

UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST
OFFICE OF THE FACULTY SENATE

Presiding Officer Robert Wilson called the 687th Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate to order on September 17, 2009 at 3:30 p.m. in Herter Hall, Room 227.

Presiding Officer Wilson welcomed and introduced new members of the University's administration:

- James Staros, Provost and Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
- Michael Malone, Vice Chancellor for Research and Engagement
- Michael Leto, Vice Chancellor for Development & Alumni Affairs and Executive Director, UMass Amherst Foundation
- Jean Kim, Interim Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs and Campus Life
- Robert Feldman, Interim Dean of the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences
- Steve Goodwin, Dean of the College of Natural Sciences
- Mark Fuller, Dean of the Isenberg School of Management
- Ted Djafaris, Interim Dean of the College of Engineering

A. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Principal Administrative Officers

Jay Schafer, Director of Libraries, commented about the Ad Hoc Committee on the Impact and Implications of Digital Scholarship. He explained that at the May meeting of the Faculty Senate there was time on the agenda to discuss the final report of the group, but, due to the merger, discussions were put off until the summer. Over the summer, the Rules Committee received the report which is in the omnibus bill today. The report discusses the impact of digital scholarship on libraries, dissemination of scholarship, on sustainability, on authors' rights and personnel action. He encouraged all Faculty Senate members to read the report. Over the next academic year, the Faculty Senate Research Library Council, the Research Council and the Graduate Council will be taking up issues related to digital scholarship. In a follow-up to the impact of digital scholarship on research, there will be the Fourth Annual Digital Quadrangle Series lecture on Thursday, September 24th. We have Stuart Shieber from Harvard and Ann Wolpert from MIT talking about the University's role in the dissemination of scholarship and research called "action." Also, the week of October 19th-23rd, we will be having our first annual Open Access Week here at UMass Amherst. He encouraged all faculty to participate in these activities.

2. The Secretary of the Faculty Senate

Ernest May, Secretary of the Faculty Senate, welcomed everyone to the meeting. Secretary May stated that it had been an extremely turbulent environment in the last twelve months. We've been on a rollercoaster, and the ride certainly could have ended very badly. He noted that, thanks to Governor Patrick, Secretary of Education Reville, and our supporters in the Legislature, the University has really narrowly avoided taking a serious licking. Even though our base budget from the state has been dramatically cut, and that is a fact, the funding shortfall has been almost completely met through the allocation of stimulus money. This was not something that had to happen; it was something people chose to do. Any year in which the challenges have been so great -and we are now starting the new year with only minor damage- is a great year. We need to be appropriately grateful to the various officials in the state that made this possible for us.

Secretary May noted that the University has an excellent new team of administrators who have been introduced, and 30-some new faculty on campus. He said that given the magnitude of the budget shortfall we were looking at last January and February, this is miraculous, stating that the campus has breathed a great sigh of relief. However, it is very hard to escape the impression that the end result of what has happened, which is our good fortune right now, has been the result of kicking the can down the road by one year. Instead of having a \$46 million problem beginning in FY10, we now have a \$46 million problem for FY11. Some are optimistic that another solution will appear similar to the stimulus money which appeared this year but, Secretary May is skeptical of that. His attitude is to hope for the best certainly, but plan to maintain our stability through a more realistic funding mechanism than another round of stimulus money. He urged the faculty to remember that in prioritizing higher education for stimulus money, the Governor and Legislature, in setting this precedent with us, must have made other people a lot less happy. He stated that the less happy ones will likely be advocating quite strongly for next year as 'their turn', if the state government has any wherewithal to make budget restorations. Secretary May urged that the faculty must be continuously focused, continuing to make the kind of

communications that seemed to have worked this year. Some components of that message include the critical value of the investment in the regional and state economy moving forward into the future. Turning back the clock is not an option and it is not an argument that has any traction at all in Boston.

Many faculty devoted unprecedented effort to the work of the Senate, the task forces, the Council and Committees during the last year. Secretary May stressed the group must thank them all immensely. The campus success in “winning by not losing,” over the past year, is partly due to these efforts. He wished he could say that such tough efforts would not need to continue but this is extremely unlikely. The challenges to the campus continue at a high level of intensity, even though the external environment is less tumultuous now. A continued level of faculty engagement is critical to the future of the institution. With respect to the Senate itself, it is gratifying to report that the Councils and Committees are mostly full or nearly full. The Senate itself, however, has a number of open seats. Secretary May welcomed new senators: Marc Achermann, Physics; Brian Breed, Classics; Mari Castañeda, Communications; Amilar Shabazz, Afro-Am; and Susan Sturgeon, Public Health. He heartily thanked Rob Faulkner for his past three years of service on the Rules Committee and the publication of his new book, *Do You Know? . . . The Jazz Repertoire in Action*, by the University of Chicago Press, which is selling like hot cakes. Beginning today, it is likely that during this academic year, the Faculty Senate will be engaging in deliberations and taking votes of great importance to the future of this campus. We will be holding elections soon to try to fill the vacant seats, so that our decisions will be taken by a fully representative, deliberative body. Secretary May thanked the faculty for their continued engagement and support of the institution throughout these continually tumultuous times.

3. The Chair of the Rules Committee

John McCarthy, Chair of the Rules Committee, opened by comparing writing legislation to making sausage, and expressed his appreciation for the people who operated the sausage-making equipment. He introduced the special report describing the proposed changes to the General Education requirements that Senators would be voting on later in the meeting. He explained that what is not necessarily apparent from the formality of the report is that all of the Committees and Councils listed met during the summer, specifically to talk about this report and to work on this. Since only the Councils and Committees were involved technically, they are the only ones that appear here. The group that was most involved in the creation of this proposal was the General Education Task Force. Members of this group included:

Faculty

Maurianne Adams (Education, Rules Committee, General Education Council)
Martha Baker (Associate Dean of Natural Resources and the Environment)
Carol Barr (ISOM Associate Dean of Undergraduate Programs)
Elizabeth Chilton (Anthropology)
Barbara Cruikshank (Political Science)
Alexandrina Deschamps (Women, Gender, Sexuality Studies, Rules Committee, General Education Council)
Isabel Espinal (Library, General Education Council)
Robert Feldman (Psychology, Dean of Social and Behavioral Sciences)
Justin Fermann (Chemistry)
Stephen Gencarella (Communication)
Judy Goodenough (Biology, General Education Council)
Anne Herrington (English, General Education Council)
Randall Knoper (English, General Education Council)
Mark Leckie (Geosciences, General Education Council)
Alan Lutenegger (Civil and Environmental Engineering, General Education Council)
John McCarthy (Linguistics, Rules Committee)
Anne C. Moore (Library)
W. Brian O'Connor (Biology, Rules Committee)
Amilcar Shabazz (Afro-American Studies)
Julian Tyson (Chemistry)
Wilmore Webley (Microbiology)
Gordon Wyse (Biology)

Administrators

Marilyn Blaustein (Institutional Research)
John Cunningham, GETF Chair (Deputy Provost, Dean of Undergraduate Education)
Bryan Harvey (Associate Provost)

Pamela Marsh-Williams (Assistant Provost, General Education Council)
Richard Rogers (Associate Provost)
Charlena Seymour (Provost)
Martha Stassen (Academic Planning and Assessment)

Graduate Students

Emily Cachiguango (Education)
Amy Fleig (Political Science)

Senator McCarthy stated that these individuals are greatly appreciated for all of their efforts and passing this would be testament to all the work they have done.

4. The Faculty Delegates to the Board of Trustees

Marilyn Billings, Associate Delegate to the Board of Trustees, spoke on behalf of Rick Adrion who is still at the Board of Trustees meeting. There were committee meetings earlier today. The first committee was the Science and Technology Committee. There was a great presentation by scientists from Worcester, talking about their Stem Cell Bank and their Registry. There was also a report out from the System Office about the progress of the research agenda for the whole UMass system. There was an Advancement Committee meeting where we discussed advancement initiatives, the Development Council and those types of things. She and Ernest May left after that meeting in order to come back to campus for the Faculty Senate meeting. The Committee on Academic and Student Affairs was meeting subsequent to that and there were many tenure decisions coming down that we will hear about in the near future.

Secretary May added that an indication that the current administration's favorable attitude towards the University has got to be the fact that the Stem Cell Institute and Bank in Worcester is fully funded. It is the only aspect of the Massachusetts Life Sciences initiative -which is supposed to include public and private partners- that was funded at all, according to this morning's presentation. It was funded to the tune of \$100 million. The building and institute are up and functioning; they have a very impressive website. I just use that as another indication of a very serious change in state attitude towards the University of Massachusetts. This certainly is great news. Secretary May also reminded everyone that the Trustees will be meeting on the Amherst campus on September 30th. He encouraged everyone to welcome and thank them since it is clear that there is a different attitude down there now. Thank you's, when something good has happened, is an extremely powerful form of advocacy. You can thank them and then go on. This is something that this campus is not known for particularly, but it is a good strategy this year.

5. The Representative of the Massachusetts Society of Professors

Randall Phillis, President of the Massachusetts Society of Professors, stated that the first item he wanted to discuss was contract funding. The contract is front loaded with a zero in the first year, a 1.5% increase in the 2nd year and a couple of 3.5% increases. All of those increases, as modest as they may be, are currently unfunded. There will be a strong political effort required, in order to achieve that funding. This funding enterprise is a joint agreement of all of the faculty and the administration. We must all move forward with a sense of political unity to persuade the legislature to indeed get that funding as an increase in the base budget so we do not absorb a hit by having contractually-agreed raises, as modest as they may be. The MSP hopes to join together with everyone. There will be a number of opportunities. Currently that bill is sitting in the Ways and Means Committee, and is not moving forward at this time. Moving it forward will require political persuasion, he promised.

The second item the MSP has been working on is the general issue of workload. This is a big problem with respect to the faculty. He described what the faculty do: they work really hard. The average tenure system faculty member on this campus works 66.4 hours per week. That's the median. Half of faculty do more than that; the slackers are only at 55 or so. There's a tremendous work load. We're talking about a time where hiring will be reduced to very low levels. Retirements and departures from the University will stay at a consistent level. Student numbers are going up and therefore teaching loads are going up. Research and productivity output by other measures, including service, are also going up, beyond apparently 66.4 hours per week. President Phillis stated faculty have a tremendous workload challenge that they are faced with. He stressed the need to be efficient and need to think very carefully about how we are using our very precious resources of faculty time and energy.

In that regard, he provided a very brief comment about the Gen. Ed. proposal that was to be discussed. He stated that it was the MSP's position that changes in workload, such as adjusting the kinds of Gen. Ed. credits awarded, sit on top of a three-legged stool (in respect to instructional effort). First, he explained, the University must expect the students to be more engaged. He said that he was not sure how this body or the faculty might achieve that, but nevertheless the students need to do their part if they're receiving more credit. He said that there's a natural expectation that they should engage more in order to earn that credit. There's also faculty effort. In order to provide a more enriched environment for student learning that therefore deserves more credit, faculty should be properly more engaged and be able to demonstrate how it is that they are providing 33% more enrichment for their course to move from a 3-credit course to a 4-credit course. Finally, the administration must be engaged, such that they recognize the additional faculty effort and respect and reward it appropriately – where those faculty are properly either compensated or relieved from other kinds of work that they might be expected, as they engage more fully in some particular aspect of teaching. That three-legged stool is important. He stressed that the Faculty Senate today has responsibility to ensure that faculty engagement and the quality of the course is indeed assigned at a properly high levels, as courses change from a 3-credit to a 4-credit system.

B. QUESTION PERIOD (10-Minute Limit)

Senator McCarthy posed a question for Vice Chancellor Joyce Hatch. He explained that departments were asked earlier this week, or late last week, to provide continuity action plans. He said it fell to him to do it for his department, and that his was rejected very promptly. He asked for clarification and received an email which he read to the group. He explained that there was a generous offer to help him do this. Senator McCarthy explained that what would be nice for him and many other people who have to do this for academic departments is just to see a model of what an academic department should do for this so we can just fill this out. If there's a model that describes what to do with your animals, we can figure out that his departments don't need to do that.

Joyce Hatch, Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance, acknowledged that Senator McCarthy's question was a good one. She said that the process was a little more obscure activity in an academic department. She suggested that Brian Olsen, who is our Business Continuity Emergency Planning Director, could provide some examples and is very familiar with what other people are doing, particularly a science department which has a lot of equipment to keep up and running as opposed to a humanities department. Vice Chancellor Hatch thanked Senator McCarthy for his question and vowed to work on some examples.

C. ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, ON BEHALF OF THE FACULTY SENATE, OVER THE SUMMER 2009

NEW BUSINESS (FOR AY 2008-2009)

(ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, ON BEHALF OF THE FACULTY SENATE, OVER THE SUMMER 2009)

1. Approval of two new courses:
SOCIOLOGY 384 "Sociology of Love" – 3 credits
CE-ENGIN 670 "Transport Processes in Environmental and Water Resources Engineering" – 3 credits
2. Final Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Impact and Implications of Digital Scholarship, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 09-058 with Motion No. 71-09.
3. Special Report of the Academic Matters Council concerning Clarification of Minors and Certificates, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 09-059 with Motion No. 72-09.
4. Special Report of the General Education Council and the General Education Task Force concerning The Purposes of General Education, presented in Sen. Doc. No. 09-060 with Motion No. 73-09.
5. Special Report of the Academic Matters Council concerning Undergraduate Program Revisions in Hospitality & Tourism Management, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 09-061 with Motion No. 74-09.
6. Special Report of the Academic Matters, Graduate and Program and Budget Councils concerning Undergraduate Program Revisions in Women's Studies and the Program Name Change from Women's Studies to Women, Gender, Sexuality Studies, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 09-062 with Motion No. 75-09.

7. Special Report of the Academic Matters, Academic Priorities and Program and Budget Councils concerning an Undergraduate Certificate Program in Multicultural Theater Practice, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 09-063 with Motion No. 76-09.
8. Special Report of the Academic Matters Council concerning Undergraduate Program Revisions in Natural Resources Conservation, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 09-064 with Motion No. 77-09.
9. Special Report of the General Education Council concerning Recommended General Education Designations for ENGLISH 307, PSIS 190C, and SCANDIN 397V, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 09-065 with Motion No. 78-09.

OLD BUSINESS

(ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, ON BEHALF OF THE FACULTY SENATE, OVER THE SUMMER 2009)

1. Special Report of the Committee on Committees concerning Nominations to Faculty Senate Councils and Committees, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 09-049B with Motion No. 54-09.
2. Special Report of the Academic Matters Council concerning the 2009-2010 Academic Calendar, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 06-043E with Motion No. 48-06.
3. Special Report of the Academic Matters Council concerning the 2010-2011 Academic Calendar, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 07-050D with Motion No. 55-07.
4. Special Report of the Academic Matters Council concerning the 2011-2012 Academic Calendar, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 08-031B with Motion No. 33-08.
5. Special Report of the Rules Committee concerning The Establishment of an Ad Hoc Committee on Strategic Oversight (AHCSO), as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 09-042A with Motion No. 47-09.

NEW BUSINESS (FOR AY 2009-2010)

(ACTIONS TAKEN BY THE RULES COMMITTEE, ON BEHALF OF THE FACULTY SENATE, OVER THE SUMMER 2009)

Special Report of the Rules Committee concerning the Establishment of an Ad Hoc Committee on General Education Revision and Implementation (GERICO), as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 10-001A with Motion No. 01-10.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate affirm the actions taken by the Rules Committee over the Summer, as listed on 02-10 this agenda, Item C.

Senator Andrew Donson, LLC, questioned conflicts with the calendar and the way UMass begins a week before Smith College and Amherst College. At the same time, the Chancellor and the Deans have told faculty they should increase our Five College cooperation. He felt that there was no way, at least speaking from the German department, that they could offer a class for the Five Colleges if the other colleges don't start at the same time as UMass does. He explained that he felt they had received mixed messages from the administration and felt this issue was supposed to be clarified over the summer.

Senator McCarthy asked if the Registrar was in the audience. [Speaking to Registrar John Lenzi] What I believe you told us at the last Senate meeting in May was that you've reached an agreement with the four colleges, that they will adjust their calendar, probably not immediately, but as soon as they can, to match ours.

John Lenzi, University Registrar, explained that at the registrarial level, the Five Colleges have come to an agreement on all of the currently approved academic calendars. He said the other four colleges are complying with the differences between the UMass calendar and their calendars, so all four schools have gone through that process. Going forward with the new approval, UMass will work closer with the Five Colleges on the 2013 calendar.

Secretary May emphasized that this, in fact, was an improvement. In the past, he explained, the Five College calendar has never been aligned, starting with the reason that we have a 13-or 14-week semester and they have a 12-week semester. They have never been perfectly aligned in the past so this is an improvement which is a welcome improvement and maybe this will make it a lot easier. He also noted that the new Five College Executive Director will be here to speak at the next Faculty Senate meeting on October 15th, so these kinds of questions can be addressed to him.

The motion was seconded and adopted.

D. ELECTIONS

1. Two Associate Delegates to the Board of Trustees

Nominees: Marilyn Billings, Library
Alexandrina Deschamps, Women, Gender, Sexuality Studies
(Further nominations will be accepted from the floor.)

There were no further nominations from the floor. Senators Marilyn Billings and Alexandria Dechamps were re-elected as Associate Delegates to the Board of Trustees.

2. One At-Large Member of the Rules Committee

Nominee: W. Brian O'Connor, Biology
(Further nominations will be accepted from the floor.)

There were no further nominations from the floor. Senator W. Brian O'Connor was elected as an At-Large member of the Rules Committee.

3. Chair of the Rules Committee

Nominee: John McCarthy, Linguistics
(Further nominations will be accepted from the floor.)

There were no further nominations from the floor. Senator John McCarthy was re-elected Chair of the Rules Committee.

E. NEW BUSINESS (FOR AY 2009-2010)

Special Report of the Academic Matters Council, Ad Hoc Committee on Strategic Oversight, General Education Council, Rules Committee and Undergraduate Education Council concerning Revisions to the Requirements for General Education at the University of Massachusetts, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 10-002 with Motion No. 03-10.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the changes to the General Education Requirements, as presented in Sen. Doc. No, 10-002.

Senator McCarthy made a motion to amend the proposal and explained that the entire content of the amendment is what is seen on number four, the first page. He noted that the sole change is that the fourth Social World requirement could be fulfilled by an AL or AT course as well as an SBI or SI course. The original motion allows that fourth social world credit to be fulfilled by a four-credit SB or SI, the SB and SI, described as a substitute. This adds to the options for fulfilling that requirement, the AL and AT courses. This seems like the best way to maintain approximately the same balance of courses that the University had under the previous system. He explained that under the previous system, we had two AL/AT and two SB, one HS and then the six course that are any of them. Under this proposal, the balance is maintained as much as possible, given the reduced number of courses by allowing AL or AT as well as SB to constitute that fourth course.

President Phillis said that what he would like is to come to understand the vetting and quality controls that the Faculty Senate intends to put in place around the enhancement of credit awarded for courses. The concern that exists among many of the MSP members is that this really represents credit inflation, that students could, in the worst case scenario, do the same work and just get more credit for it, in which case, it's a dilution of the educational opportunities that our students are provided. The question is, how do we make sure that all three legs on my theoretical stool are at work; that faculty engagement to provide an improved working environment is properly vetted through the Faculty Senate process that will lead to further student engagement; that this will lead to further student engagement, such that they earn the additional credit that they are awarded; and that the faculty engagement that is associated with that extra student engagement is properly rewarded and respected by the administration? Those are the three corners. The Faculty Senate's concern is that the courses really do represent enrichments in the requests for additional student engagement that represents the additional earning of more credit.

Professor John Jenkins, Chair of the Academic Matters Council, explained that the plan in place for implementing this change, if it is voted, is to reply entirely upon the model created for the Academic Matters Council by the Faculty Senate and that is to have a faculty subcommittee, called a Course Subcommittee. The Subcommittee is entirely responsible for vetting and communicating with departments and reaching an agreement before any course is approved. The exact same

process will be followed in the implementation in the new curriculum. That committee will vet the courses. It is very clearly understood that the intent of this program is to have students learn more and learn more effectively. He added that in thirteen years, a large number of faculty have sought these changes. He said that the University has been handed an opportunity under the worst of times, in which administrative concerns for efficiency and faculty concerns for the quality of General Education are coming together. He felt this is a one-time opportunity to do something that began in 1996 and that is to have more depth for the students. More depth can be obtained and still be efficient, but it must be obtained. That is the primary concern of this change. He said that we as faculty will make sure that it happens, but there is another factor. He explained that faculty fought for a long time to have an integrated experience, a capstone kind of experience for every student in this major University. Now the University has the opportunity to have this in the General Education curriculum and the faculty happen to have support promised from the central administration to make these things happen. He stated that he was not in a position to certify what will happen, except that he trusts what they have been told, which is that they will have the support, which they didn't have at any other time in these last 13 years, to make this happen. If faculty approve this, they're binding the administration to make this happen in an appropriate manner and the faculty have never been able to bind them in that way before. No one can foresee the future other than to see that there are troubles ahead. He explained that we know, though, that if we take advantage during these difficult times, we can have something happen that has never happened before. For that reason, he assured President Phillis that the faculty will have full oversight. He assured the faculty that he will assist them, through the Academic Matters Council and through the Oversight Committee and that the administration will do a reasonable job of making this possible. He urged that this be adopted.

John Cunningham, Deputy Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education, said there was no doubt that the administration has concerns about efficiency, but pointed out that the Task Force began two years ago with a concern about education. It's the Task Force's recommendations that are coming forward. Secondly, the Course Approval Subcommittee was made up entirely of faculty members who will say yay or nay to any individual proposal. There are no administrators on the Subcommittee. The proposal comes from a faculty member that describes their course which is then signed off by a department chair who says the department agrees the course contains four credits of content. The administration is willing to trust the faculty member and the department chair in proposing that and we think the faculty members on the Subcommittee are the right group to approve or not approve those changes or to seek further information. From the administration's perspective, the system is set up to allow the faculty to monitor or verify and prevent any dilution that might be on the horizon.

Senator McCarthy added one more thing about how the course will be approved for the fourth credit. The membership of the Course Approval Subcommittee includes Maurianne Adams, Brian O'Connor, Carol Barr, Anne Herrington and himself. That group consists of people who are now or have for a long time served on or chaired the General Education Council, or the Academic Matters Council. This is basically a sub-set of the people to whom the general education program has been entrusted for a long time. It's not a group of people who are just going to rubber stamp things, in fact; they're likely to be pretty tough.

Provost Cunningham mentioned a clarification. This process is only open to previously approved General Education courses that already have three credits so it's not wide open for all proposals.

President Phillis expressed appreciation for the effort underway. He said he has full faith in the integrity and scrutiny and thoroughness of the Faculty Senate's group, that it will work through these issues. The one thing that he wanted to be mindful of, in the long run, is the capacity of the work force on campus to achieve these goals. Faculty are expending extra effort and if they are properly recognized for that effort, then they should have their workloads with respect to teaching, other teaching or service and research somehow adjusted. In some proposals, he would imagine that the graduate students on campus could be engaged to teach discussion sections or various other types of things that could represent adjustments to make a four-credit course. However, he felt that if the University does not have the proper capacity to support those graduate students in their endeavors, then the University might find itself in a real hole. He felt the group must be very mindful as it goes through this process to think about the available workforce that can achieve these goals. He applauded many of them, and though there are great learning opportunities that students could learn or have here but this could not be done without proper and adequate workforce support to pull this off.

Senator Maria Tymoczko, LLC, followed up on what President Phillis said. She teaches a big General Education course and has been trying to think how she would adjust it to be a four-credit course. One thought was moving it up from a 200-level course to a 300-level course because, though she's taught it for years and years, the current students complain that there's too much reading, though they did it 15 years ago or 25 years ago. One of the things that occurred to her as a way to make it a four-credit course is to have TA's lead a two-hour discussion instead a one-hour discussion since so much learning actually occurs during the discussions. She wondered if her TA's were having two contact hours per week per section instead of one, and their grading is increasing by 33%. How indeed are we going to be able to afford to staff these courses?

Provost Cunningham agreed that TA's are only able to work the hours for which they are contracted for. We're not going to envision a 20-hour TA doing 30 hours of work. It sounds like, in that model, that you would need a total increase in the number of TA's to pull that off if they're doing twice as much of the work. When you go from 39 credits to 39 credits, the increase in capacity is as much about redistribution as it is about increase, but it has to be done. Every course that is four credits needs the capacity of instructors and teaching assistants and graders and supplies to deliver four credits of instruction. Every course that stays three credits needs the equivalent capacity to deliver three credits of instruction. He agreed with John (Jenkins) who said that we want to trust that the administration is going to find the resources and deliver the ability to teach the students.

Secretary May agreed that this was perhaps the trickiest part of the whole equation because it's not clear exactly how this will work. In theory, we need to supply exactly the number of credits in the new system as we do in the old system. It's a matter of recalibrating and reallocating so that the number of credits does not change. The total workload does not change, but it will be handled differently. One of the committees that was set up this summer was GERICO, the Ad Hoc Committee on General Education Revision and Implementation. It was specifically set up for a group of people to monitor the various aspects of this transitional problem. Just adding it into the workload of the General Education Council or the Academic Matters Council was not a prudent approach. So we have a special Committee that, for this period of transition, is looking at this. There is a Policy Subcommittee a Course Approval Subcommittee of that Committee and a Support Subcommittee and, a Budget Subcommittee of GERICO. On the form for the approval, Part A is showing how you're academically going to do it, adding the fourth credit. Part B is a resource question. It allows the instructor to request the appropriate resources to realize this. Obviously if faculty are trying to double their resources this may be something that may be a matter of negotiation between the faculty and their dean and the Provost and so forth. The Committee will be looking at this because they do want to make this a real increase in the depth of the educational experience in those 3-to 4-credit courses. We're getting an integrative experience on the other end of the student's experience here which will be a clear improvement in the educational process. Both of these will be costly. On the other hand, subtraction of the costs is that there are going to be three fewer courses required (a net of two, because we've added one integrated experience). As this all works itself out, there will be a transition period where additional resources will be required because we're going to be running both systems at the same time. The new system only applies to entering freshman. So one quarter of the students will be subject to this system next fall and three quarters of the students next fall will be graduating under the previous system. Progressively we'll be getting farther into the new system. During the transition, we may need one-time money and that happens to be one thing that the campus has for a short time. With the agreement of the Provost and the Provost's Office, there seems to be some willingness to make investments to get this system up and running and on its feet and bring in the reallocation aspect of it after we've achieved what we need to achieve.

President Phillis had one more question about resources and the availability of resources. Depending upon how these proposals come through, there may be shifts in classroom space demands that could be extraordinary - such as shift in demand for high volume classroom or discussion sections, smaller volume sections. With classrooms not easy to come by, how will this course approval effort mesh with the Registrar and other people who understand the classrooms?

Provost Cunningham stated that this is an important consideration and acknowledged and noted that the Registrar's Office is on alert. That is one of the reasons why we want these proposals in October so they can figure out which ones are approved and therefore need to be scheduled for the freshman in June and what size they need to be and therefore what classrooms they need to have, and which ones that are not likely to go to four credits are likely to have less demand by continuing students for those courses. They know how many freshman would have enrolled in them in the past who will not enroll in them now. It will be a lot of adjusting of capacity. Talking to departments and scheduling representatives about how it used to be 100, how about if we scheduled for 60 and see who enrolls in April. If 80 enroll in April, then we'll adjust it back to 90. That will go on and its part of the reason why we are getting it going and knowing in October what is coming. He pointed out that his math says that the incoming freshman will be on the new system and not $\frac{3}{4}$ of the students doing the old system but $\frac{1}{4}$ of the old students who are still sophomores and juniors who are still completing General Education and $\frac{1}{2}$ of the students have already completed their General Education and are juniors and seniors already. So it's not $\frac{3}{4}$ of them still looking for the old system because of that $\frac{3}{4}$, $\frac{1}{2}$ have already completed that system. It's just a mathematical difference between the two. He feels that, as a practical matter, it's $\frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{1}{2}$.

Senator Tymoczko wanted to register another concern as a General Education teacher. When there's a shortage of General Education courses, on the final day of add-drop, since her course is in fact very rigorous, she has an exodus of students and on the same day, she has an influx of students who haven't been there for two weeks who have missed the theory for two weeks, have done none of the reading, and who actually don't even know what the syllabus is, and sometimes are mightily dismayed when they find out. It seems like if we're talking about a quality experience in these General Education courses and they're moving from three credits to four credits, we need to really think about whether or not you can add-drop

General Education courses for a full two weeks because we really need those two weeks of instruction to count for those four credit courses and we need everyone to be there from the beginning.

Presiding Officer Wilson stated that it's not just general education courses that have that problem.

Professor Jenkins stated that the issue of the add-drop period has come up from time to time in the Academic Matters Council. We would welcome a faculty proposal which would be submitted to the Rules Committee, for distribution to the appropriate Councils, and stated they would be glad to take up that issue.

The motion was seconded and adopted as amended.

F. BYLAW CHANGES

Special Report of the Rules Committee concerning Bylaw Changes, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 10-003 with Motion No. 04-10.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Bylaw Changes, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 10-003.
04-10

(Inasmuch as these are changes to the Senate's Bylaws, this is the first of three readings of this motion. It will be read again at the 688th and 689th regular meetings of the Faculty Senate and voted on at the 689th meeting. The motion may be debated and amended at all three meetings.)

G. WELCOME AND COMMENTS BY CHANCELLOR ROBERT C. HOLUB (QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION TO FOLLOW)

Chancellor Robert C. Holub I would like to apologize first for being late. I was in Boston until 2:00 p.m. – we had three meetings today. So it was a little difficult to get back here for the start of this meeting and I have a reception for the United Way which began at 4:00 p.m., so I will probably be leaving directly after I'm finished here. I want to say a few words about the past year. I'm delighted to be here again this year and I think there are a lot of positives about last year that we shouldn't forget - because I'm going to talk about the budget, which tends to make people forget the positive things. We had the most applications, the best students by academic measures, that we ever have had. That includes transfer students. We have an average SAT score in Commonwealth College of 1344 which is one of the top SAT averages we've ever had in that College. So we're doing very well with regard to our students and the class of students we've got. At the same time, protecting the diversity of that class we have as well, with 22% ALANA students, the same as we had last year. We've gone up close to 30 points in SAT scores in a three-year period, which is quite remarkable, and we haven't sacrificed anything in terms of diversity of our student body.

I think we should be very proud that we served access for students. Actually, if you look at the lowest one quarter of students in 2009, they paid less money in out-of-pocket expenses than they did five years before that. In fact, three quarters of students, on average, paid less in out-of-pocket expenses in 2009 than they did in 2004. So we're keeping this institution affordable; we've devoted a lot of funding to financial aid. Financial aid has gone up. It was about \$30 million this year. And we're doing a good job of maintaining the tradition of this institution which is to attract students on their merits and not having to look at anything about whether they can pay or not. So students do come here and are able to get an education here as they have been able to for many years.

In regard to achievements, we have substantial achievements of the faculty. I couldn't begin to run down all of them, in terms of awards, appointed members of various societies, research productivity, all of these things. We have great student awards, had a Truman and Goldwater scholarship, many Fulbrights. So we're doing very well in these areas.

As you know, we have had many new facilities that have come on line in the past year. On Monday of this week, we dedicated the Integrated Sciences Building. It's a beautiful facility. We hope to be able to make this into a life sciences quadrant where we can really excel in the coming years. One other thing that has changed in the past year is the senior staff. As most of you know, there have been a good number of appointments to the senior staff. I brought with me, and he started a couple of weeks after me, Tom Milligan. Then we've appointed Mike Leto, Mike Malone, Jim Staros, and Jean Kim. We have new deans, Mark Fuller, Robert Feldman, and Ted Djafaris. We're doing a really good job of appointing good people to do an outstanding job over the next period of time.

The next period of time, with regard to the budget, doesn't look as rosy as all of these other things. The reason for that is that there has been a severe decline in the state budget. I won't go into all the details with you – most of the details can be

garnered from the budget website. I think we have documents up there, or will have documents up, that will reflect some of these details. The long and short of it is that if we take the time that I became the Chancellor in May 2008 and what the appropriation was then and look at the appropriation as it is written into the budget now, we have a drop of about \$40 million. That is a very severe drop in any budget because we're dealing with something on the order of from \$227 million to \$187 million in the state appropriation. The state appropriation is the part of the budget that goes towards our general operating budget. Other revenues that we have obviously don't go towards the general operating budget, so when we're talking about teaching and things of this nature, there's a large part of it that comes from the state budget. Now we did reduce our budget by \$10 million last year. That reduction was negated with a stroke of a pen in the legislature with the elimination of the line item for Commonwealth College which is about \$3.5 million and the fact that when you reduce the budget as severely as they did that we have to pick up fringe benefits for the salaries that are on something other than state funds. When someone is hired on state funds, then the state pays the fringe benefits which amount to 28-30% of the salary. When someone is hired on other kinds of funds, say funds that come from fees from students, then we have to pay the fringe benefits. We lost about \$7 million in fringe benefits, about \$3.5 million in Commonwealth College, so by cutting \$10 million in the budget, the state took that \$10 million and it didn't even look as though they were doing anything. That's the situation.

If we look at this year, the amazing thing is that in a year when we're down \$40 million (in the state allocation), we will probably do all right. The reason that we will do all right is because of the stimulus money. We're getting stimulus money this year to cover the shortfall that we had and that will make up the budget. That will increase the budget to the level that we had at the time that I was appointed. Not the actual \$209 but, actually, the point when I was appointed in May 2008. We will have the stimulus money covering the budget shortfall this year. Stimulus money is one-time money. It is almost all used up, it's front-loaded in 2010 and in the 2010 budget, so we only have it for this one year. If we're looking at FY11, therefore, we're looking at something that is much more severe and something where we will have a large drop in the state allocation of the budget and nothing to fill in for that state allocation. We do face a situation that is a rather severe situation. It is maybe a little bit unfortunate that it has been masked so far. I don't think that the campus has really been harmed much, not that I want the campus to be harmed, but it is difficult to come in FY11, from what has occurred in FY09 and from what I believe will occur in FY10. The reason for that is that we've been able to cover FY09 and FY10 with stimulus funding that has brought us up to levels where we didn't have to make huge reductions, although as I said, a \$10 million reduction is a fairly substantial reduction. We didn't make reductions such that it was felt across the campus very much.

This year, I believe we must rethink what we are doing as a campus. One of the things I just received in an e-mail was an economic forecast that looks at FY10 and FY11 and predicts that there will be no budget upturns in the state during that period. There may be in private industry, but the state will be relatively flat or have a decrease in its revenues. The reason for that has to do with unemployment. We haven't hit bottom in unemployment, just about everyone agrees with that. Until you hit bottom with employment and start to employ more individuals, you're not going to get revenues from state income taxes, and sales taxes. The situation we're looking at is one in which we will remain, at best, flat, next year in regard to our budget for FY11. Projecting outward to FY12, the most we can hope for there is also a flat budget. It is going to be a period in which we can't expect the state to do much for us. Could we in the past realistically expect the state to do much for us? The answer to that is no. I don't want to state that the financial policies of the campus have been improvident, but if we look over the past forty or fifty years, we see that we're on a downward spiral with regard to state allocations. In this report that I just glanced at as I was coming back from Boston, if you look at the state allocations from 2001 and you look at what is projected for 2010, the falloff for higher education state allocation is 36.8% after adjusting for inflation. We're getting 36.8% less than a decade ago in FY10. That should tell us something about depending on state funding to bail us out in the future. It's not that we shouldn't continue to lobby for state funding, and we will do that, but to depend on that as something that will solve the problems that we have and the challenges that we face would be foolish. I think we have to take action. If we don't take action, we're going to have to suffer the largest cut in the budget in the history of this institution over a three-year period. We're talking about a cut of \$50 million in our budget.

What is \$50 million? Anyone here from the College of Natural Sciences? That's cutting out the College of Natural Sciences. Anyone here from the College of Humanities and Fine Arts? That's cutting out not only Humanities and Fine Arts but the College of Engineering. Cutting out both of those colleges would bring us up to about \$50 million. Do we have people here from SBS, Nursing, Education and Public Health? We'd have to cut out those four schools/colleges in order to plug a \$50 million hole in the budget. That gives you some idea of the magnitude of the problems we're dealing with. Even if we just take a \$40 million cut in our budget, we'd have to cut about 25% of the base budget allocation that we currently give to schools and colleges in order to meet that (obviously we don't take everything from Academic Affairs so that's not what we would do). I want to give you an idea of what kind of budget we're talking about.

One of the things that was said to me when we started this budget crisis, and I heard this from quite a few people: "we know the routine, here's what we do: this is what we've always done, we take cuts and then we build back slowly." My

response to that is that we're not making any progress doing that. We're digressing doing that, and we're digressing because we dropped 38.6% in a decade in state allocations. If you look at state allocations over the past fifty years, what you see is a downward spiral. That's why I say that our policies have probably been improvident depending on state funding to come back to the level before, not to say to increase to allow us to do what we want to do to move this institution into the next level of public research institutions, which is what my goal is. I think that is your goal as well.

My conclusion is that we can't do what we've always done. We can't be satisfied. This calls for a change in our way of thinking about how we fund this institution. A change in culture. State support, we've seen, is not likely to come back to the level that it's come back. We have to take our destiny in our own hands if we are going to achieve the kinds of things we would like to achieve on this campus. We are at a fork in the road. We know what we can do. We know what the consequences are if we choose to do what we've always done. We know exactly what is going to happen. We will remain a very good University. We might even remain the best public research university in New England, since all the others are suffering. That's where we'll be. If we want to put ourselves into the upper echelon of public research institutions, we can't take that fork in the road. We must take another path.

What I'm suggesting is that we do something different. We have to think about that and its something we have to do together. It's certainly not something I can do alone, or the senior staff, or the deans. It's something that has to be done with the faculty, with the staff, and to a certain extent the students on this campus, if we're going to go along this path. I think what we have to do is look at other sources of revenue for our institutions. These sources come from many different places. We have not exhausted, certainly on this campus, the possibility of revenue enhancement from other places. Many state schools of equal or lesser quality, not to mention schools that are above us in stature; are able to support themselves more fully, more completely on the revenues that they receive from out-of-state students. We currently have about 20% of the undergraduates who are out-of-state students. As you know, Michigan has a much higher percentage; Colorado has a higher percentage; Vermont has 75% of its students from out of state. I'm not proposing that we ignore our in-state students or go up to 75% of out of state students but we certainly can do better than we are doing now and in that way secure some of the revenues that we need in order to move this University forward.

We also have to look at Summer Session. We have now very good student housing. We have facilities on campus that are excellent facilities. If we look at the Studio Arts Building, the ISB, we have some excellent facilities on campus that are not used in the summer. Most of the campus Physical Plant is not being used in the summer. We can use that for residential programs; we can increase the use of distance learning in the summer as well. These are sources of revenue that we haven't begun to really explore. We can certainly do more in that area as well. I think that one of the signs that we're not exploring that very well is that I don't know the director of summer sessions, because we don't have one. We really haven't looked into that as a source of revenue for ourselves on the campus.

Also on many campuses, in select disciplines, faculty members buy out their research time with grant moneys. That is not done very much on this campus at all. It is done for a very small percentage of individuals, certainly a lot less than on other campuses, especially in certain disciplines in the natural sciences and in the College of Engineering. We can certainly do a lot more in that area in order to buy out time and therefore give us the funding that we need in order to pay faculty salaries, or to pay salaries for graduate assistantships or graduate fellowships.

We've developed many programs in Continuing and Professional Education on this campus, but there is still room for growth in that area as well. We hope that that is an area in which we can also secure more revenues and revenues that we haven't had on the campus. Finally, I would say that in the area of five-year Masters programs, we really have not begun to scratch the surface. Jim Staros has brought with him many ideas about those kinds of programs, both in the academic curriculum and the professional curriculum. Again, these are programs that can be used to fund the academic Ph.D. programs, for example. That is, a Masters program could bring in the revenue to enable us to fund graduate students in an academic Ph.D. program. There are a lot of different things we can look at. Obviously there are other things that we've been thinking about over the summer when we looked soberly at what our present and future is. We've been looking at an increase in overhead revenues and we have gotten an increase in overhead revenues, largely thanks to the stimulus funding. I think we have \$7.5 million, so that's \$14.6 million in revenue funding. We need to be able to retain a large percentage of that. That's the trick now. Mike Malone is going to be doing everything he can to make the Research Office one where we can retain as much of the research funding that we're getting as possible.

We've also looked at fundraising where we don't perform at the level that we should perform. Mike Leto is reconstituting that office, reconstituting a campaign for us. We hope that that will also bring in funding for the campus that is much needed. We are also looking at items like differential fees. There are a lot of things we can do; a lot of revenue that we can generate from a lot of different sources. We have to have the will to do that. We have to have the policies in place to do that. For many of these, we need the faculty to assist with its creativity in going forward with some revenue generating ideas, for revenue-generating courses, with revenue-generating curriculum. We're talking about a rather severe reduction

in state funding. For every dollar we generate in revenues, that's \$1 less that we have to search for in reductions. We're also preparing for reductions. We have a zero base budget exercise for all of the non-academic units and we have a thorough review of all academic units and their budgeting. We're looking at all of these possibilities because we are anticipating that we will have to make some reductions. Anything we can earn in additional revenue is going to mean that we can stop reductions in one or another program on this campus.

Now, what are we doing at the essential campus level? What have we been doing? One of the things we have been looking at over the summer is enrollment management to recruit types of students we want and out-of-state students in higher numbers. We consider FY10 to be a grace year because we have stimulus money. If we don't do something in this year, then we're in very deep trouble next year. So that's the reason why we're trying to use our time this year in order to put into place things like this. We've set up a better system of enrollment management. We'll be hiring a specialist in enrollment management very soon to help us get more applications and increase the yield in the current applications we receive. If we could increase that yield (we currently get 1-9 from out of state, about 11%) above 11% then we would be doing very well. There are certain things we can do with regard to enrollment management and we are proceeding along those lines. How can the faculty help with enrollment management? You can have programs that are attractive to out-of-state students. You can help us recruit out-of-state students. That's one of the ways you can protect your own programs and protect the campus against the deleterious cuts that would be coming otherwise. We're also aligning summer sessions and CPE, looking at how to organize that so that we have greater facilities to offer courses and programs in the summer. We're rethinking the fee structure for Continuing and Professional Education and that should be completed.

We will be creating and announcing incentives for the summer for the five-year programs, for CPE, as well as giving models of what we've done on campus already and what are successful models in proceeding with these kinds of programs. We've been investing in development because we feel that we need to get that unit in shape for the future and I've already been speaking with the office of the President with regard to differential fees to try to see how we can move in that direction. I've also spoken to a few trustees about that. So this is what we've been doing in the central administration over the summer. What I think the faculty can contribute, as I said before, is creativity in developing the kinds of programs, the kinds of courses, the kinds of initiatives, because there may be kinds of initiatives that you can think of that we haven't thought of, that are going to put this institution on a different basis, that are going to help this institution to go forward. (Even if we didn't have this financial crisis facing us, this would be the right thing to do because we know where we're going to get depending solely on state support and fees). We have to do something different and I'm appealing to you as the leaders of this institution, as the leaders of this institution who are members of the Faculty Senate, to assist us in making this a greater campus than it is right now. Thank you. I would be happy to answer questions.

President Phillis stated that looking at the hair color of many of his colleagues here in the room, we've been around a long time here at UMass. We're interested in doing all of the things that you are interested in doing. We would like this place to be great. We would like this to have a constant and consistent and reliable revenue stream and we are completely on board. I have a little list of things we've always done; we've always increased fees for students; we've always sought more external funding; we've (at least for the past decade, at least) always tried to increase CPE income (and they've done a spectacular job at that); we've always tried to increase out-of-state enrollments (at least for a decade). One of the reasons we don't compare well to Vermont is that nobody lives in Vermont.

Chancellor Holub, but they still have to get them there.

President Phillis, I understand that, they do have to get there. And our ski resorts aren't as attractive as theirs are, but you're right, there are issues of attraction. I'm all for bringing in out-of-state students. The problem is that we have a requirement that we educate citizens of Massachusetts, because we are indeed a public university. It is one of our duties to the state and we must respect that. So the only way to bring in out-of-state students is to have a net increase in the number of students in a period when we do not have an increase in our teachers, our professors, our educators, our researchers, or other workers on campus, so it presents a special challenge to that particular goal. The overhead, with respect to the stimulus money increase, is a one-time money thing, and again we cannot count on that as a moving forward exercise. Although some of these things we've been trying for a long time, and I hope we continue to improve, some of these things are short-term issues that may not lead to a long-term financial fix. The question in the end is what does it mean to have an ever spiraling down (which there is, I'm not going to deny the facts) public resource that is provided to this institution? What does it mean that we are a public university? Is our inevitable end to become private?

Chancellor Holub, Is that a question?

President Phillis, That is my question.

Chancellor Holub, No. That's the answer. We're not going to become a private institution. We have a state that funds and owns the Physical Plant here. We have a significant state appropriation in terms of dollars and we plan to continue to lobby as hard as we can so the state will continue to support this institution. It is also my feeling that if the state sees us as a more essential part of the state economy, they will also want to join in. People join in. You may think, why do people give to Harvard? They have so much money. The reason is because they give to something that they deem to be successful. The more successful we are, the more money we are going to attract. That is the fact. It's not only going to be donors but it's also going to be from the state, it's also going to be from the federal government. The more successful we are, the more money we are going to get from the state. The answer to that question is that we're not going to become a private institution. We're just going to buffer ourselves against the vacillations in state funding and the downward spiral in state funding that has prevented us from doing what this University should do by all rights with the quality of faculty that it has which is to move into the upper echelons of public research universities in the country. That's what we're trying to do.

In regard to the things we've tried in the past, that's what I've been told many times, that we've tried things in the past. The facts are that we're at 20% in terms of out-of-state students. The facts are that we're only attracting 1-9 applicants, people already interested enough to apply here. There's a lot more we can do here. Do we have people in the state of New Jersey or the state of Pennsylvania or the state of New York where we're actively recruiting students? The answer to that is no. So how hard have we tried? I'm not exactly sure. Have we put into place the mechanisms? These aren't secret mechanisms. These are mechanisms that every university that has recruited out-of-state students has put into place. We may have said that we have tried, but we haven't put into place the kinds of things that we need. We've probably talked also about that we need to do more fundraising in the past. But have we put into place a fundraising structure that's based on the best practices that we have in fundraising at research institutions in the United States? My answer to that is I don't think so, at least not with the fundraising apparatus that I encountered when I came here. So I think there is plenty of room for improvement and plenty of room to do the things we have said we've done in the past or that we've been interested in doing and to do them in a different way, to do them with the best practices, that have been established by public research universities and to succeed in them. That's why I ask you to assist in that effort and I'm grateful that you're in favor of it and that you're supportive, because we need your support and the support of everyone in this room and the support of everyone on this campus.

No questions? You're busy thinking of things you can do, is that right? I hope so. I thank you very much for your attention and I hope we can count on the Faculty Senate, especially to assist us in fast-tracking some things that we may need to fast-track over the course of the year. Thank you very much.

The 867th Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate stood adjourned at 5:000 p.m. on September 17, 2009.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Ernest D. May
Secretary of the Faculty Senate