

UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST
OFFICE OF THE FACULTY SENATE

A recording of this meeting is accessible at <http://www.umass.edu/senate/736>.

Presiding Officer Richard Bogartz called the 736th Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate to order on April 3, 2014 at 3:30 p.m. in Herter Hall, Room 227.

The meeting began with the recitation of “The Road Not Taken” by Robert Frost.

Two roads diverged in a yellow wood,
And sorry I could not travel both
And be one traveler, long I stood
And looked down one as far as I could
To where it bent in the undergrowth;

Then took the other, as just as fair,
And having perhaps the better claim,
Because it was grassy and wanted wear;
Though as for that the passing there
Had worn them really about the same,

And both that morning equally lay
In leaves no step had trodden black.
Oh, I kept the first for another day!
Yet knowing how way leads on to way,
I doubted if I should ever come back.

I shall be telling this with a sigh
Somewhere ages and ages hence:
Two roads diverged in a wood, and I—
I took the one less traveled by,
And that has made all the difference.

Ernest May, Secretary of the Faculty Senate, moved to suspend the rules in order to move item E. #3, the Special Report of the Academic Matters, Academic Priorities, Graduate and Program and Budget Councils concerning a Departmental Name Change from the Department of Psychology to the Department of Psychological and Brain Sciences for immediate vote, as the Department Head had to leave the Faculty Senate meeting early.

The motion to suspend the rules was seconded and approved.

E. NEW BUSINESS

3. Special Report of the Academic Matters, Academic Priorities, Graduate and Program and Budget Councils concerning a Departmental Name Change from the Department of Psychology to the Department of Psychological and Brain Sciences, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 14-034 with Motion No. 35-14.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Departmental Name Change from the Department of Psychology to the Department of Psychological and Brain Sciences, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 14-034.

The motion was adopted.

A. PANEL DISCUSSION

**UPDATE FROM THE JOINT TASK FORCE ON RESOURCE ALLOCATION
“DRAFT FINAL REPORT”**

(This report will be distributed electronically with the Secretary's notes prior to the meeting.)

MODERATORS

ELIZABETH CHILTON AND TIMOTHY ANDERSON, CO-CHAIRS

PANELISTS

LAURA BRIGGS, WOMEN, GENDER, SEXUALITY STUDIES

JULIE BRIGHAM-GRETTE, GEOSCIENCES

DAVID EVANS, EDUCATION POLICY, RESEARCH AND ADMINISTRATION

A YEMISI JIMOH, AFRO-AMERICAN STUDIES

PATRICK KELLY, ELECTRICAL AND COMPUTER ENGINEERING

JENNIFER NORMANLY, BIOCHEMISTRY AND MOLECULAR BIOLOGY

MJ PETERSON, POLITICAL SCIENCE

(QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION TO FOLLOW)

Elizabeth Chilton, Co-Chair of the Joint Task Force on Resource Allocation, thanked the Senate for the opportunity to present on the work of the Task Force. She noted that the work of the group is not done. Studying various resource allocation models has been an educational process. The draft report being presented lays out guiding principles, but remains very much a living document. The Task Force has asked Huron Consulting Group to explore a customized funding model for UMass based on recommendations from the JTFRA. Those recommendations are for a model that is more transparent and more decentralized. The JTFRA is not advocating for a traditional RCM model. There are attributes of RCM in the Task Force’s recommendations, but the models being explored entail a large steering wheel housed in central administration. This guarantees that the common good of the University as a whole is not neglected.

With the help of Huron, the Task Force has been exploring a more decentralized model. Huron has compiled a detailed report on how funds flow around campus. The basic premise of UMass’ current process, in which funds are added to units incrementally year by year, is very common. They noted, however, that, in some ways, it is one of the most complicated systems they had seen. The first month or two of study was about how money flows in and out of campus and what rules govern those moves.

The JTFRA looked at these processes in the light of its guiding principles. Often the current system is so complicated that it is unclear what is happening. Department leaders may know the basic structure of budgeting on the campus, but may not be aware of real costs. It was also made apparent that decisions were often being made far from where the revenues would be flowing. The model often makes it difficult to be flexible. The draft report outlines where the Task Force feels the University is lining up with its guiding principles well, and where it could improve.

Huron modeled some simpler funds flows that would better align with University Principles. An example model shows how funds could flow directly to Schools, Colleges, and Auxiliaries, who then bear direct responsibility for those funds, some of which are allotted to the central administrative processes of the campus. Essentially, that is a more simplified and transparent model.

The primary sources of revenue at UMass Amherst are the state allocation and tuition and fees from students. The Task Force looked at how to best allocate that money based on classroom hours, majors, and research initiatives. The Task Force spent much time looking at how the campus would charge units back to support administrative and support units such as the Provost’s Office, the Library, Facilities, OIT, the Graduate School, et cetera. These are units that benefit the campus as a whole, but which do not have the means to support themselves on their own with this sort of model.

A strategic investments fund is also part of this simplified model, which would not be possible in a traditional RCM model. This sort of fund allows for strategic priorities to be carried out by the University as a whole. Much discussion needs to occur surrounding that pool, but it is considered a very important aspect of the model.

In the end, Huron put a model together to compare with the current system, which can be seen on slide 9 of the presentation. At the very bottom, there is an investment in the strategic investment pool. Looking at this model, you see that some schools and colleges have a positive unit margin, while some have a negative unit margin. This is true the nation over. UMass Amherst charges one common tuition for units with varying costs of instruction and varying research activity. While there should be conversation about this, there should be no conception of winners and losers among schools and colleges. The goal is always for the success of the University as a whole.

The Joint Task Force on Resource Allocation put forth eight recommendations, focusing on four primary recommendations:

- Further evaluate a more decentralized and transparent UMass Resource Allocation Model
- Parallel process beginning FY 2015 should include testing of an alternative resource model in parallel with the existing model
- Continuation of the JTFRA or a similar committee to lead the campus engagement throughout the parallel and implementation phases (model testing and system readiness)
- Decision and recommendations for next steps by early 2015

These recommendations are based on two important elements, the first being that more research and testing needs to be done. The second is the distinction between the model that allocates funds to the units and the larger system in which this model could exist. If decision making is more decentralized, UMass needs to be sure that it is ready for these changes. For example, the roles of Deans would change under a new model. The Faculty Senate may need to think about accommodating the changes. After a semester of testing, it may be seen that changes need to be made before a final decision is made by the Chancellor.

Randall Phillis, President of the Massachusetts Society of Professors, noted that he was struck by the fact that none of the campus unions were considered stakeholders in this process. The way that they make choices as bargaining units deeply affect the campus. In general, he wanted to know what the JTFRA hoped to do at the Faculty Senate meeting.

Professor Chilton addressed President Phillis' first comment, noting that this month was considered the most important time for campus engagement. Much work went into the report, and now the Task Force wants feedback. There is an MSP forum scheduled in April. The Task Force's goal at the Faculty Senate meeting was to get feedback from the Senate on both the process and content of the Task Force's work.

President Phillis noted that it appears that the units are being identified as schools and colleges—units led by Deans. The Deans have a lot of power. He wondered what sort of checks and balances would be in place to weigh the decisions of the Deans against the desires of faculty members.

Ernest May, Secretary of the Faculty Senate, noted that many universities have college councils in addition to campus-wide senates. This sort of process may be more important if UMass goes to a more decentralized model.

President Phillis thinks that the personnel committee model is appropriate, as there is a balance between the committees and the department leaders. He is concerned about the decision-making power in the resources allocation process.

Secretary May noted that this is currently how resources are allocated.

Professor Chilton noted that the report explicitly notes that these concerns need to be explored. Some early adopters of RCM had departments acting like primary units, and there were many disastrous consequences. The JTFRA advocated transparency all the way to the department level.

President Phillis was pleased to see guiding principles outlined from the outset and hopes that those principles are upheld going forward.

Professor A Yemisi Jimoh, Member of the Joint Task Force on Resource Allocation, stated that the guiding principles shape the allocation, rather than the other way around. The report recommends a regular review process, which could identify certain problems in the process.

Senator Steven Brewer noted that he found the process easier to understand by interpreting it as two pieces. There is the model, which is a sort of automaton, and then there is the system of larger principles that determines how that model works.

Dean Timothy Anderson, Co-Chair of the Joint Task Force on Resource Allocation, affirmed that understanding. The model in the presentation used 2013 data—nothing from the hypothetical future. All that the JTFRA did was watch how the money would flow. It is a series of linear equations that, essentially, can lead to any outcome that the University may wish. The job of the Task Force and the University as a whole is to ask if the equations are leading to desirable outcomes and, if not, make the appropriate adjustments to the larger system.

Professor Chilton added that there is a clear distinction between the allocation model and what could be done with strategic investment money. The role of the strategic investment pool is highlighted as being beyond the scope of the system. The holistic sense of the University is very important, and a strict formula-based budget was not what the JTFRA asked Huron to explore.

Senator Susan Whitbourne wondered what plans the JTFRA had to monitor some difficult questions like campus sentiment regarding the model.

Senator MJ Peterson, Member of the Joint Task Force on Resource Allocation, noted that the fact that a new system would be inherent in the adoption of a new model was always on the Task Force's mind. The Task Force has reached out a lot to try to get a reading of this. The parallel process that will take place next year will teach the Task Force more than it is possible to know now.

Professor Chilton noted that the Task Force talked a lot about the items that were not dependent variables, such as diversity, equity, inclusiveness, quality, et cetera. These are critical components of knowing if the model is doing what it should.

Dean Anderson noted that the strategic investment fund will determine much about how both the model and system will align with the campus' principles.

Professor Jimoh added that moving to a less centralized system will allow for more flexibility to meet these types of goals.

Senator Vouvakis asked about the University's endowment. He wondered if there were hopes to increase the University's endowment, as most institutions using RCM and RCM-like models have large endowments. Additionally, he wondered how the parallel process would take place.

Dean Anderson noted that many endowment funds are directed to specific University projects, and are therefore often outside of the model.

Professor Chilton stated that the University is working to increase its endowment and that the model would adjust to increased revenues.

Dean Anderson addressed the parallel process, stating that the current budget would be used next year while a new model will be analyzed in real time.

Professor Jimoh stated that endowments are not part of the model that are being addressed in the Task Force's all funds report, as there are determinations about how those funds are spent that the Task Force cannot determine. She added that this model encourages entrepreneurship.

Professor Chilton stated that the JTFRA had a special subcommittee addressing how to have a more collaborative approach to addressing administrative and support units. Part of this is to create more transparency, indicating how many resources are going to each unit, such as OIT, janitorial services, the Library, et cetera.

Secretary May stated that the units have three main ways to make additional money: CUIP, fundraising, and CPE, which is more significant, especially for one college. This model may open up new ways to make and utilize those funds.

Senator David Gross noted that the Strategic Plan is mentioned early in the report. He wonders how, exactly, the model relates to the goals in the Strategic Plan, which are difficult to quantify.

Professor Chilton reiterated the difference between the resource allocation model and the larger system. The eight principles mentioned in the report came straight from the Strategic Plan and were in the minds of JTFRA members as each variable was studied.

Professor Patrick Kelly, Member of the Joint Task Force on Resource Allocation, followed up on Professor Chilton's comments by noting that there are specific aspects of the model that represent University principles. For example, scholarships are considered a common good in the model, so there is no disincentive for departments to not accept scholarship students. A lot of the model, though, is values neutral. It is in the larger strategic investment pool that values can be more easily promoted.

John Curry, Huron Consultant, stated that the JTFRA members had spoken to a lot of the ways the model can address values. The structure addresses some principles, such as funding research appropriately. Research doesn't pay for itself, so the model needs to incentivize its continuation. It is important to think about what conversations between deans and the Provost will look like under the system. Personal engagement is essential to moving forward with University priorities.

Dean Anderson compared the situation to that of a professor within a department. That professor has control over the classes he or she teaches. However, if the department wants to increase diversity, the department head and dean have more control of that.

Senator Gross expressed the widely held concern that any resource allocation model risks a situation where the cheapest option is the best.

Professor Chilton noted the large and varied membership of the JTFRA as one check against that thinking. The work of the Task Force is to have the thoughtful conversations that need to happen around resource allocation. Chancellor Subbaswamy has made it clear that the University will not move forward with any model that does not support the Strategic Plan. UMass Amherst is lucky for not being in dire straights while considering this.

Senator Peterson stated that no matter what model UMass goes forward with, the University will always be part of larger society, and will therefore come up against the pressures inherent with that position. Some of those pressures will be to be as cheap as possible. Others will be to offer a high-quality residential education. UMass Amherst has selected what it wants to be and the principles of any budgeting system must reflect that.

Presiding Officer Richard Bogartz noted two major areas of work to be done. One is to align the model with the important principles that must be supported in order for UMass Amherst to be the kind of University it wants to be. Without the budgeting model, there would just be principles in the air. With a model that is more transparent, the University can carry on discussions about it. It makes all sorts of sense to do a test run of the model. If things don't go the way that individuals on campus want it to, he wondered how the campus can assist with modifying the model.

Dean Anderson noted his past experience with the University of Florida as it went through a change in budget models. It is a learning process. An advantage of this type of model allows for faster change than the current system. At Florida, his department made many adjustments—both beneficial and not—and it took about three or four years to really figure out the best way to utilize the new model.

Professor Chilton stated that the iterative process that Dean Anderson is speaking about is explicitly discussed in the report. The larger system includes faculty input. Campus engagement is very important for correcting the system.

Secretary May added that in the current system, all responsibilities regarding resource allocation are made by Chancellor Subbaswamy. The continuation of the JTFRA would be a move towards a more participatory system.

Senator Linda Smircich wondered what restructuring implications may be the result of using this system.

Professor Chilton stated that there is no change in administrative services under the currently studied system. It may be determined later that some adjustment may be needed in administrative units. The Task Force is not trying to decentralize people, but decentralize responsibility and resources. Part of this process will be reassessing institutional readiness to see where things may need to change.

John Curry stated that, under the current model, financial managers in units mostly think about expense reports. Under the new model, revenues, space utilization, special initiatives, et cetera, will become part of those jobs. In time, there has been, in some instances, the need to hire people with more professional skills. However, in most instances, people can rise to the occasion. He has never seen a growth in administrative costs as a result of going towards a resource allocation model such as this one.

B. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Principal Administrative Officers

Provost James Staros referred to the previous Faculty Senate meeting, where he announced Robert Feldman's appointment as Deputy Chancellor. That appointment left open the position of Dean of the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences. He was pleased to announce that John Hird will serve as Interim Dean. There will be a search next year. Although he does not usually announce individual faculty searches, there has been an appointment to a newly created endowed chair position. Stellan Vinthagen, currently of Göteborg University in Sweden, has been named Endowed Chair in Nonviolent Direct Action and Civil Resistance. Provost Staros offered two acclamations about this position. The first to the faculty in general. This chair was not given to UMass by an old friend or alumni, but by someone who saw UMass Amherst as the place to put a chair in a social justice topic like this one. The second is to Vice Provost Joel Martin, who worked incredibly hard to put all the parts of this together. Following that thanks, Provost Staros announced that Vice Provost Martin would be leaving UMass to become Provost of Franklin and Marshall College in Pennsylvania.

Michael Malone, Vice Chancellor for Research and Engagement, stated that there is a draft report on the strategic planning website describing potential areas of focus for research on campus. This is the project of the Research Strategic Planning Subcommittee. The Subcommittee would like faculty feedback on the report.

Carol Barr, Vice Provost for Undergraduate and Continuing Education, added that there are also documents on describing what a UMass education is on the strategic planning website, as well reports on outreach and engagement.

John McCarthy, Dean of the Graduate School, announced that, in order to focus graduate commencement more squarely on graduate education, the Graduate School has created two new awards for graduate faculty and staff. Nominations for the Distinguished Graduate Mentor Award come from Graduate Program Directors, Department Chairs, and Personnel Committee Chairs and include letters of support from students and alumni.

The first recipients are Eric Decker of Food Science, Erin Baker of Mechanical and Industrial Engineering, and Lynn Frazier of Linguistics. Nominations for the Distinguished Graduate Staff Award are made by students. There are two recipients this year, Barbara McGlynn, who is the graduate staff member in the Program for Poets and Writers, and Dorothy Adams from the Department of Mechanical and Industrial Engineering.

2. The Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Ernest May, Secretary of the Faculty Senate, encouraged the Senate to review the detailed slides that had been produced by the Huron Consultants. At the May 1 meeting, the JTFRA will return to discuss its final report along with representatives from the JTFSO.

3. The Faculty Delegates to the Board of Trustees

Senator James Kurose, Faculty Delegate to the Board of Trustees, stated that each campus gave presentations on the state of educational technology prior to the last Board of Trustees meeting. There was a lot of discussion about the use of data in furthering the goals of the University. As was announced at a previous Senate meeting, the BOT’s Science, Technology and Research Subcommittee was recently disbanded. The Intercampus Faculty Council wrote a letter of concern over this to BOT Chair Henry Thomas and Chair Thomas responded with a letter stating that the BOT has a deep commitment to these aspects of education and, in fact, the Subcommittee was disbanded in order to integrate its work into the larger committee and reach a larger audience.

4. The Representative of the Massachusetts Society of Professors

Randall Phillis, President of the Massachusetts Society of Professors, noted that the MSP has initiated bargaining for the new contract, which entails about \$120 million of salaries. He hopes that the mutual agreement between the MSP and administration that must take place to approve the contract will extend to the current resource allocation work.

5. The President of the Graduate Student Senate

Samantha Sterba, Vice President of the Graduate Student Senate, noted that the GSS has had interesting discussions with the JTFRA, JTFSO, and Internationalization Committee that she hopes will continue to assist international students on campus.

D. NEW COURSES

<u>COURSE</u>	<u>TITLE</u>	<u>CREDITS</u>
HISTORY 365	“U.S. LGBT and Queer History”	4
POLISCI 281	“Comparative Political Economy”	4
PUBHLTH 201	“Physical Activity and Health”	3

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the courses HISTORY 365, POLISCI 281 and PUBHLTH 201, 30-14 as recommended by the Academic Matters Council.

The motion was adopted.

<u>COURSE</u>	<u>TITLE</u>	<u>CREDITS</u>
BCT 520	“Energy and Buildings”	3

BCT 550	“Construction Project Management”	3
BIOLOGY 551	“Animal Communication”	3
NRC 580	“Conservation Genetics”	4

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the courses BCT 520 and 550, BIOLOGY 551 and NRC 580, 31-14 as recommended by the Academic Matters and Graduate Councils.

The motion was adopted.

<u>COURSE</u>	<u>TITLE</u>	<u>CREDITS</u>
EDUC 793D	“Globalization and Education Policy”	3
GEO-SCI 636	“Advanced Remote Sensing”	3
GEO-SCI 678	“Spatial Data Analysis”	3

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the courses EDUC 793D and GEO-SCI 636 and 678, 32-14 as recommended by the Graduate Council.

The motion was adopted.

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. Special Report of the Academic Priorities Council and the Rules Committee concerning Centers and Institutes: Comprehensive Policy on Approval and Review, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 14-032 with Motion No. 33-14.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve Centers and Institutes: Comprehensive Policy on Approval and Review, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 14-032. 33-14

Senator Howard Peelle wondered, while reading the report, which was bigger, a center or an institute? The report states that a center can be a subset of an institute, but not the other way around. He wondered why there are no stated lengths of terms for centers or institutes.

Senator MJ Peterson, Chair of the Rules Committee, stated that this is probably because they come into being in varied ways. Some centers and institutes that do have term lengths are those that come out of NSF grants that are for allotted amounts of time. However, some of those centers and institutes continue to exist after funding has run out. Instead of setting terms, this document advocates for five-year reviews.

Presiding Officer Bogartz asked for more clarification on why centers can be in institutes.

Vice Chancellor Malone stated that, for the most part, centers are housed within a single department or college, while institutes can span colleges. Currently, for example, the Center for Fundamental Interactions is housed within an institute, Mass NanoTech. The Institute has broader educational goals than the Center.

Senator Marta Calas asked about issues of interdisciplinary study in centers. She wonders if the limitation on centers to be housed within a single unit might keep centers from being interdisciplinary.

Vice Chancellor Malone noted that the single unit that a center is housed in could be an institute, as institutes are specifically interdisciplinary.

Senator Peterson stated that there is nothing stopping a center from interacting with other departments in this document. The document addresses specific budgetary issues, but not the wider reality of the center on a day-to-day basis.

The motion was adopted.

2. **Special Report of the Graduate Council concerning a Minor Change in the Requirements for the Certificate in Cultural Landscape Management in the Department of Landscape Architecture and Regional Planning, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 14-033 with Motion No. 34-14.**

MOVED: 34-14 That the Faculty Senate approve the Minor Change in the Requirements for the Certificate in Cultural Landscape Management in the Department of Landscape Architecture and Regional Planning, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 14-033.

The motion was adopted.

F. OLD BUSINESS

Amendment to the Special Report of the Committee on Committees concerning Nominations to the Academic Honesty Board, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 14-021B with Motion No. 17-14.

MOVED: 17-14 That the Faculty Senate approve the Amendment to the Special Report of the Committee on Committees concerning Nominations to the Academic Honesty Board, as amended, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 14-021B.

The motion was adopted.

The 736th Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate stood adjourned at 5:28 p.m. on April 3, 2014.

Respectfully submitted,

**Ernest D. May
Secretary of the Faculty Senate**