



University of Massachusetts
Boston
100 Morrissey Blvd.
Boston, MA 02125-3393

University Governance
Faculty Council
https://www.umb.edu/faculty_staff/faculty_council
Monday, September 13, 2021
1:30-3:30
Zoom Webinar

Minutes for September 13, 2021

Members present: Lillian-Yvonne Bertram (CLA); Kui Du (CM); Sommer Forrester (CLA); Priscilla Gazarian (CNHS); Margaret Hart (CLA); Maria John (CLA); Werner Kunz (CM); Sharon Lamb (CEHD); Lusa Lo (CEHD); Kibibi Mack-Shelton (CLA); Jeffrey Melnick (CLA); Pamela Nadash (MGS); Dimity Peter (CEHD); Neil Reilly (CSM); Heike Schotten (CLA); Eduardo Siqueira (HONORS); Eve Sorum (CLA); Robert Stevenson (CSM); Betsy Sweet (CLA); Michael Tlusty (SFE); Phil Troped (CNHS); Kiran Verma (CM); Roberta Wollons (CLA); Kevin Wozniak (CLA); Kai Zou (CNHS)

Members absent: Matthew Bell (CSM); Joel Fish (CSM)

Representatives present: Marlene Kim (Representative to the BoT); Michael Mahan (PSU); Steve Striffler (CLA)

Representatives absent: Undergraduate Student Government (TBD); Graduate Student Assembly (TBD)

Ex Officio members present: Joe Berger (Provost)

Ex Officio members absent: Marcelo Suárez-Orozco (Chancellor)

I. Approval of the Agenda

Vote: Voice vote.

Approved unanimously.

II. Motion to approve the May minutes

Vote: Voice vote.

Approved unanimously.

III. Chair's Comments

- The Chair welcomed all members and guests back. She reminded FC members and guests about the logistics of Zoom webinars. An FC Rep. asked for an explanation of why it was decided that FC meetings be kept remote. The Chair explained that several FC members voiced their concern over being in person, so the Ex. Com. made the decision.

IV. Reports – 5 mins each

a. Chancellor – Marcelo Suárez-Orozco

ABSENT. The Provost noted that he would be offering a report on behalf of himself and the Chancellor.

b. Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs – Joseph Berger

- The Provost began his remarks by welcoming back the campus community and noting the importance of the wellbeing, mental health and safety of all during this pandemic. He provided an update on the current state of the University and COVID-19. He noted that in Massachusetts universities, the case numbers are lower than the general public and noted that while the campus has some positive cases at this time, the number is small and the University has all necessary precautions in place and continues to abide by all CDC guidelines.
- The University continues to monitor the positive case numbers on campus and in the area, as well as the outcomes and impacts of those cases in addition to the ever changing federal guidance in order to manage the campus environment safely. He noted that the vaccine mandate was one of the most important things to do, along with masking and air filtration, at mitigating COVID-19 and the variants. He informed the FC that 98% of the student body is vaccinated and soon they will be at 100% in the next forty-eight hours because unvaccinated students will be dropped from their classes. He also noted that 85% of benefited staff are vaccinated and that they expect that number to grow as they gather additional information. The Provost reported that they were able to approve over 70% of requests from faculty to teach remotely. He explained that if there is a situation where the University needs to shift to a remote modality, they hope it will be for weeks at a time instead of the entire semester. He also stressed that this may be the University's future when it comes to COVID-19. He looks forward to collaborative learning from one another at large and when it comes to policies surrounding the impact of COVID-19.
- The Provost reported that UMass Boston received fifteen million dollars for the College of Nursing.
- The University is launching a strategic and master planning process. They want this to be expansive and include the campus community at large. The Provost wants to have key representative members of the community and they will be having a kickoff meeting on 9/28 to hear from all about this process and what the next phase will be in the development of the University.
- There is a Dean search in the College of Management going on and the searches for the Deans of College of Nursing and Health Science, College of Education and Human Development, and the Library will launch in the next few weeks.

- A new program for grants will be launching along with Curriculog and Beacon Flex. The Provost will also be working on various joint initiatives with the FC, including the Alternate Scheduling plan.

DISCUSSION:

An FC Rep. asked if there was a percentage of those in the exemption category for vaccines, and the Provost responded about .5% were approved for this exemption. An FC member asked about what will happen with faculty and staff who refuse to get vaccinated and the Provost offered clarity that students enrolled in face-to-face classes would be un-enrolled in a timely manner and that faculty and staff will be furloughed.

An attendee asked if faculty would be notified of students in their classes who are exempt from vaccination. The Provost responded that faculty will be notified if a student tests positive or is exposed based on vaccination status. UHS will reach out to the instructors and students in the class to offer specific guidance.

An FC member wanted to note that some of the questions on the FAQ dashboard have not been updated and still states that the reason we aren't doing testing is because we are still remote. .

An FC member asked if they should still report a positive test of a student even if the class is online and the Provost responded that they should because some students are taking classes online and in person.

An FC member asked if they could refuse to instruct or have a student in their class if they weren't vaccinated and the Provost re-iterated the small percentage of students who have been given an exemption and that as a University, we respect all beliefs.

An audience member asked if there are any plans to do mandatory testing on campus and the Provost responded that this is not required or needed due to the highly vaccinated population.

An FC member asked about the McCormack Graduate School Dean search and the Provost responded that this would get underway next semester and there would be an Interim in the meantime.

An FC member asked about the threshold for switching to remote and the Provost responded that there is no one set number and it would be based on a number of things, such as hospitalizations, community cases, severity of cases. He reminded the FC that they will and have put health and safety first.

An FC member asked about the language that was given out about being instructed by the Provost's Office to call campus security if a student is not wearing a mask. The FC member was worried about the language being used and if this could be addressed. The Provost noted that he appreciates the concern and agrees that they could use a more nuanced set of guidance and instruction and take a more constructive approach. He indicated that his office is working on writing new, modified guidance.

c. Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance – Kathleen Kirleis

- SEE APPENDIX.

DISCUSSION:

An FC member asked if there will be masks given out on the shuttle buses or on campus in case students don't have one. The Vice Chancellor responded that there are masks on the shuttle buses, as well as at the front desk in the Campus Center and in vending machines in the West Garage.

An FC Rep. asked about the vents in the dining halls and if there were any plans to change those more often due to it being such a high-volume area and the Vice Chancellor responded that she will look into it this but also noted that they have been working with Sodexo to keep all health and safety as a priority.

An FC Rep. asked for a reminder about the state budget and the Vice Chancellor responded that they are level funded and noted there is additional money coming to the University that will be above budget. The Vice Chancellor responded that there is a four million dollar package for the mental health needs of students.

An FC member asked about the BU professor who fell through the stairs at the JFK/UMASS MBTA stop and died. They wondered if there were any plans for updating the safety of that T-stop and the Vice Chancellor reported that they have been trying to work with the MBTA for some time on this.

An FC member asked about the deadline for the emergency aid for students. The Vice Chancellor offered some clarity on this and stated that the committee would communicate to students directly. The Provost responded with additional clarity.

d. Faculty Representative to the Board of Trustees – Marlene Kim

- There was a special BoT meeting regarding the donations to the UMass Boston System, particularly the donations for UMass Medical School and UMass Boston's Nursing program. The Rep. noted that the various programs had name changes in the donors' honor that were approved by the BoT. SEE APPENDIX.
- The Rep. reported that both the FSU President and FC Chair presented public remarks at the June BoT meeting criticizing the Bayside development plan and asked to include those remarks in the minutes of today's meeting. SEE APPENDIX.

di. Representative from the Faculty Staff Union – Steve Striffler

- The Rep. offered a report and update of how the sister campus, UMass Amherst, has been handling their COVID-19 guidelines. After cancelling a tailgating event, the student body issued a statement against UMass Amherst for their contradictory guidelines and safety precautions when it comes to COVID-19 protocols. It was noted that this is the first time the UMass system admitted that vaccines and masking mandates may not be enough. The Rep. noted that UMass Boston's administration has not admitted this and read a faculty statement on the matter. SEE APPENDIX.

dii. Representative from the Professional Staff Union – Michael Mahan

- SEE APPENDIX.

- g. Representative from the Graduate Student Assembly – TBD/none
- h. Representative from the Undergraduate Student Government – TBD/none

V. Report from General Education Committee

- SEE APPENDIX.

VI. Discipline & Grievance Committee report

- SEE APPENDIX

DISCUSSION:

The Rep. reported on the Committee’s job involving academic integrity of student work and how there has not been a change in the hearing of the cases, but now the Committee reports to the Provost’s Office.

The Provost clarified that their office is not changing the policy but that they are including restorative justice options at the appeals level of academic integrity issues as it is handled across the campus and mirrors what similar universities do. The Provost responded that given the anti-racist mission of the institution, the University must have the integrity of enacting policies and principles that strive to achieve that mission-driven goal. He stressed the importance of collaborative work.

An FC member asked what body was ultimately the final decision-making authority on the Student Code of Conduct and if changes to it require FC approval. The said he would send the current code of conduct and relevant governing documents to the FC Ex. Com. The motion’s Rep. stated that they look forward to clarity and working with the Provost’s Office going forward.

VII. Elections Committee report (from Sp2021)

- SEE APPENDIX.

DISCUSSION:

An FC member noted that he personally did not receive emails from the FC the first year it conducted all-campus elections. The FC Chair noted that they have been working with incomplete email lists and that moving forward they hope to get access to a complete and full email list. The Provost responded that they are almost done with the list and it will be updated and re-distributed on a semesterly basis to those who have access.

In reference to the report, an FC Rep. asked about where the member names and colleges would be posted and recommended that the FC check with the college bodies about whether they want to do their own elections. The sponsor of the report noted that redoing this would involve a new amendment to the constitution itself.

VIII. Motion to adjourn

Approved unanimously.

Minutes for September 20, 2021

Members present: Kui Du (CM); Joel Fish (CSM); Sommer Forrester (CLA); Priscilla Gazarian (CNHS); Margaret Hart (CLA); Maria John (CLA); Werner Kunz (CM); Sharon Lamb (CEHD); Lusa Lo (CEHD); Kibibi Mack-Shelton (CLA); Jeffrey Melnick (CLA); Pamela Nadash (MGS); Dimity Peter (CEHD); Neil Reilly (CSM); Heike Schotten (CLA); Eve Sorum (CLA); Robert Stevenson (CSM); Betsy Sweet (CLA); Michael Tlusty (SFE); Phil Troped (CNHS); Kiran Verma (CM); Kevin Wozniak (CLA); Kai Zou (CNHS)

Members absent: Lillian-Yvonne Bertram (CLA); Matthew Bell (CSM); Eduardo Siqueira (HONORS); Roberta Wollons (CLA)

Representatives present: Marlene Kim (Representative to the BoT)

Representatives absent: Michael Mahan (PSU); Steve Striffler (CLA)

Ex Officio members present: Hannah Sevian (Associate Provost), for Joe Berger (Provost)

Ex Officio members absent: Joe Berger (Provost); Marcelo Suárez-Orozco (Chancellor)

- The Chair noted that the Provost couldn't be here but Associate Provost Hannah Sevian is here in his place. She also noted that due to teaching schedules of the sponsor for items number one and two on the agenda, they would come after item three. She informed the FC members that they would be adding an agenda item for new business at the end of the meeting.

I. Motion from the Research Committee

Moved: that faculty course buyouts covered by external grant funding shall follow these guidelines:

- The maximum cost of a course buyout for research purposes will be 10% of faculty salary. Departments or colleges may create policies that lower the cost of a course buyout or lower the cost on a case-by-case basis.
- At the time a proposal for a sponsored program is developed, the faculty member must negotiate the arrangement for a buyout with the department chairperson.
- Colleges and the University should abide by faculty course buyout plans that have been written into grants and approved at appropriate levels of administration, regardless of how much time has passed since grant was submitted.

Rationale

Our proposal addresses three main problems with the existing course buyout practices at UMB. First, campus-wide course buyout guidelines have not been updated since 2005. In the 2005 faculty buyout guidelines [document](#), the course buyout rate is listed as 17% or 1/6 of a faculty member's academic year salary, per course. This is based on two main assumptions: a) faculty teach 6 courses a year, and b) 100% of faculty effort is on teaching. Clearly, these assumptions need to be updated in light of the fact that most TT faculty are now teaching four courses per AY. The past assumptions lead to a course buyout rate that is too high, with implications for faculty's ability to actually budget course buyouts into external grants. In addition, an updated policy should reflect the unofficial, but commonly-applied understanding that faculty effort is broken down as 40% teaching, 40% research, and 20% service. The Committee did not take up an in-depth discussion about if and what effort breakdown should be adopted campus-wide, but we agreed that a campus-wide discussion to better formalize an effort breakdown policy is also in order. In our proposal, we assumed 40% teaching effort and four courses a year, each course buyout,

then, is 10% of faculty salary. A final problem with the current course buyout practices is that it is invariably applied across departments and colleges / schools. The actual rates applied campus-wide range from at least 13% - 17%.

DISCUSSION:

An FC Rep. wanted to double check that the maximum would be 10% and wanted more information about the difference between a 40-40-20 or a 30-30-30 workload distribution. The Rep. responded that it is an ideal breakdown of 40-40-20 but for the purposes of this proposal they are not asking to codify this formally but rather as a conversation starter.

An FC member noted that while they agree with the motion and are in favor, that they are reducing the work that it takes for grant writing and that, as it stands, it seems that the administration is able to profit on this. There was a good deal of discussion amongst the FC members, Provost's Office Reps., and others about the cost ratio of buying out a class for a faculty member. The Provost's Office responded with clarity of the process for course buyouts and what the reality is of what it takes to either cover a class, cancel it, or hire a replacement. The Provost's Office agrees that they need to offer transparency on the process and what it involves, especially since the last time it was written was in 2006.

An FC member asked if the Associate Provost was responding that they need to revise this motion to bundle these items or if there would be next steps in terms of gathering data. The Associate Provost responded that this motion assumes two things: that all faculty teach a 2-2 load and it doesn't include NTTs. She also noted that it seems that everyone doesn't agree with the assumption that work takes place on a 40-40-20 distribution scheme and questioned if it is fair and appropriate at 10% for all faculty.

An FC member asked if the Provost's Office was opposed to this motion and the Associate Provost clarified that is not the case. The sponsor of this motion responded that they are open to working together with the Provost's Office.

An FC member wanted to share the concerns from their department that they don't want to increase course buyouts due to a possible lack of support for their graduate students.

An FC member asked if this motion is passed, is it enacted immediately? The Chair explained the formal process of when a motion is passed by the FC and how it is communicated to the Provost's Office.

VOTE: Zoom poll

20 IN FAVOR; 0 OPPOSE; 1 ABSTENTION. MOTION CARRIES.

II. Elections Committee report (from Sp2021) con'd.

DISCUSSION:

The motion sponsor wanted to answer the question from a FC Rep. about publishing the faculty rolls and the sponsor responded that they would work with the Provost's Office for updating the rolls each year. However, it was clarified that the motion right now is to amend the PDF to be archived in the FC minutes and that, moving forward, they would need to figure out the best practice for this. The FC Rep. cautioned against publishing emails and the sponsor agreed. The Rep. asked about whether those not receiving emails was the reason for this revision. The sponsor explained that only CNHS was able to provide the 2019 Elections Study Committee with data about TT and NTT voter turnout in prior elections. The sponsor's motion is designed to make the process of compiling voter rolls for annual Faculty Council elections more public and transparent in order to ensure that all TT and NTT faculty who are constitutionally-eligible to vote

are properly given a ballot each year. The paucity of turnout data left it an open question whether all eligible voters were properly contacted in past years.

An FC member wanted to thank motion's sponsor for doing the work to get the FC to this point in the process of voting.

An FC member wanted to encourage there to be better communication between the FC, the college reps. and the members of each college.

An FC member voted to call the question. Seconded.

VOTE: Zoom poll

18 IN FAVOR; 1 OPPOSED; 3 ABSTENTIONS. MOTION CARRIES.

III. Motion from Kevin Wozniak:

Motion: To amend the *Report and Recommendations of the ad hoc 2021 Elections Committee of the Faculty Council* to include an appendix that reports the names, rank, and college affiliation of every voter on the voter rolls employed by the Committee.

Rationale: Two of the major reasons that the ad hoc Committee on Elections recommend that the Council consolidate responsibility for conducting elections within itself was to standardize the elections process and make it more transparent and replicable. Publicly posting the rolls of eligible voters will fill an information void, enable the faculty to correct any omissions for future elections, and make it easier for subsequent elections committees to update the voter rolls.

VOTE: Zoom poll

16 IN FAVOR; 3 OPPOSED; 3 ABSTENTIONS. MOTION CARRIES.

IV. Motions from the Graduate Studies Committee

Motion #1

From: CM

Request for a Program Change: to make changes to the curriculum for the MS in Accounting (MSA) to incorporate substantial amounts of Data Analytics and quantitative techniques. Similar to the structure of the current MSA program, students in the redesigned MSA program will have to complete seven required courses, two elective courses, and one capstone course. (1) All of the existing required accounting courses (MBA AF 611, 612, 613, 614, 618, 691) and some of the existing elective courses (MBA AF 615, 616, 637) will be revised to incorporate substantial amounts of data analytics. (2) In addition, the redesigned MSA program will include three additional elective courses: MBA AF 623 Financial Modeling, MBA AF 636 Quantitative Analysis of Business Data, and MBA AF 640 Accounting Data Analytics. MBA AF 623 and MBA AF 636 are currently offered as part of the Master of Science in Finance (MSF) program and MBA AF 640 is a proposed new course that was offered to MSA students in Fall 2019 as a Special Topics course (MBA AF 697) to test the market.

Rationale: The current MSA program lacks training in data analytics and quantitative skills that are in high demand in the accounting job market due to artificial intelligence technology and Big Data applications. The redesigned MSA program will significantly improve the curriculum of the MSA program in this area and provide our graduate students an enhanced data analytics and quantitative training. These changes will also

enable us to qualify for the STEM designation that will provide our international students with the benefit of an extended optional practical training in the United States.

Motion #2

From: CM

Request for 9 Course Changes and 1 New Course: There are 9 course changes and 1 new course proposed for the changes in the curriculum for the MS in Accounting (see **Motion #1**) to incorporate substantial amounts of data analytics.

Rationale: These courses are designed to meet the fast-growing demand from graduate accounting students who want to obtain knowledge and skills in accounting data analytics. They will help students gain an understanding of theoretical models and sophisticated quantitative models in financial reporting and integrate the concepts into real big data. Students will learn the required data analytics skills to understand, analyze, and produce solutions to challenges in accounting. Specifically, students will have access to financial and accounting raw data for real companies through WRDS (Wharton Research Data Services), manage and handle big data, perform statistical analyses, interpret the results, and provide solutions to questions. When students complete the courses, students are prepared to act as data scientists - to incorporate non-financial data into their analyses, predict financial performance, and advise their company on actions to take.

- Course #1 (course change): MBA AF 611 Intermediate Accounting
New course description: This course provides the core of financial accounting careers. Students who take the class will gain knowledge or skills that are useful to professional accountants. Accounting is often described as the language of business. Understanding books of financial statements in the language of Accounting requires quite a bit of practices. This course also introduces topics on accounting data analytics within the scope of intermediate financial accounting, such as big data, data analytics to accountants and auditors, data visualization, etc.
- Course #2 (course change): MBA AF 612 Cost Accounting
New course description: This course covers the principles, techniques and challenges of cost analysis and strategic cost management. You will learn concepts and techniques that accountants and managers use to make planning and control decisions. This course revisits a few topics from Accounting for Managers (AF 610), and builds upon this foundation to consider a number of traditional and contemporary topics such as job costing, allocation of support-department costing, process costing and spoilage issues, cost allocation of joint products and byproducts, cost-volume-profit analysis, activity-based costing and management, and performance measurement. The course includes a semester-long project designed to help students get some hands-on experience with data collection and analysis.
- Course #3 (course change): MBA AF 613 Federal Tax Planning
New course description: This course explores the tax consequences of transactions. We will focus on both the tax and nontax motives of involved parties. We will discuss the concepts of gross income, deductions, exclusions, tax credits, and the income tax effects of transactions with an emphasis on individuals' decision-making and planning. We also will discuss Tax Practice and focus on Tax Research. Students will learn not only how to deal with and analyze large data sets but also how to identify the patterns and interpret the results.
- Course #4 (course change): MBA AF 614 Financial and Managerial Auditing
New course description: The course involves the study of the theory and practice of professional auditing. The auditing environment has become more complex and dynamic today and the need for reliable assurance over financial reporting has intensified. This course is concerned with the technical and conceptual skills involved in an audit or examination of financial statements. Students will learn about concepts and applications related to financial statement auditors' professional responsibilities,

audit evidence, internal control, audit risk, fraud consideration, audit planning, audit program, audit sampling, and audit report. Furthermore, the advancement in technologies has increased the amount of data available for analysis. The audit profession is rapidly exploring how audit data analytics might allow them to increase audit quality and efficiency. We will discuss how audit data analytics are being used in all phases of the audit. More specifically, we will discuss AICPA's Guide to Audit Data Analytics for each of major audit procedures. We will also use a comprehensive audit data analytics case.

- Course #5 (course change): MBA AF 615 International Accounting
New course description: This course covers graduate-level financial accounting and analytics in the international context. We will discuss the institutional, cultural and environmental influences on accounting standards with an emphasis on financial reporting and analytics. Many of the topics in the international accounting and analytics course have domestic counterparts. However, new factors play a role in the international arena, such as the diversity of laws, practices, customs, cultures and competitive circumstances, and the risk associated with fluctuating exchange rates, differential rate of inflation, and property rights. This course is designed to enhance your understanding of international accounting issues from the prospective of companies with internationalized operations and/or finance. Throughout the course, we will discuss the similarities and differences between US GAAP and International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS). We will also apply various data analytics techniques to analyze international accounting issues.
- Course #6 (course change): MBA AF 616 Financial Statement Analysis/Advanced Accounting
New course description: This course focuses on the effective analysis of financial statements while integrating the concepts and principles learned in previous accounting courses. It teaches students how to make informed business decisions by reading, analyzing, and interpreting accounting information disclosed in financial reports. Contemporary and engaging business cases are used to highlight the analytical skills used in financial statement analysis with emphasis on the assessment of a company's profitability and risk. We also cover cost of capital estimation and firm valuation by discussing various valuation models. In addition to the data analytics assignments in the textbook, we incorporate data visualization and analytics into our course by utilizing Wharton Research Data Services (WRDS) Classroom tools to help students interact with financial data and analyze/interpret data visualizations. Students are expected to understand the relevant toolsets of data analytics as well as their application in financial statement analysis and firm valuation.
- Course #7 (course change): MBA AF 618 Accounting Information Systems
New course description: All aspects of accounting have been fundamentally changed by information technology and the Internet. Accountants have a critical role in providing relevant information for planning, decision making, and control. Due to the impact technology has on providing this information; accountants must have a thorough understanding of Accounting Information Systems (AIS) and also be proficient in the use of technology for providing information. In order to ensure the bright future of the accounting profession, we must use technology to its full advantage. In this course students will gain a basic understanding of AIS in the areas of 1) Information Systems, 2) AIS Applications, 3) Database Concepts, 4) Internal Control, 5) Data Analytics and 6) Auditing of AIS. In this course we will supplement lectures with active learning and group work in order to make class fun and interesting while we learn! Students will complete various software assignments to gain exposure to modern technologies. This is not a computer or technology course – it is a business and information course in which you will later apply theoretical concepts learned using computers.
- Course #8 (course change): MBA AF 637 Financial Reporting Fraud Examination
New course description: Financial reporting fraud and earnings manipulation by managements of publicly traded companies are a continuing source of anxiety and concern to investors, creditors, regulators, and others who depend upon financial statements. As a special focus in the broader emerging field of fraud examination, students in this course will gain a thorough understanding of the

knowledge of the nature, prevention, and detection of financial reporting fraud, also called financial statement fraud or accounting fraud. This course examines various aspects of financial statement fraud and the role that the “financial reporting supply chain” plays in creating high quality financial statements. This course also introduces data analytical techniques to assess potential financial statement fraud and earnings management.

- Course #9 (course change): MBA AF 691 Financial Accounting Theory & Analysis
New course description: This course examines the role of accounting information in the capital markets. Financial statements are widely used by bankers, analysts, and investors to evaluate a firm's past performance and judge future prospects. This course explores a variety of financial reporting contexts, industries and business strategies to provide students with an understanding of accounting information across various corporate environments. This course will help students gain an understanding of theoretical models and sophisticated quantitative models in financial reporting and to integrate the concepts into real big data. Students will learn the required data analytics skills to understand, analyze, and produce solutions to challenges in accounting.
- Course #10 (NEW course): MBA AF 640 Accounting Data Analytics
Course description: Data has proliferated in business and managers and accountants need to understand the implications for decision-making and tap into the data to provide better insights into a firm/client/customer/supplier, etc. This course is intended to provide students with an understanding of data analytic thinking and terminology as well as hands-on experience with data analytics tools and techniques. Specific topics include but are not limited to data preparation, cleaning and data mining using SAS, data visualization using Tableau, data warehousing for managerial accounting tasks and performing audit forensics with the IDEA application. Students should leave this course with the skills necessary to translate accounting and business problems into actionable proposals that they can competently present to managers and data scientists. While there will be some use of tools in this course, the focus of this class is on concepts, not algorithms or statistical math or programming.

DISCUSSION:

The faculty members who put this motion forth to Graduate Studies explained the importance of adding data analytics, which was strongly encouraged by a consulting firm and is in line with other schools who have these programs.

An FC member asked what programs they were using in these new classes and shared his excitement over the changes in these programs. The Reps. responded with the various systems that will be incorporated into these classes and what students will be required to do when it comes to pulling data and running reports. There was further encouragement from FC members and Reps. about this program change.

VOTE: Zoom poll

22 IN FAVOR; 0 OPPOSED; 0 ABSTENTIONS. BOTH MOTIONS CARRY.

Motion #3

From: CLA

Request for a course change: that ECON 698 Mentored Research Project be changed from a nonrepeatable variable-credit (3-6 credit) course offered only in the spring semester to a repeatable, variable-credit (1-5 credit) course offered in both the fall and spring semesters, in order to provide more structured supervision for capstone/thesis completion.

Rationale: In practice, the work for the major research project required of all students in the MA in Applied Economics starts in the summer of the prior year with periodic meetings and assignments over the Fall semester. Students, however, do not receive any course credit for their work on their project in the Fall. Our proposed change would allow the students to earn credit for the work they do during the Fall, without changing the total number of credits for ECON 698. Under the new proposal, students would earn 2 credits for their first semester of ECON 698 and 3 credits for their second semester, instead of 5 credits just in the last semester.

VOTE: Zoom poll

21 IN FAVOR; 0 OPPOSED; 1 ABSTENTION. MOTION CARRIES.

Motion #4

From: CLA

Request for a new program: an accelerated BA/BS to MA (4+1 year) program that will allow University of Massachusetts Boston students to earn both a bachelor's degree and a Masters of Applied Linguistics degree in five years.

Rationale: This will help us retain our best undergraduates, support undergraduates from minoritized or first-generation to college backgrounds in pursuing an advanced degree and create a pathway to professional opportunities in applied linguistics for students. It will benefit students by allowing them to earn the two degrees in one year less than would otherwise be the case, giving them access to graduate courses in their fourth year. and providing mentoring throughout their transition from a BA/BS to an MA and into the workplace.

DISCUSSION:

An FC member brought up their concern that the University is approving 4+1 programs without clarity of whether or not it benefits students or if there is any research done for strategic planning. The motion's sponsors explained reasoning for putting the program forward to benefit the students since it will offer licensure in either ESL, foreign language, or bilingual studies.

An FC member asked what the negatives were to 4+1 programs and the other FC member explained that there seemed to be a conflict of interest at times when we hold onto a student who would do well in a full master's program at another/potentially more prestigious university and if it has the potential to negatively impact master's programs if we do this. There was discussion amongst FC member about the benefits and possible negative impacts of 4 +1 programs and how it works logistically in terms of advising and credits. An FC member recommended that this issue be put on the agenda of the master planning committees that are being constituted by the Administration.

VOTE: Zoom poll

20 IN FAVOR; 0 OPPOSED; 1 ABSTENTION. MOTION CARRIES.

V. New Business

No new business.

VI. Motion to Adjourn

Approved unanimously.

VICE CHANCELLOR FOR ADMIN AND FINANCE

It is my pleasure to be with you all this afternoon as we start the fall semester. There's been much activity over the past several months where I'll provide an update.

1. University's financial update – I'm pleased to report that UMass Boston has been successfully weathering the COVID crisis during a time of great financial uncertainty. The close for FY21 is underway and as has been the custom, results will plan to be shared with the Budget and Long Range Planning Committee once finalized. They are due to be provided to the Commonwealth by October 15th and will be reported out at the December Board of Trustees meeting. I am pleased to inform you that I expect the university to have met its margin requirements for the past year, due in large part to the one-time award of federal stimulus dollars to support both our students and our institution, which starts us off on a positive note for the current fiscal year, FY22.

The FY22 budget was passed at the June Board meeting, setting student tuition and fees at FY21 levels and allowing students earlier certainty regarding the cost of their education for this year.

The Budget and Long Range Planning Committee met regularly over the summer to address many important financial matters and I would like to thank all of the committee members, especially those here on the Zoom today, for their willingness to meet over the summer and their continued partnership and commitment to shared governance regarding the university's finances.

2. Health and Safety protocols – The campus issued many communications over the past several months on health and safety to help inform people about the work that has been going on to protect our campus community. I would draw your attention to the Return to Campus Checklist dated 8/3/2021 as one communication with a large amount of information on many topics that have been on folks' minds.

Some of the highlights are: while we've been remote, Facilities has continued working hard on campus. They prioritized review and maintenance of our ventilation systems. Public areas were consistently and thoroughly cleaned including floors and high touch surfaces. Offices received routine cleaning, which included the following items: door handles were wiped down, hard floors were washed and waxed, carpeted floors were shampooed, open areas such as shelves, empty desks, or windowsills have been dusted and wiped down, trash was emptied and the cleaners did not touch any personal items.

Regarding the HVAC systems, the university engaged an environmental consultant, Environmental Health and Engineering (EHE), to conduct a thorough study and engineering evaluation of the campus's HVAC systems in relation to COVID-19 precautions, as well as regular operations. EHE has been working with the campus during the pandemic to help ensure we are incorporating the latest guidance into our operations.

EHE conducted an inspection of the HVAC systems serving all buildings on the UMass Boston campus to identify operational or performance issues. In addition, the inspection looked at outdoor air ventilation provided to occupied spaces to optimize outdoor air intake in accordance

with OSHA recommendations as of November 2020. The Facilities Department has implemented the recommendations from these inspections.

An additional recommendation by the CDC and ASHRAE (American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air-Conditioning Engineers) was to upgrade all HVAC filtration systems to a minimum efficiency reporting value (MERV) 13 or higher. All UMass Boston HVAC systems have been upgraded and now operate with MERV-13 filtration, among the most efficient to filter out small airborne particles. These filters are changed at a minimum quarterly, which is considered a best practice.

Over the course of the past year, the university has worked closely with union representatives of all bargaining units to keep them informed of the steps being taken regarding health and safety and to address any additional concerns.

Please know that Facilities is available to check any areas of campus where faculty or staff have concerns related to our buildings. Please submit a work order and they will follow up about the matter.

3. Shuttle services – the university has negotiated a new contract with shuttle provider Paul Revere as we head back to campus. Paul Revere is using current safety protocols for public transportation in its operations here on campus. Facemasks are required and all buses have a supply of facemasks should a rider need one. Service includes a new Route #2 van service that provides service from the West Garage to the Campus Center. Routes are being monitored during the first few weeks of classes and will be adjusted as needed to best meet the overall ridership patterns of the campus community.
4. Dining Services – Sodexo has incorporated the latest CDC and food industry protocols into the planning dining operations on campus. A mobile app has been unveiled to allow the campus community to order online and then pick up their order. This app is now available in select locations like Dunkin Donuts and will be available at all retail locations over the next several weeks. We have freshened up the Food Court with new signage and have expanded the offerings at the ISC. Additional signage has been put in place in our dining facilities to remind diners to mask up when they're not actively eating or drinking.
5. Activities based budgeting – Planning for the multiyear activities based budgeting project continued over the summer. A report on work completed to date and next steps is scheduled for the next Budget and Long Range Planning Committee agenda. More information will be available at future meetings about how faculty can be part of this important work.
6. Student support – we have continued to seek out ways to support students during the pandemic through the use of federal stimulus money. The allowable uses for the institutional funds for the third round of HEERF money have enabled the university to pay off outstanding balances for students who owed the university money from Spring, Summer and Fall of 2020 and Winter of 2021. We were able to help over 1,000 students, whose account balances totaled over \$4.2M. All holds have been removed from these accounts for these time periods, allowing students to be able to continue their education in the future as they are able to do so.

Board of Trustees Special Meeting September 7, 2021

This meeting recognized gifts to the University of Massachusetts and approved the renaming of some institutions.

Gift of \$50 million from the Mannings to UMass, including \$15 million to the UMB School of Nursing. Rename UMB School of Nursing to the Robert and Donna Manning College of Nursing and Health Sciences at UMB.

\$175 million from Morningside and Chan family to the UMass Medical School. This transformational gift is the largest gift made to public medical institution.

This gift will rename the UMass Medical School to the UMass Chan School of Medicine. It will rename the three graduate schools so that they will now be called:

- The UMass Chan Medical School. TH Chan School of Medicine.
- The UMass Chan Medical School. Tan Chinfen Graduate School of Nursing.
- The UMass Chan Medical School. Morningside Graduate School of Biomedical Sciences.

The motions to re-name these institutions were approved by the Board of Trustees.

Board of Trustees Meeting June 10, 2021

Heike and Steve's speeches given during the public comments period are attached to this report.

Respectfully submitted,

Marlene Kim, Professor, and
UMass Boston Faculty Representative to the Board of Trustees

Thank you, President Meehan, and thank you, Board Members, for this opportunity to speak to you today. My name is Heike Schotten, and I am the Chair of the Faculty Council at UMass Boston.

I am here today to discuss the Dorchester Bay City development proposal.

As you know, on February 14, 2019, the UMass Building Authority and Board of Trustees entered into a 99-year ground lease with Accordia Partners, a private development firm, to transform the Bayside Expo site, owned by UMass Boston, into a mixed-use “urban innovation” district inspired, in part, by Cambridge’s Kendall Square area.

Faculty have been following this development closely. While we do not oppose the project, we have significant concerns about its negative impact on those with whom we share living and working space on the peninsula, as well as on the surrounding Dorchester and South Boston neighborhoods. In particular, we fear this project constitutes a massive gentrification of the area, which will lead to significant displacement of local residents in a primarily black and brown part of the city. The difficult history of UMB’s relationship with our Columbia point neighbors suggests that we must pay close attention to our future connections with them.

It was because of these concerns that, in December of 2019, the Faculty Council passed a resolution asking then-UMB Chancellor Katherine Newman and this Board of Trustees to require Accordia Partners to negotiate a Community Benefits Agreement, or CBA, with a representative group of community stakeholders who would be most impacted by the development (since, to that point, Accordia had been in conversation only with an unrepresentative group of largely homeowner-based neighborhood associations). We also asked that Chancellor Newman and this Board hold Accordia to more stringent standards of transparency and social justice when planning this development.

Chancellor Newman openly opposed our resolution, stating that an Article 80 process was sufficient to ensure our goals. To my knowledge, our resolution was ignored by this Board.

A year later, on Dec. 7, 2020, the Faculty Council again revisited this issue and, in a unanimous vote, signed on to an Open Letter to Accordia Partners (which has subsequently become a petition to Mayor Janey, UMBA, and the BPDA) demanding that Accordia modify its proposal in order to support fairness, equity, and racial and economic justice in its development plans.

Included among our demands were:

- That Accordia expand its Community Advisory Committee to include the people who run the greatest risk of displacement by a project like DBC, in particular renters, low-income people, people with disabilities, and unemployed people.
- That Accordia raise the percentage of on-site affordable housing units from 15% to 50%, and guarantee that 75% of those units will be located in the immediate community.
- That Accordia incorporate needed community facilities into the proposal, such as schools, daycares, libraries, and senior centers.
- Ensure employment opportunities for low and moderate-income residents, not just “Kendall Square”-type jobs, at the development site, to prevent jobs-led displacement.
- That Accordia more adequately address some of the project’s adverse environmental impacts, including the proposal’s encroachment onto Dorchester Shores Reservation and Carson Beach and its sea-level rise mitigation strategies.

This letter was signed not just by the Faculty Council, but by all of the campus unions, the undergraduate student government, the College Republicans and College Democrats, and PHENOM (the Public Higher Education Network of Massachusetts). In total, the signatories represent nearly 2500 UMB faculty and staff and 16,000 students.

Therefore, on behalf of not simply the Faculty Council, but also the vast majority of faculty, students, and staff on the UMB campus, I am here to request that this Board of Trustees put the brakes on Accordia's development plans unless and until it addresses our significant concerns with the justice and equity of its development proposal. I imagine it is not in this Board's interest to be undertaking a project widely and publicly seen as a gentrification and displacement of this city's black and brown communities. Nor does it seem to be in this Board's interest to have Boston's mayor or the City Council getting involved in evaluating or overseeing this project. In the interest, then, not only of racial and economic justice, but also preserving the public face of UMass as a system of integrity and transparency, I urge you to re-evaluate your greenlighting of Accordia's gentrification project and to get proactively involved in preventing its worst excesses.

Steve Striffler
President, Faculty Staff Union, UMass Boston.
Comments to UMass Board of Trustees, 6-10-21

Thank you for the opportunity to speak. I'm Steve Striffler, the President of the Faculty-Staff Union at UMass Boston. I'm here to ask the UMass system to use its influence to push the real estate developer, Accordia Partners LLC, to drastically improve its proposed development known as Dorchester Bay City; this is a mixed-use project featuring nearly six million square feet of new building – or roughly the size of two Empire State Buildings -- on a small plot of land located between the JFK/UMass stop, Harbor Point, and Carson Beach – that is, on land owned by the University of Massachusetts Building Authority.

The FSU realizes there is a temptation to view this simply as a real estate transaction – where the UMass system leases a piece of property, gets hundreds of millions of dollars in return, and moves on, allowing the developer to then do whatever it wants on the property. We get this. But this is not the way to understand this particular transaction because it will be seen as an abdication of responsibility by UMass to the very communities we are here to serve – working people of Boston. The project is too big, too important, will have too many negative impacts, and will be forever linked to UMass.

If the project emerges as is, it would not just add to the less than positive image that UMass Boston has already earned over decades in relation to residents of Columbia Point and Dorchester. It would also deepen and solidify that reputation in ways we could never walk back.

This will happen because Dorchester Bay City – if left as is -- will be a major driver of racial and economic inequality in Dorchester for decades to come – not to mention a traffic nightmare. This is obvious now, and will become more apparent to everyone as the project proceeds.

Why is this? To begin, it has woefully inadequate affordable housing, while paying no attention to its potential impact on housing costs in a rare area of the city still populated by a diverse working class whose majority remains people of color. It seems destined to exclude working Bostonians from its confines, while serving to displace residents of Dorchester.

It is also a transportation nightmare. With little concern to transit issues, Dorchester Bay City would add more than 1700 housing units (and massive retail-office space) to an area that faces some of the region's worst transit problems.

More than this, the fact that Dorchester Bay City will occupy public land owned by the University of Massachusetts Building Authority makes its lack of community-generating institutions like schools, daycares, and libraries all the more troubling. As proposed, this will be a playground for wealthy Bostonians, built on land owned by UMass, that will displace local communities. This is not the legacy that UMass needs.

Here is the ask from the FSU – an ask that is widely shared by campus unions, student groups, and others at UMass Boston. Please push Accordia to genuinely include community voices in the decision-making process. No one is suggesting that development should be stopped. What we nonetheless need is community engagement and state intervention that will increase affordable housing, slow

displacement, generate quality jobs, and produce other public goods that will have little impact on the developer's pocketbook, but will (perhaps) slow the increasing rate of inequality that threatens the very fabric of Boston. The UMass system has an obligation to be a positive voice in this process – a voice that will serve to enhance, rather than drag down, our reputation. Thank you.

FSU COMMENTS

I'm not sure if people caught the minor bruhaha late last week when the UMass Amherst administration abruptly cancelled its student tailgate before the football team's big game. This decision immediately irked students, leading the Student Govt to denounce the university's decision, largely because the university had been maintaining that vaccination and masking was enough – and largely dismissed measures around social distancing or campus density as unnecessary. Students pointed to a certain hypocrisy around the tailgate cancellation because indoor spaces on campus had been jammed since they returned to school, not simply in classes where 300 students were packed like sardines into standing room only classrooms, or in dorms, but in packed indoor social-type events that would seem to have no more educational importance than a football game.

To my knowledge, however, the cancellation of the tailgate might be the first time that a UMass administration has really acknowledged that vaccination and masking might not be enough in the face of the Delta variant -- that reducing social density and helping people spread out is necessary. The tailgate was a slightly odd place for the university to finally take this stand, a position that it was probably forced into because of 150 new Covid cases at Amherst this past week -- a PR scramble to eliminate a bad optic event and make it appear that the university is doing something – with a certain Mass smugness that we aren't Texas or Florida.

Many observers, nonetheless, had to ask why it took so long, or required a significant uptick in Covid cases, to really begin to implement policies and practices around distancing/density – if, in fact, the tailgate cancellation represents a trend in that direction.

The acknowledgement that a vaccine and masking mandate may not be enough is still something that our own Administration has not yet really landed on, or committed to in any significant way, as they have clung quite firmly to the position that vaccinations and masking are largely enough in the face of the Delta Strand.

This has perplexed a lot of UMass Boston faculty and librarians, in part because we are not a residential campus like Amherst, and led them to wonder what we are waiting for. One faculty member put it like this, and I think it is useful to hear her at length:

I understood why our Administration took the public stance that we were returning to a full campus, and understood why they might say publicly that with the vaccine and mask mandates that all would be good as we returned. I don't quite agree with this, but I get it. But I didn't think they would follow their rhetoric to the extent that they have. I honestly expected the campus to be physically different when I returned.

I expected the university would have policies to reduce density on shuttles – and expected them to enforce masking on the shuttles and elsewhere. I haven't seen it. I expected better signage, both to help us find our way around a campus construction

zone, but also to keep human traffic flowing – to prevent bottlenecks. This hasn't happened – but still could. I expected there would be university employees making sure students weren't scrunched into long lines in confined spaces. Didn't see it. I expected there would be better protections for our staff who are here 9-5 every day. I expected changes in the food court to help people get their food and get out – instead of grab and go we got wait and stand around....as if Sodexo is churning out works of art. I expected there would be far more seating outside as a way to encourage us all to get outdoors. Very little. I guess I also expected some efforts at distancing within our worst classrooms – my Wheatley classroom is incredibly packed and I can feel no improvements in ventilation. What I came back to was a university in denial. It literally appears as though we've done nothing to acknowledge Delta beyond vaccines and loosely enforced masking. That I haven't seen any changes makes me worried about the stuff I can't see but seem to have to take on faith – like testing, tracing, and ventilation. It's like we never heard of the Delta variant or just enjoy rolling the dice.

If FSU surveys or emails to the FSU are any indication, this faculty member is not alone, nor off-base.

The university should have a much more robust system of testing and tracing in place if we want to have a clue as to whether the number of cases on campus is increasing, or rather – how quickly they are increasing. This could or should be – as on other campuses – done through mandatory testing. We could still do this. But any improvement would be welcome....

We should also be reducing density, and if we are too late to do so on campus overall, then why not give it try in particular spaces, starting with the shuttles, but also the food court, and other highly trafficked areas – and utilize our outdoor space as much as possible by providing seating? These are all pretty cheap fixes with more health upside than cancelling a tailgate.

We also need more transparency and information in many areas – certainly with respect to ventilation and air quality. Our Covid Dashboard is not up to snuff compared to other universities, either in giving us up-to-date information or making it accessible, which has faculty wondering whether the university has a handle on tracking the number of cases, and knows what to do with the information...or whether it just doesn't know.

The bottom line is the university could be doing more to make the campus safer, which would not only be good for our personal safety, but for our ability to remain on campus and in person as long as possible.

Faculty Council Meeting
Report by Professional Staff Union Representative
Michael M. Mahan
September 13, 2021

- Return to Campus - Fall 2021

Return to Campus - Fall 2021

First, I would like to preface my comments by saying that I realize that our response to the COVID crisis is a dynamic process and constantly changing. I appreciate the adherence to local, state, and federal guidelines, and the attention and vigilance paid to mitigating the impact of COVID on our campus. That being said...

The Professional Staff Union remains very concerned about the impacts of COVID on our members, co-workers and students. We did reach an agreement with the administration that requires vaccinations for all professional staff who don't have exemptions, but it is felt that there are many additional steps the administration should be taking beyond vaccinations and masks in order to prevent the continuing spread of COVID. The PSU leadership feels that the administration should pro-actively be assessing each and every work area and classroom to ensure adequate air flow as per the CDC recommendations. Additionally, it is felt that, where necessary, work areas should be rearranged to provide the most protections possible for workers, regular surveillance testing should be carried out so members of the university community will know when an outbreak occurs, and any information about outbreaks and/or positivity rates should be reported to the campus community promptly. And, perhaps most importantly, steps should be taken to reduce the density of students and workers on campus -- allowing more classes to be taught on-line and allowing more workers to work remotely.

GEN ED REPORT

I have two advisories for the Council, with no motions attached.

There were nine General Education motions on the May 3 agenda.

Two courses, with three motions had not come to the Provost's Office by May 3 from the College as had been expected. The motions were therefore removed from the Council's agenda. In reviewing a fourth motion that remained on the May agenda, Council members asked for greater specificity in a World Cultures course description. By May 25, all of the courses had reached the Provost's Office, and I asked the Summer Executive Committee whether it would approve those courses for General Education. The proposals were sent to Council members, who expressed no objections, and they were approved by the Summer Executive Committee on June 9. The proposals were:

- May motions 1 & 7: American Studies 344: From Bus Boycott to Black Lives Matter: The Black Freedom Struggle in the US and Beyond, for the Humanities Distribution and US Diversity.
- May motion 2: Anthropology 366, the Anthropology of Religion, for the World Cultures distribution.
- May motion 6: Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies 420, Queer of Color Critique, for the Humanities Distribution.

The second advisory concerns the Writing Proficiency requirement: for students of all colleges except the College of Management, there are three ways of satisfying the Writing Proficiency Requirement.

- A sit-down essay examination, based on a set of readings that students receive five weeks in advance.
- The submission of a conventional portfolio of three course papers and a challenge essay, based on a set of readings.
- The Electronic Writing Assessment portfolio, which was approved by the Council in 2019. It is submitted in conjunction with the Intermediate Seminar. It also consists of three course papers but replaces the challenge essay with a reflection by the student on the student's development as a writer since matriculating, as evidenced by the course papers.

(College of Management students satisfy the requirement through completion of BC 230, Business Communication and Critical Analysis.)

The sit-down essay examination was not scheduled when remote teaching began, and it will not be given this year. This was a decision of the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies and the Writing Assessment staff.

In spring, 2021, the General Education Committee and the Writing Proficiency Subcommittee approved a plan for piloting a procedure that would begin to bring the two portfolios closer together. A student who is not given a “pass” by conventional portfolio readers but is felt to be capable of passing with one revision can receive one session of tutoring and resubmit. This was piloted once in the spring and it is scheduled for piloting at the next WPR portfolio. If this option continues to appear to be successful in reducing the high-stakes nature of the portfolio and bringing it into parity with EWRAP, a proposal for adopting the option will come to the Council. We will report on the results in any case.

Neal Bruss
Chair, Faculty Council General Education Committee

Joint Disciplinary and Grievance Committee

Annual Report AY 2020-2021

As per the Faculty Council By-Laws

(https://www.umb.edu/faculty_staff/faculty_council/bylaws_and_constitution)

22. Joint Discipline and Grievance Committee

A. This committee shall:

1. Review and recommend to the Faculty Council and the Student Senate discipline and grievance policies and procedures.
2. Exercise jurisdiction over individual cases as specified in any discipline and grievance policies which may be approved by the Faculty Council, the Student Senate, the Administration and the Board of Trustees.

B. Composition:

1. Voting members: Refer to 10 A.5. Membership. Plus five students chosen by the Student Senate and GSA with the appointment of seats for the two associations based on the proportion of the total number of undergraduate and graduate students on campus; each of these two associations must have at least one representative. One representative from the Professional Staff Association.
2. Non-voting members: Dean of Students ex officio

9. Duties

A. Standing committees shall:

1. Meet at least once every semester;
2. Exercise their powers and duties as prescribed by the Constitution and by these bylaws;
3. Keep and distribute minutes of all meetings. Two copies of all minutes, together with relevant documents shall be placed on file with the Chair of the Faculty Council who shall make them available to inquiring faculty members. One copy of all minutes and

relevant documents shall be sent to each of the following: The Chancellor, the Provost, and such others as the Faculty Council may designate;

4. Prepare and submit an annual report by June 1st of each year, and such other reports as may be ordered. Besides reporting on the completed action of the committee, the annual report shall also delineate areas of future concern for the committee;
5. Establish and appoint such subcommittees as are provided by bylaw or as may be deemed necessary provided that the chairperson shall be drawn from the membership of the committee.

VOTING MEMBERS

Faculty	College/School	Term
*Jacqueline Fawcett	CNHS	2018-2021
Maria John	CLA	2018-2021
Chandra Yelleswarapu	CSM	2018-2021
David Patterson	CLA	2018-2021
Lisa Rivera	CLA	2018-2021
Laura Bozeman	CEHD	2018-2021
Yijia (Eddie) Zhao	CM	2018-2021
Phil Gona	CNHS	2018-2021
Luis Jiménez	CLA	2018-2021
Adenrele Awotona	SE	2020-2023
Mridula Satyamurti	CSM	2020-2023

*Chairperson

Non-Voting Members (Students)

Undergraduates

Collin Matson	CLA	2018-?
Laura Goggin	CSM	2018-?

Graduate Students

Grace Furtado	CLA	2018-?
Emmanuel Saake	CSM	2018-?
Anusha Satturu	MGT	2018-?

Other faculty, as well as graduate and undergraduate students, had indicated their availability to serve on appeal panels.

Associate Vice Provost Karen Ricciardi served as the ex-officio member of the committee for most of the academic year. Her responsibilities for receiving reports of academic dishonesty and appeals from student, as well as organizing appeal panel hearings, continued until March 2021, when these responsibilities were moved to the Office of the Provost. A May 28 2021 email announcement from the Provost sent to Deans' Council members indicated that beginning June 1, 2021, faculty should "contact Vice Provost Liya Escalera with any general questions or concerns related to Undergraduate Studies." It is not clear, however, faculty reports pertaining to charges of academic dishonest are included in general questions or concerns about Undergraduate Studies. Furthermore, the committee members do not know who will be reviewing the charges, imposing the initial sanctions, and conducting appeals

Karen Ricciardi (personal communication, April 30, 2021) reported "There were 170 reports of dishonesty in the fall 2020 and 21 appeals (10 of suspension and 11 of the dishonesty charge). One student was found not responsible and no suspensions were overruled. In total, 18 students were suspended in the fall 2020. This spring 2021 there have been 49 reports of dishonesty and one appeal."

More recently, Karen Ricciardi (personal communication, May 27, 2021) reported, "I have been receiving the reports of dishonesty. Last semester 15 students were suspended for the spring and summer, and the Associate Provost revised the sanction to spring only. This semester, I have also been responding to multiple charges by meeting with students and having them write a reflection, as the Associate Provost has directed me to do. To date, there have been 8 multiple offenses this semester. The first was the case where I was not informed of the change in response, and my suspension was revised to requiring that the student create a video for social media [see paragraph below]. Two students met with me and wrote a reflective response. One student did not respond to me and four are recent reports that will be managed by Vice Provost Escalera. More reports of dishonesty are being reported, so there may be more multiple offenses." Continuing, Dr. Ricciardi (personal communication, May 27, 2021) reported, "Since April 30th, there have been 19 additional reports of dishonesty submitted. Up to 20 additional reports may be submitted next week [week of May 31, 2021]. One professor has shared that he has discovered 18 incidents in his classes. Liya Escalera will be receiving these reports."

The hearing for the appeal identified by Dr. Ricciardi of a university-level sanction reported by Dr. Ricciardi was held on March 10th, which was moderated by the Associate Provost and was held in accordance with a Guidance document developed by members of the Office of the Provost within the context of the Provost's requirement for restorative justice. The final outcome of the appeal was overturning the university-level sanction of suspension and imposition of two educational options by the Provost—a special workshop on plagiarism for the student, conducted by a member of the Provost's Office, and a video about academic integrity developed by the

student with assistance from the member of the Provost's Office and the UMass Boston IT department. The video was posted on the UMass Boston's social media site at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NSUdNJALWR0>. It is not known by the members of this committee whether the voice on the video is that of the student.

The voting faculty members of the Joint Disciplinary and Grievance Committee met with the Provost and the Associate Provost on April 27 2021. At that time, the Provost indicated that all discussion of any needed revisions for the Guidance document, as well as the management of faculty-level sanctions, along with what would be appropriate educational options (instead of punitive options such as course failure or suspension) would occur in fall 2021. Although the committee was told by the Provost that a brief summary of this meeting, along with the Guidance will be sent to us, we have not yet received any communications about the meeting. ..

However, since March 2021, an additional appeal – for a faculty-level sanction--was received by the Office of the Provost and a hearing was held on May 13, 2021. The appeal panel letter to the Provost was shared with Dr. Fawcett due to her position as chair of the Joint Disciplinary and Grievance Committee by the chair of the appeal panel, who wrote “Please note that implications on financial aid were provided to the Panel after the hearing had occurred. The Panel subsequently revised its initial recommendation after the implications were made available.” The final disposition of that appeal by the Provost was consistent with the appeal panel members’ recommendation. The committee chair subsequently contacted the Associate Provost to express concerns that sharing a student’s financial aid status with appeal panel members, who include faculty and students, may be a violation of protected personal information, which needs to be clarified and all faculty should be notified that knowledge of a student’s financial aid status may be considered in matters of academic integrity.

Noteworthy is that no revisions to procedures included in the Code of Student Conduct have been made as of the date of this report.

The Joint Disciplinary and Grievance Committee recommends that the work of this committee during AY 2021-2022 include meetings with the Provost and staff to:

- Identify a theoretical definition of restorative justice, to be reviewed and approved by the Faculty Council
- Develop an accurate and comprehensive Guidance document that serves as an operational definition of restorative justice, to be revised and approved by the Faculty Council, to the end that all UMass Boston faculty understand the procedures to be followed in instances of violation of academic integrity
- Identify a range of educational options and other options that are consistent with restorative justice, to be reviewed by the Faculty Council and disseminated to all UMass Boston faculty, to the end that all have knowledge of options for sanctions to be imposed in instances of violation of academic integrity.
- Revise the Code of Student Conduct to be consistent with the theoretical and operational definitions of restorative justice and gain approval at all appropriate levels of university governance, to the end that all students understand what is expected with regard to academic integrity.

I would like to express my most sincere appreciation to all voting and non-voting members of the Joint Disciplinary and Grievance Committee for their commitment to the ongoing work of the committee, as well as to all other faculty and students who served on appeal panels. I also would like to express my most sincere appreciation to Dr. Karen Ricciardi for her superb support and wise counsel of students who experienced academic integrity issues, as well as her sustained support of the members of the committee.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Jacqueline Fawcett". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, looping initial "J" and a period at the end.

Jacqueline Fawcett, RN; PhD; ScD (hon); FAAN: ANEF
Professor, Department of Nursing
Chairperson, Joint Disciplinary and Grievance Committee



**Report and Recommendations of the ad hoc
Committee on Elections of the Faculty Council**

March 25, 2019

Committee Membership

- Kevin Wozniak, *College of Liberal Arts (Committee Chair)*
- Caroline Coscia, *College of Liberal Arts*
- Marc Pomplun, *College of Science and Mathematics*
- Tim Poynton, *College of Education and Human Development*
- Teresa Roberts, *College of Nursing and Health Sciences*
- Romilla Syed, *College of Management*

Committee Charge

In 2017, the ad hoc Committee on Representation and Voting Rights identified numerous contradictions within the Constitution of the Faculty Council (FC) regarding representation and electoral procedures, especially as applied to colleges that were formed relatively recently in the university's history. Some of the most notable problems identified by this committee included:

1. The right of non-tenure track (NTT) faculty to cast votes in elections for FC candidates, but their inability to serve on the Council as representatives.
 - a. The committee was also unable to conclusively verify the extent to which NTT faculty who are constitutionally eligible to vote in FC elections are properly included in each college's election. Given the more fluid nature of the NTT ranks, their "eligible voter lists" must be updated more frequently than lists of the tenure-track (TT) faculty, and it was unclear how or if the colleges undertake such a screening process.
2. The Constitutional mandate that seats on the Council be apportioned relative to the number of faculty in each college conflicts with the cap of 29 Council seats and the requirement that each college have at least one seat on the Council. The creation of new colleges, such as the Honors College, necessitated taking seats *away* from larger colleges, which strains the principle of proportional representation.

3. The principle that each member of the faculty shall cast one vote for a representative may be violated if faculty who teach in more than one college receive more than one ballot per election.

Among the recommendations that this committee made to the FC was the following: “An Elections Committee should be formed to study the elections procedures in each college in the university and to make any necessary recommendations for reform or implementation in order to ensure that all NTT faculty are being correctly and sufficiently included in their college’s voting procedures for FC and ensure that no one is voting in more than one college.” This charge guided the work of the present committee. We distilled three key mandates from the Representation and Voting Rights Committee:

1. Gather information about the *process* by which each college currently elects its representatives to the FC.
2. Document the inclusion or exclusion of NTT faculty in said elections.
3. Determine whether or not any faculty receive ballots from more than one college in practice.

Process of Inquiry

In order to gather the information to write this report, the members of this committee attempted to contact the faculty or staff in each college who are responsible for conducting the elections. In many cases, this process lead us to speak with members of the deans’ staff or college steering committee. In a minority of cases, we were unable to successfully identify and contact the individual who historically oversaw the elections; in these cases, we queried the sitting Council representatives of the college in question to procure relevant information.

We omitted the College of Advancing and Professional Studies for two reasons. First, as discussed by the Committee on Representation and Voting Rights, CAPS presents one of two uniquely problematic cases for the FC. Though the FC Constitution dictates that CAPS, as a college, has a right to a seat on the council, CAPS possesses no TT faculty of its own, which means that it has no faculty who are constitutionally eligible to serve on the FC. Due to this constitutional contradiction, CAPS has never actually seated a representative on the FC. Second, at the time of this committee’s inquiry, CAPS is in a period of significant flux. With the creation of the system-wide UMass Online, changes to the UMB

collective bargaining agreement that allow TT faculty to teach online courses on-load during the academic year, and encouragement from the UMB Administration that departments expand their online course offerings, many responsibilities that were previously the province of CAPS are now being located elsewhere. These changes render the role of CAPS in the future of the university (and faculty governance) unclear.

FINDINGS

Procedures to Nominate and Elect Candidates

The Constitution of the Council states:

The Executive Committee of the Faculty Council shall inform the colleges no later than February 10 of each year of seats to be filled, and shall require that the colleges conduct elections to fill the seats.... Nominations for Council positions, and the Faculty Representative to the Board shall be accepted for a period of at least two weeks (excluding school vacation periods) and elections for the same positions shall encompass a period of at least two weeks. The results of the elections for the same positions shall encompass a period of at least two weeks. The results of the elections shall be reported no later than April 20 of each year. All full-time faculty members and all part-time faculty members who are at least half-time or who, during the course of their current employment as part-time faculty, have taught five courses over three consecutive semesters may vote in elections of members to the Faculty Council and of the Faculty Representative to the Board of Trustees.

Though this language dictates the timing of elections and defines who is eligible to vote, the Constitution does not define the process by which the colleges and schools are to conduct their elections. In the absence of specific guidance or a centralized electoral process, the colleges have historically employed a variety of different procedures to choose their representatives on the council.

The major distinction is between online versus in-person processes. As the largest college in the university, the College of Liberal Arts employs an online process and has done so for many years.

When the college has vacant seats on the FC, a member of the CLA dean's staff emails the college faculty to solicit nominations. Typically about two weeks later, the staff person again emails the faculty with a link to an online portal through which the faculty can cast their vote. The college has employed different web sites in different years to conduct the election, sometimes SurveyMonkey, sometimes Microsoft Office Forms. Voters are only presented with the names of nominated candidates; candidates do not provide any information or statement about why they wish to serve on the FC. When CLA has more than one vacancy on the FC, voters are asked to choose X number of candidates, where X corresponds to the number of vacant seats.

Two other colleges, Education & Human Development and Nursing & Health Sciences, are transitioning from in-person elections to online elections for the first time - during the 2018-2019 academic year in CNHS and approved to begin in the 2019-2020 academic year in EHD. Their new processes are similar to that of CLA; nominees are solicited via email, and a later email invites faculty to cast their vote through an online portal. CNHS employed SurveyMonkey for the 2019 election, and this committee confirmed that the election email was sent to both TT and NTT faculty in the college. Like CLA, only the names of CNHS nominees were presented to voters without additional information or candidate statements. CEHD has chosen to centralize its election process within the College Senate. The Senate will email faculty to solicit nominations, and nominees will be asked to present a brief statement explaining why they wish to serve on the FC. Faculty will cast their votes through an online portal; they anticipate using Qualtrics since the university has a subscription to this survey software. This committee was not able to conclusively determine the process by which CEHD will ensure that both TT and NTT faculty are included in the pertinent emails.

Prior to the 2018-2019 academic year, CEHD and CNHS were allotted a number of seats on the FC that equaled the number of departments in their colleges. As such, these two colleges previously delegated responsibility for the elections to the departments. All aspects of the elections were conducted in-person during regular department meetings. Changes to their numbers of allotted seats necessitated the shift to centralized, college-level, online processes.

The processes of the School for Global Inclusion & Social Development and the School for the Environment are similar to the old processes of CEHD and CNHS. Being smaller in size than the colleges at the university, these schools do not contain separate, formalized departments, and the faculty hold

meetings as a whole. As such, when the schools have a vacant seat on the FC, nominations are solicited during a faculty meeting, and faculty cast their votes in person at a subsequent meeting. Nominees from SFE are typically asked to prepare a brief statement explaining their interest in serving. This has reportedly not been the case among the SGISD faculty. NTT faculty in the SFE are invited to attend the school's meetings (which would include them in the election). A member of the SFE dean's office informed this committee that the number of NTT faculty who attend meetings varies month-to-month, but roughly 20% of eligible NTTs attend. In contrast, NTT faculty do not attend SGISD faculty meetings, which means that they have historically been excluded from the school's FC electoral process.

The College of Management employs a slightly different procedure. Dean's office staff work with the college Faculty Steering Committee to solicit nominations via an email sent to the faculty. Faculty must then go in person to the dean's office to cast their vote, in contrast to the department-level votes held in several other colleges.

Finally, three colleges – Science and Mathematics, the McCormack Graduate School of Policy & Global Studies, and the Honors College – report that they have not held an election for representatives to the FC in recent memory, for different reasons. For CSM and McCormack, members of the deans' staffs in each college report that it is commonly a struggle to motivate any of their faculty to nominate themselves to serve as a FC representative. As such, the typical course of events is that the deans' staff will cajole the eligible faculty until they produce enough willing faculty to fill the vacant seat(s). Since these are non-competitive circumstances, the faculty of these colleges have forgone elections and just allowed their deans to appoint representatives to the FC. While this sequence of events appears to be standard operating procedure in CSM and McCormack, it is not unique. There are some years in which CLA elections have also been non-competitive, and nominees are simply appointed to the FC without an election. Similarly, faculty in SGISD report that their elections are often pro-forma since they, too, often only produce one nominee at a given time to fill their one seat on the FC. Though this committee's fact finding process did not produce specific anecdotes of similar circumstances in other colleges, we suspect that non-competitive elections have occurred in every college at one time or another.

Similar to CAPS, the Honors College presents a unique problem for the FC. As UMB's newest college, HC is constitutionally granted a seat on the Council. However, HC currently possesses only one single TT faculty member who is wholly appointed within the college (other than the founding dean herself, but deans are not eligible to serve on the FC). Three other TT faculty hold joint appointments between HC and another college, and the rest of the college's faculty are merely affiliates whose appointments are held by other colleges. As it happened, HC's one sole TT faculty member was already an elected member of the FC when the honors program was elevated to college status, and so his seat on the council was simply shifted from CSM (his prior college of appointment) to the HC. His term on the FC is just now ending. As such, the HC has yet to hold an election for its representative on the FC. The HC Steering Committee is considering soliciting nominations from any faculty who have taught an honors course within the past 3 years, and extending the right to vote for the HC representative to the same pool of faculty. Given that virtually all the faculty who teach in the HC hold appointments in other colleges and likely have the opportunity to participate in those other colleges' FC elections, this will violate the FC Constitution's one person, one vote principle. The HC leadership and Steering Committee are aware of this conundrum, but they have been unable to think of a way to satisfy the conflicting constitutional requirements that each college have a seat on the FC, but each faculty person cast only one vote (i.e., vote in only one college's election). As the Representation and Voting Rights Committee noted, the FC Constitution, as it presently exists, simply cannot accommodate colleges like CAPS and Honors that do not possess their own ranks of TT faculty.

The Inclusion of NTT Faculty

This committee was rarely able to gather hard evidence to conclusively determine the extent to which NTT are appropriately included in each college's electoral process. In the cases of colleges that hold in-person elections during faculty meetings, the faculty present were obviously able to verify whether NTT faculty typically do (School for the Environment, Nursing & Health Sciences) or do not (Global Inclusion & Social Development) attend and participate in elections. Unfortunately, none of the colleges that employ online nomination (Science & Mathematics, Management) and/or elections procedures (Liberal Arts, now Education & Human Development) provided their faculty email lists to this committee so that we could verify the inclusion of NTT faculty. When queried, faculty and/or staff

in those colleges often said that they *believed* that their NTT colleagues were included on the emails, but they were not positive. Based upon the information provided to this committee, only the College of Nursing & Health Sciences appears to systematically ensure and track the participation of both its TT and NTT faculty in FC elections.

Due to the paucity of data and/or the reticence of colleges to share their data, this committee was largely rendered incapable of fulfilling one of its primary charges. We can draw no valid and reliable conclusion about the extent to which NTT faculty who are eligible to vote for FC representatives are systematically and routinely included or excluded in elections across the colleges. As the Representation and Voting Rights Committee noted, the NTT have recently surpassed the TT faculty to make up a majority of the faculty population employed at UMB. Given this fact, the uncertainty surrounding their inclusion in the faculty governance process is a significant problem that must be addressed.

Participation

Only the College of Nursing and Health Sciences was able to provide data about the rate at which their faculty have participated in recent elections. During the 2018 election (in-person or via conference call during a faculty meeting), 13 out of 24 TT faculty and 16 out of 136 NTT faculty cast votes. This equates to 54% participation among TT faculty and 12% participation among NTT faculty. During the 2019 election (online via SurveyMonkey), 32 out of 51 faculty voted for a 62% participation rate; the college was not able to provide data separated by tenure stream for this election because doing so would have violated the anonymous nature of the survey they employed. This committee did confirm that CNHS was *not* able to systematically update its eligible voter email list before conducting the new, online election survey, which means that some NTT faculty who do not meet the voting eligibility criteria may have been invited to cast a vote.

Violation of One Person, One Vote

Despite making requests of Human Resources, the Office of the Provost, and the Faculty Staff Union, this committee was unable to procure a complete list of TT and NTT faculty. Ultimately this did not matter since we were unable to procure the faculty email lists employed by each of the colleges to

cross-check anyway. Thus, just as we could not produce the data necessary to evaluate the inclusion of NTT faculty in elections, we also cannot empirically answer the question, “How many joint-appointment faculty receive ballots from more than one college?” All we can say for certain is that once the Honors College implements its election plan, all faculty who have taught an honors class in the past 3 years will be invited to vote for both an HC representative to the FC and a representative(s) for their home college or school.

Summary of Findings

Table 1 summarizes the findings of our inquiry. Our overarching conclusion is that electoral processes employed by the colleges and schools of the university are insufficiently formalized. The colleges employ a range of tactics to solicit nominations and conduct elections, but most of these tactics have significant limitations. When nominations are solicited and elections are conducted during in-person faculty meetings, faculty who are not present are unable to exercise their rights granted under the FC Constitution. This disenfranchisement-in-practice most likely falls disproportionately on NTT faculty. We have evidence of this fact from CNHS, but based upon anecdotal conversations, we believe that NTT faculty are systematically underrepresented at faculty meetings across the campus. Setting up a proxy voting process could alleviate this problem, but none of the people who shared information with this committee indicated that their colleges employed such a process. Online elections potentially have a more comprehensive reach, but only if the email list used to solicit nominations and conduct the elections is comprehensive. Our informants across the colleges were distressingly incapable of answering our questions about the integrity of said email lists, at least with any specificity or certainty. The lack of data also means that we cannot judge the degree to which faculty actually participate in FC elections (i.e., how many votes are cast in proportion to the population of eligible voters). Finally, we discovered that many colleges routinely struggle to motivate faculty to nominate themselves or others to serve on the FC. This apathy toward the FC is so pronounced in a few colleges that they have not conducted a true election in years, instead merely appointing whichever faculty member could be cajoled into filling the college’s FC seat for a term.

Table 1: Summary of Findings

College/School	Nomination Process	Electoral Process	Candidate Information Provided to Voters?	NTT Faculty Included?	Turnout/Participation
Education & Human Development	<i>Pre-2019 =</i> In-person; <i>2019 =</i> Online	<i>Pre-2019 =</i> In-person; <i>2019 =</i> Online	Yes (Anticipated)	Unclear	No data available
Liberal Arts	Online	Online	No	Unclear	No data available
Management	Online	In-person	No	Yes	No data available
Nursing & Health Sciences	<i>Pre-2019 =</i> In-person; <i>2019 =</i> Online	<i>Pre-2019 =</i> In-person; <i>2019 =</i> Online	No	Yes	<i>2018 Election:</i> 54% TT, 12% NTT <i>2019 Election:</i> 62.3% (total eligible faculty)
Science and Mathematics	Online	Not applicable	No	Unclear	Not applicable
Honors	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	Not applicable
McCormack Graduate School	Not applicable	Not applicable	No	Unclear	No data available
Global Inclusion & Social Development	In-person	In-person	No	No	No data available
Environment	In-person	In-person	Yes	Yes	No data available

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based upon the information we gathered, and more importantly, the questions we were unable to answer due to a dearth of archived, publicly available data, we recommend that the FC consolidate and standardize the election process. We propose that the FC adopt the process utilized by the Faculty Staff Union (FSU). An elections committee of the FSU is responsible for soliciting nominations for open seats on the FSU Executive Committee and for overseeing the elections process. Both stages of the election are conducted online. FSU members are sent an email announcing Ex Comm vacancies with nomination forms. To conduct the elections, the FSU elections committee uses BallotBin,¹ a free online elections portal. BallotBin allows a list of email addresses to be uploaded from an Excel file, and the website automatically flags broken email links. A separate ballot is created for each open position on

¹ <https://www.ballotbin.com/>

the Ex Comm, and FSU members receive ballots that correspond to each position for which they are eligible to cast a vote. Ex Comm positions are tied to faculty stream and rank. For example, one Ex Comm member represents tenured faculty, one represents tenure-track faculty, one represents NTTs, etc. The president and vice president represent the whole membership. Thus, in a hypothetical scenario of a year in which the president and vice president were up for election, a TT assistant professor member of the FSU would receive three ballots: one to vote for president, one to vote for vice president, and one to vote for the tenure-track (i.e., pre-tenure) representative. BallotBin tracks and identifies voters who have cast their votes (i.e., it tracks participation on a rolling basis), but it never reveals to the administrator (i.e., the members of the elections committee) the individual vote *choices* of the voters, and the aggregate *totals* of the votes are also blinded from the administrators until the close of the election period.

The FC could easily adapt this process. The FC could constitute a standing elections committee that would be responsible for gathering and maintaining the rolls of TT and NTT faculty in each college or school who are eligible to vote, delineated by college of appointment in the data file. The elections committee would use the college-specific lists to solicit nominations for open seats via email. Come time for the election, the elections committee would create ballots in BallotBin that would be tied to each college's seats on the FC in the same way that the FSU creates ballots tied to the rank-and-stream-delineated seats on the Ex Comm. Voters would only receive a ballot associated with his/her/their college of appointment.

We believe that making this change would ameliorate several of the problems identified by this committee and our predecessor, the Committee on Representation and Voting Rights. First, if the FC centralized and assumed responsibility for the election of its members (delegated to an elections committee), the FC would be able to constantly monitor and update the rolls of vote-eligible faculty. Importantly, if all the data were contained in one place, the FC would be able to identify faculty who teach in more than one college. By employing an online process, the FC would ensure that all eligible faculty are contacted and included in the election, not just those faculty who are able to attend a faculty meeting or cast an in-person vote on campus. The digital ballots could be programed to include both a short statement about the duties of Faculty Councilors, in general, as well as specific statements from candidates explaining why they wish to serve on the FC; this information would empower voters

to make more informed decisions when casting their votes. Finally, a centralized, online election process would ensure that a true election is always held (even if the choice presented to voters is a single candidate vs. a write-in space), and BallotBin would empower the FC to track voting participation rates over time. We do recognize that this solution would not be perfect. Merely quantifying the number of cross-appointed faculty would not resolve the problem they present to the one person, one vote principle. Nor would a centralized process fix the problems that the Honors College (and possible also CAPS) presents to the FC Constitution, as presently written. However, we believe that an online election process run by a standing elections committee of the FC through the use of BallotBin (or a comparable website) would be the best, feasible way to strengthen the elections for representatives to the FC.

A Comment on Engagement

We end this report with a broader, more fundamental observation. In the course of our investigation, the members of this committee detected an underlying sense of apathy from the faculty toward the Faculty Council and the faculty governance process it represents. We draw this conclusion based upon several of our findings:

1. The fact that most of the colleges appear not to track their faculty's participation in FC elections over time, and that the absence of these data do not register as a problem
2. The fact that most colleges struggle to recruit nominees to serve on the Council, frequently yielding non-competitive elections
3. The fact that the problem noted in (2) is so pronounced in several colleges that they haven't even *held* a proper election in several years (even if that election would only give voters a choice between a single candidate and the option to write in a different nominee)

Through informal conversations with faculty colleagues, several members of this committee (across colleges) learned that faculty, by and large, have only a vague sense of what the FC does or how it affects their working conditions. Due to a lack of understanding of the FC's role and lack of confidence in the FC's institutional importance, faculty are not terribly motivated to serve on the FC, pay attention to what the FC does on a regular basis, or bring their concerns to the FC (as evidenced by the generally-poor attendance at the bi-annual Open Meetings).

Centralizing and standardizing the elections for the FC would fix several of the *structural, process-related* problems with the status quo, but a streamlined process will be for naught if faculty are neither motivated to serve nor vote for their representatives on the FC. Fixing this problem will require a much more extensive dialogue among the faculty to better understand what the faculty want the Council to be and do. In the preceding year, the FC has begun to hold conversations about how to improve the representational link between Councilors and their college constituents. We recommend that these conversations continue and reach beyond the Council “chamber” itself. Only then will we be able to revitalize faculty engagement in the governance process from the ground up.