

Faculty Senate Meeting 11-13-2007, Gr2 Rm 228, 3:30 – 5PM

Call to Order

Note on Minutes: Minutes will be circulated electronically for comment and posted to the website, the comments will be edited and then voted on at the next meeting.

Approval of Minutes: Motion to Approve, Seconded by Susan LeClair, Motion Passed

Report from the Faculty Senate Steering Committee

Concern about Ad-Hoc task forces that have been created or will be created as a result of the Strategic Plan. There is a concern that these committees duplicate some of the Faculty Senate committees and we would like to avoid any potential conflict. We met with Provost Garro and one particular issue is that the Admin would like to get the Faculty Senate out of the contract and only a statement that “there will be a faculty senate” no delineation of committees, etc. In our meeting with Provost Garro some of the charges were vague and rather loose and the Senate has a history of amending those charges as time passes. According to the Faculty Senate website and possibly the Union contract have the ability to come up with ad hoc committees. There is a proposal coming from the Faculty Senate Steering Committee to amend or change the charges for the committees. We would like to discuss the proposed amendments to the charges. We are making changes to the Faculty Senate website so it is more up to date and more complete with minutes, etc. Everything will be up to date by the next meeting. The committees work will also be kept up to date.

Provost Garro is invited to address the Senate about the issue of committees, etc. With respect to the issue of using standing committees in the implementation of the strategic plan. The composition of those committees might not be what is necessary for the strategic plan. There is a call to set up a task force to advise on an IT Savvy campus if you look at the composition of the computer users committee some of the most forward thinking and some of the major changes are not on that committee and there is a need to include those on the committee. A solution may be to use this member of the committee and supplement them. IF that is okay with the Senate may require discussion. With regards to the Institutional Research Committee the Research committee needs to be those who use those services. Again we can use the Senate committee but we can supplement or add people to the group. If that is a process that is okay then that can work.

Gerald Koot: Many see this as Black and white many in admin seem to see the faculty outside the contract. The structure has been that the Faculty Senate’s charter has been in the contract and lists a number of standing committees some of which are elected from the faculty as a whole, others are college committees, or formed in a somewhat different way but in a similar election process, others are appointed by the Senate steering committee but look at important university policies that affect faculty and the university mission. They are not about administrating the university but are about suggesting

policies broadly conceived. But to argue that should be only one phrase that “there should be a faculty senate” leaves it up to the admin as to what the Senate will look like.

I have an issue looking at the particulars. In the end we suggest policies and if they don't like them we have a procedure for resolving them but if it is important to the faculty we can go to the Trustees. But in the end they still decide. But what is not shared governance to have administration pick a bunch of ad hoc committees because we don't have the expertise they need. This is not shared governance. What is wrong with the current structure? If the administration has a need they can suggest when we are forming the committees and we can ask but faculty ultimately volunteer. If they are asked by the people who decide their raise and their future it is a different type of request.

Suzanne Scott: It is important to remember that the make up of the committees are volunteer faculty. I want to make sure that we understand that if we go to committees and augment them with administration that those members would be ex officio

Bal Ram Singh: I think it would be very helpful to have some guidelines from the Senate if there is a particular reason. There is really not that much interaction from the administration members. Most of the time looking at the groups which are represented I have worked to find people in the areas that are not represented and tried to find someone to fill the gap. I think that administration should really support these committees. We will need some administrative support to help with uploading to the website, etc.

Michael Baum: My sense was that we could work together for example if the computer users committee you think there are some faculty who should be on it I as faculty Senate President would call and ask them to serve. That would demonstrate that the Provost is working through the Faculty Senate and by going around the Faculty Senate committee it looks as if you are creating shadow committees. IF there is an area where you feel there is a problem then we can address that. But as Gerald voiced this is the role of the faculty senate to appoint and administer these committees.

Suzanne Scott: I know that the computer users committee has not met within the year because the Chair stated that another group has been working on their charge and that the CUC has become irrelevant in the last year.

Jim Griffith: I think that were this discussion is going is a decision whether or not we want a faculty/librarian voice or whether or not we want these tasks done as expediently as possible.

Dan Georgianna: I think the committees that involve faculty and senate on the committees is a great idea for shared governance. My more recent experience, as President of the Federation is that when we try to put together these committees such as the Standards Committee and the Affirmative Action Committee I could never tell what was going on but it seemed the Chancellor didn't want these committees. We named people, the Chancellor wrote the charge, which was very specific and then nothing happened. If administration wants to be involved in the committee structure it doesn't seem that that is what Universities are about. I prefer the model where both faculty and

administrators are on the committee and there is a give and take. I don't see why this is so complicated all the Universities do it.

Discussion: Ultimately it is in the best interest of the University to have shared governance. All of us have a stake in working to advance the University. To make the point that the Senate doesn't have the expertise that would not fly as a reason. No one would believe that we don't have the necessary expertise. All of us have this interest that we have quality and work to make the University convenient for all, useful for all and advance. The faculty are here for 30 – 35 years whereas the administration is here 10 – 15 years so it would help you to work with us.

Provost Garro: There is absolutely no question that expertise exists on the campus and whether or not the people who have the expertise are serving on the committee. Beyond that we need to have faculty and administrators, and all committees have admin liasons and the committee's tasks don't always align with the charges. We need an appropriate mix of faculty and administrators to implement the strategic plan. We need to find a way to put the appropriate groups together this does not mean that I don't believe in shared governance I strongly believe in shared governance. I am trying to strengthen the role of the senate in shared governance. I don't believe the Federation has a role in governance but that is where we are at an impasse. We need to have appropriate faculty input in all these areas. Whether or not that can be accomplished by using faculty senate committees.

Dan: You are not willing to join in shared governance because you don't view federation as having a role.

Provost Garro: I am will to join in shared governance. I have been meeting with FSSC there are going t obe a number of RFP's from Mass Life Science Commission I asked the group a number of faculty from various committees the issue here is an RFP that involves the interaction of faculty with industries, and one for new faculty. There can only be two submissions from each institution. I suspect there will be more than two proposals. I suggest a faculty committee but who should that be? I feel we many need a sub committee from the life sciences that can review these proposals. I feel we need the appropriate faculty committee to vet these proposals.

Elaine: I think the administration becomes dubious about the faculty's ability to do their job. So they create a shadow structure to get the job done. If you look at it conversely there maybe an administrative behavior that might be viewed dubiously but the faculty don't set up shadow committees to conduct the administrators business. But as Michael said he was open to the suggestions and would incorporate them.

Michael: I don't see why if you think the Research Committee does not have the necessary expertise then suggest to the research committee that they set up a sub committee and come up with nominations for serving on this committee. I think that would be the administration and faculty senate working together. I want ot get past this

us and them mentality, and we might have to muddle through until these contractual issues are resolved but I do want us to work together.

Discussion: There is a secondary issues where committees have worked through and muddled forward and have passed things along to administrative desks where they have died. There is a frustration that when we have done our job it is not responded to. That weighs heavily on use because committees worry that their work will not be responded to. We can do this if there is more consultation.

Provost Garro: I don't think there has been animosity in my dealings with the FSSC in suggestion of working with the faculty who is on the faculty and the administration will also need to work on who should be from the administration.

Gerald Koot: When the statement is that the Faculty Senate should not be part of the faculty contract that is a pretty radical statement and to state that the Faculty Federation has no role in governance is wrong because the contract includes the Senate. This is not merely a philosophical difference but it is not since it goes to the root of shared governance. The current Provost has been very cooperative and much more willing to talk to us. But if the bottom line is we really want to get rid of you and take you out of the contract then that is looking for a confrontation it doesn't seem like a philosophical difference but a fundamental difference. What is wrong with the current system? I have not heard a conversation from the administration and it seems to be looking for a confrontation.

Michael Baum: Go through a list of charges or we can table this discussion of changes and charges and we get to the rest of the agenda. Motion seconded and passed.

Introduction of Julie Parker and Mary Beckwith about the new sexual harassment online reporting program.

Julie Parker: Examining the sexual assault policy the one piece I want to share with the faculty is the new sexual assault anonymous tracking form. We have a form to provide an accurate picture of sexual assaults happening on campus. The national average is one in four college students will be the victim of sexual assault. We have a very low reporting rate on campus for a myriad of reasons. I am still working on having this form in a more visible place.

Mary Beckwith: Beyond the low numbers of reporting and whether or not we are getting accurate numbers. WE would like to be able to support the victims of sexual assault. The Clery report which requires use to report all instances of sexual assault on campus to the Federal government it must also be publicized to the Dept of Public Safety guide. It requires that all of us who have a report of a sexual assault it must be reported anonymously. All university employees are required to report any incidences. In all cases the victim decides what type of response they want. You need to let them know that you are going to report it even anonymously. For those of you who hear about these incidents, the resources on campus are the Women's Center the Counseling Center, I am

happy to speak with anyone, the dept of Housing and Residence Life, Dept of Public Safety and Judicial Affairs office as well are all available to work with you. IF you have any questions on how to fill out of the form.

Barbara Jacobson: If the student asks that you don't report what can you do?

Mary Beckwith: Inform the student that you have a duty to report, and it will be anonymously. No one is going to take action. The report is simply to report accurately. The data goes to the director of public safety who will compile it. A student may come to multiple people and the director is trained to recognize similar reports.

Susan LeClair: Please make the form accessible. Plus please put the definition of what is a sexual assault. What is the legal definition? What is important for me to know about this? Who do I refer her to? She might not go to someone else so I need immediate, accessible information and I need it clear enough so I know who I should send this person to and oh by the way there is a form.

Julie Parker: The form is listed on the website for Housing and Residential Life, Public Safety, Judicial Affairs,

Susan LeClair: It needs to be very accessible because I am not going to look for it.

Mary Beckwith: There is a new policy for all types of sexual assault. I think we made it much more intuitive so it comes up to a page.

Sonja Peterson: There are nurses that are specially trained at the South Coast Hospital group and they should be listed as a resource.

Elaine: Do you have the form to put on the screen?

Julie Parker: The form is listed online and it is listed on a variety of web site under the button "report a sexual assault".

Introduction of Susan Atkins International and Exchange Study Programs

Susan Atkins: This week is international education week the focus is to prepare Americans to be good international students. My role and my office shows a commitment to internationalizing the curriculum. These new initiatives can only be done in cooperation with the faculty. We have been working on a wide variety of programs, and the numbers are increasing in terms of the number of students participating. We are currently surveying the students to see where they want to go and what they want to do. We are looking to bring Fullbright to the faculty and bring scholars here as well. There will be a presentation in February.

Do we have any tie with the UMass Amherst International Programs.

Susan: Their programs are open to our students. There is an international relations advisory council with the asst vice chancellors already talking about these programs.

Dick Panofsky: A number of these programs are across the UMass campuses. We are starting to be on the map and involved in these areas that a few years ago we were just talking about.

Elaine: Does this include programs that are conducted in the individual colleges.

Susan LeClair: We are trying to get these various programs centralized and make them more uniform. As well as addressing health and safety issues.

Report from the Gen Ed Committee:

Rob Darst: Chair of Gen Ed Committee: One of our tasks is having a system for assessing the competencies coming out of Gen Ed. A system for measuring and The University has this task before it. Some of us met with Dick Panofsky we have not discussed exactly what the assessment instrument would look like. But the discussion focused on how do we get there from here to there.

We have this task, everybody in the University has this task because of accreditation. The first question was is the gen ed committee the appropriate vehicle for addressing this. Our general sense is that the gen ed committee is not the appropriate committee we are very large, we have a lot of routine business, quite frankly I view my role to speak to the interest of the member this is not what they signed up for, they will not be compensated for it and they are avoiding the meetings. A smaller dedicated group needs to be created by the Senate to address this short run task that needs to be carried out efficiently, quickly and there are members who are interested. One option is to have a sub-committee the member who are interested are wary because when their work came before the Senate it died. So my sense is that it needs to have representatives from the Senate so that you have a better sense of whether or not the motion would pass. This is an argument in favor of mixed composition. As far as I am concerned the Gen Ed committee is done.

Dick: There is a first task to decide that every gen ed category has a learning outcomes. And that some group could take that on and make recommendations. To have the learning outcomes defined and then some group could have some basis for developing assessment pieces and outcomes.

Rob: There is a preliminary task to determine which tasks have been done and by whom. We have as part of our charge what has been approved with respect to each competency. But all that will do is set which competencies are there. .

Jim; I move that the recommendation of the gen ed committee. Be brought before the FSSC for immediate action.

Motion.

The comments of the committee and VC Panofsky I believe that there is enough awareness of this issue that the FSSC can appropriately consider a path that they can take and be given an opportunity to do so and act on it quickly.

Susan: Just from historical A complete list of the committee members be stated and those cannot be done and submitted to the Senate by the next meeting.

Steering Committee shall report to the Senate, by the next December meeting. A committee or task force will be named the assessment something meeting. Specific committee, charges and reporting dates.

Elaine: It would be wise to forward the names of potential new members.

Rob: I have done that informally.

Amendment, Passed

Gerald Koot: A couple of things from the gen ed committee. You are comfortable with the general goals of each area of gen ed.

Rob Darst: We need to codify the various interpretations, etc. that have occurred over time.

Gerald Koot: What this committee is supposed to do is oversee assessment in these areas. The job would be to figure out

Dick Panofsky: We need a design of what the faculty wish and design the assessment plan. The implementation will be run by VC Panofsky and the office of research assessment.

Gerald Koot: What would this subcommittee do? Who is actually going to do this? Departments have a responsibility to assess. So who is going to do this?

Dick Panofsky: I would respectfully ask to invite to meet with the FSSC and discuss who would be good to serve on this committee. It is important.

Suzanne Scott: I would like to clarify that we are talking about the committee to have each of these learning goals.

Rob: A single group to come up with a proposal.

Suzanne: They are going to actually look at the way of assessing each. Will they oversee the process of how the assessment will be done.

Jim: It is the intent of the maker that the recommendation of the Gen Ed Committee be forwarded to the FSSC if they have need for additional information that will come from the recommendation from the FSSC.

Bal Ram Singh: One of the reasons I went on Gen Ed was because of this issue. I voted against the last meeting. I am not sure the gen ed committee could come up with that but I think it is a good idea for the FSSC to come up recommendations.

Phyllis Currier: I believe that this sub committee needs to define the parameters of the problem. It is a big problem to define the big picture, find the resources and then define the process. It is a big job. The members of this sub committee will require resources and support and this will be critical to this next initiative of Gen Ed assessment.

Elaine: This is going to be a big issue for us to discuss with the FSSC and the next meeting is in three weeks.

Susan LeClair: We do not have the luxury of waiting around to next year so if we don't formulate this so it begins by the end of December or the beginning of February.

Motion, seconded, carried.

Student Senate Issue: No one from student Senate

Motion to adjourn