

## **Memorandum**

**To: Faculty Senate**

**From: Professor Janet Burke, Executive Secretary**

**Date: January 22, 1996**

**Re: Minutes, January 22, 1996 Meeting of the Faculty Senate**

The Faculty Senate Meeting was called to order on Monday, January 22, 1996 at 3:30 PM in O'Leary 222. The following Senators were in attendance:

William Phelan, Education; Dominick Sama , Chemical & Nuclear Eng; James Sheff, Chemical & Nuclear Eng.; Dan Golomb, Civil Eng; Ziyad Salameh, Electrical Eng; Ross Holmstrom, Electrical Eng; Ross Stacer, Plastics Eng; James Huang, Plastics Eng; Michael Ellenbecker, Work Environment; David Wegman, Work Environment; Robert Nicolosi, Clinical Lab Science; Michael O'Sullivan, Health; Pauline Ladebauche, Nursing; Eileen Williamson, Nursing; Susan Reece, Nursing; Connie Seymour, Physical Therapy; Michael Carter, Economics; Charles Ryan, English; Jonathan Liebowitz, History; Peter Blewett, History; John Staulo, Language; Michael Jones, Legal Studies; Robert Innis, Philosophy; Joyce Denning, Political Science; Joseph Waterman, Psychology; David Landrigan, Psychology; Arlene McCormack, Sociology; David Eberiel, Biology; Harry Rubinstein, Chemistry; Albert Kowalak, Chemistry; Nelson Eby, Earth Science; Mary Beth Ruskai, Mathematics; Donald Ameen, Mathematics; Arthur Mittler, Physics; George Chabot, Physics; Riaz Khan, OMMIS; Philip Moss, Policy and Planning; James Coates, Art; John Ogasapian, Academic Studies; Kay Roberts, Music Performance; Helen Jones, Library; Margaret Manion, Library; Mario Aste, Language.

### **Agenda**

I. Approval of Minutes: The Minutes of the December 4, 1995 meeting of the Faculty Senate were unanimously accepted as presented.

Senate president Nicolosi requested a motion to amend the Agenda in order to allow the President of the Faculty Union to present a ten minute informational report on the Faculty union's activities regarding restructuring.

MOTION to amend the agenda to include a ten minute report from the President of the Faculty Union regarding restructuring.

The motion was seconded and unanimously approved.

II. Report of the Faculty Representative to the Board of Trustees.

Professor Phelan reported on the December 5th and 6th meetings of the Board of Trustees. Copies of his report and accompanying information regarding enrollments were distributed to Senators at the beginning of the meeting.

In response to a question from Professor Ruskai Professor Phelan reported that the trustees did not have the Senate Program Review Committee report at the December meeting, although the Chancellor did submit the report to the President's office. Professor

Phelan indicated that this was appropriate in terms of the Senate By-laws; and that today's meeting contains an agenda item designed to address problems with the existing by-laws as they relate to the new University structure.

In response to several other comments regarding distribution of the Program Review Committee's report, the Senate President indicated that issues dealing with the distribution of the Program Review Committee's report will be addressed in Item IV of the published agenda.

Senate President Nicolosi recognized Professor William Burke, Department of Legal Studies who requested the opportunity to address the Senate and to present a motion.

### **Motion**

Whereas the Legal Studies Department was just created in August of 1991 and has had a consistent demand for all of its courses and could be the flagship sector of the University structure for pre-law and paralegal students we the senate recommend:

That the Legal studies department be allowed to maintain its autonomy in order to better obtain a solid position in the university structure as the pre-law segment of the university along with its ability to offer a high demand minor. Further that no action concerning the faculty within the legal studies department be taken at any trustees meeting until further study of this situation is addressed fully by the Faculty Senate and the faculty union.

The motion was seconded.

There was a brief discussion. Professor Ruskai presented the following substitute motion.

### **Substitute Motion**

The Faculty Senate Recommends that no action be taken regarding the Department of Legal Studies until the Senate in collaboration with members of the Department has sufficient time to study the issue.

There was discussion of the substitute motion. Professor Innis suggested the second sentence of the original motion as a more appropriate substitute motion.

### **Substitute Motion**

That no action concerning the faculty within the legal studies department be taken at any Trustees meeting until further study of this situation is addressed fully by the Faculty Senate and the faculty union.

Professor Sheff suggested that further consideration of this issue be delayed until the part of the agenda that deals with this and related issues. Professor Sheff made the following motion.

### **Motion**

To postpone consideration of the substitute motion until after consideration of item V on

the agenda.

**Yes 34 No 2 abstain 3**

III. Report of the President of the Faculty Union. Professor Mario Aste reported on the Union's activities regarding restructuring. He informed the Senate that the union has been engaged in negotiations with the administration. He indicated that the elimination of departments will not create a cost savings for the university, and that no personnel actions can be taken by the administration until there have been negotiations with the union.

In response to a question from Professor McCormack he indicated that the creation of a new department does have to be negotiated, under certain conditions.

IV. Executive Committee Report. Senate President Nicolosi requested the Executive Secretary to present a comparison of the Chancellor's January 12th recommendations on restructuring, which were distributed to all members of the faculty, and the recommendations of the Senate Program Review committee. Professor Burke indicated that there were substantive and significant differences between the Original recommendations of the Chancellor and the January 12th recommendations. She briefly summarized those differences.

V. Distribution of Faculty Senate Report -Process Issues and approach. Senate President Nicolosi reported that the Executive Committee recommends a revision of the Senate By-laws to accommodate the new structure of the University.

Professor Phelan made the following motion:

**MOTION**

That the Academic Governance Committee reexamine the By-laws and make recommendations regarding the relationship between the Chancellor, The President, The Board of Trustees, and the Faculty Senate.

The motion was seconded.

Professor Sheff suggested that the Governance Committee look at the By-laws of the Amherst campus in this regard.

**VOTE** The motion was unanimously supported.

Professors Ogasapian and Roberts spoke in favor of maintaining the Masters Program in Music, indicating that the program can not be offered through the College of Education as suggested by the Chancellor.

They indicated that Lowell is the only public institution in this geographic area providing this graduate training. Since school systems generally reimburse a dollar amount equal only to public institution levels, the elimination of the MM program in Music will leave students with no viable option for graduate training. Many of these students are former undergraduates of Lowell and its predecessor institutions.

Professor Sheff deferred to Professor Gil Brown.

Professor Brown addressed the uniqueness and importance of the program in Nuclear Engineering, which the Chancellor is recommending for closure. He indicated that placements of graduates was excellent, but that enrollments were down, largely due to publicity about the elimination of the program.

Professor Ruskai asked whether the Executive Committee has plans to meet with the Chancellor. Senate president Nicolosi responded that the Executive Committee meets with the Chancellor once a month and that a tentative meeting is scheduled for Feb. 9th.

Professor Rubinstein pointed out that since the next Board of Trustees meeting is scheduled for February 7th that the Senate has to take some action now. He stated that the differences between the Chancellor's recommendations and the Senate's recommendations should be publicized immediately to the President and the Board of Trustees. Rubinstein stated that he would like to make a motion to that effect. There was a discussion and Professor Rubinstein was asked to formally state his motion and to give it in writing to the Secretary. While Professor Rubinstein was preparing his motion, Professor Ruskai indicated that she would like to propose a friendly amendment to the motion that contains a statement regarding the inability of the Senate to meet with the Chancellor prior to the Board meeting. Professor Phelan read the following statement from the December Board of Trustees meeting: " The Board of Trustees acknowledges the progress being made in the program review process and authorizes and directs the President to continue the process and to take any actions appropriate and necessary through the Chancellors to implement the outcomes of the review and to report back to the Board of Trustees at its February meeting."

Professor Rubinstein read his motion:

#### **MOTION**

That the Faculty Senate President inform the President of UMass and the Board of Trustees that the Faculty Senate is in disagreement with some of the recommendations of the Chancellor of the Lowell campus, and outline the issues which are in disagreement between the Chancellor and the Senate.

Professor Ruskai withdrew her amendment to the initial motion.

Professor Innis suggested that the Senate send a copy of its report with the motion.

It was the sense of the senate that this should be done.

#### **VOTE on the motion Yes 27 No 0 Abstain 4**

The Parliamentarian pointed out that the Senate had lost its quorum, and that no further votes could be taken.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:30 pm.