Senate

College of Liberal Arts

November 21, 2016

**CC 3540**

2:30-4:00

**MINUTES**

1. Approval of Agenda
* The meeting was called to order at 2:34 pm
* The agenda was approved unanimously at 2:34 pm.
1. Approval of the minutes from October 17, 2016
* The October 2016 minutes were approved unanimously at 2:35 pm.
1. Moderator’s Report
* AAC approved all courses submitted prior to October 15, which the SEC reviewed at its most recent meeting.
* Kelly Ahearn: all courses are entered into a spreadsheet to track when they are submitted to her, and when they are forwarded to the next step (as in: sent for diversity/distribution review, AAC) in the course approval process. This spreadsheet is available to the AAC, and can be shared with the Senate.
* Kelly Ahearn: Courses must be carefully annotated to indicate whether it is either distribution/diversity/new/change – ensures that courses are forwarded to the appropriate review body in a timely fashion.
* Moderator’s report was completed at 2:38 pm.

*The Dean arrived at the meeting at 2:44, which is when the Dean’s report began. Until the Dean’s arrival the Senate proceeded with reviewing/approving courses (Agenda item 5).*

1. Dean’s Report
* Report regarding budget began at 2:44 pm.
	+ Implementing the recommendations from the University Committee on Budgeting
	+ Extent of the deficit is unclear: may have fallen from approximately $30M by $8-12M since the Chancellor’s email to the university on Nov. 10, 2016
	+ A deficit of $3M may be acceptable; thus not requiring a balanced budget
	+ Still need to find savings for an additional $5M; would appreciate any input on how this may be achieved
* Report/discussion regarding 2-2 accountability began at 2:46 pm.
	+ Meeting with Union on Nov 28; not sure of the reason for the meeting. If this becomes an issue that must be bargained at contract negotiations, will just pass it up the chain.
	+ Will not affect many faculty right now, or for the next 3 years.

Question/Comment from a Senator (QS): How can it only affect a few people? And, what about interpersonal problems within departments?

DEAN: Does not see this as being any different from the tenure and promotion discussions within departments. Departments have to do this sort of review of colleagues anyway.

Based on the AFRs, does not see that the need for accountability will affect many people based on department-level determination of productivity.

Other colleges are looking to us. Provost is requiring us to have this in place or we may lose the 2-2. We should be concerned that this will come from further up the chain, and it is better for us to have a policy in place rather than have one forced on the college.

QS: Which colleges are we being compared to?

DEAN: CSM does not have anything in place. CN is much more heavy handed, and requires publication in specific journals, etc. CHED is moving in this direction, but does not have 2-2 yet. CM/MGS teaching load is unclear. Definitely not comparing the CLA to other institutions.

Due to the manner in which our contracts are structured, we have a 3-3 teaching load and this is really an issue of CLRs.

QS: Not similar to the process of tenure and promotion because there is much more oversight of those processes.

DEAN: The Dean’s Office is really the only body that shifts faculty back to a 3-3 load. So departments cannot behave punitively.

PMYR cannot serve in place of the 2-2 accountability as it has its own purpose. PMYR has no teeth; merely sets up a faculty development plan if research productivity is considered to be low.

QS: Teaching should not be viewed as punitive.

DEAN: Agrees, would like to see this to be voluntary. That is, would the faculty agree to take on more teaching as a means of not having to do the research. Very relevant to what could/should have been put in place at the time of the merger with Boston State College.

QS: Suppose someone moves to 2/3 or 3/3. Does this mean that an NTT individual loses a section?

DEAN: Yes, probably. But not at the expense of continuing contract NTTs.

DEAN: The absence of scholarship would necessitate a shift back to the higher teaching load.

QS: What about service as a substitute for research?

DEAN: Yes, DPCs should take significant service contributions into account. In the instance that the DPCs don’t value the service, then the Dean’s Office will be take it into account.

QS: More information about the individual/personal circumstances: unusually high teaching load, with higher number of students, higher service (AQUAD, for example)

DEAN: Will also include unexpected family commitments, emergencies, etc.

QS: What about adding more information/examples to the “individual circumstances” in the statement?

DEAN: More detail can be a problem, because it can actually limit what counts in this category. Would like to see it remain as open ended as possible.

QS: Yes, we discussed this in our department meeting. Prefer the ambiguity.

QS: Shifts in the higher administration will allow for much more interference in this process over time, in terms of shifting expectations.

DEAN: You are vulnerable to this right now. Provost can change us back to 2-3/3-3 right now. The accountability statement may help prevent this.

QS: Once the policy is in place the ambiguity embedded in the statement allows for an expansion of our overall commitments.

DEAN: The pressuring of oneself is really the only way that this could be managed in a manner that negatively impacts a majority of the department. This would only happen if the DPC/majority of the department agreed to have a higher expectation of research productivity. Therefore, the departments will maintain control anyway.

QS: Would it create a two-tiered culture in the departments? Those who teach and those who do research. We really need an overhaul that implements a 2-2 rather than a 3-3 policy across campus.

DEAN: This is really an implicit versus explicit expectations issues. Even if have an explicit 2-2 policy, the evaluation process is still going to be determined by the individual departments.

Politically, it is not reasonable to expect (at the legislature) that we could move to a 2-2. It is expected that this would affect funding to the university.

QS: This raises issue of punishment v reward (in terms of merit).

DEAN: This is really a department issue in terms of what is valued. Better to allow such faculty to teach 3-3 and earn merit that way, rather than teach 2-2 and then be penalized by not meeting the research standards for merit.

QS: Departments may need to alter the merit process due to this, as the teaching commitment is much larger for some (junior) faculty. How can we prevent a DPC being punitive in these circumstances?

DEAN: Hopefully departments will not be so punitive in their judgement of research productivity when an individual is teaching a higher load (even in terms of number of students).

QS: Probably shouldn’t change these processes before the departments figure out these details. Therefore, managing this at the individual department level requires the ambiguity.

DEAN: Each department is already managing these issues.

QS: What is the expected timeline for when this will be implemented?

DEAN: It is possible that the implementation will begin in Spring 2017.

QS: Opinion on the change in the political climate particularly in regard to our diverse/vulnerable student body, as well as the instruction of sensitive material.

DEAN: Was expecting the Chancellor’s Office to issue a statement to the university that addressed these concerns. There have been only a few minor instances of the current political climate being used in a disparaging manner in class.

The Dean cannot issue a statement on this to CLA students.

QS: How will the changes in the political climate affect the university? Will this lead to UMass Boston being compared to other universities, nationally?

DEAN: Does not expect that any accountability of the university will be determined at the federal level. However, expects to see the shift in accountability towards one based on an accreditation process. Does not expect that this will have any impact on the academic freedoms of faculty.

QS: What happens when students report that there are anti-Trump issues being discussed in class?

DEAN: This may be brought to the attention of Department Chairs. The campus must be cognizant of addressing the concerns of undocumented students on campus, who had come out of the shadows but they are now not sure how they will be affected.

QS: Can the CLA articulate a policy that supports the instruction of sensitive information?

DEAN: Absolutely, can have it start in the Senate.

* Dean’s report was completed at 3:30 pm.

*The Dean arrived at the meeting at 2:44, which is when the Dean’s report began. Until the Dean’s arrival the Senate proceeded with reviewing/approving courses (Agenda item 5).*

1. Motions from the Academic Affairs Committee to approve the following New courses:
* Course approval discussions began at 2:39 pm.
* ART212L
* Cross listed with Asian studies
* Course approved unanimously at 2:40 pm
* ART370
* CINE320
* Both courses are part of the Cinema Studies minor, and should have been in the associated collection of courses discussed at the October CLA Senate meeting.

QS: Course description contains the term “auteur theory”, will students understand the term?

Yes, students are coming into these courses with sufficient knowledge from the pre-requisites to understand/recognize the term.

* Motion presented to approve the ART & CINE courses as a block.
* Motion to approve the courses as a block passed unanimously
* Course approved unanimously at 2:43 pm.
* ENG303
* ENG436
* ENG444
* These courses are serving the growing interest in the Creative Writing minor, as well as general interest in this area of study.
* Motion presented to approve the ENG courses as a block.
* Motion to approve the courses as a block passed unanimously
* Course approved unanimously at 3:31 pm.
* MUSIC109
* Course approved unanimously at 3:33 pm.
* RELSTY227
* Course was incorrectly placed on the agenda, as it was approved in Spring 2016.
* WGS227G
	+ Cross listed with Asian studies
* WGS268
* Motion presented to approve the WGS courses as a block.
* Motion to approve the courses as a block passed unanimously
* Course approved unanimously at 3:34 pm.
1. Motions from the Academic Affairs Committee to approve the following CHANGES to courses:
* ANTH317/617 Dual Listing & pre-reqs
* ANTH346/646 Dual Listing & pre-reqs
* ANTH349/649 Dual Listing & pre-reqs
* ANTH353/653 Dual Listing & pre-reqs
* ANTH358/658 Dual Listing & pre-reqs
* ANTH365/679 Dual Listing & pre-reqs
* ANTH/HIS/LABOR210L Cross-listing
* These courses are being renumbered so as to make them consistent with courses that count as graduate credit, for the new Public Anthropology MA program.

QS: Concerned about the pressure that is being passed down in terms of the growing trend to cross list courses at the graduate level. Cross-listing some of these courses does impact pedagogy as the undergrads may not be able to cover the readings. That is, undergraduate students being pushed to do more than is realistically feasible. As well as graduate students taking courses that are below what would typically be considered graduate level courses.

A: Yes, this is driven by the complication that as a new program it may not be able to meet enrolment requirements for graduate-only classes.

QS: The concern is also being raised in many departments. Some departments have been much more careful in which courses count at the undergraduate and graduate level, and are very selective in allowing undergraduate students to take the 400-level course.

A: Yes, our department envisions many of these courses as a transition course for the better undergraduate students.

Following discussion was not specific to these courses

QS: Will the current graduate student enrollment cap be raised? Shouldn’t the high enrollment undergraduate courses mitigate the problem with low enrollment with the graduate courses?

* This has implications for the shift to 2-2, as the move is supposed to be budget neutral. This may have to be evaluated by the Senate.

QS: Enrollment pressures are driving a number of policies that are watering down the integrity of the academic programs; such as the push to allow 300-level courses to count as capstones.

* The Senate could plan to discuss this in more detail in the Spring.

QS: Possible solution: allow graduate students to take 400-level courses at the discretion of the instructor, with the expectation of doing extra work.

* Motion presented to approve the ANTH courses changes as a block.
* Motion to approve the courses as a block passed unanimously
* Course changes approved unanimously at 3:48 pm.
* COMM490 Pre-req and from P/F to graded
* Increased the GPA requirement, and changed the requirements for completing the internship.
* Course changes approved unanimously at 3:49 pm.
* HIS/ASIAN115L Description change
* Course changes approved unanimously at 3:49 pm.
* LABOR230 Name & Description change
* LABOR315 Name & Description change
* Motion presented to approve the LABOR courses changes as a block.
* Motion to approve the courses as a block passed unanimously
* Course changes approved unanimously at 3:50 pm.
* MUSIC101 Credit change
* MUSIC102 Credit change
* MUSIC104 Credit change
* MUSIC106 Credit change
* Motion presented to approve the MUSIC courses changes as a block.
* Motion to approve the courses as a block passed unanimously
* Course changes approved unanimously at 3:50 pm.
1. Motions from the Majors, Honors and Special Programs Committee to approve:
* History Major and Minor changes
* Change to the History Major and Minor approved unanimously at 3:51 pm.
1. 2:2 Productivity Policy
* Moderator: There have been a number of suggestions for improving the accountability policy, which were included in the document shared with the Senate.
* Seeking volunteers for a small (3-member) committee to redraft the statement to be passed on to the Dean’s Office.
1. Faculty Statement
* Expect to discuss the statement at the Senate meeting in December after the Budget Planning and Review Committee updates the statement.
1. Individual Majors (Emily Wiemers from MHSP)
* Not discussed. Will be added to the agenda for the Senate meeting in December.
1. New Business
* CLA policy/statement on the instruction of sensitive material. Following from this issue being raised during the Dean’s report, Senators decided to move forward with drafting such a statement and that it will be discussed in the Senate in the near future. Senators interested in contributing to the draft should contact the Senate moderator who will create an adhoc committee to handle this task.
	+ One suggestion from the Senate is that this statement takes the form of the paragraph/section that can be added to syllabi.

Meeting adjourned at 3:56 pm