost by definition cautious and so cautiousness may not be the thing we need most at this point in time.

Professor Murray Eisenberg, Mathematics and Statistics – I want to pursue the idea of substance versus process, although certainly process is the easiest thing to pursue in the present context. The issue of the business mentality is again the thing that bothers me, specifically the idea that you've done something if you move pieces around and secondly if you centralize everything and that seems to be at the heart of what Tocco and Wilson seem to be doing. Now one of the things I'd like to see asked in some forum and perhaps an answer given and I didn't get a chance to do this at the first session of the General Faculty Meeting is President Wilson's often touting the value of "one university" as exemplified by the UMass Online project. He always tells us and tells the press and the press repeats how much revenue it brings in, but never, ever in all the years of existence so far, as I have seen, have they reported what the profit is from that organization. They haven't balanced the revenue against the costs and that operation that Wilson was specifically hired originally to head was represented as a project that would bring money into the campuses. It was not represented as something intrinsically valuable as an educational operation, but as a money-making operation that would return money to the campuses. So, I would like President Wilson in some forum to answer the question of how much money it has, in fact, brought to the campuses when the costs are deducted from the revenues.

Professor William Israel, Journalism/Communication – It's the question of resources, but specifically the process on consolidating fundraising databases which, if I'm not mistaken, is all but occurring at the moment and needs to be stopped as a matter of process if we're to get a deliberate review of what's going on with this proposal. So, I would like to ask if it's appropriate to consider an amendment to move a motion.

Secretary May – That is difficult because it is administrative. What they say they are doing sounds reasonable. They are basically consolidating the back office functions and that the donor relationships and all that are going to happen on the campuses, sort of like having the platform for UMass Online being central. That's what they say they are going to do. That's not an area of faculty primary responsibility. When they messed with Gen Ed, I dashed off a violation notice that used the words "cease and desist" because it was treading on sacred ground, faculty primary responsibility for the curriculum. We have advisory responsibility for administrative affairs such

as that, and so it's more difficult. We've let them know that we don't like this, but it's not our primary responsibility; I cannot go to the mat on that one as a representative of the Faculty Senate. I know some development people are extraordinarily concerned about that. Our best route to that is through the Foundation because that's where the biggest donors are. So, people like Gene Isenberg and John Armstrong and Ditomassi and all the rest of them – they are the ones who are making this case very strongly, but I'm afraid we have to defer to them. I am in contact with them. We're working on it, but I don't think a resolution from the Faculty Senate on this subject would have the standing that a resolution about the curriculum does.

Senator Bogartz – Concerning Ernie's point, I would like to suggest that the constraints on the Faculty Senate do not apply to the General Faculty and that, while the Faculty Senate may be constrained in the positions it can take, the General Faculty is not so constrained, and we can take those positions.

Senator Marios Philippides, Classics – Perhaps our friends, the politicians, can help us with that. Maybe Stan Rosenberg can help us on that or somebody from the Senate or Representatives.

Secretary May – So, the suggestion was that we contact Stan. I have and I will.

Professor Jennie Traschen, Physics – I would like to add a couple of more thoughts to the discussion about content. I was very happy to read this plan for UMass, partly because it started to address this content stuff and funding accessible education, for example. On the other hand, I think I might have a slightly different interpretation of the factual baseline of the last five years than some of the other people who have made comments. I've been very concerned that I see a lot of things in terms of our fundamental academics and intellectual environment getting worse. I think a core example is a situation of graduate students. As far as I can tell, and this is anecdotal but I am a professor here, things have gotten worse for graduate students. I feel that we have to strongly invite President Wilson and Chancellor Lombardi to start with a couple of paragraphs as a summary, something that we can read without having to go through a very long document, and say what is their commitment to the content of this campus in terms of funding graduate student study, and what is the commitment in terms of hiring faculty to keep pace with the increasing student enrollment. I, for one, am open to listening to anyone who can come up with a good plan that shows a commitment to graduate study, to faculty, to paying staff and, also I want to mention, affirmative action: my impression over the last five years is that the number of minority students in my classes, sometimes very large classes, has gone down.

II.

MOVED: That the Faculty and Librarians support the Intercampus Faculty Council's three resolutions
GF 05-07 adopted on June 18, 2007.

Secretary May – Let me briefly reiterate these motions. It is rare to get faculty from the five universities together (we are trying not to buy into the language of the five campuses). This group is concerned about different things, and they are definitely coming from different places, but they did agree on the motion about the Governor's commission which is now a moot point. The second motion has to do with the quality of the Trustee appointments that we want. That was mentioned earlier in this meeting, and we do urge the Governor to appoint people who have a passion for public higher education and who have experience and distinguished careers, some of them being in academics. The third one has to do with a serious issue regarding the manipulation of the process for appointing a system President and campus Chancellors.

This motion was seconded and adopted.

III.

MOVED: That the Faculty and Librarians applaud Governor Patrick for responding favorably to their call
GF 06-07 for the establishment of a commission that is independent of the Board of Trustees and the President. We expect this commission to include UMass faculty and representatives of other UMass constituencies; involve full and open public discussion; and make proposals to provide the resources needed to create a top-ranked public university system.

Professor Nikki Stoia, Music and Dance – made a motion to amend the motion by inserting in the second sentence the words “from each of the five university campuses” after the words “include UMass faculty.”

Senator Calas – On that same amendment, the question therefore becomes a little bit more extended because the question is of proportionality because we are saying it has to be equal because this can run into 10 from Boston and 1 from here, or none from here.

Professor Dan Clawson, Sociology – Peculiarly enough, I think I’m actually against it. That is, if you think about the character of any group that’s undertaking this, the larger it gets, the more likely it becomes that a small circle of four or five people actually make all the decisions and, even if we called for representation, that doesn’t mean, I don’t think that they can’t find a way to manipulate who the representative from our campus is. So, I think I’d rather have a smaller group that actually meets and that all the members of the group actually have some input than if we have five faculty members and five students and five staff members and whoever else on it by the time it gets through, how it will actually operate.

Professor Eisenberg – What is the effect of this amendment, should it pass, and should the motion pass, given that the Governor has given the task to an existing commission or task force?

Professor Page – I think the resolution has no effect if we don’t do anything with it. All the resolutions that happened on May 24 had an effect because then the press reports it, and then we go to the Governor and other people in the legislature and say this is what the faculty in Amherst have declared and be sure that you follow this as closely as possible. The commission, though they have assigned a chair of that Readiness Project, they have not chosen the rest of the commission members nor the specific sub-group members, so we have a real chance to shape it.

Professor Eisenberg – I’m a little concerned that UMass faculty could include administrators who hold the position of faculty.

The motion to amend failed.

The main motion was seconded and adopted.

IV.

MOVED: That the Faculty and Librarians support the Executive Advisory Council’s endorsement of “A Plan for UMass.”
GF 07-07

This motion was seconded and adopted.

V.

MOVED: That the Rules Committee of the Faculty Senate should establish an Ad Hoc Committee on System Performance and System Governance.
GF 08-07

Secretary May – This suggestion originally came from a member of the MSP Executive Board, Steve Brewer, and I think it’s actually a great one because there is a lot of expertise and a lot of knowledge about the subject of university organization and so forth within this campus and within the five university system. By the time Governor Patrick’s taskforce gets organized, and then they hire their consultant, and consultants usually have this process where they interview the people that they are working for and they figure out what it is that they want and then they get paid a big fee, and then they produce a report which simply finds the evidence to support the opinions which they started with, and then the report ratifies that. I think what we need to do is to have a mechanism providing objective, well grounded expertise, facts and advice to this commission. We are not trying to supplant it; we’re not trying to conflict with it, but we’re going to provide them with information that they need that’s from the bottom up; it would be very difficult for them, by the time they get organized in the fall, to have that same kind of information available to them for the report by March 31st. So it will probably depend on some consultant which may produce the same kind of ill-received results as President Wilson’s so called “think piece.” We’ve got the momentum going here. This is an attempt to keep it going, stay ahead of the curve, provide

information to them which should result in strengthening the performance of all the universities in the system, and then creating a governance structure which will support the increased performance of all the universities. We may even hire our own consultants. I don't know, but we've got a lot of expertise in the system and we'll start there.

This motion was seconded and adopted.

VI:

MOVED: That a task force appointed by the Board of Trustees cannot act independently of the Board of
GF 09-07 Trustees. Therefore, we vote no-confidence in the task force just appointed by the Board of Trustees.

Professor Phillis – I think if we suspend this motion and, at some future faculty meeting where we might have it just after the Trustees do try to appoint their own commission, that we then reconsider the motion and take it up at that time.

Presiding Officer Wilson – I will accept a motion to withdraw the motion. Is there a second on this? We will discuss and vote on the question of whether to withdraw this motion and, if it is withdrawn, then there will be no discussion on the main motion. Is there any discussion on the motion to withdraw the main motion?

Senator Steven Brewer, Biology – Would it be more appropriate to table the motion rather than withdraw it?

Senator Roland Chilton, Sociology – If you want to make it to time certain, table it until the next extended meeting of the General Faculty so you know when it's going to come up again.

Presiding Officer Wilson – Is it the consensus that this motion to table to the next General Faculty Meeting is what the intent is? So the motion is to table the motion until the next General Faculty Meeting.

This motion was seconded and tabled to the next session of the General Faculty Meeting.

VII:

MOVED: That the Faculty and Librarians of the University of Massachusetts Amherst will reconvene this
GF 10-07 General Faculty Meeting at any date in June, July, August or September, the final date to be set by the Secretary of the Faculty Senate in consultation with the Rules Committee and the Executive Board of the Massachusetts Society of Professors.

Senator W. Brian O'Connor, Biology – I think this is more of a point of personal privilege, but before we recess, I do want to express my thanks to Ernie May and Max Page for doing a tremendous amount of work to get the whole General Faculty together, and I also want to commend the General Faculty for really coming out. I've been the Faculty Rep for the past eleven years. I have never seen the Trustees so concerned about how we feel. I have never been approached like I have been approached. Ernie mentioned the cocktail party last night. He was not invited. I was invited; only the Faculty Reps were invited. I corrected Trustee Carlin on that in the hallway just a few minutes ago saying that "you were wrong in chastising Ernie because he adhered to the rules. He did not come because he wasn't invited." "What to you mean, he wasn't invited? Maybe we ought to change things." So, I think that they are listening to what we are doing here, and I repeat what many people have said before, we have to remain vigilant. We certainly have to remain vigilant, and I think we're providing an excellent example in doing this.

Senator Bogartz – I'm just a little concerned about the requirement that we have 12 million people at the meeting before anything new can be brought up. So, what, if any, provisions are there for people raising issues and getting them on the agenda?

Presiding Officer Wilson – I guess I would suggest to you that the agenda for the General Faculty Meetings have been developed by a committee of the Rules Committee and the MSP and if you have any suggestions, you forward those suggestions to anyone at any time and I would assume they would be considered. So, the agenda items in this case were discussed probably starting about a week and a half ago and were finalized three or four days ago. The meeting was called prior to setting the agenda so I would suggest to you if you have any suggestions that you start forwarding them either to the MSP or to the Rules Committee and they would be considered but certainly when there is a notice of an upcoming General Faculty Meeting, there would normally be an opportunity at that point to continue to discuss the agenda items. At the same time, the reason for new items not being considered is because we've got 70, 80, 100 people here and the faculty consists of 1200, and it is generally considered by Robert's Rules of Order that it's not appropriate for a smaller group to discuss a major issue that affects the entire group without the entire group being notified of it in advance. That's the thinking behind it, but again, I suggest you contact the various people to make those suggestions.

Senator Brewer – I wanted to speak very briefly to this issue, that we are not considering some of these points. Certainly, the groups that have been trying to establish the agendas and to build, for example, The Plan for UMass, have taken a lot of view points, but in order for us to work together, in order for us to work in concert, we need to focus on the things about which there is broad, general agreement, and so, in The Plan for UMass, some people have complained that it's nothing but platitudes. There was a much larger list of ideas that people presented there, but it was winnowed down to something that could generate broad support. I know that there are some issues that some groups of people would like to see represented that don't always make it onto the agenda, but I would like to commend both Max and Ernie and the rest of the people that have contributed for recognizing that we need to speak with unanimity, we need to speak with a broad consensus, and we need to move forward together, and that not everyone's issues will always make it to the forefront when we're dealing with such a large group.

Professor Eisenberg – I was a bit concerned, even at the first session, at a low percentage of the total faculty present and what that might signal to the press and to the Board of Trustees. Is there any provision in the rules for general faculty allowing a mail ballot which could include conceivably an email ballot unless, of course, the issue was so pressing that we can't even wait that time?

Presiding Officer Wilson – I think we could look into it. As far as I can tell, the rules regarding general faculty meetings are two sentences long because we don't generally have them.

Senator Chilton – To follow that up, I think it might make some sense to put on the agenda for the next meeting of the General Faculty a motion that calls for a vote of the entire faculty by mail ballot. If this had happened last time, I'm sure we would have had more negative votes, but we would have had a lot more than 214 votes. So, I think this is something that the two groups can take up and, if it's on the agenda for the next meeting, when the group meets again, they can endorse such a vote.

This motion was seconded and adopted.

The General Faculty Meeting stood recessed at 12:06 p.m. on June 21, 2007.

The proceedings of this meeting are available on audiotape in the Faculty Senate Office.

Respectfully submitted,

Ernest D. May
Secretary of the Faculty Senate