

UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST
OFFICE OF THE FACULTY SENATE

Presiding Officer Richard Bogartz called the 730th Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate to order on October 10, 2013 at 3:30 p.m. in Herter Hall, Room 227 and commenced the meeting by reading a poem by Walt Whitman:

“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 and 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.

A. “DEMONSTRATION OF THE ACADEMIC/CURRICULUM MANAGEMENT SYSTEM”
BY STEPHEN BATTISTI, DAVID HART, CHRIS HOFFMAN AND KEN LEE
[CENTER FOR EDUCATIONAL SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT (CESD)]

Ernest May, Secretary of the Faculty Senate, introduced the presentation. The much-loved Course Approval Procedure Guide, that has guided the Faculty Senate’s business for decades, has long needed replacement. It is clumsy, time consuming, and few people on campus fully understand it. It is a very complicated document because it complies with the edicts of many masters, including the Board of Higher Education, Trustee policies, the UMass President’s Office, NEASC, campus policies, and probably other entities as well. When UMass reformed the General Education program, about four or five years ago, it provided an impetus for change, and the Provost’s Office supported the creation of a website to process the Gen Ed revisions taking place. Some 240 three-to-four-credit conversions and about 100 Integrated Experience approvals were processed in a very efficient and effective manner using this website. All other Gen Ed business is now run through that program. This work occurred through the work of the Center for Educational Software Development (CESD); Martha Stassen, Assistant Provost for Assessment and Educational Effectiveness; and the graduate assistants in General Education. About three years ago, the Provost’s Office, and Bryan Harvey in particular, offered to support putting all of the Faculty Senate procedures online in a way similar to that of General Education. This program will eventually replace the Course Approval Procedure Guide with a user-friendly system to process all academic and curricular business that goes through the Faculty Senate. Exciting it may not be, but revolutionary it will be. For getting to this advanced stage of development, thanks are particularly due to Bryan Harvey, Associate Provost for Academic and Resource Planning; Anne Benz, Assistant to the Secretary of the Faculty Senate; and Bryan Beck, Project Assistant for the Office of the Faculty Senate; as well as the very talented people at CESD who will be speaking today: Stephen Battisti, David Hart, Chris Hoffman, and Ken Lee.

Bryan Harvey, Associate Provost for Academic and Resource Planning, noted that, when he inherited the Provost’s Office’s end of the shared governance process a few years ago, he and Secretary May saw a lot of each other. They tried to unravel the Course Approval Procedure Guide and answer faculty questions. During this process, it became clear that this was a situation in which a lot of talented and intelligent people were misdirecting their effort trying to figure out how the system worked rather than collaborating on great ideas. A number of solutions were attempted. A commercial program was looked at, and it turned out to be nowhere near as good as the program developed by CESD. The Gen Ed revisions, including the GERICO reviews, were handled excellently by CESD. The Gen Ed process is the most complicated part of the shared governance system, so it was decided that this program could be expanded to all other areas of the Faculty Senate. A number of months of head scratching and problem solving later, we saw that the Gen Ed system served as a great model, or basis, or fundamental engine, for driving a lot of these processes. In addition, other processes on campus that share characteristics with the shared governance processes were explored. Right now, further expansion of this model—including personnel processes—is being explored. A lot of effort at the beginning is going to pay off for a long time. CESD has been terrific. The presentation today is not a tutorial, but a preview. The program is not-quite-ready for primetime, but it is a very exciting process.

Stephen Battisti, Principal Software Engineer, Center for Educational Software Development, gave an overview of the system and some of the project goals. The system will manage all of the curriculum workflow for the University. It is designed to make sure that all University and Faculty Senate policies are easily followed. It will not change any existing policies. The project goals are, first, to allow people to propose changes to the curriculum, courses, academic plans, organizational units, etc. This is a lot of the business that comes before the Faculty Senate. Secondly, we want this information to be shared. It should be clear where in the workflow each proposal is at every step of the way. Right now, there is a paper-based system,

where it is sometimes difficult to know where it is in the workflow process. Finally, we want to be able to provide reports. With these goals in mind, CESD started looking at the work it had already done for the General Education program, including three-to-four-credit conversions, Gen Ed designations, and the Integrative Experience. CESD decided to generalize the tool and use it for everything, rather than develop more one-function systems. A commercial tool was looked at, but there were many flaws and it wouldn't fit the model at UMass. CESD, the Faculty Senate, the Provost's Office, and the Office of the Registrar came together as a group and, over the span of several months, discussed and articulated the requirements for the project. CESD then began building the system. The legacy site being used by Gen Ed has about 1,000 proposals, of which about 700 have been approved. It is a well-tested system. The new system is building off of that legacy site.

The system is designed to be easy to use for people that will only be using it one time. A common user will be a faculty member that needs to create a new course that he or she wants to begin teaching. After logging in, you are brought to an individualized homepage. If you have tasks assigned to you, those will be shown here. Other proposals in the system can be browsed, as well. The system presents many options for various types of proposals. They represent much of the workflow tasks done by the Faculty Senate, like creating or modifying courses, designating a course for General Education, creating or modifying curriculum or degree programs, reorganizing departments, or creating new departments. It is a generalized system, and any type of workflow process can be added to it. If you wanted to do academic policy or rules changes for the Faculty Senate, that can be supported.

Mr. Battisti then led the Faculty Senate through the process for creating a new course by selecting the "Create New Course" option in the system. Most of the time, when you select an option, some information will be displayed to verify that you are choosing the right option. For the new course option, it prompts you to verify that you are not modifying an existing course and that the course was not previously taught as an experimental. For the demonstration, a new Biology course was proposed. The system lets you pick a rubric and note at what level the course is being taught. Gen Ed designations can be noted if they are part of the course. At this point, the proposal can be saved as a draft. The proposal will remain in draft mode until it is submitted to the workflow. When it is submitted to the workflow, it goes through the usual process, which, for a course, means it goes to the curriculum committee in the department, the department chair, the curriculum committee at the dean's level, and the dean's office before getting to the Faculty Senate. The workflows can be customized for any different, particular process. Then, a course proposal has been created. For a new course, one form needs to be filled out, the equivalent of the current Form B in the Course Approval Procedure Guide. Some additional prompts have been added because it was determined, during the requirements analysis, that there was information that was not being collected at the outset that was needed by the AMC Course Subcommittee and the Registrar's Office that they had to obtain by calling people in the department during the review process. It makes sense to collect all of the information up front. The questions can be made to be required, so that proposals could not be submitted until the questions are filled out. There is a place where you can attach a syllabus or any other material that will then become part of the record. When the proposal is in draft mode, it is private to the proposer. The proposal can, however, be shared or reassigned to someone else. This is helpful in instances such as classes that are co-taught. One person can fill out part of the proposal and it can be finished or reviewed by someone else. Once the proposal is submitted by the proposer, that person, for the time being, is done. The proposal then has to be approved by the department chair. There is a notification system built into the workflow, so that anyone who needs to review or approve a proposal is notified when they need to do that. In the email that is generated, a link to the proposal is provided. When you follow that link, any proposal you need to review will be listed on your homepage. There is also a recent activity section where you can review proposals that you've worked on. If you need to review proposal information for approval, the system prompts you to the proposal page where you can review all of the submitted information and attachments. Approvers are then prompted to make an approval decision. There are four options here. You can do nothing, by checking "No Decision Yet," maybe because you're not ready. Otherwise, you can "approve" it, you can "not approve" it, or you can "return it to the proposer" for more information. At any step, an approver can relegate it back to the proposer stating that the proposal needs more work. When this option is chosen, the approver drafts a note explaining what more work is needed, which is then sent to the original proposer. Hopefully this tool will help with the communication between council members and proposers.

Skipping ahead, a proposal that has been approved at the department and college level is then sent to the Faculty Senate Office. There it gets a little more complex, as any given proposal can be sent to a number of councils, and we want everyone involved to be able to see the proposal, comment on it and see each other's comments on it in order to know what is going on, as communication has been identified as one of the problems with the current proposal review process. The first place it will go after getting to the Faculty Senate Office is to the Rules Committee. The Rules Committee determines which councils and committees need to review each proposal. The Rules Committee will do that in the system, through a function of assigning review agencies. The Committee can make any changes it wants through this function. Then that information can be submitted, and the chairperson of each entity will receive an email saying that they need to review this proposal and it becomes part of their to-do list. A feature that was requested by Faculty Senate Secretary Ernest May allows approvers at this stage to propose an online vote. If this function is utilized, a voting option would be sent to all members of the

council or committee and a vote could be taken following the current protocol of the Faculty Senate, which states that a quorum must be met and the vote must be a majority. There are three options in the voting function: yes, no, or a veto requesting that the vote happen in person. Electronic voting is already happening via email, so this function should help clarify this process. For members of the different review committees, the homepage will note all current items that are up for review. Reviewers can fill out their review form with any set of questions they want. For proposals that go to more than one committee, the reviewers will be able to see the questions and comments that are being made by all other reviewers and committees.

At this point, most of the system's development has been completed, and it is about ready to roll out. A subset of the system that supports Gen Ed, Integrative Experience, and Junior Year Writing is going to be rolled out at the end of October.

Senator Amilcar Shabazz noted that, with the system that is currently in place to support Gen Ed proposals, you have to download a large number of PDF documents in order to review the proposals. Is there some idea to change that in this iteration or is it in the same mode?

Mr. Battisti stated that the new system is in the same mode. File attachments are hard to deal with, because anybody can really attach anything. Most people attach PDFs or word documents. It might be possible to create a viewer to display them online, but it is more difficult to do. In this version, there is a print preview function that shows users all the forms that have been submitted in a way similar to viewing a long webpage. It shows all the history of what has gone on. That should make it easier to view by not making everyone have to click back and forth. Some thought has been given to making the links that go to the forms collapsible elements, so you don't have to go off the page. There will be more experimentation going forward.

Senator Monika Schmitter asked if this would be the program that one would use to change the title or description of a course.

Mr. Battisti said that it is the place. Changing the title of a course is a minor course change, so you would go to "Revise Existing Course" and choose "Minor Course Change," which is applicable to a small number of revisions. The system has attempted to be as faithful to the Course Approval Procedure Guide as possible, and the minor change option, as dictated in the Course Approval Procedure Guide, applies to a limited number of small changes that don't have to go through full workflow approval.

Senator Daniel Cooley asked if this system would be hooked into a database of all existing courses.

Mr. Battisti stated that it would. It is tied into the SPIRE database. It will include the historical record of all the courses, as well as all the information regarding the courses that have been taught. One goal is to have a link to its past information, such as where it has recently been taught, enrollment, et cetera. There is also information about each academic plan and the rules associated with each one. There is a display of that information. If you choose to modify and academic plan, you would see all the rules for that academic plan, and could then submit changes and get it to the workflow. This tool is not meant to replace the Enterprise SPIRE tool that holds this information. All of the information in this system is transient information about proposals. The last step in the workflow is sending the final report to the Registrar's Office. The Registrar's Office is responsible for entering the information into the Enterprise SPIRE system.

Ernest May, Secretary of the Faculty Senate, noted a final concern brought up by the Rules Committee. This system is going to be terrific, but having an online system replaces written documentation. The question of "What is the text?" becomes difficult. It is sort of like the University Catalog. We need to have versions of "the text" on September 1st of each year archived somewhere. Things change over time, and people need to be aware of the changes as they occur. Secretary May wondered, relatedly, if the online catalog is archived in the version as it exists on a certain date, because, if it is, this system should operate similarly.

Mr. Battisti noted that the online catalog is archived each year, and that this system will be the same.

B. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Principal Administrative Officers

Chancellor Kumble Subbaswamy spoke to Provost James Staros' announcement that he will be stepping down from his position as Provost and rejoining the faculty at the end of the fiscal year. We wish him well as he does that, and there will be an appropriate time to thank him for all that he has contributed to this campus over the past five years. In the

meantime, a search committee is being formed to conduct a national search, which will be launched in the next couple weeks with the idea of having someone in place by the beginning of the next fiscal year.

Michael Malone, Vice Chancellor for Research and Engagement, announced that the University is well into the process of designer selection for the fit-out of the second phase in the Life Science Laboratory Building. There are a dozen responses to the requests for proposals, and it is expected that a designer will be selected in the next several weeks for work to begin in November. The federal government is not currently fully in operation. There have been some questions about the impact of this on grants. There are no major impacts known yet, but, if the shutdown continues, it could be a problem. The University is continuing to distribute grant money, even though it is not coming in from the government for the time being. Renewals and no-cost extensions are going to be a problem. Faculty members with problems should contact Vice Chancellor Malone's office.

Ernest May, Secretary of the Faculty Senate, had a couple of questions for administrators. First, there are many celebrations coming up commemorating the University's sesquicentennial. He wondered what opportunities there are for participation. Second, in Chancellor Subbaswamy's address at the Faculty Convocation, there were a couple of issues Secretary May was unfamiliar with. One was the legislative Commission on Higher Education, and the second was the Student Success Collaborative.

John Kennedy, Vice Chancellor for University Relations, stated that the Boston Day celebrating UMass' sesquicentennial will be held on Friday, October 25th. The calendar of events is online. The three major events of the day are a breakfast with business leaders at the UMass Club, including a panel of partners of the University from various businesses, including State Street, Raytheon, and the Massachusetts Life Sciences Center discussing the University's impact on the Commonwealth; the second is an 11:00 a.m. rally and concert at the State House, during which the Marching Band will march up Beacon Street, introducing legislators and University leaders, and then down to Fanueil Hall, where there will be a free concert; finally, in the evening there will be a multi-bands concert at Symphony Hall. There is a lot of advertising taking place to promote the event and also to promote the campus brand. There is a new institutional TV spot running in primetime for the next three weeks in Boston. There is advertising on boston.com, as well, and a big push-out on social media.

Chancellor Subbaswamy addressed the national concern about the increasing cost of higher education. At the end of its last session, the Massachusetts General Assembly established a joint committee to study the costs of public higher education in Massachusetts. In particular, it is looking at performance based funding models. There is a system representative working with the legislature. Like a lot of joint legislative committees, it will do a lot of studies. At the system level, an existing performance-based funding system is being studied. This is something that will take a while. Proposals might be drawn up, which would then go through all appropriate processes. Secondly, the student success initiative is a system-wide project whose goal is sharing best practices. The President's Office has tried to set up systems to initiate conversations. UMass is engaged at the national level, as well. The Education Advisory Board system is a software platform that can be used both for reaching students and streamlining advising as well as monitoring student progress and success. That is a national consortium of which UMass is a part. Provost Staros and Vice Provost Barr have been pushing for systematically improving advising and monitoring student progress.

Carol Barr, Vice Provost for Undergraduate and Continuing Education, noted that the Student Success Collaborative is an early intervention advising system that allows the University to assist and support students early in their academic careers if they are having difficulties in their majors or with certain courses. Right now, advisors are alerted when a student drops below a 2.00 GPA, at which time they try to assist the student. This product will provide UMass with an opportunity to pay more attention to students that may have a decent GPA, but who are not doing well within their major or are having trouble in courses that may predict difficulty in more advanced courses. It is a really robust, data-rich product that will provide advisors with more information to assist students.

Amilcar Shabazz, Faculty Advisor to the Chancellor on Diversity and Excellence, noted that there would be a major opportunity to enhance campus climate, diversity practices, and student outcomes. There will be a lecture by Dr. Sylvia Hurtado on October 24 at 7:00 p.m. in the Campus Center Auditorium. The event is free and open to the public. Dr. Hurtado is the Director of the Higher Education Research Institute at UCLA. Her publications in this area establish her as a national thought leader, especially in the area of diversity. She will be coming to UMass just after spending two days at the University of Wisconsin-Madison where she will speak in light of their new chancellor, new campus diversity leaders, and a new framework for inclusivity and diversity on campus. She will be speaking in a grounded fashion on the state of diversity issues; about things such as the expanding definition of diversity under the law, holistic approaches to diversity leadership, safe spaces for LGBTQ youth, the definition of support needs with cultural sensitivity, recruiting and retaining a diverse student population, funding the essential components of diversity work, and partnering with community agencies.

A student advisory committee on diversity issues has been formed. There has not been a meeting yet, but scheduling is taking place and the committee has been populated by students eager to get to work.

Vice Chancellor Kennedy added to his earlier remarks that on Thursday morning, October 24th, Fox 25 Boston is going to film its morning show on campus, on the Goodell lawn. The show will air from 6:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. in the Boston area. You will not be able to see it in western Massachusetts, but it will air live in Boston and it will be a great time to show school spirit.

2. The Chair of the Rules Committee

MJ Peterson, Chair of the Rules Committee, noted that this is the second year of the University's serious exercises in strategic planning. The Joint Task Force on Strategic Oversight will continue working this year. Moreover, a vote will be taken later regarding the creation of a Joint Task Force on Resource Allocation. There are other ad hoc committees that are likely to appear. Senator Peterson is new as Chair of the Rules Committee, and her knowledge of the talents of people around campus is not what she would like it to be. She appealed to all members of the Senate to give her suggestions of names of people that they know are experienced or have good judgment and have awareness of particular, pertinent issues. Recommendations can be sent to her or to the Committee on Committees, so that, as we move forward, the campus' talent base is best utilized.

3. The Faculty Delegates to the Board of Trustees

James Kurose, Faculty Delegate to the Board of Trustees, summarized the Board of Trustees meetings that took place on campus in late September. Before the meeting began, SGA President Zac Broughton expressed concern about the level of representation and interaction of students in governance on campus. The item was taken under advisement by the Chair of the Board of Trustees, and there should be follow-up on that. It was the first meeting of the year, so it started off with good news from all the campuses regarding issues such as research expenditures, level of research income, student quality, student numbers, et cetera. There was a discussion of concerns over sequestration. It is likely that research income will be down a little bit across all the campuses. A capital plan was approved that includes \$3.8 billion of spending for the system over five years. The plan includes 184 projects. Almost three-quarters of the expenditures will be paid by the University; 28% will be paid by the state. President Caret undertakes a tour every year. The first year was a listening tour, the second year was an attempt to promote the University as an economic engine, and this year will be a "selling the University" tour. He will be focusing on the 50/50 plan and on contacting alumni around the state.

4. The Representative of the Massachusetts Society of Professors

Randall Phillis, President of the Massachusetts Society of Professors, reflected on the legislative committee on higher education. He hopes that the Chancellor is right that it is going to take time. This initiative is about the allocation of state funding to institutions of higher public education against some measures. How UMass will be measured, and how that allocation will be divvied up accordingly, is not a trivial consideration. If we are not careful, and do not get in front of it and think about it ahead of time, and instead let it wash over us once it's done, UMass might find itself in a tough spot.

Secondly, with the current national fiscal crisis, there is a large number of faculty members becoming increasingly anxious about grant support for their research. This is a very real problem. Even if the government were to become sane again and start funding research, the funding trend is most certainly going down for the foreseeable future. This has a significant impact on the careers of many faculty members on campus. If you lose grants, what do you do with the personnel you have? What do you do to keep your productivity high? This is a very real and very serious concern on campus. As much as we might influence the feds or not, we have to think about how the implications of this trend as we consider promotion, tenure, and personnel decisions.

In a bit of good news, the IRS has made a ruling that those who chose to join the optional retirement system, thinking that there could never be a stock market event that would disrupt the growth of that system's funds, now have the option to buy back into the state retirement system. This is huge. Instead of getting stuck with a tiny retirement fund, you can put that money back into the state system, pay some interest on the money, and then become eligible for the state retirement system. This process will be run through the Board of Higher Education. Their website will provide all of the information. There are two very minor adjustments that will require legislative action, but there is every indication that that will happen this fall.

Finally, there have been a growing number of concerns coming to the union about the conversion of email to Microsoft Exchange. People who are having this conversion occur are sometimes finding that they don't have access to things that were once in their email accounts, such as address lists, old and sent messages, and the like. It clearly has glitches. The

conclusion seems to be that you call OIT and spend a couple of hours with them fixing it. That does not seem like an efficient plan for the thousands of people on campus who rely heavily on email. The MSP board voted unanimously to request that the conversion of email from its current system to Microsoft Exchange be delayed until the system is guaranteed to be glitch free. That is quite a guarantee, but, nonetheless, it is the will of the board.

6. The President of the Graduate Student Senate

Ghazah Abassi, Vice President of the Graduate Student Senate, noted that the GSS held its first meeting recently. She was happy to report that 54 new senators were elected to the GSS. This is the highest number of senators that the body has ever had. The GSS now represents 32 academic departments across campus. The GSS is working on a number of specific issues this year, including graduate funding, graduate housing, family issues for graduate and undergraduate students, international student issues, teaching, and professional development. The GSS is also addressing the issue of graduate student isolation. To do this, the GSS is forming a social committee to provide more events for graduate students. The GSS has also set up an ad hoc committee addressing the goals of the University. It hopes to use that committee to discuss what the goals of a public university like UMass ought to be. The committee will be a space dedicated to soliciting and providing feedback on initiatives that are taking place at the University level, such as the strategic planning process. It will provide an organized, coherent, and representative response to these initiatives. Regarding the strategic plan, the GSS has scheduled an open forum for graduate students at which Chancellor Subbaswamy will be present, along with Dean John McCarthy and Vice Chancellor Enku Gelaye. It will take place on October 31 at 4:00 p.m. The forum will provide an opportunity for graduate students to discuss the strategic plan with these administrators. Recently, the GSS met with the Chancellor. This followed the Board of Trustees meeting at which SGA President Broughton raised concern about the lack of student participation in University governance. Robin Anderson, President of the Graduate Student Senate, was present at this meeting, along with Vice President Abassi, SGA President Broughton, SGA Vice President Emily Hajjar, SGA Speaker Sionan Barrett, and SGA Attorney General Emily Notini. Student representatives were unanimously of the opinion that every time one of the three governing bodies (the Faculty Senate, the GSS, and the SGA) develops a motion or policy that will affect the constituents of the other two bodies, the other bodies must be consulted. Student participation in administration was discussed in general, and there was a suggestion that student advisory boards be set up for each of the sub-divisions of the University, with graduate student representation. Other initiatives of the GSS include a social justice dialog series, the first of which was on sexual violence, and the second of which was about racism at UMass; and the creation of an ad hoc committee charged with reviewing and revising the Wellman Document with a view to make its language stronger. Updates regarding the GSS can be found on its blog: blogs.umass.edu/gss.

7. The President of the Student Government Association

Renée Barouxis, Secretary of University Policy and External Affairs for the Student Government Association, stated that the SGA was very busy. The first SGA Senate meeting took place on September 23. It meets every Monday night at 7:00 p.m. in the Campus Center, Room 163. Secretary Barouxis introduced herself by noting that she is serving on the Commonwealth Honors College Council and has previously served on the Campus Physical Planning Council and the Status of Women Council. During this semester, Secretary Barouxis would be representing the SGA at the Faculty Senate, as President Broughton has an academic conflict at the time of the Senate meetings. The SGA has a Facebook page and a Twitter account to keep the University community up to date on their work. SGA contact information and updates can also be found at umass-sga.com.

C. QUESTION PERIOD

Presiding Officer Richard Bogartz stated that he had heard that the issue of the UMass football program could be discussed during the question period. Noting that the Presiding Officer must maintain neutrality, and acknowledging his own history of public comments regarding this issue, he turned the duties of the Presiding Officer over to Secretary May.

Senator Curt Conner introduced a question for Chancellor Subbaswamy and Associate Provost Bryan Harvey. Eric Kaler, President of the University of Minnesota, has promised to cut that schools administration by 50%. Senator Conner left copies of a *Wall Street Journal* article about President Kaler in the back of the room and wondered if UMass was going to be proactively trying to significantly cut down on administration to reduce overhead costs associated with education.

Chancellor Subbaswamy stated that he is familiar with Eric Kaler and his efforts. UMass is constantly looking to streamline and improve efficiency. The one-word answer to Senator Conner's question would be, "No."

Senator Frank Hugus was asked by a concerned colleague to bring up the following questions about football. The Chancellor has requested an inquiry into the matter of the combative football drills seen in the video of the UMass team's practice. That inquiry is being conducted by the Compliance Subcommittee of the Athletic Council. The Faculty Senate has

heard very little about when that report is expected and when it will be submitted to the full Senate for review. Secondly, it has now been two weeks since the *Daily Hampshire Gazette* reported on the existence of a petition by alumni of the football team requesting the dismissal of Coach Charley Molnar. UMass is about to have its first home game since that report. Senator Hugus wondered if there has been any change in the position of these alumni in these weeks since the article. Thirdly, at a time when UMass is celebrating its 150th anniversary and advocating to establish a flagship reputation, Senator Hugus wondered how UMass can deal with the perception of a large section of the state that the UMass football program is not the appropriate way to advertise the University, as the program is quite pathetic. Senator Hugus added that if the original Minutemen were as effective as today's Minutemen, we'd still be British.

Vice Chancellor Kennedy spoke to Senator Hugus' second question, stating that Athletic Director John McCutcheon met with some of the alumni that had advocated the position and, as a result of that meeting, the petition has been rescinded. There is no active petition anymore.

Senator Rebecca Spencer, Faculty Athletic Representative to the NCAA, spoke to the timeline of this investigation. She is working with the Athletic Council's Compliance Subcommittee on the investigation. The timeline will be determined once more data is collected. Significant progress has been made on that front. Job number one is to be thorough. As far as Senator Spencer knows, the Athletic Council is responding to a charge from the Chancellor, and the Athletic Council will present that report to the Chancellor. If, after the Council reports to the Chancellor, he wants the Council to report to the Faculty Senate, it will be glad to do that, but the report is being made for the Chancellor.

Secretary May asked the Chancellor if that report will be shared with the Faculty Senate.

Chancellor Subbaswamy stated that he regards anything that is done at and in the name of the University to be public to the extent that is allowed by law. In other words, excepting personnel information, FERPA-protected information, et cetera, he regards these matters as open to the public. Appropriate versions will be made public. The Senate and all other interested bodies will have access to the information. He did not charge the Athletic Council with a timeline on the report specifically so that the Council will be able to compile a thorough report.

Senator Susan Whitbourne returned to the issue of the petition. She searched for it recently and, although people are no longer allowed to sign it, every single comment on it is visible. UMass is taking a slathering about this in the local press. With Homecoming approaching, this is tough for the school. She wondered what the Senate could do about this issue. The investigation will go on, and reports will be made, but, right now, it looks like there are people that we are not caring about. Coach Charley Molnar went on record with quotes that are not very assuaging to the sensibilities of the University community. Are there any plans for handling this public relations nightmare?

Vice Chancellor Kennedy stated that the most important step that has been taken is the Chancellor's calling for an investigation. Granted that it is an unpleasant incident and a difficult time, the University is working with Coach Molnar to improve his communication skills.

Senator Max Page posed two questions. Many people have been disturbed by what they saw and read about the football team, both in the articles and petition themselves and in the very specific comments by former players. He asked the Chancellor why Coach Molnar has not been suspended until this investigation is complete. UMass recently cancelled several concerts where there was the possibility of a drug being consumed that might possibly lead to injury or death. That was an appropriate decision that Senator Page applauds, even though it cost a fair amount of money. Now we have a video and specific testimony by named individuals stating that they were injured during these training events. If Senator Page asked his student to perform the much safer task of running around the Fine Arts Center to get ready for class, that would be inappropriate. The University's Hazing Policy defines hazing as "conduct that willfully or recklessly endangers the physical or mental health of any student. That conduct shall include forced calisthenics, exposure to the weather, forced physical activity which is likely to adversely affect the physical health or safety of any such student." Senator Page asked the Chair of the Rules Committee why this issue was not assigned to the Student Affairs and University Life Council, rather than the Athletic Council. Furthermore, regarding the investigation, it is only the Rules Committee that is allowed to assign questions to councils and committees. The Chancellor apparently did that without consultation with the Rules Committee, which decides if the Senate is going to handle a question and where it should go.

Senator MJ Peterson, Chair of the Rules Committee, noted that the Bylaws distinguish between issues that are clearly within Faculty Senate governing authority and issues where the Faculty Senate is advisory, but does not have coordinative governance authority. One of the realities that the Rules Committee is dealing with and constantly trying to figure out what to do about is the fact that the management of athletics is not within the co-governing authority of the Faculty Senate. Therefore, the Chancellor does have the power to decide which council to go to. Senator Peterson knows that Senator Page disagrees with that position, but that is her understanding of it. The Chancellor moved on this issue very quickly and

decided that, because it raised NCAA concerns, it would be relegated to the Faculty Representative to the NCAA and the Compliance Subcommittee of the Athletic Council. Bringing in the Hazing Policy raises interesting questions that need to be thought through.

Presiding Officer Bogartz saw the video. He does not believe it was hazing. Whether it was inappropriate behavior on the part of the coach, he will leave to be decided. He does not believe hazing to be the kind of thing that goes on during a team's practice. He also thought that what was happening to the players during the combative practice drills was not nearly as bad as what happens to them on the football field. As is well known, Presiding Officer Bogartz is in favor of ceasing all participation in intercollegiate football—not because of any money issues, but because of what happens to brains as they continue to move ahead to the inside of the skull when the skulls upon contact with another player or the ground or some other hard object. With respect to the details of this issue, Presiding Officer Bogartz is not so sure it requires such a big fuss. With respect to football, UMass ought to get out of it.

Senator Audrey Altstadt hated to break the mood, but has been concerned by another issue. In the last three semesters, she has had a larger-than-usual number of students who had transferred from various Massachusetts community colleges whose skill level is far below what is expected at the university level. They have difficulty reading parts of assignments. They have even more difficulty writing. The kinds of classes that they came to before coming to Senator Altstadt's history courses are clearly not competitive with the university level. Some appear even less challenging and less comprehensive in coverage than what Senator Altstadt's daughter gets at Amherst Regional High School. Senator Altstadt's question is not how do we solve this, but how to go about getting more information about how UMass accepts transfer students, where the bar is set for them, how UMass agrees to transfer credits, and whether there is room for any change in how this operates. Secondly, Senator Altstadt voiced a concern that touches on safety issues. She has seen a lot of bicycles around campus zipping around between pedestrians. Although Senator Altstadt is pretty quick on her feet and in good health, she had a recent near-miss with a very rapidly moving bicycle. Thinking about people with physical mobility concerns or poor eyesight, this is a great concern. Senator Altstadt was a student at the University of Illinois (a Big Ten school where for every dollar spent on football ten go to the library). At Illinois, there is a complex system of bike paths. Still, while Senator Altstadt was a student, there were a number of serious accidents, including one fatality. She is concerned about the safety of bicycles on campus. She noted that she would bring up a third issue regarding football, but she does not want to repeat herself.

Carol Barr, Vice Provost for Undergraduate and Continuing Education, spoke to Senator Altstadt's concerns about community college transfers. Associate Provost for Enrollment Management James Roche works with admissions and assists on admissions requirements for community college transfers. UMass is part of the Massachusetts Transfer Agreement, a program allowing students that take certain courses at community colleges and complete UMass general education requirements, among other stipulations, be admitted. If certain courses are not working, or if the transfer equivalency of certain courses is not working, and students are not prepared, the administration absolutely wants to hear about it. We want to make sure that the students we are accepting, and the courses equivalencies we are accepting, prepare transfer students to achieve success. Otherwise, the University is doing those students a disservice. Associate Provost Barr noted her desire to meet with Senator Altstadt, along with Associate Provost Roche, to hear her specific concerns and position them within the framework of transfer issues in general.

Senator Brian Ogilvie spoke to Senator Altstadt's concerns about bicycles on campus, noting that he is a new member of the Campus Bicycle Advisory Committee. He has not been to a meeting yet, but he could say that, as someone who cycles to and on campus, he shares Senator Altstadt's concerns. Some people—students, faculty, and staff—are not aware of the people around them, and it is especially a problem with the construction that is going on around campus. The issue will be brought up for discussion with that committee.

Senator Ralph Whitehead joked that his colleagues from the History Department, Senators Altstadt and Ogilvie, gave new meaning the notion of the “cycles of history.” He asked for a clarification from Vice Chancellor Kennedy. When it is noted that the football alumni who spoke out against the football program a couple of weeks ago have taken their petition down, does that mean that they have withdrawn all of the criticisms that were expressed in that petition?

Vice Chancellor Kennedy stated that he was not in the actual meeting with the alumni, but Rebecca Spencer was, and could likely speak to that.

Senator Spencer recently met with Athletic Director John McCutcheon and a group of alumni, some of whom were, although not directly involved, part of the group that originally posted the petition. At least the group of alumni that were there said that they did not want the issue handled as it was. This group felt the heart of the issue, but disagreed with the one individual that responded to the issue by posting the online petition. One purpose of the meeting was to have a different

or additional venue for addressing their concerns. She does not know if the meeting and the taking down of the petition are related.

Senator Whitehead noted that it appears unclear whether or not this group of alumni still harbors a critical view of the performance of the coaching staff.

Senator Spencer stated that these alumni could not speak for everybody. The group she met with shared some of the views that were in the petition, but did not agree with the petition completely.

Senator Whitehead asked Senator Spencer if she was saying that they objected to the idea that these views were expressed in a petition and also that they disagreed with some of the views that were in the petition.

Senator Spencer stated that that was her understanding. There were four alumni present at the meeting and all four did not fully agree with the content of the petition.

Senator Whitehead asked if it would be fair to say that they all disavowed the petition in its entirety.

Senator Spencer said that that would be fair. One of the individuals went so far as to say that he is not a petition person and would never be behind it.

Senator Whitehead asked if, setting aside the act of petitioning, which is a public act, all the present alumni disassociated from the criticisms of the coaching staff that were expressed in the petition, stating that they did not then and do not know feel that those criticisms were true.

Senator Spencer stated that they did not say that.

Senator Whitehead concluded, therefore, that some of the people in that meeting, as well as others who may not have been at the meeting, may still hold a critical view of some, if not all, of the performance of the coaching staff.

Senator Spencer clarified that this issue is not about all of the coaching staff. It is all regarding Head Coach Charley Molnar. Do these alumni fully support the Head Coach? No. Do they think that, as Vice Chancellor Kennedy pointed out, Coach Molnar could communicate better? Yes.

Senator Whitehead asked if the findings of the ongoing investigation, assuming that it concludes that Coach Molnar has not broken any NCAA regulations or the Hazing Policy, would respond fully to all of the concerns about Coach Molnar that are harbored by the members of this group.

Vice Chancellor Kennedy stated that, from his communications and media training standpoint, he would advise anyone under this line of questioning not to answer hypothetical questions, such as the hypothetical results about the NCAA investigation posited by Senator Whitehead.

Senator Whitehead wondered if it is possible that a successful investigation that completely clears Coach Molnar of any charges of NCAA violations could also clear him of any suspicion that he is not as good of a football coach as some UMass alumni would like him to be.

Vice Chancellor Kennedy noted that the investigation is not looking at his ability as a coach.

Presiding Officer Bogartz noted that he was going to speak against the instructions of the trustworthy little voice inside his head that tells him when to speak. Presiding Officer Bogartz' concern with Coach Molnar is not so much that he had the players throwing one another to the ground and boxing in the middle of the winter, but that whenever Coach Molnar is quoted following a game, his analysis of why things did not go well for the team is always in terms of what the players did or did not do. Presiding Officer Bogartz has never seen Coach Molnar quoted making a remark about any kind of shortcoming on the part of the coaching. To Presiding Officer Bogartz, that suggests a character flaw, which is different than just not speaking right. Presiding Officer Bogartz hopes he is wrong about this, and has had conversations with Athletic Director John McCutcheon during which Director McCutcheon noted that he had had conversations with Coach Molnar that indicated failings on the part of the coaching staff. Maybe Coach Molnar is aware of this issue, and maybe it is only that no one has chosen to quote him when he makes these remarks.

Senator Steven Brewer noted his interest in a recent episode of Frontline regarding chronic traumatic encephalopathy (CTE), which is the brain injury that Presiding Officer Bogartz has spoken to the Senate about before. The episode was

very informative, and drew the analogy that the NFL behaved much like tobacco companies in the past, in that it knew about these kinds of injuries as early as 1990 and worked to avoid letting the issue reach the public and influence policy. Senator Brewer hopes that people on campus are aware of this line of research. The head of the national center for the study of CTE is at Boston University. UMass should be aware of this research and understand its implications on the activities here.

Senator Frank Hugus asked Vice Provost Barr about the new scheduling matrix that is to go into effect next fall. There have been a number of questions raised by faculty members that Senator Hugus has spoken to that he believes demand further clarification. For example, which Senate councils is this going to for review? Where did this idea originate? Was it from on-campus or off-campus? Are there other universities that use this system? If so, what kind of success have they had? Have there been conversations with faculty members who teach Monday, Wednesday and Friday after 2:30 p.m., times during which many language courses meet and during which time many graduate courses are scheduled because graduate students may teach in the morning? There are a lot of issues that have come up, and Senator Hugus hopes that these will be reviewed.

Vice Provost Barr stated that the idea for this course scheduling matrix originated in 2010, although various versions were discussed before that. UMass currently has a course scheduling system in which, if a faculty member wants to teach in a 75-minute block, they must do that on a Tuesday-Thursday schedule. For many years, there has been a large demand in the Registrar's Office from faculty members who want to teach in 75-minute time blocks, but who could not do so because the Tuesday-Thursday slots are completely full. In 2010, a course and classroom utilization study was performed. In 2012, it was repeated knowing that the New Academic Classroom Building would soon be coming online, providing relief from the facilities perspective. This development led to a reconsideration of the scheduling matrix. Even with facility space, the University was tentative to offer 75-minute time blocks on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday because they would interfere with two 50-minute time blocks offered at that time, limiting student options. Last spring, there was a faculty-wide survey asking about teaching pedagogy, classroom design, and desired time blocks. There was not a huge turnout—about 33% of faculty responded—but the majority of those that did respond stated that they would prefer more 75-minute time blocks. Over the summer, the Rules Committee called together representatives from various councils, such as the Academic Matters and Undergraduate Education Councils, and received feedback on the scheduling matrix. Based on those conversations, the proposed matrix was revised. The revised matrix was presented to all department heads and chairs at the Academic Retreat. They were asked to take it back to their faculty members and get feedback. Based on that feedback, the matrix was further revised, cutting back on the number of 75-minute time blocks on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday afternoons in order to provide more 50-minute Monday-Wednesday-Friday courses. The 2014-2015 academic year is going to be a test year. The administration will monitor the response of the faculty. The goal is a 75-75 win, meaning that the system will accommodate those wanting to teach 50-minute sections and accommodate the need that we know exists for 75-minute time blocks, meeting in the middle and trying to make as many people happy as possible. Vice Provost Barr has heard concerns from language departments and other departments. The University will try to accommodate the demand for 50-minute time blocks with six sections in the morning. If there is more demand for 50-minute, three-times-a-week sections for fall of 2014 than there is space for, the University will look into putting 50-minute sections into 75-minute blocks. Vice Provost Barr encouraged the faculty to work within the matrix as it is and see how it pans out.

D. ANNUAL REPORTS

1. Annual Report of the Academic Priorities Council, Academic Year 2012-2013, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 14-001.

The report was received.

2. Annual Report of the Health Council, Academic Year 2012-2013, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 14-002.

The report was received.

3. Annual Report of the Research Council, Academic Year 2012-2013, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 14-003.

Caren Rotello, Chair of the Research Council, stated that the Research Council did much work during the past academic year, reviewing grant proposals, monitoring issues like RCM and the strategic plan as they impact research, and many other initiatives.

The report was received.

4. Annual Report of the University Press Committee for Academic Year 2012-2013, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 14-004.

Senator Maria Tymoczko, Chair of the University Press Committee, noted that the University of Massachusetts Press had a wonderful year. Financially, it was in the black. It published 37 books and sold about 40,000 copies. When you consider that many of those copies went to libraries, it is clear that the dissemination of knowledge and research was terrific. One-hundred and fifty years ago, the Morrill Act established what are now the great state universities, including UMass, to undertake, nurture, and disseminate research. Obviously, the University of Massachusetts Press is a central element in our research mission. The Press has a fantastic director and a wonderful staff. The University Press Committee works hard, as is detailed in the annual report.

Senator Max Page asked if Senator Tymoczko would agree that, given the University's efforts to broaden its appeal and spread the word of all the good work that goes on here, one of the best return on investments would be with the University Press, which has such a strong reputation around the country.

Senator Tymoczko agreed and added that the University of Massachusetts Press is among the most efficient university presses in the country. That is partly because the director and the staff give 150% all the time. The Press Committee is a part of a really fabulous team.

The report was received.

E. BYLAW CHANGES

Special Report of the Rules Committee concerning Bylaw Changes, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 14-005 with Motion No. 03-14.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Bylaw Changes, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 14-005. 03-14

(Inasmuch as these are changes to the Senate's Bylaws, this is the first of three readings of this motion. It will be read again at the 731st and 732nd regular meetings of the Faculty Senate and voted on at the 732nd meeting. The motion may be debated and amended at all three meetings.)

Senator MJ Peterson summarized the proposed changes to the Bylaws. One would change the procedure for adding items to a Senate agenda, providing an alternative to a vote to suspend the rules, in section 1-1-5, if adopted. In section 5, there is a proposed change to the nominating procedures for at-large members of the Rules Committee. There is a proposed change to the substantive responsibilities of the International Studies Council. Finally, there are a few proposed changes to the composition of councils.

Senator Frank Hugus noted that the proposed change to section 1-1-5 states: "A question or resolution or other matter may be made a special order for the following Senate meeting by a simple majority of those voting." He asked for further clarification on that proposed change.

Presiding Officer Bogartz stated that a resolution could be voted on at a Senate meeting to become the first order of new business at the following meeting.

Senator Hugus stated that, to do so, you would still have to suspend the rules, as the Senate would be discussing something that is not the order of the day.

Presiding Officer Bogartz stated that the Rules Committee would look into this issue further.

F. NEW COURSES

<u>COURSE</u>	<u>TITLE</u>	<u>CREDITS</u>
CE-ENGIN 684	"Environmental Reaction Kinetics"	3
EDUC 621B	"Race, Class, and Gender in Higher Education"	3
EDUC 674A	"International Higher Education Policy"	3
EDUC 767	"Researching New Literatures: Multimodal Media Production and Social Justice"	3

HISTORY 665	“Writing History for Popular Audiences”	4
PSYCH 662	“Improving Group Relations”	3

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the courses CE-ENGIN 684, EDUC 621B, 674A and 767, HISTORY 665
04-14 PSYCH 662, as recommended by the Graduate Council.

The motion was seconded and adopted.

G. NEW BUSINESS

1. Special Report of the Academic Matters Council concerning the Nutrition Second Bachelor’s Degree Requirements, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 14-006 with Motion No. 05-14.
2. Special Report of the Academic Matters Council concerning the Conversion of Political Science Major Requirements from Courses to Credits, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 14-007 with Motion No. 05-14.
3. Special Report of the Academic Matters Council concerning the Revision of Senior Year Courses in Electrical Engineering and Computer Systems Engineering, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 14-008 with Motion No. 05-14.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Sen. Doc. Nos. 14-006, 14-007 and 14-008, as recommended by the
05-14 Academic Matters Council.

The motion was seconded and adopted.

4. Special Report of the Graduate Council concerning Revision of the Master of Architecture Program, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 14-009 with Motion No. 06-14.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Revision of the Master of Architecture Program, as presented in
06-14 Sen. Doc. No. 14-009.

The motion was seconded and adopted.

5. Special Report of the Rules Committee concerning the Establishment of an Ad Hoc Committee to be named the Joint Task Force on Resource Allocation, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 14-010 with Motion No. 07-14.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Establishment of an Ad Hoc Committee to be named the Joint Task
07-14 Force on Resource Allocation, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 14-010.

Senator MJ Peterson moved to amend the paragraph on “Background,” in the third line from the bottom, which currently reads: “Meeting those goals in resources allocation requires developing the analytic tools necessary to evaluate the costs.” The proposed amendment would change that to: “the analytic tools, evidence and decision-making frameworks necessary to evaluate the costs and benefits of different choices.”

The amendment was seconded and adopted.

Senator Frank Hugus asked a question regarding the charge, which states the Joint Task Force will “make recommendations to the Chancellor for moving forward with any proposed improvements that result from the study.” There is nothing in the document stating that it will be released concurrently to the Faculty Senate. If it is a Joint Task Force, Senator Hugus believes that joint reporting should occur at the same time. Senator Hugus asked for clarification before making a motion to change the document.

Presiding Officer Bogartz noted that there is nothing in the document prohibiting reporting to the Faculty Senate.

Chancellor Subbaswamy asked to have the minutes reflect that the report will be released to the public on the Task Force’s website.

Senator Brian Ogilvie noted that, under “Reporting Dates,” the document states: “The Joint Task Force will issue progress reports to the Faculty Senate as appropriate.” And, later: “JTFRA will develop preliminary recommendations and present them to the campus community.”

Presiding Officer Bogartz offered an editorial remark, stating that he believes that sooner or later the Faculty Senate will get this document. The Chancellor is not trying to hide stuff from the Senate.

The motion was seconded and adopted as amended.

H. OLD BUSINESS

1. Amendment to the Special Report of the Rules Committee concerning Establishment of an Ad Hoc Committee to be named the Joint Task Force on Strategic Oversight (JTFSO), as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 13-004B with Motion No. 05-13.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the amendment to the report on the Establishment of an Ad Hoc Committee to be named the Joint Task Force on Strategic Oversight (JTFSO), as presented in Sen. Doc. 05-13 No. 13-004B.

Senator Hugus noted that this document states that the fifth-year report is due on August 15, 2013. He asked for someone to clarify how urgent this is, because, if it was supposed to be submitted in August, we’re way behind.

Secretary May stated that this proposal is a reiteration or continuation of the existing Joint Task Force. The August 15 deadline was met. The report for that deadline was discussed at the last Faculty Senate meeting. The version that went to NEASC was a slightly modified version of the strategic planning document. Secretary May proceeded to propose an amendment to the document, adding to the membership “23) The President of the Graduate Student Senate or designee.”

The amendment was seconded and adopted.

The motion was seconded and adopted as amended.

2. Amendment to the Special Report of the Committee on Committees concerning Nominations to Faculty Senate Councils and Committees, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 13-063B with Motion No. 69-13.

MOVED: That the Faculty Senate approve the Special Report of the Committee on Committees concerning Nominations to Faculty Senate Councils and Committees, as presented in Sen. Doc. No. 13-063B as amended.

The motion was seconded and adopted.

The 730th Regular Meeting of the Faculty Senate stood adjourned at 5:26 p.m. on October 10, 2013.