Faculty Senate Meeting

Minutes

March 5, 2012

3:30 PM

Presiding: Michael Carter


Recording: Martha Burns

The meeting convened at 3:34 PM.

1. Minutes of February 6, 2012 Faculty Senate Meeting

   Sarah Kuhn’s comment in the minutes shall be changed to read: “Sarah Kuhn noted that she appreciates Vice Provost Mandell’s work on the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) and hopes that the results from the Survey will be incorporated into the proposed Report Card.”

   A motion was made to approve the revised minutes and it passed unanimously.

2. Report from the Faculty Representative to the Board of Trustees, (Professor Buzawa)

   Education Secretary Reville

   - The Governor’s budget recommendation preserves state support for the Massachusetts public higher education system at levels equal to fiscal year 2011 support. Education budget is better than any other sector and an overall 6% increase.
Governor supports President Caret’s 50-50 model for costs (now 45%)
In fiscal year 2010 and fiscal year 2011, Massachusetts public colleges and universities received funds through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act’s (ARRA), State Fiscal Stabilization Fund (SFSF) to preserve budgets at the campuses.
This federal legislation allowed states to use their allocations to help restore reductions to state support for campuses, but these funds are no longer available for fiscal year 2012.
In addition, the commitment of the Patrick administration to keeping the costs of higher education affordable is demonstrated through $88 million in funding for scholarships for Massachusetts residents.

Performance Incentive Fund
In addition to level funding, state funded appropriations for an incentive fund titled the Performance Management Set Aside is established.
In fiscal year 2012, this fund will allocate $7.5 million to the campuses. All campuses will be eligible to compete for these funds through a competitive grant process based on priorities determined by the board of higher education in pursuit of operational efficiency and goals articulated in the commonwealth’s Vision Project.
Vision Project established by the DHE has been established with the goal of attaining national leadership in five key areas of achievement in public higher education.
Historically, each campus maintains full operational independence, including procurement, curriculum development, and implementation. This fund will provide incentives to campuses to encourage advancing these objectives while also providing incentives for adopting fiscal improvement and accountability measures that will lower costs and increase efficiency.
There will be a complete review of the finances in all of Higher Education including UMass.

President Caret
Board had a retreat to establish priorities of Marketing and PR to get message out, Advancement, UMass online, efficiency (including academic size) and Capital budget.

Administration and Finance
Net assets - University increased its net assets by 9% in FY 11 (matches peer group average)
Debt Service - University’s % of funds dedicated to Debt Service remained flat, but annual commitment now stands at $126 million (4.4%) Peer average 5.3%
Our credit rating is very high and lower than the rest of the state.
Exceeds peer average of 5.3% (would be 4.2% without UConn). State of Connecticut subsidies a significant % of UConn’s debt service payments.
Financial Cushion – UMass just below peer average of 24% (23%)
Unrestricted net assets per student - $10,884. Peer average $9,454
Endowment/student - $9,000 per student compared to $13,158 average (without California)
Science and Technology - $65 million will be released for Mass Life Sciences in the next 2-3 years.
Compensation Committee - consistent with university practice elsewhere.

3. Spring 2012 Faculty Senate Election, (Professor Carter), Attachment 3
Michael Carter indicated that a question arose relative to including “non-tenure” track faculty and “visiting” faculty on the Senate. He informed the audience that “non-tenure” track faculty are eligible to be Senators but “visiting” faculty members/lecturers are not eligible.
Michael Carter provided an overview of the upcoming Faculty Senate/Officer Election Guidelines. Re-elected or newly elected Senators should be e-mailed to Martha Burns by March 30, 2012.
Nominations for President, Vice-President, one Faculty Representative to the Board of Trustees and one Associate Faculty Representative should be e-mailed to Martha Burns by April 12, 2012.

4. Undergraduate Policy Committee (UPC), (Professor Mittler)
   A. Proposal for a new STEM Teaching Minor, (Dean Greenwood), Attachment 4A

   Dean Greenwood presented the proposal for a new 24 credit STEM Teaching Minor. The proposed minor is modeled on a highly successful program developed, tested, and maintained by the University of Texas Austin in which scientists and engineers can complete their teaching certification within their four year undergraduate science or engineering major. It represents a real plus for UMass Lowell in that we are the only university in the Northeast to be granted. Collaboration shall exist among science, engineering and technology. Ken Levasseur and David Kazmer will serve as representatives. A motion was made to accept the proposal and it passed unanimously.

   B. Proposal to change B.S. Environmental Science – Geoscience Option to Environmental Geoscience and modify curriculum, (Professor Eby), Attachment 4B

   Professor Eby presented the proposal to rename the Geoscience option to Environmental Geoscience. A motion was made to accept the name change and it passed unanimously.

5. Research and Development Committee, (Professor Parkin)
   A. Policy and Procedures Relating to Misconduct in Research or Scholarship, Attachment 5A

   Robert Parkin indicated that the policy was debated briefly a few years ago. The thrust then was on scientific conduct. It was thought of as being too narrow in scope so the intent now is to make it broader in scope. He presented a process flow diagram. There were a variety of concerns raised in debating this document. One concern was that the policy did not provide an appeal process for the complainant if she/he felt that the complaint was erroneously dismissed at an early stage prior to appointment of a fact finding committee. Further concerns seemed to be that the process provided inadequate notification and rebuttal opportunities for the accused. It was determined after a lengthy discussion that no motion would be passed and that the Research and Development Committee will re-convene and make adjustments to the drafted Policy and Procedures document.

The meeting adjourned at 4:50 PM.