

1. Approval of the Agenda

Unanimously approved

2. Approval of Minutes

Unanimously approved

3. Academic Master Plan Discussion (in place of Dean's Report)

University Administration is putting together a more strategic approach to program development and academic planning. The Dean's office is asking for faculty help in determining what this means. One of the main goals is clearing the backlog of revenue neutral programs that have yet to make it through governance as a result of the budget crisis. The University needs a review system for this and is asking faculty to help develop this mechanism. Feedback is due to the Dean's office by April 1st. We've been asked to focus on six major questions that will help make the framework for the AMP. So, we need to think about where we want to be and where we don't want to be in terms of our aspirational vision.

Moderator explains that there is potentially some language from the Mellon Grant that can help as this grant, which the Dean was involved in securing, explains how they are evaluating what constitutes "high impact humanities." Moderator reached out to Dean Terkla and Vice Provost Nixon, who both worked on this grant. They explained "high impact humanities" as courses/programs that incorporate: community engagement; project-based learning; applied elements and hands on learning; guest speakers in the classroom; innovative teaching methods; technology; immediate relevance to current issues.

Aspirational Vision Brainstorming:

- Make sure the urban mission and the university's role as a minority serving institution is central to this vision; the urban mission needs to be protected
- More attention to the urban mission in a global context – diversify curriculum to speak to global and local issues
- Increase in foreign language learning and strengthening of multi-lingual learning and support
- Make space for learning critical, cultural, and theoretical programs – not just revenue generating or market responsive programs
- Maintain commitment to teaching face-to-face and involving students in physical learning spaces and experiences
- Commitment to both funding and supporting graduate students; have money and resources to give students a well-rounded academic experience (we should be competitive in more than funding for TAs; support for the program itself and the cohort and resources that they need to flourish – dynamic intellectual community and mentoring)
- Make sure that the master plan meets the needs of students *and* faculty
- Protect valuable courses that have low enrollments (e.g. upper-level language courses)
- Co-operative enrollments both within *and* across departments (flexibility to run courses that don't mean minimum caps because we value those courses)
- Prioritize small class size
- Prioritize faculty contact and mentorship with students

- Move to four credit classes to create a more manageable full-time status for students (which will help with timely graduation)
- Student success shouldn't be defined singularly – recognize that different students will evince success differently, especially in terms of time to degree
- Commitment to improving on-campus technology resources for teaching and learning – upgrading of technology in classrooms (increase number of Tech 2 rooms; more innovative classroom spaces like TEAL)
- Reduced parking fees – accessibility for students; need to make a space for students to be part of the community (which ties into retention)
- Develop a proactive vision to respond to parking crisis – e.g. offering more one and two day a week classes

Ideas for Evaluation Process and Criteria

- Evaluation should not be based on whims of administrators and their particular visions; process must ensure that new programs are evaluated according to a clear set of criteria
- New programs should reflect current research in a given field – engage with the changing shape of a particular discipline
- Programs should have a rigorous curriculum with clear, progressive path (sequence of courses that build on each other in terms of content and/or skills)
- Programs should be evaluated in the context of the UMass system – new programs should consider what they offer/are doing differently that will draw students to this school? New programs should be unique programs and speak to specific campus strengths
- At the same time, this emphasis on unique programming within the system should not be used as an excuse to defund or close programs that are central to a Liberal Arts Education even if they exist on other campuses; we maintain the right to offer core programs, even if they are unenrolled
- New programs should demonstrate student demand
- Programs should be evaluated in the context of CLA – is there overlap? How will the new program impact existing programs? Will it cannibalize students from existing departments? Will it produce redundancy and repetitiveness?

Comments about the Mellon Grant and department priorities

- Submission to Mellon is happening before department review. New Mellon courses are approved without department input – not clear how they fit into existing curriculum
- Current courses are being cancelled while the Mellon is pushing new ones
 - Moderator pointed out that here is a mechanism for involving the department, but it might vary in terms of how departments are approaching the grant

Will return to these points in March meeting – will send notes out with minutes and talk more about these before submitting the feedback by April 1st.

4. Visit from Bill Kiernan, Chair of the UMass Boston Center and Institute Taskforce and Provost McDermott

BK outlines the process for the Taskforce: The taskforce (TF) has focused on three areas; definitions, funding, and evaluation. TF comprised of 15 people – 5 from C&I; 5 administrators; 5 faculty who have grant money but do not work through C&I. TF set up three listening sessions to gather information from faculty and interested persons. About 54 at 1st; 36 at 2nd; 3rd to be

scheduled. At the 1st session – about 2/3 signed up to make a statement – either a verbal statement or pass something in (3mins). Some additional commentary has been sent through the webpage; people can enter comments on one of three areas. The website also has a fourth option for feedback outside of the three areas and will be available for about three weeks. The website has already generated some response from people outside the campus. The TF is now looking for consistent themes (waiting for third session to see what these are). Their report to the Provost is due 3/20. All meetings for the TF are online; there have been 8 so far with 6 more to come. The TF has three subcommittees based on the three areas. Some members of the subcommittees aren't on the TF. The subcommittees are meeting over the next three weeks. The TF also did some content analysis at the formation of the TF; they looked at 18 HE institutions that had robust system for working with C&Is around these three issues. Subcommittees are also looking at these examples.

Question: What have you learned to date?

BK: TF has received around 60 comments, most of which describe what C&Is are doing at UMB; what they are proud of; and what challenges they face. The TF is now in the process of digesting this feedback and content analysis to frame the issues and create the report. The TF plans to hold an open town meeting before submission of the report to go over what the TF has found.

Provost: General background: In developing budget reduction strategies her office began looking at C&Is. Of the 54 on campus they focused in on 17 that had been receiving support from state resources of \$60,000 or more with the goal of finding ways to bring them into a more self-supporting model. Best practice is generally thought to be that C&Is are, to some degree at least, self-supporting through grants etc. These C&Is were put on glide paths towards becoming self-supporting. Not all C&Is will have the goal of being fully self-sufficient – some have such a value to the institution that they won't have this goal. The TF is re-defining zero. There are a variety of models for how to make C&Is sustainable, and the TF is looking to figure out what these might be.

BK: TF is looking to see what the glide path(s) will look like for each institute. They may be uniform or different depending on the C&I. TF is establishing guidelines for who should have to support themselves and to what extent. TF is looking at all C&Is and trying to establish some baseline. Different activities (pure or applied research; policy; training and mentorship etc.) will be considered in determining a glide path – what is core to the C&I and what is core to the university, for example.

Provost: The TF is also developing guidelines for how budgets should work – e.g. what to do if the director of a C&I is a tenured faculty member; how should their salary be budgeted in relation to home department and the C&I (e.g. have directors teach in departments and have the faculty member run the C&I as research and service). The TF is in the process of rationalizing ways that costs have been debited and credited.

Question: To some extent, the issue of budgets is a red herring since we're carrying legacy debt and incredibly high interest. The budgets for C&Is seem very small in comparison to this legacy debt, which is what we should be focusing on getting rid of. Given this, why is the general principle of self-sufficiency the best practice, especially since C&Is do different kinds of work?

Provost: The basic premise has been that research institutes are vehicles by which we can bring in external funding in order to conduct more research than we would through individual faculty members doing basic scholarly activities. The basic premise has always been that they should be striving for self-sufficiency. We might give them seed money, but they should be moving towards self-sufficiency.

Question: How much is the TF learning about the real funding landscape for the C&Is you're looking at? Not all C&Is are equally able to find external funding – some don't have predefined funding streams. How can we find funding with the staff cuts? What about C&Is that are not purely research oriented? Will any be given a cushion or leeway given this?

Provost: TF is specially tasked with identifying types of funding options and sources. They should be giving advice to the C&Is and be making resources available, so they know where to go for support. The Chancellor has committed the new Advancement Office to working with foundations to try and get advancement opportunities for C&Is (donations). We are hoping to tie the upward trajectory of advancement (big increase in donations \$1.5 – \$22.5 million from last AY to this) to supporting C&Is.

BK: The TF has heard through listening that people are trying hard for funding, but they don't have much support. The TF has realized the need for backup and support for helping people work on budgets; leaders of C&Is might not have these skills. C&Is also need to have multiple plans given the changeability of funding like this (often tied to politics). This is hard to do with cut backs in staff; the TF is thinking about this as well as how people with shared areas of interests might work together and pool resources.

Question: Race and ethnicity C&Is ensure student success in ways that aren't quantifiable. Please clarify if there is money earmarked from the state that we won't use to keep these C&Is open. And, if there aren't earmarks, where and how will the university continue to support these services to keep up with the urban mission?

Provost: There were earmarks back in time. If there are existing earmarks we will honor them, but over time the original earmarks stopped being earmarked and the legislator joined them into the general budget. As costs went up, the university wasn't always able to give this money to the C&Is. The legislature asked us to either restore last year's funding to the C&Is without giving us more in the budget or make a compelling case why we shouldn't. We chose the latter option since we'd taken \$700,000 out of the budget for C&Is, and if we gave it back it would have to be cut from other places, including other student services and programs that serve the whole campus.

Question: Why were the earmarks lost?

Provost: In some cases, the legislator gave earmarks for a number of years and then stops. In some cases, the administration talked with C&Is and talked them into giving up earmarks.

BK: The rule of thumb is that earmarks are short term money for 2-4 years, responding to a need. Usually they aren't in perpetuity.

Provost: In 1982 we had an earmark for a football team based on the purchase of Boston State College – the legislature gave an earmark for the football team, but only for a couple of years. When the earmark ended, we cut the football team.

Question: Please recognize that the C&Is bring a value to our campus and a commitment to the urban mission that may not always produce revenue, but is central nonetheless. This needs to be protected.

5. Moderator's Report

Mount Ida: Business analytics and Nursing programs will now be offered at Mount Ida, despite the statement that the campus won't offer new programs that would compete with those already in Boston. There is an Emergency BOT meeting on 2/14; no one knows what is being discussed but the FSU is attending to protest what is happening at Mount Ida. Faculty Council is

looking into UMass System Bylaws to see if there is language to prevent setting up competing programs in the vicinity. Kathleen Newman is also looking at building consortiums of some kind with other Boston schools to protect against this.

Raise in course caps: If your department is being asked to raise course caps, please email Sari and the FSU. This seems to have happened in multiple departments, and we are trying to get clarification around what happened.

Frustrations with the Mellon: If faculty have concerns or ideas about the administration of the Mellon Grant, please email Bonnie and Betsy directly; they're looking for ways to work with, not against, departments and are open to suggestions.

5. Motions from the Academic Affairs Committee to approve the following NEW courses:

Recap of new protocol – vote on all as a block unless there are concerns.

New courses: ANTH 268; CINE 355; CLASSIC 233L; PHIL 377; RELSTY 312

Questions: No questions

Motion to approve as a block: Unanimously approved

6. Motions from the Majors, Honors and Special Programs Committee to approve the following CHANGES to courses:

Changes to courses: PHIL 299; PORT 375L; PSYCH 255; SOC 101; SOC 230; SOC 311; SOC 342; SOC 375; SOC 382

Questions: No questions

Motion to approve as a block: Unanimously approved

7. Further discussion of C&I Q&A

Senators expressed concern that the visit from Bill Kiernan and the Provost was too focused on explaining the process and didn't give enough time to faculty for asking questions. Many key concerns remain unanswered. The question of earmarks is still unclear; what happened historically? Where is the once earmarked money going? If it's been filtered into other student services, the administration isn't seeing the work that the C&Is do to provide support and community for the students that are the core of UMB's mission. This is especially true for C&Is focused on race and ethnicity as money is taken from these and put towards other general student services.

Senators were frustrated that BK seemed unhappy that people didn't follow the protocol and agenda that the TF setup; this was because most participants didn't agree with the three areas that the TF agenda laid out. BK also failed to address the letters that have been sent out to the heads of the C&Is about the plans for cuts to salary and budget.

8. Meeting adjourned: 3:55pm