CLA Senate Minutes

March 10, 2025

2:30-4

1. Approval of February meeting minutes (5 min)
	1. Approved
2. Dialogue with CLA Dean on Faculty Satisfaction and Retention report
	1. Has read through the report, considered it
	2. Thoughts and Reactions
		1. Deans lead from the middle
		2. Seeks to find and expand Venn Diagram of commonality between faculty, upper administration
			1. There is much common ground in the political moment that we are in
			2. We can work together
		3. Two areas of unhappiness among faculty: lack of support for research and grants (cannot address right now)/Salaries
			1. They are quite low, and especially compared to other UMass campuses
			2. And we don’t have merit pay, which was a way to address this
			3. Across-the-board raises are inequitable
			4. Merit pay is NOT the only solution to all of our problems, but we are in bargaining now and that might be one way to go
			5. People over time are making less and less
			6. Counter offers are the way to get higher offers
			7. Too much of a gap between salary anomaly reviews as well
		4. Second Area: Service Inequities
			1. Twenty percent service translates to ~6 hours/week
			2. But some people do a lot and others do very little
			3. Caution: sometimes a named service gets a lot of prestige, but people doing a lot of unnamed service are doing more work
				1. Think of directing a small minor vs. the CPC, for example
			4. If we do dashboards, need to quantify hours
		5. Shared Governance: Dean’s Office attempts to be as collaborative as possible

* 1. QUESTIONS FROM FACULTY:
		1. One senator asks about offload service and lack of standardization of this, wonders if it leads to unrecognized work
			1. Dean would prefer no ad hoc understandings of this issue
			2. Would be open to an MOU for the entire college, work with Faculty Council’s work
		2. One senator asks about the 40-40-20 criteria for teaching/research/service, which they have not seen; is this the current criteria for promotion?; also, how does this relate to departments that have consciously maintained more equity between the three?
			1. Dean suggests raising this with the Dean of the Faculty
			2. This was an informal mention of their policy
			3. We all have nine-month contracts, and summer is 100% research, so quantifying this is difficult and perhaps not advisable in some ways
		3. One senator disagrees with the characterization that merit pay would lead to higher salaries automatically; we need decent salary floors to allow everyone to live decently in Boston; first we should do that, THEN think about merit pay; would love for the Dean to help with this
			1. Dean asserts that the salary floor question is being discussed
			2. Often associate deans are lobbying for the faculty as well
			3. Some departments have a more equitable salary structure than others, partly due to hiring practices and partly due to other factors
				1. Does not make sense, as departments are doing the same work
				2. But dependent upon most recent junior hire
			4. Salary inequity is a real problem and agrees that everyone’s salaries must go up
			5. Wants to stress that the administration is “open to merit”
		4. One senator notes that merit is a small part of salary increases
			1. There is no perfect meritocracy here
			2. There are a few things: awards, etc
			3. On a yearly basis there is some value to it
			4. Should happen across departments, perhaps grouping some
		5. One senator notes that the merit process created strife within departments as well
			1. But the bulk of the merit was in Pool B, which deans allotted
		6. One senator remembers feeling like merit took money away from other people in their department; equitable merit ended up being an almost across the board process anyway
		7. One senator is concerned about shared governance and how it might be implemented better
			1. There are currently groups of faculty members meeting in small groups
			2. Both parties need to be willing, and wondering about willingness on both sides
			3. Any suggestions?
				1. Senator: LOTS of issues, could develop a list but there have been lots of recommendations
				2. Senator: would like to meet and establish some sort of plan
				3. Senator: lack of satisfaction with the process as it stands

Could have town halls, timelines, etc

We DO have a lot on the table

* + 1. One senator would like some acknowledgement of the lack of shared governance; difficult to arrive at resolution without that; needs to be the first step
		2. One senator thinks it would be in the interest of the Provost to have some sort of discussion with us; burden of proof should not rest on faculty alone
1. Moderator’s report
2. Report back from SPACE resolution
	1. Heard back from Kathleen Kirleis, encourages faculty to go to BORP as the appropriate place for feedback
	2. Feels like an insufficient response to the existing, flagrant problem
3. Report back on governance body leadership
	1. Other schools DO have representation:

i. College of Liberal Arts Senate: Chris Barcelos
ii. College of Science and Mathematics Senate: Maxim Olchanyi
iii. College of Education and Human Development Senate: Andre Maharaj
iv. Manning College of Nursing and Health Sciences Senate: Laurie Milliken
v. College of Management Steering Committee:  Atreya Chakraborty
vi. Honors College: No senate, only a governing council with the Dean as chair.
vii. School for the Environment: Juanita Urban-Rich Chair (AY2024-2027)

1. Report on possible all University survey
	1. Likely that FC will launch an all-faculty, cross-university survey; NOT for CLA (since CLA results are so recent)
		1. Hoping to do this before NECHE
2. Reminder to submit public comment for NECHE by 3/23

https://www.umb.edu/about/accreditation--rankings/

1. Ask from Maria on budget
2. The budget is proposed to incentivize: 1) impactful research, 2) holistic student success and 3) community engagement. We worry that some of the current "levers" represent a misalignment and might in fact counter these goals that are supposed to be incentivized. One core area is research where 15% of the state appropriations are distributed in accordance with research - but the only parameter used is in terms of financial support received i.e. "grants and contracts". We are afraid that most of CLA's research will be hidden on these metrics and thus not incentivized. (We asked at the last info session about this and were given a nonsensical answer - that it had to be based on income as there had to be an income to distribute. But that does not make sense as there already is such an income to distribute, namely the state appropriation.)

In terms of the senate or ask was if senators share our concern and if so if people can think of other metrics that would make their research visible and incentivize "impactful research" at our college.

(I also presented other similar issues of potential misalignment e.g. on the issue of paying for space use - we have not been able to get very clear information about what space more precisely will be charged for - but all centers and institutes it seems will be charged for example. Again is this something senators are concerned about etc.)

Basically, it is up to the senate to decide what to do with the information, but the other connected question is whether the senate wants to use our information to push back on aspects of the BBM via other avenues perhaps including FC and/or potentially formally ask the budget committee to seek more precise info from the provost office on areas that have not yet been clarified or where there are misalignments. We can then say that the senate has sent us to find out/suggest changes etc.

1. New business
	1. No course approvals this month—some for next month, so please read
	2. Discussion of new R1 designation and impact on research productivity and promotion
		1. Any concerns on impact for research productivity?
		2. One senator notes that their first job was at an R1 and there was a very different metric for research productivity and teaching
		3. One senator believes this will solidify a long-term trend at the institution to create a hierarchy between teaching, research, and service
			1. Seems reflective of administrative denial of problems
		4. One senator agrees, we need clarity on these issues; AND graduate programs need to reflect R1 status—need more money for longer, better research structures, etc
		5. One senator argues that we need far more faculty to be able to maintain an R1 institution; “you can only operate” like this “for so long—this is unsustainable”
		6. One senator wonders if there are specific expectations or guidelines given the current state of our country; we have higher expectations for research, but we don’t have the infrastructure (faculty numbers, satisfaction, other resources) necessary; we NEED guidance on this; cannot fall on faculty to maintain
		7. One senator notes that it is difficult to retain R1 status with underfunded faculty, grad students, etc—this is unsustainable; wonders how long statuses last
		8. One senator states that the Dean of the Faculty is a good person to ask about these issues
		9. One senator thinks we could ask for clarification from the Dean’s Office as well—moderator will ask about this
		10. Perhaps this is a long-term thing to pay attention to
	3. Request for participation in faculty event
		1. Faculty organizing an event responding to global/national events
		2. Please contact Kelly.Colvin@umb.edu if you have any questions or are interested
	4. OER memo
		1. Soon we will have to justify course costs
		2. Where is this push coming from? Is there a Senate response?
		3. One senator observes that the administration is making OER a requirement rather than a suggestion, but could be positive for students ultimately
2. Adjourn