

UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST  
OFFICE OF THE FACULTY SENATE

Presiding Officer Richard Bogartz brought the 756<sup>th</sup> Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate to order on March 10, 2016 at 3:30 p.m. in Herter Hall, Room 227, and began by reading #34 of the Tao Te Ching, by Lao Tsu:

The great Tao flows everywhere, both to the left and to the right.  
The ten thousand things depend upon it; it holds nothing back.  
It fulfills its purpose silently and makes no claim.

It nourishes the ten thousand things,  
And yet is not their lord.  
It has no aim; it is very small.

The ten thousand things return to it,  
Yet it is not their lord.  
It is very great.

It does not show greatness,  
And is therefore truly great.

A. **PRESENTATION BY JOHN BRYAN, VICE PROVOST FOR ACADEMIC PERSONNEL  
“ACADEMIC PERSONNEL WORKFLOW SYSTEM - APWS”  
(QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION TO FOLLOW)**

*John Bryan, Vice Provost for Academic Personnel:* Good afternoon. I'll be talking about something that you have undoubtedly encountered: the Academic Personnel Workflow System (APWS). You might be asking yourself: "What's the problem that we're trying to solve with this system?" If you look at it from the perspective of the Provost's Office, we have a tremendous volume of personnel actions that come through. In round numbers, it's something like 1400-1500 AFRs, 150 RPT files, 100 faculty hires, 400 campus-interview candidates, 125 PMYRs, 200 sabbatical applications and reports, and on and on. All of these were on paper, being carried back and forth across campus by staff and students, and all were scanned for archival purposes. None of these materials were accessible to all the various users unless they actually had the paper copy in their hands, and there was no reliable way of tracking the statuses of these files. In short, we had a historical system that was labor-intensive, inconvenient, inefficient, error-prone, wasteful, and opaque to users. There was poor access to current and historical data. Frankly, the system was about 15 years behind industry standards.

We started this project with the following scope: We wanted a UMass-hosted and designed online system that would handle all personnel actions in academic affairs. This is more than just a paperless system; after all, many of the Colleges had systems using the UDrive or Box with Word documents or PDFs uploaded and people had rights to log in and see them. But these systems have no workflow. The APWS's intent is to provide custom—custom is the key word—routing of personnel actions from the person who created the action all the way through to the final repository of the completed action.

We had immediate and longer-term goals. The immediate goals included speeding up the workflow, especially in the context of hiring faculty in a very competitive environment. Speed is important, not only in getting requisitions approved quickly but especially in the later stages when you're inviting people to campus for interviews and getting those lists approved, ranking the finalists, and making offers as candidates are receiving offers from other institutions. We wanted to make sure that we improved procedural transparency. For example, when a faculty member submitted a tenure file, it would go into the "black box", and they didn't really know where it was or where it was going. That ties closely to the next goal, which was improving users' access to information. We wanted users to be able to look at the system and see exactly where the personnel action stood in the process. Other immediate goals included reducing errors. We know that whenever anything is transcribed, there's the introduction of error. Certainly, we

wanted to maintain confidentiality, since we're dealing with confidential personnel actions and we need to maintain that confidentiality. Finally, we wanted to promote the paperless environment, promote sustainability, and reduce waste and costs.

Longer-term goals included improving data access and analysis through data aggregation and custom reports. Eventually, we want to be able to look in the system and get insight on issues like, how many of our top-ranked faculty do we actually land in our faculty searches? That sort of thing is enormously labor-intensive if we tried to do it right now. This may be a pipe dream, but I do hope that we eventually are able to integrate this system with our other systems, including Interview Exchange, PeopleSoft HR, and EO&D. For example, when a search is requisitioned, the job ad in APWS would automatically populate in Interview Exchange. Even now, we still have to hand over a paper copy of a file to EO&D, and they scan it and put it in their database. We hope that we can get that automated in the future. Finally, our last goal is perhaps the least discussed. We want to create a permanent repository of professional work for each faculty member and librarian. Imagine that the AFR is not just a mechanism to file an annual report, but a repository where, over time, you can maintain your publications, your teaching materials, anything you have that could eventually be used in a personnel file of some kind, like a tenure review or application to promotion to full professor.

How are we doing in achieving these goals? Certainly, we have run into some challenges. Among them are legal challenges. Most of these actions have to comply with privacy policies, the collective bargaining agreements, and privacy laws. To give you an idea of how complicated that can be, three years ago, we created a flowchart of the tenure and promotion process—how it flows from one point to another, who gives feedback and who has the right to respond at certain points, what happens to the file when they are responding. We have faced and continue to continue technical challenges. The folks at UMass IT and the Center for Educational Software Development (CESD)—Dave Hart, Stephen Battisti, and Chris Hoffman—have been really terrific in handling these; I've been very impressed at what they've been able to accomplish in the amount of time they've had to devote to this process. Some of the technical challenges include accommodating differences across departments and colleges, such as variable DPC compositions and colleges that don't have departments. Being able to build that into the software was a significant challenge. We want to maintain user flexibility in the system. We do not want a system that drives how people actually do their job—we do not want the tail wagging the dog. For example, we know that, in many departments, staff perform some of the functions that officially belong to a department head or chair, so we instituted a proxy system so a department head can turn some of their activities over to their department staff. At the same time, we don't want to have those kinds of changes at the central level, reducing local control. Thus, we've built into the system an amount of decentralized administration, such as allowing people at a college level to designate proxies.

There are also cultural challenges. We were quite surprised that, even though we have a collective bargaining agreement that prescribes how things are supposed to work, little differences appeared in how departments actually implement those policies. Of course, the major cultural challenge is change. People have done things in one way for a long time. Many don't want to accept a new way of doing it, so we're working through that. We've also had financial challenges. It is expensive to develop new software, to maintain it, and to do it with the very prompt support system that the folks at IT have provided.

All of this began when the Provost engaged UMass IT in spring 2013. By the spring and summer of 2015, we were able to pilot the first module, the eRPT, with a few tenure cases in the system. We conducted focus groups and system introductions to get feedback from faculty and staff. By this last fall and winter, we implemented the APWS for all faculty reappointment, promotion, and tenure cases, all tenure-track searches, all AFRS, and all sabbatical applications. We continue to conduct dozens of overview sessions, training sessions, faculty/staff focus groups, demonstrations, and individual coaching sessions in order to both train and get feedback on how well it's working. A lot of the changes that have occurred over time have been the result of that feedback. What we're focusing on this semester is getting that feedback and fixing bugs and making usability enhancements. Our top priorities are refining the APWS interface and user functionality. The first priority is being able to download entire RPT files as a single PDF, even when it comes from multiple files and formats. Lots of people have requested this functionality, rather than

having to open and close multiple files. People also want to view major sections of a file—for example, all external review letters or all recommendations—in one window. Another priority is to simplify the external reviewer procedures in the eRPT. This will enable department chairs to do that iterative process with faculty members undergoing review: identifying external reviewers, making all of the materials available to the reviewers, and then soliciting and receiving the reviews. We know that the interface has become cluttered, in part because of the features added over time. It started out fairly simple, but has become more and more complicated, so we will unclutter that. We have training videos in development; one will be ready for viewing next week. We also want to provide more support documentation. We will also continue our focus groups to get feedback from faculty and staff to assess ongoing usability improvements. We also know that, as much as we'd like to eliminate printing in these processes, some people really desire that, so we're going to provide a print tool that works better than the one we have currently.

By this coming summer, we want to extend the Requisition & Hiring module all the way to the hand-off to EO&D in searches. We will also implement the annual reviews of librarians that weren't put in at the same time at the faculty AFRs. We also want to more seamlessly integrate the AFR module into APWS. Right now, they are somewhat separate systems and that causes a lot of confusion. We're going to continue our focus groups and user testing. By fall 2016, we want either new APWS modules or add-ons to existing ones consisting of extending the Requisition & Hiring modules to librarians and non tenure-track faculty, extending the eRPT module to promotions to Distinguished Professor and Named Chairs, and including applications for parental leave, applications for sick leave, applications for leave without pay, and submission of sabbatical reports in the system. We think we'll be able to extend the Requisition & Hiring module to all staff in calendar year 2017, so we will finally be away from paper in the hiring process. We will also add a module for the PMYR and for the review of administrators.

*Senator Frank Hugus:* As I understand it, virtually every aspect of our careers, and our student's careers, will be housed in some electronic database somewhere at some point.

*Vice Provost Bryan:* That's one way of looking at it.

*Senator Hugus:* Another way of looking at it is: How secure is this going to be? Since we still have most of the records on paper, it is very difficult for a massive data robbery to occur. I assume, and I would like to be certain for my own peace of mind, that you have thought about the security issues long and hard and have come up with a system that is better than some that we have heard about recently.

*Vice Provost Bryan:* I am not an expert in this field, but we have some of the system developers here, and maybe they could speak to that issue. I know that they have been working closely with the IT security team on these questions.

*Stephen Battisti, Assistant Director, Software Engineering, Center for Educational Software Development:* We are working closely with the UMass IT security department. We have already reviewed the security around the system and we've talked to them about those issues, so, yes, we are addressing this. By the way, a lot of this information is already available in electronic systems on campus, like the HR system. We get a feed from the HR system and the Campus Solutions system for a lot of the data that is in the APWS. That being said, we are taking security concerns very seriously and working through those issues with the IT security department.

*Vice Provost Bryan:* A lot of what is already in place out there, such as using UDrive, uses the NetID login credentials. So does this system. I think it is kind of a status quo move with regard to security.

*Senator Marta Calas* noted that faculty members often have many pulls on their time as they try to perform their research, teaching, and service. She has found that, even though she is an early adopter of technology, technology can unnecessarily clutter her life. She would like to know what the implications of using the APWS will be for her actual work life.

***Vice Provost Bryan:*** Let me try to answer that while agreeing with your premise—as I age, I have certainly found myself less adaptable to new technologies and wondering, “Why do I have to learn something new? I was doing just fine with what I had before.” Yes, there is a learning curve with any new system. Let me give you one example of where we think it will actually make your life easier. Let’s say you are a member of a department or college personnel committee. Depending on where you are, different departments and colleges handle the process differently. In some units, the tenure file was a physical file, it was kept in a locked room, and people had to go read it in that room after signing paperwork saying that they would not disclose the information in it. Under the APWS, all members of the DPC or CPC would have simultaneous access to the file, they can download it to their hard drives as a single file and take it on an airplane and read it. The kind of access available with the APWS is, I think, hugely advantageous. There are also compliance concerns that will be better addressed. In my role, I hear about procedural problems. Let’s say a tenure candidate is not given a copy of the recommendation written by the dean or the CPC. Only later is that discovered and, if the candidate had seen the letter in time, they would have written a response to it in time for the next level of review. This system eliminates that kind of error because it makes notification to the candidate automatic whenever there is something uploaded to the file. They can go in, at any time, and see exactly where the file is in the process or identify any kind of bottleneck. They can go in and elect to put a hold on the advancement of the file so they have time to respond. We know that there are trade-offs. But, overall, it is actually going to make your lives easier.

***Senator Susan K. Whitbourne:*** I am big fan of technology. But what you said in your previous response does confirm one of my issues. You said, “you can download it to your hard drive.” You can download it to Drop Box, Google Drive, you can read it on a plane. I don’t mind any other aspect of this system until you get to that loss of security of the file, because you’ve lost it once you log out of the system. As member of my department’s personnel committee, I agree that it’s convenient. It was great to be able to do that, but I felt very anxious about it the whole time. We had stuff in Box, which was helpful. But there’s nothing to deter downloads and when you have downloads, you have the possibility of uploads. I’d really like to see this addressed.

***Vice Provost Bryan:*** Of course, if you’re reviewing the file using UDrive or Box, you’re also downloading it. About the only way to avoid that is to have it live on the screen and have it disappear when you’re done, or use paper. One of the things that we’re going to implement, as I alluded to before, is a new interface in which you’ll have a very long scrollable window with windows inside of it. Each of these will be scrollable as well, so you’ll be able to scroll through and see a lot of information in the APWS interface. Assistant Director Battisti, is the information downloaded when it is populating those windows?

***Assistant Director Battisti:*** Even when you’re viewing information on a web browser, it’s on your computer. No matter what you do, it’s on your computer. It’s really an issue of mitigating risk. I agree with you about the file download. That provides another potential vector to lose control of something. That’s one of the reasons that we were initially hesitant to build a lot of download features into our system. But there have been a lot of complaints about that, because people *do* want to download things and view them offline. Everything is a risk, and it is about mitigating risk as much as you can. What we’re trying to do is create a user experience that doesn’t make a person feel like they have to download the file—we’re trying to address this as much as possible. We have a few prototypes we’ve built that we’re going to circulate to various people to show them the possibilities of viewing the file online without having to actually download it. I agree with you that this will be a more secure way of dealing with this. Again, we want to try to reduce downloads and printing as much as possible so we want to provide a user experience for people within the web application that will fit their needs as best as possible.

***Vice Provost Bryan:*** Given the enormous population of users that we have, it’s very tough to satisfy everyone’s needs. There are a lot of people who want to download files and take them with them. But I understand the concerns that you have.

***Senator Steven Brewer:*** I mostly wanted to echo what Assistant Director Battisti said. If you’re getting the data on your computer, you’ve got the data on your computer. Someone could probably capture that and take advantage of it, unless you do some pretty weird things that will make it hard to use. What we might

want to think about doing is having the downloaded versions get watermarked in various ways or stored in an encrypted format that would need to be decrypted. Those kinds of things are not perfect either. All of these things open particular kinds of security issues, but that might give us some information about, if something got released, where it might have come from and to let people know about the risks of sharing certain kinds of information.

***Senator Howard Peelle:*** I would like to follow up on the subject of benefits for faculty members. Would you be willing to estimate the number of faculty right now on this campus who are favorable to your system? While you're thinking about that, do you have plans for a survey or some systematic way of finding out where faculty stand on this development?

***Vice Provost Bryan:*** I'd be very hesitant to estimate, especially if the question is a global "do you favor it or not favor it?" What I hear from other faculty and other users of the system is that it has a long way to go but it is going to be great when we get there. I hear frustrations over certain aspects of it, and that's why we continue to hold focus groups and other kinds of sessions to find out what could be better. I had a department head pop into my office yesterday who said, "I just signed off on a promotion file, and it worked great. I was really surprised." I'm not saying that's a representative point of view, but I think that there are a lot of people who see the potential there. I hope that everyone will be patient as we improve it.

***Senator Aura Ganz:*** I'm heading my department's personnel committee this semester, and this system is incredibly efficient. It's easy to use to distribute work and to point to all the necessary files for each case online. It's very efficient. I wanted to suggest a possible solution for the PDF files. There is a way to password protect PDF files. I think this may be an answer to concerns about downloadable files—they really should be password protected. We do have that technology.

***Vice Provost Bryan:*** Yes, that's true. A lot of these issues depend a lot on what you want to impose on the user. So we could say to the user, "Well, people are asking for a single downloadable PDF, so please, that's what you should upload: a single PDF with all of your tenure file in it." That makes it a lot easier for the people doing the review, but harder for the person submitting the file. Same thing for password protection.

Anyway, we've got a lot to learn. I really appreciate getting feedback from you. We're not afraid of criticism. I'll keep coming back and seeing how it goes. Thank you.

## **B. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

### **1. Principal Administrative Officers**

***Michael Malone, Vice Chancellor for Research and Engagement:*** The recipients of the Conti Faculty Fellowship for 2016-2017 have been selected: Professor Melinda Novak, Psychological and Brain Sciences; Dr. David A. Reckhow, Civil and Environmental Engineering; Dr. Donald Tomaskovic-Devey, Sociology. Please congratulate them if you see them. We hope that you will join us at the Faculty Awards Dinner on April 13 to recognize them personally.

While I am up here, I would like to make one remark, relevant to the rest of the agenda, about the Academic Honesty Policy. I am in favor of this motion when we get to it. I would just like to remark that it will need a little more work, perhaps a small amendment, in order to harmonize with the Board of Trustees Responsible Conduct of Research Policy and, if it should happen, the Research Misconduct Procedures. Both of those are responses to federal regulation.

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

***MJ Peterson, Secretary of the Faculty Senate:*** I just want to let everybody know about a couple of things that are running in the background. They are not necessarily going to come to the Faculty Senate for approval but they are relevant to what's going on. The committee to look into search processes, established in accordance with the settlement of a grievance, has begun work. Its task is to look at search practices for

tenure-track faculty on this campus and on other campuses, and come up with recommendations about what we can do going forward. Another thing going on is some discussion about the incomplete policy. This policy was established by the Registrar but it has caused some problems. The third, which is coming very strongly from Boston, is questions about whether we are using our resources efficiently given our class sizes. Unfortunately for us, we have practices about this, but no formal policy. The Board of Trustees is looking around for a singular document. This is being worked on—the administration is consulting with deans and department chairs. They are going to consult with the leaders of the Faculty Senate and the leaders of the Massachusetts Society of Professors. Their aim is to develop a document that will satisfy the Board’s concern but, at the same time, will preserve the distinct elements of the mission of this campus, which, as the flagship, runs programs in the whole gamut of sizes. Therefore, we can’t take the policy from UMass Dartmouth or UMass Lowell and bolt it onto our campus, because our configuration of programs is very different. In all of this, everybody involved wants to make sure that we protect the programs on campus and, at the same time, that we do have a way to assure people that, when you look at the teaching activity of each faculty member overall, everybody is making a contribution to the teaching mission. I’m not going to talk about it as a teaching load, but, as Presiding Officer Bogartz has often referred to it, as a teaching contribution. We have to acknowledge that it is easy to look course-by-course and say, “Well, is that person only teaching tiny courses?” But that is not the typical pattern. The same people who are teaching very large courses also teach smaller ones. We have to deal with this partly in terms of meeting demands and partly in terms of educating in return. Educating our own Board of Trustees as to why we do certain things on this campus and why, in fact, they are valuable and do provide a good return on investment for the state dollars, the student dollars, and the donation dollars.

### 3. The Chair of the Rules Committee

*A Yemisi Jimoh, Chair of the Rules Committee:* I have two brief announcements. I would like to add to Vice Chancellor Malone’s announcement about the Academic Honesty Policy. As you see on the agenda, we will be amending the procedures for the academic honesty hearings. We also anticipate that the Graduate Council will be proposing additions that address graduate education. We must have a policy in place that addresses our current procedures and that’s what we’re asking for today. My second announcement is that we expect the Open Access Policy, agreed between the Massachusetts Society of Professors and the administration, to come as a special report from the Research Council on April 7th and the Faculty Senate will be asked to endorse it.

### 4. The Representative of the Massachusetts Society of Professors

*Randall Phillis, President of the Massachusetts Society of Professors:* We’re busy in the Massachusetts Society of Professors office, but the thing I’d like to give you a head’s up about is that we’re preparing for the next round of bargaining already. It seems like a process that never ends. What will happen is that, this spring, we will do rather extensive canvassing of the faculty and figure out what the priorities and what faculty think about various positions that we’re constructing. Then, our desire is to initiate bargaining a little earlier than usual so we can complete bargaining during the legislative cycle and get into the funding cycle in a timely way, rather than trying to push it all past the legislative cycle and then ask for a supplemental, which clearly failed this time. We’re really eager to get on with it and provide the legislature easier access to giving us the money that it should provide.

## C. QUESTION PERIOD

*Senator Frank Hugus:* I came here this afternoon to ask a question about the desire on the part of the Trustees to see that we are using our resources as frugally as possible. I must say that there are many rumors going around, and I won’t repeat them here. What I would like to know is how imminent is this? What is the timetable? In a sense, how urgent is this for us as a campus?

*MJ Peterson, Secretary of the Faculty Senate:* My understanding is that this is very urgent. We need to have it finished up by the end of the academic year. In saying that, we need to make a good deal of progress and explanation but exactly how complicated this is going to be depends on how well what gets written into a

consolidated document corresponds with already existing practices on campus, and there are a lot of them. One of the things that we're finding out is just how many of them there are.

*Senator Monika Schmitter:* I had a question about the same issue. Thank you for bringing it up. Why isn't it coming before the Faculty Senate? I think this is a good forum in which ideas could be put forward and expressed, especially those that can't necessarily come through the usual channels.

*Secretary Peterson:* There are a couple of things that we could actually do that, given the wide dispersions of rumors that are out there. One way would be to send it through the Councils and another would be to throw out ideas on April 7<sup>th</sup> by convening part of the Faculty Senate meeting as a Committee of the Whole meeting. We would not have a formal motion, but we would express and exchange ideas. Maybe that would be a good idea.

*Senator Schmitter:* I think so. I think that the more feedback we can get, the better we can address this issue.

*Secretary Peterson:* And Senators can encourage their constituents to give them feedback. I think that some Senators have very good connections and communication with their constituents and some are still working on that. This would be a topic that might inspire constituents to communicate a bit more.

*Senator Ernest May:* Can I ask Associate Chancellor Bryan Harvey to give an explanation of what is going on?

*Bryan Harvey, Associate Chancellor and Chief Planning Officer:* I think it is important to keep in mind that the genesis of this particular discussion isn't any special policy or inquiry going on at the system level or elsewhere. There are general conversations that go on all the time and there are various Trustee committees. I think that all that happened in this case is that a question came up in which there was a request for the campuses to report on what their policies were. I think most people assumed that we had one and we looked around and discovered that we don't exactly have one. There being no particular reason for not having one, if we decided that we did want one, a conversation would be had. I think Secretary Peterson summed it up rather well. All of these conversations are pretty formative right now: trying to get an idea of what other people do, what we've done in practice in the past, for the purpose of bringing forward what seems to represent the way that we'd like to approach this. The reason is that if we don't have to be in the position of saying we've never thought about this or done anything about it, why would we want that question to be asked? This is not some particular, specific policy coming down. It was just, in the course of events, discovering that we didn't have something like this and deciding that some discussion would be good to have, and that launched the wheels that Secretary Peterson described.

*Richard Bogartz, Presiding Officer:* Alternatively, if there is no problem being raised by our null policy, why don't we just turn in a sheet of paper?

*Associate Chancellor Harvey:* We do report on a lot of things from time to time about what we do. Fairly recently, we reported on the distribution of classes. It's not as if these are questions that people don't ask. If you look at a report or the result of conversation, and discover that we have a fair number of small classes, which we do for very good reasons, we want to be able to talk about what those reasons are. We want to be able to talk about how we make decisions. We have nothing to be ashamed of and nothing to hide. But if we're not really sure or we haven't talked about it, that is not as good a position to be in.

#### D. NEW COURSES

<u>COURSE</u>	<u>TITLE</u>	<u>CREDITS</u>
AFROAM 392	"Songbirds, Blueswomen, Soulwomen"	3
ART-HIST 120	"Venice: Art, History, Environment"	4
COMP-LIT 144	"War Stories"	4

MIDEAST 360	“Arabic and Hebrew in their Social Settings”	4
NRC 494ED	“Environmental Decision-Making”	4
SOCIOL 334	“Sociology of International Crises and Disasters”	4
SOCIOL 356	“Social Forces, Health and the Lifecourse”	4
STOCKSCH 186	“Introduction to Permaculture”	3
STOCKSCH 286	“Permaculture Design and Practice”	3
STOCKSCH 320	“Organic Vegetable Growing”	3
STOCKSCH 354	“Nonprofit Management of Community-Based Farming Programs”	3
STOCKSCH 386	“Sustainable Site Design and Planning”	3
STOCKSCH 387	“Global Food Systems”	3
THEATER 363	“Sound Design I”	3
UWW 360	“Experiential Reflections on Learning and Education”	4
WOMENSST 230	“Politics of Reproduction”	3

**MOTION:** That the Faculty Senate approve the courses AFROAM 392, ART-HIST 120, COMP-LIT 14-16, MIDEAST 360, NRC 494ED, SOCIOL 334 and 356, STOCKSCH 186, 286, 320, 354, 386, and 387, THEATER 363, UWW 360 and WOMENSST 230, as recommended by the Academic Matters Council.

*MJ Peterson, Secretary of the Faculty Senate:* I rise to request that AFROAM 392: “Songbirds, Blueswomen, Soulwomen” be removed from the list of courses to be approved. It was included in the list in error; discussion is, in fact, not finished yet.

AFROAM 392: “Songbirds, Blueswomen, Soulwomen” was removed from the list of courses to be approved.

The motion was adopted.

**E. NEW BUSINESS**

1. Special Report of the Academic Matters and Graduate Councils concerning the Policy and Procedures concerning Academic Honesty, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 16-038 with Motion No. 15-16.

**MOTION:** That the Faculty Senate approve the Policy and Procedures concerning Academic Honesty, 15-16 as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 16-038.

*Richard Bogartz, Presiding Officer:* In the light of Vice Chancellor Malone’s remarks, would it be appropriate to table this motion?

*MJ Peterson, Secretary of the Faculty Senate:* The desire of the Graduate Council and the Academic Matters Council is not to table it, because that would delay our ability to implement procedures that take the management of formal academic honesty hearings out of the Ombuds Office and put it into the Provost’s Office. This change will make the Ombuds Office more consistent with national practice that has ombuds only dealing with informal, consensual resolution processes and not with formal, contentious cases.

*Michael Malone, Vice Chancellor for Research and Engagement:* I fully support passing this motion. My earlier remark was only meant to be that it will be coming back with small amendments to harmonize it with other policies related to sponsored research. My own viewpoint and recommendation is that it not hold us up from making progress on this front.

*Senator A Yemisi Jimoh:* I just wanted to confirm what the Secretary said. The Graduate Council would also like the policy to not be delayed for its forthcoming amendments as well.

The motion was adopted.

2. **Special Report of the Rules Committee concerning Revision of the Faculty Senate Election Districts, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 16-039 with Motion No. 16-16.**

**MOTION:** That the Faculty Senate approve the Revision of the Faculty Senate Election Districts, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 16-039.  
**16-16**

*Senator Marta Calas:* I only have a question. I could only see the numbers for the different districts and how they've been reconfigured, and it's logical. I can see that there are a lot of vacancies. I was wondering what the logic of the reconfiguration was, since I don't have a document that is a comparison for what it was like before. It caught my attention that, in my district, we are losing one senator. It's one of the only ones that has a full slate. It is also many departments together, and I just don't know what the logic was. I know that you sent some things, but they were not useable.

*MJ Peterson, Secretary of the Faculty Senate:* I did distribute a document that did compare the new districts with the current districts about two weeks ago.

*Senator Calas:* I know that you sent it. The trouble was both opening it and making sense of it.

*Secretary Peterson:* I'm sorry you had trouble with that. In this process, I received another lesson in the ongoing war between the PC galaxy and the Mac galaxy. If you create an Excel file in one, it will not open in the other. I tried to send a PDF, but that may not have worked. The main logic of the redistricting involved two things. One was the creation of a new college. We have a longstanding tradition in the Faculty Senate that districts do not cross college lines. So we had to rearrange things on the north side of campus to accommodate the College of Information and Computer Sciences. It turned out that there wasn't a change in the number of senators, it was just pulling a district out of the College of Natural Sciences and calling it the College of Information and Computer Sciences. There were some other districts where the faculty numbers—and we should be happy about this—had gotten above the 80 that is the maximum size under the Bylaws. So things had to be moved around to deal with that. Along the way, there were some other adjustments, which may not make quite as much logical sense. There are two places where the redistricting leaves a group slightly over-represented. Again, we have a tradition in the Faculty Senate that, when that happens, the senator who was elected to a term that would not expire in 2016, but would expire in 2017 or 2018, be allowed to continue serving. We tried very hard to get things to work right, but we're prepared to admit that, while on the whole we did a very good job, there are one or two details that we didn't get quite right.

*Senator Calas:* Thank you. I wasn't overly concerned about us, but mostly about the logic of the redistricting and how it compared.

The motion was adopted.

3. **Special Report of the Academic Matters, Academic Priorities and Program and Budget Councils concerning a Certificate in Medical Humanities, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 16-040 with Motion No. 17-16.**

**MOTION:** That the Faculty Senate approve the Certificate in Medical Humanities, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 16-040.  
**17-16**

The motion was adopted.

4. **Special Report of the Academic Priorities, Graduate and Program and Budget Councils concerning a Dual Master’s Program: Master of Regional Planning (MRP)/Master of Sustainability Science (MSS), as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 16-041 with Motion No. 18-16.**

**MOTION: 18-16 That the Faculty Senate approve the Dual Master’s Program: Master of Regional/Planning (MRP)/Master of Sustainability Science (MSS), as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 16-041.**

**The motion was adopted.**

5. **Special Report of the Graduate Council concerning a New Concentration: Master in Business Administration (MBA) with a Focus in Business Analytics, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 16-042 with Motion No. 19-16.**

**MOTION: 19-16 That the Faculty Senate approve the New Concentration: Master in Business Administration (MBA) with a Focus in Business Analytics, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 16-042.**

***Senator David Gross:* I have a question for someone about a sentence in the “Resources” section of the proposal. The first sentence says, “This proposal requires no additional resources because all the courses will be sourced on an additional compensation basis by the faculty in the Isenberg School of Management or by affiliated experts who are either academically or professionally qualified.” Are the people who are not faculty—the “affiliated experts”—already affiliated with a program on campus? My motivation in asking that is to find out, first, if they are not already affiliated, how are they vetted? And second, what about additional compensation? If there is no one who can answer these questions, I move that we postpone the vote on this concentration until someone can come address the concerns that I raised.**

**The motion was tabled.**

**The 756<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Faculty Senate adjourned at 4:35 pm.**