

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

Presiding Officer Richard Bogartz called the 789th Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate to order on October 17th, 2019 at 3:33pm in Herter Hall, Room 227.

Presiding Officer Richard Bogartz: Paul Dirac was a Nobel Prize-winning theoretical physicist who predicted the existence of anti-matter. Alas, I regret to inform you that Dirac also said:

“The aim of science is to make difficult things understandable in a simpler way; the aim of poetry is to state simple things in an incomprehensible way. The two are incompatible.”

and

“In science one tries to tell people, in such a way as to be understood by everyone, something that no one ever knew before. But in the case of poetry, it’s the exact opposite!”

Thus validating Goethe’s claim that “Where the light is brightest, the shadows are deepest.” Dirac could not have read my favorite poem:

Unseen Buds.

UNSEEN buds, infinite, hidden well,
Under the snow and ice, under the darkness, in every square or
cubic inch,
Germinal, exquisite, in delicate lace, microscopic, unborn,
Like babes in wombs, latent, folded, compact, sleeping;
Billions of billions, and trillions of trillions of them waiting,
(On earth and in the sea—the universe—the stars there in the
heavens.)
Urging slowly, surely forward, forming endless,
And waiting ever more, forever more behind.

—Walt Whitman

A. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Principal Administrative Officers

Chancellor Kumble Subbaswamy: Mr. Presiding Officer, I would like to point out that while Dirac talks about explaining science in simple terms, he certainly did not do that. Dirac’s formulation of quantum mechanics is much harder to comprehend than Schrödinger’s explanation of quantum mechanics.

Presiding Officer Richard Bogartz: But not for him!

Chancellor Kumble Subbaswamy: Not for him, of course. That aside, I have a couple of announcements.

You’ve all just seen the announcement about the Mt. Ida campus now getting a managing director. This decision has been building for some time. Steve Goodwin has been kind enough to go back and forth multiple times a week and has been spread so thin—thinking of his wave function formalism, he did not have enough wave function in any one part of Massachusetts to really be noticeable, but we are happy to have him back just in time for another change.

As you may know, the UMass Center at Springfield is in its sixth year. When it was first established, it was really supposed to be a system-wide center, but we knew that would never really be the case. For all intents and purposes it’s really our center; we are the only ones with any presence there, such as the significant operation of a

nursing program, University Without Walls, and a few other things. Coming to that realization, the President's office decided that we should be the ones who are actually operating it rather than the system office operating it from Boston. So as of this July, we will be operating the Springfield Center. As a part of that and as a part of making it more efficient and less expensive, we are trying to streamline the operations and integrate them as much as possible into our own operations rather than have this be something run out of the President's office. So there will in fact be a managing director for that center as well. The search for someone to fill that position is getting underway.

One other notice of a vacancy being filled is for the Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs and Campus Life. We are within 24 hours of being able to announce who the next Vice Chancellor will be. We are waiting for that individual to be able to inform their current employer before we make our announcement. I am very pleased to say that we got our first choice and a very experienced individual is coming to our campus. That's it for my announcements.

Provost John McCarthy: First, I just want to note that the theoretical physicist who runs this campus was instrumental in the retention of a very fine poet indeed.

I want to report, as it seems I always do, on searches for new campus leadership. The Dean of Nursing search is moving along nicely. The search committee will soon be selecting a semi-finalist with airport interviews planned for the middle of November. The Dean of HFA search committee will be meeting next week for the first time. For the Dean of the Commonwealth Honors College search committee, we have identified the members of the committee and we are in the process of scheduling the first meeting. The Dean of the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences search is at the initial consultation stage to determine the composition of the search committee. We are hoping to hear today from the college personnel committee.

Vice Chancellor Andrew Mangels: I just want to give an update on the shared service initiative. I mentioned this a couple of months ago. The system office and all of the campuses are working together to move the operations of the procurement and the accounts payable operations to a shared service operation which will be located in Shutesbury. As part of that transition, some of the staff will continue to remain on campus. We are working out the details. There's been a new Chief Procurement Officer that has been hired by the system office. His name is David Cho. He'll be on campus over the next month or so to meet a lot of the different groups, particularly on research and the different areas that interact closely with the procurement area. We're looking forward to a smooth transition. The staff and the leadership have been working very hard to make sure that everything goes well. The plan is that starting January 2020, the transition will be in place. So these next two months we'll be working to move the operations over there.

Matthew Dalton, Chief Information Security Officer, on behalf of Vice Chancellor Chris Misra:

We've been announcing through several platforms the following reminder: On Saturday October 19th between 7:00 am and 1:30 pm, we will be making some infrastructure upgrades in the data center. One of the effects of that is that Moodle and Spire will be unavailable during that time. There will also be intermittent periods where other services such as email may also be unavailable. This is in order to have a period of time when those services are down so we can upgrade the infrastructure.

2. Others

MJ Peterson, Secretary of the Faculty Senate: Here we are in October, not quite midway through the semester. The biggest issue that I think we face now is the one that we are going to be discussing in a few minutes, the question of what kind of messages are being sent when a unit of the campus says that it is sponsoring an event. So I'm not going to say any more about that. Annual reports will be coming from the councils. They're a little late this year, but we're prodding them and they are moving along the way they should. There are quite a number of program proposals coming through. There are quite a few proposals to revise programs to accommodate addition of features to use the Mt. Ida campus more effectively. This is all good and it shows that the faculty are thinking very clearly and cleverly about curriculum, while trying to make sure that the curriculum still gives the students a good broad education—something more than just training for whatever their first job might be—because their first job is not going to be the only job they have in their life, and they are going to need to be ready for that.

Rebecca Spencer, Chair of the Rules Committee: We've met once the past month—October 4th—not a huge agenda but a busy and important agenda. One of the things that we discussed was which recommendations we would make for membership to the SBS Dean search. A majority of our time was spent discussing the agenda item that we'll get to: an Ad Hoc committee for event sponsorship. You'll be hearing plenty about that in the next few minutes.

Eve Weinbaum, The Representative of the Massachusetts Society of Professors: The MSP is starting to think about going back to the bargaining table. The contract that we are working under right now expires at the end of this academic year, so we are going to be starting negotiations in just a few weeks—looking forward to it. Our big priority right now is talking with our members about what you think the priorities should be in this contract, so we are reaching out to people. We'd love to take you to coffee or have lunch and hear what you're thinking and what you're hearing in your departments and programs. We have a great bargaining team in place. We are looking for help on a number of bargaining support committees. Those are the groups that do research, help to formulate proposals, think through a specific issue for negotiations. We have a committee on online education, and a committee on teaching evaluation methods. We're thinking about one for a teaching professor track. You'll see all of those on our website and in emails. We hope people will volunteer to participate in those committees. We're also thinking about some less-typical union issues including climate change and how we can bargain around climate justice and sustainability and take the lead on that agenda. So we are looking for people with ideas and expertise to work on those.

And I just wanted to say in regard to the question about sponsorship of events, MSP has been talking about this issue a lot. We really see it as a question of faculty governance and this is one of the areas where we are I think in complete agreement with the central administration in terms of the importance of clarifying both processes within departments to endorse or cosponsor events and also to think about what it means for a department. But very much as part of the discussion of faculty governance and free exchange of ideas on campus. We did meet with the Provost and Chancellor this morning and just expressed our gratitude for their leadership around free speech and academic freedom and having these discussions.

B. QUESTION PERIOD

(No questions were asked at this meeting.)

C. COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE: SPONSORSHIP OF EVENTS

Presiding Officer Richard Bogartz: This item means that we are leaving the ordinary agenda and doing something separate and different. There will be no motions, no votes, just an opportunity for all of us to engage in discussion concerning the issues being raised regarding units sponsoring or endorsing events, speakers, and the like. If many of you choose to speak, line up at the two mikes and we'll just alternate.

Professor Stephen Clingman: Good afternoon. I'm from the English Department. Thanks for this opportunity to speak. This idea came about through a group of us who got together through the summer: myself, Alon Confino, who is the Director for the Institute for Holocaust, Genocide, and Memory Studies, Banu Subramaniam who is Chair of Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies, and Stephanie Shonekan who is the Chair of Afro-American Studies. Each of us in our own way had been confronted with questions about sponsorship of events and some of the issues that can result from that.

We thought it would be a good idea to clarify what those issues are and to provide some sort of guidance to the campus as a whole but particularly to faculty and departments. Part of our thinking around this has to do with the fact that there is serious polarization in this country. The campus, like other campuses, can become a flash point for conflict around events and around sponsorship of events. In the spring, there was a lawsuit around one event. There are provocateurs out there who make it a point of going to campuses and creating a furor of one kind or another around issues of free speech and accessibility and so on. We thought rather than let discussion get out of

hand and be driven by the agenda of others, it would be really valuable for the campus to take the initiative—particularly for faculty to take the initiative, we see this very much as an issue that concerns faculty.

As is underlined in the document that you have, the key thing here is that we want to see this as central to the mission of creating an environment of intellectual, social, cultural, and political inquiry. That's what we really want to preserve. We think that's what the University should want to preserve and so that should be front and center. I think the ambit of the committee, if it is established, should be a careful one and a very thoughtful one, and I think its purpose is to—if I can use these metaphors—is to provide a map and a compass. What does the terrain look like and how do we navigate our way through that terrain? There are many moving parts in hosting events that can be directed in multiple ways. Events can be hosted by on campus units for on campus speakers, on campus units for off campus speakers, off campus units for on campus speakers, and vice versa. There are multiple variations. There are various kinds of sponsorships: sponsorship without funding, sponsorship with funding—do they have different implications, not only for departments and units but for the campus as a whole? They can excite opposition—what are the rights and obligations of those who oppose certain events? There are many aspects to this and many variables.

There are also multiple constituencies, which include faculty, students, parents, lawyers, the administration—everybody has an interest in understanding this terrain better. I think the public also has an interest, and a legitimate interest—we are a public institution and so representatives of the public are also going to want to know what's going on. And far better, as I said at the beginning of these brief remarks, far better to take the initiative and to understand what we are doing so that we can explain it to ourselves and to other people as well. It's pretty clear from the document what the committee that we've suggested will not be doing. It will not be curtailing freedom of speech or academic perspectives. These are matters for debate. It will not tell departments how to run their business, that's for departments to do themselves. But if departments decide on processes for what they would like to do and how they are going to do it, I think what this committee can help define are the principles whereby those processes are established. And so we see this as kind of a symbiotic process overall in which the campus will come out with a clearer idea of what it all means. In sum, I think the overall intention of this is to find out what we do, how we do it and why we do it, to reinforce what we do, and how we do it and why we do it, and to come out with greater clarity at the end of this process as we go forward. Thanks very much.

Senator Gonen Dori-Hacohen: To fill my usual role it seems as a contrarian, I don't understand why we need this Ad Hoc committee. I think we can come up with a definition of sponsorship in between 35 seconds and a minute and a half. I am coming from the department that started this thing, sponsoring an event that got a lot of attention and media, and a lawsuit that was thrown out of the court in I think half an hour or so, but no more than a day. I think it is easy to define what sponsorship means to us as an academic institution. That is, we promote discussions of public affairs while knowing that we do not endorse any opinions in any event that is sponsored. So we sponsor the existence of the event but not whatever is said in it. Therefore we are neutral to any opinion expressed at an event, while sponsoring climate in which opinions can be heard. I see it as a waste of time to discuss it further. I understand that people want to do that, okay, but I'm not sure why as an institution we decided to do that, other than to appease some donators or some public concerns. I think we have better things to do with our time, like doing research, which is a thing we are supposed to do, or, in my case, better prepare for teaching, which is something I can always do. We could be doing those things instead of discussing something like this. Thank you.

Presiding Officer Bogartz: So far we have “Let's do it” and “Let's not do it.” Would anybody like to elaborate?

Secretary Peterson: As I look around at controversies around the country, a lot of academics do understand things the way that Senator Dori-Hacohen said, but there are members of the public who do not. A number of universities have actually found it very useful to have a policy statement that affirms the kinds of points that have just been made. We were looking around—I got my research machine, graduate project assistant Jill Hughes, going and asked her to go to websites of public R1s. Public, expressly, because public universities are in a very different position than private universities under the First Amendment. Which is why the case got thrown out in thirty minutes, but you may remember that the run-up to the case was a controversy that went on for three weeks and distracted a lot of people. There was a lot of carrying-on, from which various parts of the campus did experience backwash. So, we found that other universities have faced this, have developed statements, they have

found that useful. We don't have one. We have agreed with both MSP and the administration that this is an area of faculty governance and as such, the Faculty Senate should address it—it may not take us long, but we should address it.

Senator Maria Tymoczko: My suggestion would be that we postpone this for the moment and that you send all of us those statements that you have found at other public universities so that we have those in hand and can think about it in a fairly pragmatic way that will eliminate three weeks of contention before a court judgment.

Presiding Officer Bogartz: By postpone it, you mean postpone the motion that might happen? What is it that you would like to postpone?

Senator Tymoczko: I think we should postpone this discussion, the committee of the whole, because there doesn't seem to be a rush of people who would like to speak and we might have something more pragmatic to do.

[Discussion of Committee of the Whole protocols. Finding that no motions, even to postpone, can be made and that the Committee of the Whole must continue until discussion has ceased, Presiding Officer Bogartz calls for any further speakers to approach the microphones.]

Provost McCarthy: I concur with Senator Dori-Hacohen about the agreement on campus generally as to what sponsorship means. But the rest of the world doesn't get that. That's an understanding that's sort of private to us. And as a public university and as an educational institution, I think it behooves us to clarify what we mean and to explain to the world what we mean by sponsorship. A relatively simple way to do that is to adopt a policy of the type that other universities have adopted as Secretary Peterson has made clear. It's really not a complicated thing I think.

Presiding Officer Bogartz: For instance, something that's not clear to me is: what are the implications for a member of a department that decides to sponsor something? Does that mean that the member of the department is ipso facto sponsoring it too? Or is there some kind of statement to the effect that this is sponsored by the department by majority vote, or by whatever means it occurs, and does not make a statement about every member in the department? We don't have anything that explicit. We might want to get into it. But not here or not today, it seems. If no one else has anything to say, I declare the Committee of the Whole to have come to an end.

D. NEW BUSINESS: Special Report of the Rules Committee concerning Establishment of an Ad Hoc Committee on Guidelines regarding Sponsorship of Events, as presented in Sen. Doc. #20-014

Senator Rebecca Spencer, as Chair of the Rules Committee made the motion that the Faculty Senate approve the establishment of an Ad Hoc Committee on Guidelines regarding Sponsorship of Events, as presented in Sen. Doc. #20-014.

Discussion of the motion:

Senator Dori-Hacohen: It seems there is some kind of agreement here that this is not a complicated issue, and so I don't understand why we need a new ad hoc committee. We have various councils and committees—can't we assign this to one of the existing committees instead of adding an ad hoc committee? I don't understand the need for something new when this matter at hand seems to be not complicated, as agreed upon by not just me.

Secretary Peterson: Part of the reason for doing this is that the councils all have fairly full agendas. What we wanted to do was move this along more quickly with a small group. You'll notice that the proposal foresees an ad hoc committee of, say, 8-10 people. We'd like to have this roll forward without disrupting the flow of all of the other item being considered by the other councils. We thought about this as in fact a fast track mechanism rather than as a distraction.

Presiding Officer Bogartz then called for a vote. The motion was adopted by a large majority.

E. NEW BUSINESS: CONSENT AGENDA—COURSES

[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.]

<u>COURSE</u>	<u>TITLE</u>	<u>CCMS #</u>	<u>CREDITS</u>
COMP-LIT 130	Translation Matters	5932	4
SUSTCOMM 232	History of Sustainable Community Development: Beyond Indigenous Subsistence Vs. Globalized Superabundance	5256	4
STOCKSCH 293	Holistic Fruit Production	5782	3
PUBHLTH 319	Cancer and the Environment	6284	3
BMED-ENG 320	Bioinstrumentation	6354	3
BMED-ENG 330	Quantitative Physiology	6349	3
MICROBIO 494VI	Viruses in the News	5489	1
M&I-ENG 565	Operations Research in Healthcare	5505	3
SCH-MGMT 606	Strategic Cost Management	5774	3
SCH-MGMT 607	Principles of Federal Taxation for Individuals and Businesses	5775	3
SCH-MGMT 608	Corporate Governance, Risk Attestation and Attestation Services	5796	3
MUSIC 690	Advanced Graduate Jazz Analysis	5810	3
JOURNAL 452	Public Relations Campaign Management	5924	3
M&I-ENG 645	Project Budgeting and Finance for Engineers	5930	3
JOURNAL 336	Writing for Public Relations	5933	4
JOURNAL 432	Public Relations and Integrated Communication Cases	5938	3
BMED-ENG 300	Biomaterials	6009	3
M&I-ENG 670	Technical Project Management	6137	3
M&I-ENG 442	Propulsion System Performance	6140	3
CICS 256	A Hands-On Introduction to Physical Computing	6232	4
JOURNAL 352	Public Relations Research and Analytics	6141	3
ANTHRO 209	Approaching Death: Culture, Science and Experience	6218	4

Secretary Peterson presented Motion 08-20, That the Faculty Senate approve the courses COMP-LIT 130, SUSTCOMM 232, STOCKSCH 293, PUBHLTH 319, BMED-ENG 320, BMED-ENG 330, MICROBIO 494VI, M&I-ENG 565, SCH-MGMT 606, SCH-MGMT 607, SCH-MGMT 608, MUSIC 690, JOURNAL 452, M&I-ENG 645, JOURNAL 336, JOURNAL 432, BMED-ENG 300, M&I-ENG 670, M&I-ENG 442, CICS 256, JOURNAL 352, ANTHRO 209, as recommended by the Academic Matters, General Education, and Graduate Councils.

Motion adopted unanimously.

F. NEW BUSINESS: CONSENT AGENDA—ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

[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 and the General Education Council concerning Revision of a Degree Program in Sociology (BA), as presented in Sen. Doc. #20-015.**
2. **Special Report of the Academic Matters Council and the General Education Council concerning Revision of a Degree Program in Anthropology (BA), as presented in Sen. Doc. #20-016**
3. **Special Report of the Academic Matters Council and the General Education Council concerning Revision of a Degree Program in Communication (BA), as presented in Sen. Doc. #20-017**
4. **Special Report of the Academic Matters Council concerning Revision of a Degree Program in Sociology (BA), as presented in Sen. Doc. #20-018**
5. **Special Report of the Academic Matters Council concerning Revision of the Concentration in Mathematics and Statistics, as presented in Sen. Doc. #20-019**
6. **Special Report of the Academic Matters Council concerning Revision of the Degree in Nursing (BS), as presented in Sen. Doc. #20-020**
7. **Special Report of the Graduate Council concerning Revision of a Degree Program in Communication Disorders Speech-Language Pathology (MA), as presented in Sen. Doc. #20-021**
8. **Special Report of the Academic Matters Council concerning Changes to a Minor in Education, as presented in Sen. Doc. #20-022**

Secretary Peterson presented Motion 09-20, That the Faculty Senate approve (1) Revision of a Degree Program in Sociology (BA), as presented in Sen. Doc. #20-015; (2) Revision of a Degree Program in Anthropology (BA), as presented in Sen. Doc. #20-016; (3) Revision of a Degree Program in Communication (BA), as presented in Sen. Doc. #20-017; (4) Revision of a Degree Program in Sociology (BA), as presented in Sen. Doc. #20-018; (5) Revision of the Concentration in Mathematics and Statistics, as presented in Sen. Doc. #20-019; (6) Revision to the Degree in Nursing, as presented in Sen. Doc. #20-020; (7) Revision of a Degree Program in Communication Disorders Speech-Language Pathology (MA), as presented in Sen. Doc. #20-021; (8) Changes to a Minor In Education, as presented in Sen. Doc. #20-022.

Senators Gonen Dori-Hacohen and Anne Ciecko requested separation of items 1, 2, and 3 from the consent agenda.

The remaining items on the consent agenda, numbers 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8, were approved unanimously.

Discussion of Items 1, 2, and 3:

Senator Dori-Hacohen: I think those should be taken separately. Each of them deserve discussion, although I think items 1 and 2 deserve different discussion than item 3.

The context for these proposals are the canceling of the second language requirement by SBS a couple of years ago. That was done by eliminating the global education requirement at the SBS college-level and shifting everything to the department level. This was something heavily done by college administration to departments. It was postponed the first time it was brought to the Senate, and then the following semester the Senate approved it. One would assume that it was well-planned, but it seems that it was not well-planned because it seems that we need to revise that plan at the department level, mainly because the departments never discussed these changes in a thorough way. I cannot speak to what happens in the Department of Sociology or the Department of Anthropology, but I can tell you that the Department of Communication has never discussed this revision to its curriculum. It goes directly against the faculty governance of the Department of Communication which states that "any proposal to revise program requirements generated through and agreed to by the Graduate Studies and Undergraduate Studies Committees, [is] discussed in person at one or more faculty meetings, and then subject to a vote conducted by the chair through email."

discussed in person at one or more faculty meetings and then subject to vote conducted by their Chair through email. Two-thirds of all full-time faculty must vote in favor to change Undergraduate Program Requirements...”

There was no such vote, there was no such discussion—this revision was never discussed. If the Senate approves this revision, it basically says that the governance of the Department of Communication is nullified. This is why I think at least Revision 3 should be not just postponed, but rejected. Whereas 1 and 2, I don’t know what happened in the other departments. Additionally, the Department of Communication is going through an AQAD process this year which may lead to other revisions in the undergraduate curriculum. Making many revisions one year after the other is a mess. That’s why I want Revision 3 to be rejected, not just postponed.

Secretary Peterson: I actually think what Senator Dori-Hacohen did was made a motion to postpone Revision of the Degree Program in Sociology and to postpone Revision of the Degree Program in Anthropology, in order to find out from those departments how they feel about the proposals, but to go ahead and vote on the Revision of the Degree Program in Communication because the process by which it was developed violated their department’s governance. So I think he made three motions. Whether one person can make three motions in one speech is another question.

Presiding Officer Bogartz: It’s out of order, because we should be considering these one at a time. So, let’s make it explicit that we are now considering the Degree Program in Sociology. Does anybody want to do anything concerning the motion to adopt the Revision of a Degree Program in Sociology?

Senator Eve Weinbaum: As someone who is in the Department of Sociology and goes to faculty meetings, I can say that this was discussed in Sociology faculty meetings over a period of time and it was agreed to by the faculty.

Presiding Officer Bogartz: Okay. Any further discussion concerning the proposed Revision of the Degree Program in Sociology? There is a motion to close debate.

The Senate voted in favor of closing debate, permitting an immediate vote on the motion.

The motion to approve item 1, Revision of a Degree Program in Sociology, was adopted.

Discussion of Item 2, Revision of a Degree Program in Anthropology:

Senator Dori-Hacohen: I would like to postpone this motion until we know from the Department of Anthropology whether they actually discussed this motion. (*The motion was seconded from the floor.*)

Secretary Peterson: I think the thing that makes a difference between this motion and the one just adopted is that there does not seem to be anyone present from Anthropology who can speak to the circumstances. Therefore, I think that postponement is a good idea.

Provost McCarthy: It does seem to me that there are processes and presumptions that votes have taken place along the way and things like that. If every time a departmental vote was questioned and we looked for somebody from the department in the Senate, and so on, the work of this body would become even slower.

Secretary Peterson: I realize that. But it is not very often that a challenge to the early part of the process comes up in a Faculty Senate meeting. So we have to think about a good balancing mechanism here. Since no one from Anthropology is present to speak, we have this very interesting kind of conflation of three similar motions—it’s entirely possible, because each department operates differently, that they did different things. Now I do agree that these proposals went through councils, and the question of whether there were procedural problems at the department level or not was not asked in the councils because they accept that if a proposal has come up through the department level, and through the college, that things were done properly. But here we have a fairly serious question.

We settled the question for Sociology, we are not quite able to answer it for Anthropology, so there is a shadow of doubt now. The shadow is indirect in that it is being expressed by people who are not members of the

Department of Anthropology, but I am still concerned by it. However, the members of the Senate may make the decision collectively by whether they vote in favor or against postponing consideration.

Senator Dori-Hacohen: I will be brief. I think that the Provost should encourage such discussion because it means that a representative or the senator from the Anthropology Department would understand why it is important to be here instead of having so many empty chairs. Part of governance is having representation of the departments in the discussion. Therefore, as the representative is not here, I think we should postpone it until we get more information.

Senator Tymoczko: As a former Rules Committee Chair, I can say that we have plenty of precedents for this motion. That is, the motion to postpone. Or also the motion to turn down something in absence of a representative from a department.

The motion to postpone consideration of item 2, the Revision to a Degree Program in Anthropology was adopted.

Discussion of Item 3, Revision of a Degree Program in Communication:

Senator Dori-Hacohen: I will not repeat myself, I will just clarify: These three proposals are basically the same thing, just with a different name at the end. Therefore the proposal to revise the Communication Degree was not discussed in the last two/three years after the changes of the SBS. This proposal was not discussed, and therefore should be rejected by the Senate because it goes against the department's governance. Thank you.

The motion to adopt item 3, the Revision of a Degree Program in Communication was defeated.

G. OLD BUSINESS

1. Special Report of the Academic Matters, Academic Priorities and Program and Budget Councils concerning the Creation of a Certificate Program in Korean Language, as presented in Sen. Doc. #20-012 (Tabled from the September 12, 2019 Faculty Senate Meeting)

Secretary Peterson presented Motion 05-10, That the Faculty Senate approve the Special Report of the Academic Matters, Academic Priorities and Program and Budget Councils concerning the Creation of a Certificate Program in Korean Language, as presented in Sen. Doc # 20-012.

Secretary Peterson: This motion was postponed at the last meeting because there was a desire to get additional information from Smith College. That information did arrive; it is now included in Senate Document 20-012.

The motion was adopted unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 4:30pm.

*Respectfully submitted,
MJ Peterson
Secretary*