

The Faculty Senate Monday October 5, 2009 at 3:30 Alumni Hall

Attendee's:

To be added

Notetaker: Kerry Donohoe
The meeting began at 3:30am.

1.) Approval of Prior meeting minutes

The first item was to review and approve the Minutes of May 4, 2009 Faculty Senate Meeting. *Minutes were approved.*

Note: Prior to voting to approve the minutes, Senate President Ann Marie Hurley announced that there were missing names from the list of meeting attendees and asked if senators were in attendance and his or her name was missing that he or she alert her so this can be updated. Then she asked for questions and or comments on the minutes.

2.) Faculty Representative to the Board of Trustees

Michael Carter (Professor of Economics and Faculty Representative to the Board of Trustees) delivered the report to the full senate. Michael shared that the Board of Trustees had completed the first round of meetings over the last two weeks. The Board of Trustees has focused on budgets and has been discussing the budget for fall 2010. Michael stated that “barring additional 9C cut we should be alright due to \$118 million in federal stimulus money. The bad news is that there is hardly any stimulus money left for next year which means we will have a \$118 million deficit.”

Michael suggested that the Board of Trustees would push for 2009 funding which would restore \$70 million. All in all, he suggested the budget situation was bleak and suggested that it will be difficult to maintain funding. If these budget challenges persist there was talk that personnel will have to be cut. However, Michael indicated that there is a consistent commitment to not cut core academic programs or operations.

Michael also discussed what he termed was “controversial talk.” This included consideration to move to a fee structure that resembled the private schools which was defined as “higher cost and higher aid.” It was also discussed at the Board of Trustees to have a higher fee increase at UMass Amherst (controversial). Michael reported that at this point there are no real details.

He did share that there is also discussion about the \$1500 fee increase that was voted last year and that was rolled back to \$400. Michael suggested that this \$1500 could be reinstated and that \$400 could be added on top of this. Michael also shared that there has been some changes to the board and that there were trustees who had opposed fee increases that had not been reappointed.

On the brighter side, Michael shared that the credit rating of the university is “quite good” and that the university is planning to borrow \$63 million dollars to fund the Emerging Technology Building, The ICC, and the new academic building on South campus that may start construction next fall (2010). This all is to promote growth.

Michael also shared that Chancellor Meehan laid out an ambitious plan to the Board of Trustees which included:

- 2% increase in retention per year
- 2% increase in 6 year graduation rates
- 10% increase in Research and Development
- 8% increase in CSCE
- 10% increase in advancement

Lastly, Michael shared that the University had received a \$124 million dollar grant from the Sloan Foundation to develop 10 Professional Masters Degrees across the 5 campuses and that Provost Abdelal will provide the leadership for this.

3.) Reports from Standing Committees

A. Academic Resources: No Resolutions

B. Graduate Policy and Affairs:

Resolution 1: Orthopedic and Rehabilitation Nursing Certificate Program. There were several typos on the documents provide to the senate. There were several corrections made to course numbers (this was correct in the document that GPAC approved. A motion was made to approve the resolution. The motion was called to a vote. **Motion approved.**

Resolution 2: Sleep Certificate Program. Again there were formatting issues with the document, but after a presentation by Geoffry Phillips McEnany and a brief discussion a motion was made to approve the resolution. The motion was called to a vote. **Motion approved.**

Resolution 3: Professional Science Master’s track in the SMS non-thesis option MS Degree. (Note: this is not a new program but a new option.). After a presentation by Juliette Rooney-Varga, a motion was made to approve the resolution. The motion was called to a vote. **Motion approved.**

Resolution 4: Computer Science Proposal. There were two resolutions within this proposal.

Part A. The First was to change the required courses as outlined in the proposal. A brief presentation made by Giampiero Pecelli a motion was made to approve the resolution. The motion was called to a vote. **Motion approved.**

Part B. A New Masters Degree in MSCS Software Entrepreneurship was presented. A brief presentation was made by Giampiero Pecelli. There were a few questions about prerequisites which were followed by a motion to approve the resolution. The motion was called to a vote. **Motion approved.**

Notes on GPAC discussions

- It should be noted that there were formatting issues in the resolutions that we sent out to the Senators. Several senators identified this as an issue in reading the proposed resolutions. Senate President Hurley indicated that she was not sure what happened and that the original documents were formatted correctly.
- It was shared that the secretary position is open if anyone wanted to take on that position. There is also an effort in place to get administrative support for sending out information and for taking minutes.

C. Undergraduate Policy

Resolution: Course Grade Appeal Policy-This was referred back to committee to look specifically at the steps and to have greater discussion on the time frame allowed for each step. It was also raised that the reasons for appeal should be clearly articulated.

D. Research and Development: Bob Parkin began by sharing that he was working on an updated list of new senators and asked if everyone in attendance could please check this list he had. This was in follow-up to a new senator who had raised the issue that she had not received email communications.

Bob then discussed that the Research and Development Committee was looking for members. The overarching goal would be to promote research and scholarship, create opportunities for collaboration, identify strategic goals, and to discuss issues such as intellectual property. Bob shared briefly that there had been some issues with CVIP. Bob also explained that a starting point of this committee would be to establish a mission statement.

Questions were raised by a senator (Craig Slatin) whether this initiative was driven by the Provosts request last spring and if this would be open to non-senators for participation and greater representation? It was also suggested that this be tabled until the senate can have the opportunity to have a full discussion on this. There were several exchanges as to whether this was a “stall tactic” or if this was being driven by the senate. These questions were responded to by Bob Parkin and Senate President Ann Marie Hurley who reminded the senate that this is a standing committee of the senate and it is being reinstated. This is outlined in the By-laws. They also said that the committee would 1st solicit membership from the senate because there needs to be

a percentage of voting members of the senate on the committee. However, this would be open to all faculty members because a goal would be full participation. Senate President Hurley also shared that the senate had held a welcome for new faculty and will be reaching out to include new faculty as well.

At this point another senator (Nicole Champagne) asked that the bylaws be added to the website because there was not an updated copy online that demonstrated the changes made last spring. President Hurley had shared that she did add these new bylaws and they reverted to an older version. Charlotte Mandell confirmed this and that the new bylaws had been posted. It was recommended that there be follow-up with the web office to be sure this was addressed. Nicole Champagne also suggested that the “revised date” be listed to help senators know which version was the most updated.

Additional Agenda Items & Announcements

O’Leary Library

Liana Cheney announced to the senate that there have been discussions in regards to O’Leary Library and that there is a plan in the works to move the books from O’Leary Library to North Campus. She indicated that there was not much information available but wanted to share with the senate so faculty could be informed as well as to suggest that the faculty senate request to be included in planning and decision-making as it relates to academic resources.

Charlotte Mandell shared some information and indicated that there would be committee’s formed to discuss this. She also shared that in a given year only 10% of books in circulation are actually used. Melissa Pennell also added to the discussion sharing that books would not be thrown away and that departments would be involved in discussions regarding resources. In addition, the University would partner with an organization that helps to share older books with schools and other community agencies (if they cannot be used on campus).

The will be communications sent out shortly in regards to this discussion and planning.

General Education Announcement

Michael Graves announced that the General Education committee needs to have representatives from the School of Health and Environment, Management, and Engineering and asked senators to share this with their colleges and departments. Also, in addition to reviewing new courses, the General Education Committee will be reviewing syllabi (approx. 10 per semester) to see if it is being taught the way it was initially proposed.

Fall 2010 Schedule

There were three options of schedules presented for the fall 2010. Once again we are faced with the need to start before Labor Day. It was after 5pm and a number of senators had left. After a brief discussion it was requested if the different options could be forwarded to the full senate and that each senator could bring it back to their departments for discussion. This will be discussed at

the next meeting. Pat Duff (registrar) and Charlotte Mandell will be sure that copies of the various schedules are emailed to senate.

Meeting Adjourned at approximately 5:30pm