FACULTY SENATE MEETING Minutes
November 28, 2018
3-5:00pm
Dion 115

Prepared by: Glaucia Silva
Members Present:

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

14GUESTS:
Kathy Carter, Interim Dean of CCB
Mohammad Karim, Provost
Karen Barnett, Assistant Dean of Nursing
Kimberly Christopher, Dean of Nursing
Terri Burton, Dean of Library

Jean VanderGheynst, Dean of Engineering
Pauline Entin, Dean of Arts and Sciences
Amy Shapiro, Carol Spencer-Monteiro, Craig Elkins, Chan Du, Robert Andrea, Yuegang Zuo, Shannon Finning,

1. Meeting was called to order at 3:01 pm by Mike Goodman

    Approval of minutes from October meeting—copies are distributed to those who want it. Vote called at 3:02pm. Shannon Jenkins (SJ) moves to approve, Chad McGuire seconds, all in favor.

2. President's Report (3:05-3:15pm)
    a. Appointment of Interim Senate Secretary: Professor Glaucia Silva
    b. SJ questions whether bylaws allow for steering committee to do interim appts. Subsequently, SJ nominates G. Silva as Senate secretary, seconded by Cathy Gardner. The nomination is approved.

3. Provost's Office Update: (3:15-3:30pm)—**ends at 3:10**
    a. 2-3 items to share. Retention/registration going to Spring. Every year we lose about 7% from Fall to Spring; have been actively reaching out to Deans so that they can work with Chairs/advisors/advising centers to reach out to students. Students that have PDB are contacted by the University Enrollment Center and the Bursar's Office to see what can be done to help bring their balances under $1000 so they can register for the Spring semester. At this point, about 14% of grad students (229/1566) and 17% of undergrads (1177/6649) have a PDB above $1000, which prevents them from registering.
    b. For Fall 2019: still too early, but a total of 3301 students have applied (up 8% from this point last year); completed applications are up 15.4% from last year (2221 now, 1924 in 2017). So far, 1056 sts have been admitted for Fall 2019 (up from 14 this time last year); many are early admits. Number of transfer applications is now 125 (up 6% from 118 last year).
    c. For Spring 2019, 107 freshmen have applied, up from 73 last year; 36 have been admitted (up from 27). The number for Spring transfers is down: 379 this year, 422 last year; 177 admits for SP 2019 (196 for SP 2018). However, deposits are up 13% from last year, at 113 now (100 last year). Mixed-bag news about enrollments.

4. Update from Holger Dippel (HD), Chief Information Officer and Associate Vice Chancellor for Information Technology (3:30-4pm)—**3:10-3:50**
    a. Concerns about faculty program and changes done over summer.

b. Open discussion: faculty laptops. April communications about how they would have larger drive, changed over summer due to budget. Negotiated to stay within $200k, so needed to reduce storage size. Remedy: faculty could request update, CITS would help with reducing space. CITS has honored 20 drive upgrade requests. Most new laptops have been picked up. CITS tried to have 3-year cycles, but there were problems in 2014-15; currently looking at whether they should stay in 3 or move to 4-year cycles, which might allow for more storage space. The idea is to have the machine with the drive ready when faculty pick it up.

c. Doug Roscoe asks whether One Drive could take files and store them in the cloud and not sit in computer. According to HD, yes, though it's more seamless in Windows than on Macs.

d. Beste Güçler (BG; Technology Committee) brings up issue of data security: a lot of data is secure, but would One Drive be the most ideal way of storing NSF data? BG indicates that there are ongoing conversations about security.

e. The Senate President (Mike Goodman, MG) asks how much more would be required to build larger drives (considering we are R1 university). According to HD, $50k. For research data there's ongoing discussion on what is feasible. CITS has not identified or been able to fund anything. Even cloud services would not be adequate for large research data. Upgrade to 512 GB.

f. C. McGuire notes CITS can provide clear guidelines as to what university-owned laptops do and don't do in terms of storing secure data. HD responds that there needs to be discussion on what is the best way to store that. C. McGuire notes that a strong resource for research would be to develop a real institutional resource, not just add computer space. BG mentions that issue includes getting the company to be accountable for breach; if not, faculty will not be comfortable using cloud.

g. David Manke mentions that there's been a decrease in storage space in the past 5 years, but some faculty need to keep data on computer. The problem was that changes were made without any discussion; in certain cases, space is more important than nice drive.

h. BG suggests that more depts can be represented in the Technology Committee, since several issues depend on faculty representation. Please contact Beste Güçler at bgucler@umassd.edu.

i. HD explains that decisions have to be made in the summer, when they get budget. If moving to 4-yr cycle, could get laptops in Spring and would communicate to Technology Committee. D. Manke points out communication can happen in the summer too; MG notes that there are ways of communicating with Senate to disseminate news.

j. D. Roscoe asks whether a committee that was to be formed a few years ago has moved forward. HD answers that they tried to put together a committee, but the group is not active yet. It will have students and other

representation besides faculty. MG reinforces request that Faculty Senate be notified about changes so that faculty can be involved.

k. About lock outs, HD explains they are sorting those out. They have to move to newer ==indication protocols.==

l. Stephen Witzig reiterates that timing was bad and any way to mitigate that is welcome. He has been told there is no solution for his issue (old iphone) other than getting new phone, can't get email on old phone. Automatically forwards email to Gmail, which may not be very secure. HD informs that they are researching the issue.

m. Still on issue of timing/notification, SJ states that all her emails prior to January 2016 were lost and have not been discovered. HD notes that this is a different issue (Zimbra migration to Outlook). SJ acknowledges but indicates that CITS can work with faculty for conversion issues. According to HD, there had been cases and email had been recovered, but prior Counsel only recommended keeping two years of email.

n. D. Manke brings up that something has never been made clear: **who** has access to our devices? HD explains that Microsoft provides access to institution depending on what one uses (native email app, e.g.). CITS could access email, but HD assures that don't. They do have the capacity to wipe everything (mail) on the phone if you use the native app. D. Manke asks if Microsoft would notify the university if someone was doing something illegal. HD answers that they wouldn't, and that CITS can't access anything else in someone's private device. D. Manke then asks whether students should be informed that the university may have access to their phone.

o. MG requests update on work with Counsel. HD clarifies that they have been working with UMass General Counsel re: accessibility/privilege. Although there have been a few cases of people abusing privilege, those employees have been terminated. Protocols are in place to find out whether an employee is abusing such privilege.

p. SJ raises a different issue: outdated classrooms such as AUD 007. Can a mobile solution be developed when system doesn't work? HD affirms that there is a mobile unit, but a case needs to be filed, and without a case filed, carting the mobile unit is often useless because, by the time it reached the classroom, class would be halfway through. According to HD, the only solution is to upgrade all the classrooms, but things happened in the summer that prevented upgrade. Adam Hausknecht notes that more routine checks in classrooms would help make sure everything is working. HD adds that all new classrooms can use wireless displays.

q. MG thanks HD for coming to meeting and engaging with faculty. Also notes that faculty might benefit from a document on one's expectations and rights, as well as disclosing or sharing what the university has the right to access. BG adds that CITS can disseminate processes for help as well.

5. Discussion of new and continuing business (3:30-4:00pm)—**3:51-4:36**
    a. Credit bearing status of UNV 101 (referred to UCC)
        1. Non-faculty teaching assignments; concerns about non-traditional admissions. Approved as US 1E. MG looked at syllabus, but course didn't seem to have a strong academic content, even though it's offered for 3 credits. Matter referred to UCC. Access is part of our history, College Now has been important in this process. Will meet with Jim Mullens.
        2. Ricardo Rosa questions if there a precedent for course to return to UCC after it has gone through all channels before. SJ states that most courses we teach are reviewed, faculty talk about what they do in their annual review. For courses that don't have dept homes, no one discusses what is going on. There's a broader category of courses without on-going faculty oversight. Faculty review allows for review of courses.
        3. Viviane Saleh-Hanna comments that faculty look at syllabi, but never touch content and asks if this new review applies only to courses for alternative admissions. MG notes that academic freedom is reserved for faculty, but all voices will be heard. When the Senate hears a concern, it's referred to College, but there's no affiliation in this case. V. Saleh-Hanna wants to make sure Senate and UCC are not singling out alternative admissions programs— we need to follow or create process. According to MG, process is being followed; the issue is that the course is not led by faculty.
        4. D. Roscoe reminds group that bylaws have a section that talks about curriculum changes. There may be some ambiguity, but if course is not seen as providing students with 3 credits worth of content, then we have the responsibility to look at it.
        5. Carol Spencer notes that College Now operates under CAS and would welcome opportunity to meet with UCC to discuss academic content in UNV 101. MG assures that the UCC will hear College Now.
        6. BG states that we should not only talk about curriculum but also assessment, and suggests that there be interaction between units and faculty, especially in light of issues such as retention.
        7. D. Manke asks whether College Now is reviewed by AQAD, which it is not, since AQADs are reserved for academic units.
        8. V. Saleh-Hanna asks if the Senate can look at where else on campus this occurs. MG assures that it can, and that mechanisms are in place for courses taught by faculty; maybe we need a discussion for cases of courses that are not housed in an academic dept.

b. Admissions policies for Navitas affiliated students (referred to Admissions Committee)
    1. Concerns about changes in language in proficiency requirement for admission. Conversations were had with Magali Carrera and Tesfay Meressi; matter has been referred to admissions committee.
    2. SJ asks if is Navitas offering a 0-credit UNV 101, and, if so, whether it will it be reviewed by UCC. D. Roscoe notes that non-credit courses should be approved by department.
c. Excused absence policy for student athletes (referred to SFAAC)
    1. Committee will be making proposal
d. Transition of the campus bookstore to fully online delivery of course materials
    1. There are issues with the website; faculty end up calling store. As to why request books via the bookstore, students can use financial aid in bookstore but not elsewhere.
e. SAT optional admissions policy change in CCB and CVPA
    1. SAT not particularly predictive, but decision had not been communicated to CCB and CVPA prior to implementation.
    2. Paul Bacdayan, chair of CCB Curriculum Committee, had not been informed of decision. Dean Carter asserts that emails were sent and that issue was discussed in faculty meetings and in and open meetings. Apparently, optional admissions were approved in 2015. Since the chair of CCB Curriculum Committee was not aware, communication was not as effective as it could have been.
    3. Kathy Miraglia asks how colleges were chosen. Bob Andrea (Enrollment Management) says that it was easier to introduce pilot program in those colleges. CON was not interested, neither was COE. CAS is too large. Conversations were had with deans.
    4. SJ points out that in 2015 those students would count as Category 4 admissions, but now it's not clear. Provost clarifies that they are Category 4, and at most 30-35 Cat 4 students can be admitted (according to DHE).
    5. MG reinforces that Senate is committed to making sure that communication with faculty happens; asks that Administration keep faculty in the loop before decisions are made and implemented.
    6. P. Bacdayan: financial issue is valid, but campus has history of bringing in students who are unprepared. Concern: what's the impact of this type of admission on student preparedness? MG restates that faculty need to be involved.
    7. V. Saleh-Hanna states that this is a two-fold conversation: history on one hand, research on the other showing that SAT is not

predictor of academic success. Our mission includes serving 1st generation students.

6. Action item (4:00-4:30pm)—**4:36**-**4:50**
    a. Proposal to Form an Ad Hoc Committee on Clinical Faculty and Professors of
       Practice

        1. *Proposed Charge: To identify and recommend best practices for defining the roles and responsibilities of clinical and "of practice" faculty, and related issues as appropriate. To report back to the full Senate no later than the March 2019 Senate meeting.*
    b. Discussion of the merits, size, composition, and methods of identifying members of the proposed committee
    c. D. Roscoe: motion to approve charge, Monika Shuler seconds. SJ suggests that depts submit volunteers. Several departments are interested. C. McGuire suggests that committee starts with people present who have shown interest, namely Nick Anguelov, Kathy Miraglia, Frank Scarano, Ted Powers.
    d. S. Witzig: committee needs to define how this type of position is different from PTLs and FTLs.
    e. MG will amend charge to reflect discussions during meeting.
    f. P. Bacdayan: people may want to know what problem we are trying to solve; would be useful to clarify.
    g. M. Shuler: what if the committee's conclusions are different from the role of clinical faculty in CON? MG states that the Faculty Senate's role is advisory, but it may be determined that the way it's done now doesn't align with best practices, in which case recommendation will be made to modify it accordingly.

7. Other Business – If needed (4:30-5:00pm)
    a. Will be working with Sandy to find a more congenial location for meetings in Spring.
    b. Senate meeting moved to December 11.
    c. Adjourns at **4:50**-Kathy Miraglia motions, Adam Hausknecht seconds.