

**UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST
OFFICE OF THE FACULTY SENATE**

Presiding Officer Richard Bogartz called the 769th Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate to order on May 4, 2017 at 3:30 p.m. in Herter Hall, Room 227. Bogartz began the meeting with a reading of his poem, "On Love."

Love is the feeling of the reality of unity made possible by the illusion of duality.

The pretense of lover and beloved gives rise to the feeling of love because the truth of unity, which cannot be totally concealed, arises and reveals itself in the attraction that the apparent part feels for the illusory other part.

While the lover pretends that the beloved is other, the ground of their being, which is one, insists at the level of the emotions, and the thought arises that we are one.

Fear is the temporary condition in which the illusion of separation becomes so strong that the feeling of unity is completely suppressed.

Other seems to threaten self and the realization of the truth lies submerged.

Self appears to behold not-self and the risk that not-self will annihilate self looms, blocking the light of reality.

Ego is our vulnerability. The threat that other appears to present is the struggle of ego to maintain its illusion of separate existence. The reality is that we are fundamentally invulnerable while at the same time we constantly die again and again, arising anew as another. From moment to moment the ground of our being is unchanged and outside those moments: eternal; the apparent separate self is continually subject to modification while pretending to remain unchanged behind the name "I."

We are love because love is the self-realization of our fundamental unity and that self-realization is what we are.

Consciousness aware of itself.

Love is like peekaboo.

The parent hides behind the hands, but the hiding is a public display that says "I am here" while it pretends to conceal.

Love pretends that unity is not here and then parts its hands to reveal that unity was hiding here all along.

The self plays peekaboo with itself.

What is fear of love? Fear of love is the memory of the temporary ascendance of the sense of separation and an accompanying pain that ego suffered.

But love removes the fear of love.

Love reveals the truth and self is the innocent victim that dies the death of purification.

Fear burns in love.

But love cannot be burned by fear because love is the truth and fear is an error.

Fear can conceal love for a time but love remains the fundament of our existence. We are love. We are one.

Trust is the hand extended toward the truth before the truth is in hand. Trust is the germ of the truth that makes itself known in secret. Trust is John the Baptist preceding Jesus. Trust points to the truth before the truth has arrived. Trust knows before knowing can be. Simply trust. Trust in yourself. Trust in life. Trust in the reality that is our life and being.

- A. PRESENTATION BY JULIE BUEHLER, VICE CHANCELLOR FOR INFORMATION SERVICES AND STRATEGY AND CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER, AND MATTHEW DALTON, CHIEF INFORMATION SECURITY OFFICER
"NEW CAMPUS CYBERSECURITY POLICY" (10 MINUTES)
(QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION TO FOLLOW)**

Due to unforeseen circumstances, the presentation was postponed to the Fall 2017 semester.

**B. PRESENTATION BY JENNIFER NORMANLY, CHAIR, CAMPUS PLANNING AND RESOURCE COMMITTEE (CPARC)
“REPORT TO THE CHANCELLOR OF THE CAMPUS PLANNING AND RESOURCE COMMITTEE (CPARC), ACADEMIC YEAR 2016-2017” (SEN. DOC. NO. 17-069)
(10 Minutes)
(QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION TO FOLLOW)**

Professor Jennifer Normanly, Chair of the Campus Planning and Resource Committee: We met starting last spring semester and met this year at least once a month if not twice. We have one more meeting coming up on May 19th. We had three action items in our charge: first, to undertake a review of the annual budgeting process as it was going forward for the preparation of the fiscal year 2018 budget and to recommend adjustments as needed. We were also charged with fully integrating the work of the Joint Subcommittee on Administrative Costs and Services (JSACS) by the end of the fall semester; finally, CPARC was charged with encouraging ongoing efforts to pursue campus-wide priorities including but not limited to the campus diversity plan, plans for internationalization, and an outreach and engagement strategy.

On the campus budget planning process, we identified a number of challenges and potential modifications. Feedback was quite varied from unit to unit. We had input from department heads. We had dean representation on CPARC so we got a sense of how the deans were thinking. We had a meeting with the Provost. Of course, we had representatives from Administrative and Support (A&S) units on CPARC, as well. What we struggled with is that it's very hard to actually monitor and absorb and reflect upon a process as it's happening. As it turns out, we didn't really see the details of college roll-ups until the week that our report to the Faculty Senate was due. We knew this was going to come late in the game; the process as it's set out is not quite in sync with the academic calendar. There's also the fact that we're still waiting to hear what the state is going to do with the budget and we won't really know the outcome of the budget planning process until later in the summer.

One of the things that we identified is that there are departments that feel that they don't really have closure on their strategic planning; that is, they're not really getting a sense that there is an approval of their plans. They have a budgetary outcome that doesn't really speak to their strategic objectives. There are also insufficient opportunities for departments and colleges to talk about not just the strategic planning initiatives but also just the realities of the shifts and trends and budget cuts that are affecting their daily activities. There has been some confusion about what information and reports are due to whom and when; we think that there's room for clarity there.

We also noticed that it was very challenging to work with just year-to-year budgets; we really would like to be much more strategic, even though that's challenging given the funding circumstance that every year we wait on the state, but we would like to put in place a culture of multi-year planning in the sense that a multi-year plan is tentatively approved pending funding availability and that units are on the right track in general. We didn't quite achieve integration of academic planning and A&S unit planning. We focus entirely, it seems, on financial resources but space planning and facilities don't seem to be integrated into that; we thought that that was an important part of the budget planning process. There is also some confusion about what is a strategic investment and what is just investing in maintaining quality and capacity in the face of changes in enrollment trends. Also, are we talking about just the overall central-based budgeting or are we talking about internal re-budgeting that happens in A&S units and in colleges? Again, we were very rushed; there doesn't seem to be time to really reflect on what happened and ask whether or not the budget outcomes are aligning with the strategic priorities. There was also a sense that sometimes the input into the budget planning process seems repetitive or like busy work so we wanted to make sure that there is clarity on what it is that's most useful for people to be doing. And, we really didn't achieve the student input that we were looking for.

We came up with this schema and Nancy Cohen and Bryan Harvey worked very hard on this. I'll just touch on a few aspects of it. We're proposing that we'll shift the timing of CPARC's main activities so that, in the fall, there will be a look back. What were the budget outcomes for fiscal year 2018 and how did the decisions align with unit priorities? We liked the governance meeting. Two years ago, the Chancellor called a meeting of Faculty Senate Council Chairs and campus leadership to lay out the budget; there was an opportunity to discuss how the budget outlook was going to play out and how we should be thinking about budgets, cuts, or what have you. We recommend that this be reinstated. We also note that there are a number of student advisory boards for the A&S units; we would like to encourage opportunities for students to get primers on the budget process so that they can be more involved, and that should happen more in the fall. We didn't want to require that departmental units have student advisory boards but it could be useful to come up with some ways to get student input when departments are coming up with their own unit plans. We also wanted to include explicitly space and facilities planning. The idea to have a multi-year plan would tie in with our upcoming New England Association for Schools and Colleges (NEASC) re-accreditation activities; rather than going through these deep-dives and looks in the mirror every single year, we'd have a multi-year plan that gives a sense of the big picture in terms of the priorities of the campus allowing us to move forward and adjust it as trends change. Then, you're not coming up with new strategic initiatives every single year. So, that's the gist of what we're recommending and it's detailed much more in the report that we submitted.

To give an update on the JSACS, they did a survey of faculty and staff asking people to identify administrative processes that are taking up most of their time, causing frustration, or could use improvement. We got 257 comments in ten broad areas and analysis resulted in establishing some action categories for future consideration. The outcomes of the survey are going to be used to inform ongoing Administrative Quality Assessment and Development (AdQAD) processes, possibly launch some new AdQAD's, get more information about a particular area that's highlighted by many people, talk to the relevant administrators, and look at ways in which A&S units can develop performance metrics that everyone can relate to and speak to when they're going through annual budget planning and whether there are things that are not as urgent and could be set aside for a couple of years.

The next steps for CPARC – and we have one more meeting this semester, as I said – are to organize ourselves for our action items for the fall and focus on how we can achieve that look back of seeing how the budget outcomes for the fiscal year 2018 process align with strategic priorities and campus values. We'll be looking forward to using the feedback that we've received to recommend specific changes to the process. We have been charged with advising on the preparation for the NEASC re-accreditation process which is due in eighteen months or something like that. So, there will be more to come on that, and CPARC will be commenting and advising on that. And, we need to continue our discussions with groups engaged in other types of strategic planning including internationalization, outreach and engagement, and also diversity planning.

MJ Peterson, Secretary of the Faculty Senate: There's been a lot of back-and-forth, not just on CPARC, but around the campus, on who gets to look at what information when. I know that this is something that is under discussion. I also know that the budgeting process isn't over until the state legislature acts in June. Do we have a sense of what the timing is on when people should see things? What's useful for people to see? What's the spirit with which people should be thinking about what they're seeing?

Chair Normanly: We all commented that the Provost's narrative, which I think she put out in late August or early September of this past academic year, was helpful to give a sense of what the thinking was at the Provost/Chancellor level around strategic investments. So, we'd like to see

something like that again. We didn't quite see that elsewhere; it was much more numerically based from the A&S units and we'd like to see some narrative from them, as well. Again, this was the problem that we had during the semester. We could have asked to see all of the unit budget plans; it would have been something on the order of 60 that we would have had to somehow digest in a few weeks time. Then, we wanted to look at the college priorities, but, again, they literally came the same week that the final report was due. So, we're hoping that, if we can look at all of this in the fall, we can come up with some recommendations for when this should be available campus-wide, in what form, and how we can use it to reflect in a less hurried manner, to advise the process going forward and ask if, in fact, we are achieving the priorities that we set out to, which are that there are adequate transparency, opportunities for discussion, and alignment with our values.

Senator Steven Brewer: One of the things during the Joint Task Force on Resource Allocation (JTFRA) process was that there was this kind of commitment to radical transparency with big spreadsheets of Harvey-esque complexity being widely disseminated. Since then, there's been kind of a dearth of information, and I've talked to a number of people who say that those kinds of data are simply unavailable, and, when they ask about being able to get a sense for what things are like in other departments or other patterns, those data are being withheld. Is there going to be more transparency, or are we simply going to move into a world where there is this much more tightly filtered view of information?

Chair Normanly: We did have fairly limited feedback campus-wide on, for example, the college consultative processes. HFA has a town-meeting style meeting and the feedback we heard about that was positive. CNS had no college consultative process. I have been as eager as many of you on the transparency; I really want to dive into the numbers and I do like to compare my department with others. We do have three new deans coming in, and I think that level of transparency is sort of in the realm of the deans: a large part of it is their comfort level with showing their hands, if you will, before budget decisions have been made. There is also a genuine concern about expectations being raised; if we say that we really think that we're going to invest in Biology and then things go terribly wrong with the budget, there's a balance managing those expectations getting out of hand. Yes, we're continuing to push for more transparency; I think it's somewhat wait-and-see. We have at least one new dean who comes from an RCM campus who I think could inform us; and, one of the new deans comes from industry and, I think, could also inform us about how we should be looking at transparency and processes.

Presiding Officer Richard Bogartz: Throughout the life of the Joint Task Force on Strategic Oversight (JTFSO), from the very beginning to the end of its life, we talked about transparency. Your response says a couple of things. Maybe it says that it's more or less in the hands of the dean; maybe it says that we'll have to wait and see about transparency. I suggest that CPARC should be a change agent. We should initiate and push for transparency. We've been promised it; it's time we demanded it. And, if there are things that cannot be made transparent, there should be a rational justification for it so that things are transparent unless we get told in some sensible way why it's inappropriate for people to look at it. I'm a member of CPARC.

Chair Normanly: So, that will be your first motion next semester. You've said that before and I don't disagree with you.

Presiding Officer Bogartz: I have said it before and I intend to say it again.

Senator Curt Conner: Transparency, of course, would be great, particularly when it comes to things like overhead money. Both at the undergraduate and graduate levels, we have fees that continue to go up and up and nobody has been able to explain to us where the money goes. The fees keep on

increasing, and I suspect that administrative salaries are the greatest cause of it, but know that transparency on this has been absolutely lacking.

Chair Normanly: Well, there have been several presentations by the Chancellor that show where the student fees are going: the largest items are campus debt, financial aid, and salaries. He has presented, here in this forum, the comparison of administrative salaries and faculty salaries; I remember that the largest part of the salary pie was faculty salaries.

Bryan Harvey, Associate Chancellor and Chief Planning Officer: The simple answer is that the 70% that goes to the University is treated as general revenue like every other dollar, like tuition revenue, like state dollars. So, really, it's a fraction, probably 4% or 8% of the whole pile of money that pays our salaries.

Senator Conner: It's still not clear.

The report was received.

C. SPECIAL REPORT OF THE GENERAL EDUCATION COUNCIL CONCERNING THE GENERAL EDUCATION DIVERSITY LEARNING OUTCOMES AND COURSE STRUCTURE RECOMMENDATIONS, AS PRESENTED IN SEN. DOC. NO. 17-070.

MOTION: 29-17 That the Faculty Senate approve the General Education Diversity Learning Outcomes and Course Structure Recommendations, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 17-070.

Senator Anthony Paik: I just have a couple of questions. In the current Diversity requirement, there's language stating: "Since the sensitivity to the social and cultural diversity is advanced by an understanding of the dynamics of power in modern societies, courses that focus on the differential life experiences of women outside the mainstream of American culture, minorities outside the mainstream of American culture, and the poor also come within the scope of this requirement." Will that requirement still hold under the revised learning outcomes? Secondly, with the merging of the Social World and Diversity portions of the General Education program, current courses with stand-alone U.S. Diversity (U) and Global Diversity (G) designations would have to be reallocated to other Social World categories: AL/AT, HS, SB, I, or SI. What is the plan for that reallocation?

Professor Claire Hamilton, Chair of the General Education Council: In terms of the stand-alone G and U courses, those were implemented in 1989 due to implementation difficulties with the intended structure for Diversity courses, which was to be a primary designation in Social World and a secondary designation in Diversity. So, we had several courses develop at that point as stand-alone G's and U's. In 2009, when we moved from a three-credit to a four-credit requirement for all of our Social World courses, courses that held the G or U designations and stayed at three credits were treated as a separate category on the chart but were always supposed to be embedded in Social World. They were moved in the table and continued to meet the Gen. Ed. requirements for Diversity. We currently have a very small number of stand-alone G's and U's. In fact, I tried to get a good count, but you know that sometimes it's hard to manipulate our data sources, so I'm going to say that there are less than ten, but I think that there are about three courses that are stand-alone. Those courses will now be required to share a designation with a Social World designation and they would be going through the same expedited quinquennial (QQ) review process to add that Social World designation. So, there's no additional requirement that they be embedded in Social World; that has been the intent all along. It was the 2009 issue with the move from three to four credits that we're correcting with the label. They were always there.

Our current Diversity requirements, in terms of the language, stipulate only three things. The courses emphasize the need for educated citizens to understand that different cultures and societies provide unique context for human experience. The courses help students analyze and appreciate the ways norms and values differ across cultures and society and encourage pluralistic thinking. The language then goes on to discuss what kinds of courses might satisfy that requirement: courses may satisfy that requirement by focusing on the people of Africa, Asia, or the Middle East, descendants of those people in North America, minorities in Western industrial societies, and Native

Americans. These courses may also advance cultural diversity with an understanding of the dynamics of power and focus on differential life experiences of women. In our new learning outcomes, we are not using the same language, but we are capturing the foundations of that language with the intent that students will gain knowledge of structural and cultural forces that shape or have shaped discrimination based on factors such as race, ethnicity, language, religion, class, ability, nationality, sexuality, or gender. I think that, by including and explicitly referencing “discrimination,” we move further toward addressing the issues that are in that 1985 language. That 1985 language is gone under this but, I think, captured under the proposed learning outcomes.

Senator Ernest May: This looks, to me, to be greatly improved, and I’m not questioning the validity of what you’ve done here. But, as a member of the Program and Budget Council, I don’t think this particular version of it went through the Program and Budget Council. So, I would just ask you to address the question of resources and the delivery of this. I see that it has been postponed for a year to allow for us to gear up to do this; it’s not going to be implemented next fall but the following fall. I assume that some administrator can assure us that there will be sufficient resources to implement this at a level of appropriate quality.

Chair Hamilton: In terms of the implementation of this, we’re relying on the current U and G courses, and, in fact, we would move to convert those to DU and DG. The issue in implementation that could require resources would be the first bump year when we would require students to take these courses in their first year. After that, it would even out because we are already offering courses to meet the Diversity requirement. On this question, I look to Vice Provost Carol Barr who is leading the effort to work out the details.

Senator Paik: My apologies; I don’t want to belabor the point. I do want to thank the Council for its work on revising the requirement which was obviously somewhat dated. My concern is that this last statement in the current requirement really highlights the importance of differential experience. It basically says that you could focus on maybe a specific population and not necessarily a diversity of populations. I think that might be lost in the proposed learning outcomes; my reading of the proposed learning outcomes is that they suggest multiple perspectives for a given course. But, let’s suppose that there was a course that was focused on a specific population, the urban population in a single city in the United States for example, that would meet the current requirements for the Diversity requirement but it may not under the proposed learning outcomes; I just want to clarify that it does. I want to make sure that the meaning of this language is still present in the revised learning outcomes.

Chair Hamilton: I would respectfully suggest that indeed it is met in the proposed learning outcomes because they need to reflect multiple perspectives, as you read in the last learning outcome, but also, as stated in bullet four, because the students also need to gain knowledge, disciplinary or interdisciplinary, of the structural and cultural forces that shape or have shaped discrimination based on several factors including race, ethnicity, language, religion, etc. That is captured by putting both of those learning outcomes together.

Senator Mzamo Mangaliso: Thank you. I’m the Co-Chair of the Status of Diversity Council (SODC). The Council did discuss many of the issues that were raised in the proposal, and I want to thank Professor Hamilton, the Chair of the General Education Council, who came and discussed some of them with us. Of course, you know our concerns that we expressed. We appreciate that you took into account what we said when we sent you the resolution of the SODC and accommodated the language change in that first bullet point. In fact, there are two aspects of this motion here: one says, “the Faculty Senate approve the General Education Diversity Outcomes” and the second one says, “the Course Structure Recommendations, as presented....” So, the way that the SODC is seeing this is that there would be a movement of some of the courses that were not offered in the first year so that the student body at large and students in the first year will be exposed to that; this is a positive move that we like. The SODC is mainly concerned with outcomes two and three, which, I think, are still there now. The fact is that students are expected to demonstrate awareness and communication skills acquired in these courses and yet the criteria for demonstrating this are left to the instructor’s discretion; this is problematic for many of us on the SODC. We believe that this is an important part associated with the implementation. The development and evaluation of these important skills will require thoughtful, deliberate, and sustained interaction between the students and the instructor. The instructors will need to be helped in wrapping their arms around these very important issues, especially given what we’ve heard from the reports that have recently come out. We were still concerned after the revisions that that aspect of the right stuff getting delivered to the student and the preparation

that goes into it has been left, at this point, entirely to the discretion of the instructors across the campus. We all know that we get trained in Ph.D. programs, and very few of these train their graduates how to teach and what to teach. You are left to your own resources to stand in front of the class and lecture. So, how can we take such a very critical thing and leave it to the discretion of instructors who are required to navigate around this area without much spadework done? We don't know the nature of what that spadework has to be, but it's a concern that we have. Thank you.

Senator Farshid Hajir: Having served on the General Education Council for five years, I know that a lot of work goes into creating documents like this, so I want to thank the Council for its work. Also, if the motion passes, they're going to have to do a lot of work changing the designations. I just want to make sure I understand correctly; is it the case that U and G courses will be automatically designated DU or DG, or will they have to go through the QQ process to become DU's or DG's?

Chair Hamilton: One of the things, I think, that came up as we were going through everything, having discussions and getting feedback on this was the commitment and the ways that different instructors were currently teaching their G's and U's. What we decided on as an implementation plan was to recognize the good work that was being done by having courses immediately convert from U to DU and G to DG, unless a faculty member or department said that they did not wish for that to happen, but we would then implement an expedited QQ process for these converted DU's and DG's. So, we would see them all in two years. Instructors would be notified of the new learning outcomes, asked in good faith to implement those outcomes, and then, having had a chance to consider their syllabi and course structures in terms of those outcomes, go through a QQ process within two years.

Senator Hajir: So, in other words, the courses will immediately become DU and DG, but then would have to go through a process in which they would have to demonstrate alignment with these new learning outcomes.

Chair Hamilton: Yes, the expectation would be that instructors would immediately begin implementing these learning outcomes and that they would be given the opportunity to think about what revisions would be needed.

Senator Hajir: But they could opt out by saying, "Actually, no thank you. I want to keep my course the way it is. I don't want it to become a DU or DG."

Chair Hamilton: If an instructor or department wishes to opt out, that is their choice. We would regret that because we have good courses, but, yes, they could choose to do that. Also, to clarify, the expedited QQ-like process would be for all courses that move from G and U to DG and DU, as well as any Social World course that would like to become a DU or DG and all currently stand-alone G or U courses that wish to have the DG or DU, because they would have to get a joint Social World designation. So, we would be doing all of them at the same time.

Senator Hajir: I have another technical question. Students in their first year on campus have to take one of these courses. Does that mean that transfer students must also satisfy this requirement?

Chair Hamilton: This would apply to transfer students just like the rest of the Gen. Ed. curriculum. There are some courses that are approved by Transfer Affairs for coming straight to us, but, yes, they would have to meet these requirements.

Senator Hajir: But, we would have to go through a process to figure out how these courses at other colleges, community colleges say, that formerly satisfied the G or the U will now satisfy the DG or DU. Isn't that correct?

Chair Hamilton: Currently, they have to take a G or U when they come in. Do we have Transfer Affairs here? We have a Mass Transfer Block and, within that Mass Transfer Block, we can require two courses. We did look at this carefully: they have to take the Integrative Experience (IE) and one of the Diversity courses, a G or a U. They currently have to take one of those. They will have to take one of those in the first year. What happens with the other one is dependent on what they bring in and that's for the Mass Transfer Block. What we take in for other transfers, I don't know, but the Mass Transfer Block is more specific.

Senator Hajir: Thank you. From a personal perspective, I understand why the requirement is for students to take the course in the first year. I do think that this puts a burden on students, such as Science and Engineering students, who already have a very strained curriculum. Secondly, I think that it will force a lot of freshmen to be in classes together and that a lot of the other Gen. Ed. classes will suddenly be bereft of the freshman. I also think that something similar is going to happen in the Social World classes that don't have the DG or DU; all of a sudden, they will lose enrollment because students will always look for courses that will satisfy multiple designations whenever they can. So, I think you've done a very good job to try to meet the requirements of what you were going after, but I do worry about the unintended consequences, and I also worry about whether we will be ready and in a position to have a successful implementation of this program in that first year. Thanks for your time.

Chair Hamilton: I would just add to that that approximately 70% of our students take one of their Diversity courses within the first year, so, I think, Professor Hajir is correct: we're going to get some drifting around with what students take and at what levels, but currently we have about 70% completing at least one Diversity course in the first year. So, it will have an effect, but, to what degree, I'm not sure.

Senator Gonen Dori-Hacohen: Under the proposed learning outcomes, students would be expected to demonstrate the capacity to listen to and communicate respectfully with others. My first comment is that I consider listening to be part of communicating, so I find it strange that you need to have both of them. My actual question is this; is this respect a cultural code that imposes American values on people from other places? In the language of the Diversity platform itself, there is a lack of diversity because of this code. Usually, I don't get the American respect and I need to work extra hard to give the respect that Americans demand which is usually an hour extra for every email that I write. So, using respect here is basically showing that there is a problem with this idea of diversity because you force people to accept the cultural norm about respect in the U.S. system and not to be diverse to other cultural experiences.

Senator Marta Calás: This is along the lines of what has just been mentioned. Whose world is being represented in this diversity world? There is a tendency in Western knowledge to put things into boxes. This proposal, which is very nice and has been well thought out, includes things like focus on the peoples of Africa, Asia, Latin America, the Middle East, and so forth. There is a world of places, but something that is more relevant today is the world of movement. Migration is constantly happening all the time, and, through this process, societies are becoming different kinds of societies. So, when diversity is defined with boxes, we somehow lose that process of becoming diverse and that concerns me tremendously.

Chair Hamilton: Just as a point of clarification, I really appreciate that comment, and that was why we so carefully moved away from that language, which is from our current requirement from 1985, to our new learning outcomes which don't reference Asia or North America. So, the last page shows the old language, and, hopefully, our new language has moved away from that.

Professor Janice Telfer, Veterinary and Animal Sciences: I have a technical question. I'm the Undergraduate Program Director and an advisor in the Department of Veterinary and Animal Sciences. The requirement is to take one of these courses in the first year. You can advise a student, but then they go off and register for something else. So, when it comes to graduation clearance time, what should the graduation clearance person in the department do, or what does the University clearance person do, if the student did not take either a DU or DG in the first year?

Chair Hamilton: Because this would become one of our Gen. Ed. requirements, it would need to be reflected in the Academic Requirements Report (ARR) on SPIRE; then, we would be aware that a student was failing to meet the requirement in semester one and hopefully catch them for advising in semester two and nip it in the bud right then. If it's not caught then, I assume the student would have to go through a waiver process similar to the waiver process that they go through for not meeting one of their other Gen. Ed. objectives; basically, they'd have to indicate that they were not advised properly. So, I think it will show up on the ARR, they'll get it with New Student Orientation (NSO), and it will need to be reviewed as part of the advising process.

Professor Telfer: So, are you saying that, thanks to our new SSC advising system in which we can document what we tell the students every time we meet with them, if it's in their advising report that we told them in semester one that they need to take this and in semester two that they need to take this and then they don't follow our advice either semester, basically they'll be blocked permanently from graduation?

Carol Barr, Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education: We will be working in SPIRE on the system side of this for the requirement for the first year. Even though we don't yet have the mechanics formally in place in SPIRE, a lot of advisors advise their students to take MATH 104 in the first year or to take calculus or some other course in the first year because it's a prerequisite for upper-level classes. So, we'll be following a similar sort of process in working on the SPIRE system itself, perhaps even using the new SSC advising tool, to see how we might be able to put in place a more formal way that the student actually could not enroll until they take that first-year course.

Senator Cynthia Suopis: Just to follow up on the first-year requirement, from a technical perspective, University Without Walls students are all transfer students. Many of them do not have the Mass Transfer Block so, when they come to us, they could have 60 credits already. So, when we look at SPIRE, there should be some kind of accommodation for those students.

The motion was adopted.

MJ Peterson, Secretary of the Faculty Senate: We are in an interesting technical situation because we agreed at the last meeting that we would postpone the election of a Presiding Officer but it does not appear on today's agenda because today's agenda had been distributed before we made that decision. So, technically, I need to request a suspension of the rules so that we can take up the item that we agreed to postpone to this meeting, specifically the election of a Presiding Officer.

The rules were suspended and nominations were opened for Presiding Officer of the Faculty Senate.

ELECTION

PRESIDING OFFICER OF THE FACULTY SENATE

Senator David Gross: I would like to nominate Senator Frank Hugus for the position of Presiding Officer of the Faculty Senate.

NOMINEE: Senator Frank Hugus, German and Scandinavian Studies

Nominations were closed.

Senator Hugus was elected by acclamation.

D. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Principal Administrative Officers

Andrew Mangels, Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance: The Chancellor asked me to update everybody about the budget. As noted by Professor Normanly earlier, we're still in a lot of limbo. We have not received economic parameters from the state for our collective bargaining processes. The Board of Trustees has asked us to test a series of scenarios. We have a sort of base-case scenario which is roughly that the state will fund our collective bargaining and that we will be allowed to have limited tuition and fee increases of about 2.5% for in-state students and about 3% for out-of-state students. We're in the process of modeling that. The next test is more than stress testing. It shows what would happen if we are unable to raise tuition and tuition was to remain flat over the next five years; that would put us into an approximately \$17 million deficit over a five-year period, so you can see that we still have reliance on in-state tuition increases. The last test is to look at what would happen if the state appropriations were to not fund

collective bargaining after the first year over the next four years. Again, that's a very difficult budget situation to be in; even with some limited tuition and fee increases, we would be looking at roughly a \$45 million deficit going out. So, we still remain dependent on state appropriations to fund collective bargaining and in-state tuition and fees to fund other salaries as well as what was mentioned earlier, debt service, operation and maintenance, utilities, and those types of things. We're in the process of providing that to the Board of Trustees, as well. They've asked for additional information about enrollment patterns; I should mention that those scenarios do not involve significant enrollment growth outside of a few programs. They've also asked for updates on fundraising, efforts in Continuing Education and other revenues, and other significant data that will go to support the five-year projections. Each campus will be making presentations at Committee of the Whole meetings in the future on these types of budget projections. The Board is obviously concerned about these what-if scenarios. That's the update from the Chancellor.

2. The Secretary of the Faculty Senate

MJ Peterson, Secretary of the Faculty Senate: The first thing I want to state is thanks to the Presiding Officer for his service in that position and as a member of the Rules Committee since September 2013.

Presiding Officer Richard Bogartz: It has been my joy.

Secretary Peterson: The second is a shout-out to the General Education Council, the participants in the January "think tank," and the many people who offered comments, written and spoken, on the proposal. I think what we have here is a very significant advance over 1985 and it is going to put us in a much better position to help educate our students.

Now, to get us out of a tangle we got into last time, you recall, at the last meeting, there was discussion and it was decided to not continue considering the SBS proposals about their Global Education requirement and a motion was made to table them. There was then a discussion about what that meant: did that mean that it would be on the table forever or that we would resume discussion at a particular time? There were a number of possibilities. We could bring it on May 4th, which obviously we have not done. We could bring it back in September. We could bring it back in December. There has been a lot of consultation in the last week and the desire appears to be that the SBS set of proposals come back for consideration at the first meeting in September. So, on the basis of that discussion and after looking at Robert's Rules of Order and consulting with the Presiding Officer, what I want to suggest is that we understand the action taken at the last meeting as a motion to postpone consideration of the set of SBS proposals to the first meeting in September. Do we need affirmation of that?

Presiding Officer Bogartz: I think that's going to have to be handled by Senator Hugus in the fall. I will share my understanding; my understanding is that we moved to table it and that it takes a motion to lift it from the table which can happen whenever it happens.

Secretary Peterson: Alright, then, this is a notice. I was asked if it would get lifted from the table and I made a commitment that it would. I now make a commitment that I will make this motion at the first meeting in September.

I am also required by the Bylaws to announce that there will be two vacancies in the at-large membership of the Rules Committee and that we will need to elect those people at the first meeting in September. Persons interested in serving on the Rules Committee can talk to me or any other member of the Rules Committee. If you are interested or if you want to nominate somebody, it would be most helpful if you got those nominations to the Faculty Senate Office by September 1st, so that does give you a while to think about it, but it also gives you time to forget about it because we all know what happens when we go into summer.

Finally, we have a number of retirements that need to be noted, four to be exact, and these each involve people with a good deal of service on the Senate. To not make anybody feel like they're being especially favored or disfavored, I'm going to take them in alphabetical order.

RESOLUTION

D. Anthony (Tony) Butterfield
Senator: 2010-2017
Rules Committee: 2010-2013
Graduate Council: 1987-1989, 1999-2007, 2009-2017
Chair, 2002-2006
Program and Budget Council: 2007-2017
Research Council: 2002-2007
Academic Priorities Council: 2000-2002
Council on Public Engagement and Outreach: 2000-2002

Careful applier of insights from organizational psychology to business leadership, organizational dynamics, and advancement of women in business; master of budgets and balance sheets; hawk-eyed finder of the telling detail, you have enriched faculty participation in campus governance with your wisdom, energy, and wit. After interrupting your service with the Faculty Senate to lead the Isenberg School for two years, you returned to more prominent positions as Senator and member of the Rules Committee.

RESOLVED: That the Faculty Senate expresses its thanks for your energetic and valuable service to faculty participation in in campus governance and wishes you happiness and continued achievement in your retirement.

Secretary Peterson: Before reading this, I will divert for a moment to say that Senator Kinney was just recognized by the Jones Library in Amherst with the Samuel Minot Jones Award for Literary Achievement.

RESOLUTION

Arthur F. Kinney, Jr.
Senator: 1980-2017
Rules Committee: 1988-1995, 1999-2007
Delegate to the Board of Trustees: 1988-1990
Associate Delegate to the Board of Trustees: 1999-2007
Nominating Committee: 1984-1985, 2000-2017
Assistant Chair: 2000-2001
Chair: 2001-2017
Graduate Council: 1988-1993, 1999-2017
Chair: 1991-1993
Graduate Council Academic Standards and Curriculum Committee Chair: 1999-2017
University Relations and Advancement Council: 2008-2017
Research Library Council: 2006-2017
Co-Chair: 2006-2008, 2015-2016
Chair: 2008-2015
Campus Advising Committee on Honorary Degrees: 2000-2015
Service Departments Committee: 2002-2004
Research Council: 1988-1998
Committee on Regents Policies and Initiatives: 1988-1994
Ad Hoc Future of the Library Committee: 1991-1994
Ad Hoc Higher Education Reform Committee: 1991-1994
Academic Priorities Council: 1991-1993
Ad Hoc Strategic Planning Council: 1991-1992
Ad Hoc Budget Advisory Committee: 1991-1992
University Press Committee: 1975-1978, 1988-1990
Program and Budget Council: 1980-1981
Fine Arts Council: 1980-1981

Master of all things Renaissance, with a breadth of interest extending even into 20th-century American literature, and a wideness of vision exemplifying to the highest degree the notion of a “Renaissance man,” you began participating in campus governance forty-two years ago when you joined the University Press Committee in 1975. A Senator continuously since 1980, you have served on a majority of the Faculty Senate Councils and Committees and on an impressive array of ad hoc committees addressing concerns ranging from the arts to graduate programs to strategic planning. For most of two decades, you also provided leadership as a member of the Rules Committee, not letting the process of founding and establishing the Renaissance Center obscure your view of the campus as a whole or the importance of faculty participation in campus governance.

RESOLVED: That the Faculty Senate expresses its thanks for your lengthy, varied, and valuable service to faculty participation in nearly all aspects of campus governance and wishes you happiness in your retirement and success in your continuing study of the Renaissance.

RESOLUTION

Patricia Vittum

Senator: 2006-2007

Athletic Council: 1991-1995, 1997-1998, 2000-2017

Co-Chair: 1992-1995, 1997-1998, 2007-2008, 2015-2017

Chair: 2000

Nominating Committee: 2007-2017

Council on Public Engagement and Outreach: 2008-2017

Academic Honesty Board: 2000-2009, 2013-2017

Status of Women Council: 1993-1995, 2015-2017

University Computer Committee: 1986-1988

Nationally honored exponent of using biological rather than chemical methods to control turfgrass pests, you began your participation in faculty governance with membership on the University Computer Committee in 1986 as it considered developments at what we now know was the dawn of the information technology age. A member of women’s field hockey, basketball, tennis, and volleyball teams as an undergraduate, you devoted particular energy to the Athletic Council, on which you served nearly continuously from 1991 until this year.

RESOLVED: That the Faculty Senate expresses its thanks for your varied and valued service to faculty participation in campus governance and wishes you happiness in your retirement and continued success in improving the science of cultivating turfgrass.

RESOLUTION

Susan Krauss Whitbourne

Senator: 2013-2017

Rules Committee: 2014-2017

Faculty Delegate to the Board of Trustees: 2015-2017

Joint Task Force on Strategic Oversight: 2015-2016

Commonwealth Honors College Council: 2010-2017

Academic Honesty Board: 2000-2017

Honorary Degree Committee: 2003

Athletic Council: 1996-1999

Academic Matters Council Honors Subcommittee Chair: 1997-1999

Careful investigator of how personality and cognitive processes change throughout adulthood and active communicator on psychology and health to the general public, you took up significant roles in campus governance in the late 1990’s through membership on the Athletic Council and the Academic Matters Council Honors Subcommittee. Most recently, you have served in important leadership roles,

as Faculty Delegate to the Board of Trustees, member of the Rules Committee, and member of the Joint Task Force on Strategic Oversight.

RESOLVED: That the Faculty Senate expresses its thanks for your varied and energetic service to faculty participation in campus governance and wishes you happiness in your retirement and success in the gerontology research you will be pursuing with colleagues on the Boston campus.

5. The Representative of the Massachusetts Society of Professors

Senator Steven Brewer, Representative of the Massachusetts Society of Professors: I'm just making a few updates for the MSP. We still have no parameters, so we still can't settle the contract. Some of us would like to charge false advertising because we were assured that there was interest in getting the contract wrapped up very quickly so we'd be done by January. In point of fact, we still don't have parameters so we still have not learned all of the positions that the administration wants to take. They haven't made all of their proposals yet, so we're stymied; that's of concern.

The MSP is interested in creating a task force on faculty governance; email the MSP Office to join it. As you're aware, the faculty have primary responsibility with respect to personnel matters and the administration should override the faculty in decisions of personnel matters only under extraordinary circumstances and when detailed reasons have been given. As you're undoubtedly aware, in recent years, this has changed in an unprecedented way and created consternation for people caught in these circumstances, so the MSP is interested in putting together a group of people to look at the nature of faculty governance and how it's being managed on the campus to develop a response.

Finally, there will be a rally for public education at 2:00 p.m. on May 20th at the Boston Common. This rally will be similar to the March for Science and we were able to send three busses to that rally from this campus. This is, in part, a follow-up to the huge victory that we had in defeating Question 2. There was something like \$26 million spent to try to eliminate the charter cap. If it had passed, basically, they could have created twelve new charter schools every year going forward into perpetuity and could have identified whole regions where they could come in and eliminate all of the public schools in those areas. The state rejected that in an overwhelming way and sent a strong message to the forces that want to undermine and destroy and privatize public education. In any case, there's going to be a big rally on the Boston Common. There's going to be a march from the MTA annual meeting at the Hynes Convention Center and, even if you're not participating as a delegate, I'd encourage you to go, participate in the march, and be there at the Boston Common for the rally in support of public education.

6. The President of the Graduate Student Senate

Aurora Santiago-Ortiz, Representative of the Graduate Student Senate: Good afternoon, everyone. I'm going to make an announcement. On May 2nd, the Graduate Student Senate approved a motion to support the presentation of the following to the Faculty Senate: resolution in support of the University of Puerto Rico and the students, staff, faculty, and research affected by proposed budget cutbacks imposed by the fiscal management and oversight board. The motion of support was approved with eleven votes in favor and one abstention. The intention was to present the motion to pass the resolution here in the Faculty Senate but, due to time constraints and technicalities – suspension of the rules by a two-thirds vote – we were unable to, so I just want to let you know that the resolution is on the GSS website if you want to read it. Thank you.

7. The President of the Student Government Association

Lucas Patenaude, Representative of the Student Government Association: First of all, I would like to extend a thank you to the Faculty Senate for passing the Diversity learning outcomes. A lot of hard work has been put in by the faculty, administration, myself, and other SGA colleagues. We are extremely grateful that this is moving forward; this is something that we think meets a dire need and we're very happy to see this being implemented.

The other week at our SGA Senate meeting, we recognized a faculty member, Professor Hatch from the Physics Department, for his outstanding commitment to the student body through his implementation and promotion of open education resources in the Physics Department. This is the first year we have recognized a faculty member with this award and we hope to keep this going as an annual tradition of recognizing faculty members who are using this great tool to save students money. Thank you.

E. QUESTION PERIOD

Senator Gonen Dori-Hacohen: This is a question for the Secretary. As a Senator, I represent a district. Is there an email list for my constituents that I could use to share my reflections on meetings?

MJ Peterson, Secretary of the Faculty Senate: Right now, there is not, but I am anticipating that, by the end of the summer, there will be. It's just a matter of getting a few technological pieces together that I have not quite gotten together.

F. NEW COURSES

<u>COURSE</u>	<u>TITLE</u>	<u>CREDITS</u>
ANIMLSCI 456	“Research Animal Management II”	3
ART 153	“Foundation Studio 3”	3
COMM 209	“LGBT Politics and the Media”	4
COMM 325	“Race, Media, and Politics”	4
COMPSCI 328	“Mobile Health Sensing and Analytics”	3
EDUC 326	“Assessment for Instructional Decision Making”	3
EDUC 327	“Research Methods and Evidence-Based Practices”	3
EDUC 328	“Reading Instruction for Students with Mild/Moderate Disabilities I”	3
EDUC 329	“Writing Instruction for Students with Mild/Moderate Disabilities”	3
EDUC 330	“Reading Instruction for Students with Mild/Moderate Disabilities II”	3
EDUC 429	“Universal Design for Learning in Special Education”	3
EDUC 430	“Evidence-Based Behavior Management in a Multi-Tiered System of Support”	3
MARKETNG 413	“Social Media & Marketing Analytics”	3
PUBHLTH 332	“Holistic Health and Healing”	3
PUBHLTH 433	“Ecotoxicology and Public Health”	3
ARCH-DES 530	“Design Engagement”	4
HPP 560	“Globalization and Health”	3
COMPSCI 682	“Neural Networks: A Modern Introduction”	3

MOTION: That the Faculty Senate approve the courses ANIMLSCI 456, ART 153, COMM 209 and 325, 30-17 COMPSCI 328, EDUC 326, 327, 328, 329, 330, 429 and 430, MARKETNG 413, PUBHLTH 332 and 433, ARCH-DES 530, HPP 560, and COMPSCI 682, as recommended by the Academic Matters and Graduate Councils.

The motion was adopted.

G. NEW BUSINESS

(CONSENT AGENDA)

[A consent agenda may be presented by the Presiding Officer at the beginning of a meeting. Items may be removed from the consent agenda on the request of any one member. Items not removed may be adopted by general consent without debate. Removed items may be taken up either immediately after the consent agenda or placed later on the agenda].

1. **Special Report of the Academic Matters Council concerning a Name Change from the “Trust, Assurance and Cybersecurity Certificate” to the “Undergraduate Certificate in Information Security,” as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 17-071.**
2. **Special Report of the Academic Matters Council concerning a Certificate in Professional Writing and Technical Communication, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 17-072.**
3. **Special Report of the Academic Matters Council concerning Revision of the Bachelor of Arts (B.A.) Program in Middle Eastern Studies in the Department of Judaic and Near Eastern Studies, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 17-073.**
4. **Special Report of the Academic Matters Council concerning Revision of the Requirements for the Bachelor of Arts (B.A.) Program in Spanish in the Department of Languages, Literatures and Cultures, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 17-074.**
5. **Special Report of the Academic Matters and Academic Priorities Councils concerning Revision of the Bachelor of Science (B.S.) Degree Program in Sustainable Community Development in the Department of Landscape Architecture and Regional Planning, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 17-075.**
6. **Special Report of the Academic Matters, Academic Priorities and Program and Budget Councils concerning the Establishment of Continuation Requirements for the Major in Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 17-076.**
7. **Special Report of the Academic Matters, Academic Priorities and Program and Budget Councils concerning Revision of the Commonwealth Honors College Requirements, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 17-077.**
8. **Special Report of the Graduate Council concerning a Graduate Certificate in Soft Materials for Life Sciences – National Research Traineeship (SMLS-NRT), as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 17-078.**
9. **Special Report of the Graduate Council concerning a Name Change of the Master’s Program from the “Master of Arts (M.A.) in Communication Disorders” to the “Master of Arts (M.A.) in Speech-Language Pathology,” as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 17-079.**

**MOTION:
31-17**

That the Faculty Senate approve 1) the Name Change from the “Trust, Assurance and Cybersecurity Certificate” to the “Undergraduate Certificate in Information Security,” 2) the Certificate in Professional Writing and Technical Communication, 3) the Revision of the Bachelor of Arts (B.A.) Program in Middle Eastern Studies in the Department of Judaic and Near Eastern Studies, 4) the Revision of the Requirements for the Bachelor of Arts (B.A.) Program in Spanish in the Department of Languages, Literatures and Cultures, 5) the Revision of the Bachelor of Science (B.S.) Degree Program in Sustainable Community Development in the Department of Landscape Architecture and Regional Planning, 6) the Establishment of Continuation Requirements for the Major in Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, 7) the Revision of the Commonwealth Honors College Requirements, 8) the Graduate Certificate in Soft Materials for Life Sciences – National Research Traineeship (SMLS-NRT) and 9) the Name Change of the Master’s Program from the “Master of Arts (M.A.) in Communication Disorders” to the “Master of Arts (M.A.) in Speech-Language Pathology,” as presented in Sen. Doc. Nos. 17-071, 17-072, 17-073, 17-074, 17-075, 17-076, 17-077, 17-078 and 17-079.

MJ Peterson, Secretary of the Faculty Senate: The Commonwealth Honors College has requested that the Faculty Senate postpone consideration of Item 7 on this consent agenda, the Special Report of the Academic Matters, Academic Priorities, and Program and Budget Councils concerning Revision of the Commonwealth Honors College Requirements, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 17-077. So, in light of that, I am going to read and move a modified version of the consent agenda that excludes Item 7.

At the request of the Commonwealth Honors College, Item 7 was removed from the consent agenda and withdrawn.

The motion, excluding Item 7 of the consent agenda, was adopted.

The 769th Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate adjourned at 4:58 p.m. on May 4, 2017.