Senate

College of Liberal Arts

March 28, 2016

**CC 3540**

2:30-4:00

**MINUTES**

**1. Approval of Agenda**

The agenda was approved unanimously.

**2. Approval of the minutes from Feb. 22, 2016**

Approved unanimously

**3. Moderator’s Report:**

* Moderator (Bonnie Miller) announced that she will be ending her term at the end of this academic year. Sari Edelstein (English Dept.) will take over as Moderator and Bonnie will work with her to make transition as smooth as possible.
* There are at-large seats open for next year.
* We need to constitute a new Senate Executive Committee, who basically act as advisors to the Moderator. Please think about it. We will solicit volunteers at the next meeting.
* There is also the question of whether we want to have a long-standing budget committee. We may indeed vote to constitute it, but if there are no nominations to fill it, it wouldn’t do much good. Please encourage your faculty to volunteer. Nominations for AY 2016-17 Senate committees will go out shortly.

**4. Dean’s Report:**

**The budget:** As was discussed before, the University remains deep in the red. Departments have offered to give back unused money, if it is possible. The good news is that the legislature came up with 10 million dollars for the UMass system. This money was part of a long-standing disagreement about wages and whether or not the state had paid them or not. Nonetheless, this chunk of money might not be as nice as it sounds because 7 million of that is tied to financial aid. It is difficult to tell how much there will be for the system, and it’s difficult to imagine that we can ask for more.

The Dean’s Council developed a budget committee that was originally created to consider the issue of chair compensation. So there was a planning committee for the FY16 budget. For the FY17 budget, the Provost’s Office thinks that we will have a 20 million deficit. That means that the first things that will get cut will be NTT sections. The Dean will reexamine the fall schedule and will be looking at the watch list very carefully. There will have to be some compromises. Right now, the Provost Office is implying that undergraduate classes that don’t enroll 12 students will have to be canceled, but the Dean doesn’t think this will always happen. The Dean has advised Chairs to be preemptive and think about making some changes, especially for those classes that are not as well enrolled. The anecdotal signs are that we are going to see higher enrollments. There seems to be a lot of interest in CLA courses. Also, this committee is looking to create multiyear budgets.

**REAB:**
Where’s REAB? Deans pushed back on it. So it seems that currently it is not going anywhere. There were good intentions, but trying to improve the situation of every department was simply not going to happen. From the Dean’s perspective, moving under REAB is probably never going to happen.

As far as the timeline for improving classrooms, one would hope it would happen this summer, but it remains unclear.

Another committee has been formed to deal with the future of the science building and plaza.

Question about enrollment: Enrollment minimums do not apply to CAPS classes. They have their own rules. There has been a move by A&F to take distinction away from CAPS and CLA, especially with how we handle NTT faculty. It is not clear what that means right now.

Question about grad enrollment programs: Do we have any clarity on financial packages for graduate students so that recruitment and admissions can go forward, especially since the graduate programs are seemingly being required to have a minimum number of 8 students in fall courses for them to run? This seems counterproductive.

What the dean recommends is to try to get as many students as you can, and go with status quo and hope that reason will prevail.

Question: What’s leading the deficit? Committee mentioned before that it is looking into that. It’s not the underfunding of union contracts and it’s not clear if it’s health care costs. In fact, it’s not clear to the Dean that it’s structural at all. He think that perhaps the investment in the buildings have not yielded as much as they had expected.

**5. Courses (Discussion began at 2:54pm, ended 3:11pm)**

Motions from the Academic Affairs Committee to approve the following New courses:

* AFRSTY 406
Approved unanimously.
* COMM 380

This would be a nice addition to their advanced level classes. The concentration would be on understanding the role of science and technology in the media. They do not have any 300 level classes right now. The iteration will be different each time it is taught. Approved unanimously.

* ECON 407
* ECON 413

Economics is repurposing the numbers because they are adding a capstone.
Move to treat them as a block. All in favor.
Approved unanimously.

* MLLC JAPAN 205

An expansion to Japanese offerings. Approved unanimously.

* LABCTR 221G

Approved unanimously.

* MUSIC 107
* MUSIC 108

Questions about the name/course description. Why can we not identify the course with a voice? Is this the right name? Is this gender inclusive?

There was a proposal to have a positive addition to both the course description in WISER as well as adding a course description to the syllabi.
There was a move to table the course because of significant questions. All in favor. Both courses TABLED.

* PHILLAW 260

This is a new course to CLA. Approved unanimously.

* PSYCH 131G
* RELSTY 272

Approved unanimously.
1. **Motions from the Academic Affairs Committee to approve the following to Changes courses:**
* COMM 205 (New number/ level change)
* COMM 270 (New name, description & pre-reqs)

Move to treat this as a block. All in favor.
Approved unanimously.

* ECON 420 (New name, description & pre-reqs)

Approved unanimously.

* LABCTR 210 (New name & description)
* LABCTR 220 (New number/ level change)
* LABCTR 325 (New name & description)
* LABCTR 330 (New name & description)
* LABCTR 405 (New name & description)

Move to treat as a block. All in favor.
Approved unanimously.

* MUSIC 101 (New course description)
* MUSIC 132 (New pre-reqs)

Approved unanimously.
1. **Motions from the Majors, Honors, Special Projects to approve the following proposals:**
* Approval of Applied Linguistics Certificate

Most students that go to school do not have the option of bilingual education. The problem is that because there’s no state licensure there are not many programs that train people to teach dual language. So this is the goal of the program. These consist of six courses that they already teach, but this is just packaged to make this into a certificate program.
Approved with unanimous secret ballot.

* Approval of History minor

History of science was approved with requirements already, but these do not reflect the current requirements.

Approved unanimously.

* Approval of Sociology Ph.D. revision of requirements.

Approved unanimously.

**8. By-Laws**

Moderator suggested that we should separate the bylaw discussion from the specific conversation about if and how the Senate should review course and program proposals. After we approve laws, we can go back and change procedures if we want. We also may need to look at the CLA constitution to see if changes need to be made if we change Senate procedures.

One big issue with the bylaws, the Moderator continued, is what to do with the budget committee. The Senate at several points thought about taking it out because it has not been constituted in over a decade. Should we keep it in? Should we constitute it now?

Also, should the Senate have some role in looking at new Centers/Institutes? It’s not clear which committee should take on that role. This should be clarified with the current bylaws.

**Question:** What should we call this committee? The actual name is currently Long Range Program Committee but in the bylaws it says specifically that it can look at budgetary issues. That’s why people referred to it as “the budget committee.” Idea was perhaps that it was not limited to budget, but looking at resources.

Someone responded: It’s not ever disadvantageous to have it, even if it’s dormant. No harm, no foul, especially given the context we are facing.

It should be constituted given the times we are facing.

**Question:** How was the budget committee run? What did it do?
**Response:** It is unclear. We do not have that institutional history. Committee could come up with their own procedures.

This budget would/could look at the CLA budget and would make recommendations about our budgetary priorities. The committee would have to figure this out.

**Question:** What about changing the name?

Several names were offered. The one that seemed to have the most support was budget and program review committee.

There was concern from the senators about overlap between MHSP and this new committee. Are we replicating duties or making the processes of approval of new programs even longer? It was pointed out that this was important because it meant that a program proposal with budget would have to go to both committees and this could potentially slow down its approval. It was agreed that the budget committee might look at proposals, if the MHSP asked it to, but would only be providing advisory feedback, not official approvals.

There was discussion about what this budget committee would do. Wouldn’t it be better for it to deal with Centers? Senators argued that if it did this, it would have to be advisory only (not required for approval).

**Question**: What is the distinctiveness between curricular and budget issues. Are they distinct?

Someone responded that perhaps the question for the committee should be about priorities and their recommendations for long term. They would review things that come into focus in a year, and then would report back on institutional trends. So they do not approve anything. They would just create a feedback loop with information. This relates to the discussion about meaning vs. rubberstamping. This person then said: “I do not see any reason for redundancy, but constituting this committee with some name and description, with large scale meaning would be great where we can evaluate trends. I like that.”

Given the discussion, it was proposed that we strike the last sentence of the current by-laws.

New document would then read: Proposal for name to be “The Budget and Planning Review committee.” It would have the charge: “This committee shall make recommendations to the Senate and the Dean regarding planning, programming and budgetary priorities.”

There was a motion to approve by laws. It was approved unanimously. No abstentions.

There was a motion to constitute budget planning review for next year. All in favor. No one against. Moderator then reminded us that we need people to volunteer. So she called for nominations and asked us to talk to our departments about it.

**9. Adjournment**. It was unanimous.

Minutes completed by Luis Jimenez, Political Science