

FACULTY SENATE MEETING Minutes

April 3rd, 2019

3-5:00pm

Lib 205

Prepared by: Glaucia Silva

Members Present:

	Present		Present		Present
Dilshod Achilov	X	Cathy Gardner	X	Kathy Miraglia	X
Scott Ahrtens		Michael Goodman	X	Kari Mofford	X
Nick Anguelov		Karen Gulbrandsen	X	Jose Mora	
Brian Ayotte	X	Adam Hausknecht		Ziddi Msangi	
Paul Bacdayan	X	Shannon Jenkins		Nancy O'Connor	X
Carlos Benavides		Arpita Joardar	X	Aminda O'Hare	
Jerry Blitefield	X	Shakhnoz Kayumova	X	Grant O'Rielly	X
Tom Boone		Guarav Khanna	X	Ricardo Rosa	
Michelle Bowers		Anna Klobucka	X	Doug Roscoe	
Eric Casero	X	Hilary Kraus	X	Frank Scarano	X
Cathy Curran	X	Susan Krumholz	X	Monika Schuler	X
Rob Darst	X	Wayne LeBlanc	X	Glaucia Silva	X
Ana Dempsey	X	Elizabeth Lehr	X	Amit Tandon	
Chris Eisenhart	X	Crystal Lubinsky	X	Iren Valova	
Gavin Fay		David Manke	X	Stephen Witzig	
Rebecca Flanagan		Chad McGuire	X	Marni Kellogg	
Jennifer Fugate		Cristina Mehrtens		Molly O'Brien	X

15 GUESTS:

Mohammad Karim, Provost

Kathy Carter, Interim Dean of CCB

Chan Du, Associate Dean of CCB

Terrance Burton, Dean of Library

Magali Carrera, Associate Provost

Tesfay Meressi, Associate Provost of Graduate Studies

David Gingerella, Vice Chancellor of A&F

Joanne Zanella-Litke, Ram Bala, Greg Walters, Elizabeth Hart, Shannon Finning, Lorraine

Heffernan, Matt Roy, Mike Lagrassa

FACULTY SENATE MEETING AGENDA

April 3, 2019, 3:00pm-5:00pm, LIB 206

- Call to Order - 3:00
- Update from the Student Course Rating Committee (3:00- 3:15pm): Professor Kenneth Manning
 - 6 members, faculty/admin
 - Follow through on 2009 charge in the CBA
 - Typical at UMD: paper form
 - “Student course evaluations are one of a number of useful indicators of teaching performance.” (on ppt)
 - Problems: gender, racial bias; instructor popularity rather than pedagogical approaches.
 - Committee looked at strengths and weaknesses in student course evaluations.
 - Committee believes that evaluations can be useful; doesn’t agree that data should not reported. However, these should be used with other tools, not the “be all, end all” of evaluation teaching.
 - Need to identify questions that address instructor classroom effectiveness, professionalism, and quality student interactions.
 - Committee has not finalized list to be recommended.
 - Key issue: delivery method (online x paper-based survey). Students generally don’t respond to online student evaluation, because there is no enforcement, which poses methodological problems. With paper, most students opt in (they fill it out). Paper provides robust response rate.
 - Committee will be wrapping up work in the next few weeks.
 - Chad McGuire: his online response rates are close to 80%; classes are all online; high response rates are possible.
 - Tom Boone: reverse coding of questions? KM: ultimately, that has to do with delivery method. TB: the committee could insist that reverse coding be done.
- Review and approval of minutes from February and March meetings (3:15-3:20)
- President’s Report - 3:20-3:25pm
 - All personnel cases went through.
 - CASA (Committee on Academic and Student Affairs) was unable to schedule a meeting that had a quorum; decided to skip it. This is unprecedented. We have to be concerned that if going around CASA becomes the norm; this could lead to an expedited vetting process without adequate academic oversight for any new programs offered by the online college being proposed by the President.
 - UMB pointed out failure of system to identify issues; e.g., UMB has graduate program in Business Analytics, Amherst also (other examples as well).
 - Was also informed that meeting with Meehan is being rescheduled (maybe 4/17 at 3 pm).
- Discussion of Proposed Honors College (3:25-4:00pm)
 - Presentation of proposal: Professor Catherine Gardner and Professor Brian Ayotte

- Why?
 - Transformative learning experience (not just more courses)
 - Attract, retain, graduate highly motivated students
 - Increased opportunity to offer broader and more consistent courses
 - Allow more flexibility in entering college (up to 60 credits x current 40)
 - How many students do we lose by being only campus in UMass system without an Honors college?
 - Act as a feeder for graduate programs
- What?
 - Provide creative, student-centered research community
 - Provide “incubator” for faculty to pilot a diverse selection of Honors courses
 - Approx. 24-credit curriculum
 - More resources/opportunities for student engagement in/out of classroom (can’t do much with current budget for program)
 - Powerful recruitment tool for high achieving faculty
 - Chad: lines wouldn’t be for college? BA: that is TBD
- How?
 - AY19-20: planning; AY20-21: launch; will work with Senate Honors Committee
 - Phases: 1 / 2/ 3
 - Budget: the expense budget includes existing budget, honors college fee, funds from net tuition. Even at full capacity, tuition is less than 5% of total tuition.
- Susan Krumholz: why can’t these changes be made within the program? CG: administrative resources not available; need to have faculty that will be properly employed to teach; can’t go on begging people to teach as overload. BA: recruitment issue. Talked to people anecdotally; different reputation than honors program.
- Shakhnoza Kayumova: aren’t we supposed to be providing more engaging education for all our students? If majority of students are not performing at the top of their level, it’s related to socioeconomic issues. What kinds of implication does an Honors college bring? BA: we want to challenge all students, so it’s unfair to top achieving students not to offer them the challenge that they need. CG: trip to Alabama: professor was able to interview and take photographs of Civil Rights leader, which will be used in regular history courses. Also, with a college, students can transfer up to 60 credits, giving opportunity to different students to get into Honors college.
- Grant O’Rielly: problems with numbers in budget (percentages; dollars). Joanne Zanella-Litke: total expense budget is bottom line; source of funds are the other 3 lines. CG: enrollment projections are conservative.

- Jerry Blitefield: will general student population be subsidizing this college. MG: to the extent that net tuition is used, yes. Joanne: tuition figures are those that Honors students are paying. MG: is it 100% self-sufficient? Joanne: if the tuition they are bringing in is that, then yes.
- Susan K: at Amherst, many students get tuition waivers, which would deplete the numbers. Joanne: that's what the 33% is on first line. Susan K: CAS doesn't get 100% of tuition, but rather small fraction. If CAS will still have to offer 75% of the courses, those numbers don't seem to make sense.
- MG: how are you going to persuade faculty to either teach overload or be redeployed?
- Chad M: the idea may be that new people will come, but we can't know until it's here. New students will create new resources. Don't see new faculty lines. Will people be redeployed for a part of the time? CG: that's a possible model (there are others). CM: at the beginning there is an ask. Provost: looking at other Honors colleges, faculty couldn't be tenured in that college. It has to be funded by buying people out. If a dept contributes heavily, that might mean they get a new line. The majority of tenured people have to stay in their primary college, but Honors college would pay for it. CM: the beginning: not stealing from Peter to pay Paul. MG: UCC was concerned about faculty and funds. One honors student relayed that they Honors program need to make classes harder. Concern about not delivering quality—UCC is concerned about moving forward without a bona fide commitment.
- Grant: cost of paying for lecturers to replace faculty is not in budget. BA: course replacements are included in the full budget. Ram B: college would offer new sections, but not only new sections.
- Cathy Curran: is this the most important college we need to create? College of Sciences proposal blew up because of political issues; would address concerns about sciences in CAS. Strategically, this doesn't seem to be the best college to create right now. Also, can they enroll in the college and not take honors course? BA: no, because they need to meet requirements. MG: not familiar with proposal for Natural Sciences college. CG: don't think that Honors college would detract from possibility of building another one.
- David Manke: students are admitted to Honors and another college? Answer: yes.
- Tom Boone: can non-honors take an honors class? CG: it has happened, but overall not ideal. TB: we lose some of our better students. Potential for retention? BA: yes, great part of projecting budget. Other universities have increased retention.
- Dean Burton: nothing in the proposal about library resources. That has to be addressed. MG: do you foresee new library needs? CG: we are focusing on research-oriented college. Ram B: not a degree program, so we shouldn't need anything new. Dean Burton: don't see us able to aptly support it at this time.

- Jerry B: fine with Honors college as long as it pays for itself. Part of problem: faculty. BA: if faculty have a chance to develop new approaches or learning objectives and bring back to their department, that would be positive.
- Susan K: interested in seeing curriculum as it comes up. CG: can't really speak about curriculum, because curriculum needs to follow process. Needs to be next step. Most of the 18 credits that we offer also meet university studies requirements. Good way for colleges with tight curriculum to meet those requirements.
- Grant: it appears the college is built around community engagement and service learning. BA: that is a component of one of the courses (community engagement research). Grant: one of the concerns students have is they do a separate project. CG: we can talk about HON 301, but we can discuss with faculty; there seems to be misunderstanding about course. MG: we are not discussing curriculum at this time.
- MG: UCC concern is that resources are made available to staff (teach). Recommendation would be to approve with UCC condition.
- Chad M: motion to recommend Honors College, subject to conditions mentioned by UCC, Tom Boone seconded. 11 in favor; 6 opposed with at least 3 abstentions . Motion carries.
- Update on the status of the "Bookstore" vendor procurement process (4:00-4:30pm)
 - Michael LaGrassa, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Administrative Services
 - Note about new responsibilities: all auxiliary services except for dining services (student affairs)
 - Follett contract expires 6/30/2019; extending to 12/31/2019. In regards to virtual bookstore, has asked for data about orders. Doesn't know if we will continue with it or not. Faculty and students need to be involved in process for next contract.
 - RFP development and evaluation team:
 - Faculty: one from CCB, one from biology
 - Student representation
 - Consultant (TBD)
 - Cathy Curran: will campus be allowed to submit a proposal to un-privatize and bring bookstore back to campus? LaGrassa: all options would be considered. MG: issue: timely delivery of needed materials. LaGrassa: what we will do in this process is to define what your current models are and try to come up with a model that will mitigate issues.
 - David Manke: process has become complicated for faculty. Why can't someone at the bookstore fill out the information? LaGrassa: can I call you to get more details about this situation? DM: just get the email that is sent out to every faculty member.
 - Chad M: we act as the ordering agent now. We have to order anew every time. Before efollett, we were in-house. Did we save money? LaGrassa: one of the reasons to change is that our in-house revenues were dropping and we didn't have

the resources to deliver online ordering. The cost of the operation would be approx. half million dollars.

- David Gingerella: one of the key things is that this is very complicated, only two major players (Follett and Barnes & Noble). Faculty ordering keeps costs down. Need a consultant because they understand the business. Very difficult to run in-house (Rentals, open source, etc.).
- MG: the current contract will be extended; we will have a revised contract by the end of the year (vendor can be changed or not).
- Other Business – If needed (4:30-5:00pm)
 - Minutes from last two meetings: Monika Schuler motions to approve; Susan K. second; motion passes.
 - Max from MASSPIRG: educate faculty on how to use OER. Grant program and workshops will be designed to help faculty to incorporate OER.
 - Crystal Lubinsky: announcement of event: symposium on Student and Worker Power on Campus (April 9). Will talk about social justice, racial justice, shared governance.
 - MG: final meeting of year is May 2nd, will be packed as usual.
 - Motion to adjourn: 4:36 pm.