



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

University Governance
Faculty Council

https://www.umb.edu/faculty_staff/faculty_council

November 4th and 18th, 2024

Minutes for Monday, November 4, 2024, 1:00 – 3:00 pm

Members Present: Richard Hunter (CLA), Lynne Benson (CLA), Marlene Kim (CLA), Harry Konstantinidis (CLA), Timothy Oleksiak (CLA), Amy Todd (CLA), Gretchen Umholtz (CLA), Peter Lert (CSM), Larry Kaye (CLA), Nelson Lande (CLA), Niya Sa (CSM), Lusa Lo (CEHD), Abdelkrim Mouhib (CLA), Daniel Gascon (CLA), Todd Drogy (HC), Ana Lindsay (CNHS), Robert Kim (CM), Lorena Estrada-Martinez (SFE), Jason Rodriguez (CLA), Leon Zurawicki (CM), Alex Mueller (CLA), Jeffrey Stokes (CNHS), Shaman Hatley (CLA), Tyler Hull (CM), Lisa Heelan-Fancher (CNHS)

Members Absent: , Edward Ginsberg (CSM), Wenfan Yan (CEHD), Paul Dyson (CLA), Anthony Van DerMeer (CLA), Janna Kellinger (CEHD), Mohsin Habib (CM), Nurul Aman (on leave, CLA), Gonzalo Bacigalupe (on leave, CEHD)

Representatives Present: Caroline Coscia (FSU), Penelope MacDonald (PSU), Alexa McPherson (CSU), Jonathan Vega Martinez (GEO)

I. Motion to approve the Agenda

Motion Approved – unanimous

II. Motion to Approve the Oct 7, 2024 Meeting Minutes

Motion Approved – unanimous

III. Motion to approve minor updates to Standing Committee membership:

- Academic Affairs Committee: Michael Johnson, representative from the Restorative Justice Commission (2024-2025 AY)
- Research Committee Co-chairs: Daniel Remein and Sun Kim
- Writing Proficiency Subcommittee: Bryan Williams, Undergraduate Studies
- Distribution Subcommittee: Ting Chen, Sheldon Kovitz, and Lisa Rivera as co-chairs of the Distribution Subcommittee

- Further additions and changes to committee memberships are still open and should be communicated to faculty.council@umb.edu, they will be brought to a subsequent Faculty Council meeting for a ratification vote

Motion Approved – unanimous

IV Motions from the General Education Distribution Committee (See [Appendix A](#))

Motions Approved – unanimous

V. Motions from the Graduate Studies Committee (See [Appendix B](#))

Motions Approved – unanimous

VI. Discussion of previously circulated reports from union representatives:

- Full reports available: [6. Reports from Representatives to Faculty Council](#)

a. Classified Staff University (CSU) President, Alexa McPherson

- Securing living wages is the priority of bargaining. CSU payscale has not had a major overhaul in over 20 years, Governor’s parameters have not kept up with rate of inflation and CSU members are falling into debt while working full time. Low wages are compounded by rising healthcare and parking costs, many CSU members drive because they go directly from campus to a 2nd job.
- CSU Member testimonies available here: [1\) CSU Living Wage Testimonies 10-11-2024.pdf](#)

b. Professional Staff Union (PSU) Vice President, Penelope MacDonald

- PSU filed Unfair Labor Practice (ULP) charges on 9/18 regarding management’s resistance to allowing for PSU members to participate in bargaining sessions as silent representatives, ground rules have since been established to allow for silent representatives but no bargaining sessions have been scheduled yet
- PSU sent management a Cease & Desist Letter regarding the Space Use Policy, but no action has been taken because management doesn’t recognize the policy as relevant to bargaining issues

c. Faculty Staff Union (FSU) President, Caroline Coscia – postponed to later in agenda

d. Graduate Employee Organization (GEO) Representative, Jonathan Vega Martinez

- In October meet Administration reported having a positive operating margin and having doubled financial reserves, was this achieved by reducing labor costs and imposing austerity measures onto employees?
- GEO was not notified about the Beacon Budget Model’s impacts on Graduate Assistantship allocations, nor were Graduate Program Directors. GEO supports the resolution (Agenda Item VII) to halt implementation of this policy.
- Will this new Budget Model have the effect of forcing departments to compete with each other over scarce resources, sowing discord among colleagues?
- GEO is concerned about Administration implementing Space Use Policies without any consultation, and now using it to discipline union organizers from CSU

VII. Motion concerning the Graduate Assistant Allocation Policy (See [Appendix C](#))

- Member Alex Mueller introduced motion:
 - Motion has been endorsed by CLA Senate and 25 Graduate Program Directors (GPDs) across colleges
 - Existing allocation policy grants level-funding year to year, offering predictability and consistency which allows for informed recruitment and admissions decisions; new allocation policy forces programs to compete against each other via departmental applications reviewed by upper administrators
 - Two primary objections to the new policy:
 1. It was implemented without consultation of any faculty governance policies, betraying principles of shared governance (including GPDs, Department Chairs Union (DCU), or Graduate Studies Committee of Faculty Council)
 2. The policy was announced October 2nd and applications for allocations are due by December, thus not enough notice given to meet this dramatically short turn-around time
- DCU Chair Michael Carr comments on lack of clear purpose behind policy
 - Deans were the only ones notified of the new policy, and have struggled to provide clear instructions or communicate clear expectations of outcomes from this data gathering exercise
 - Department Chairs have not been provided clear guidance on what information they are expected to provide, nor given adequate time to gather it
 - Entire process feels like “doing something for the sake of doing something” rather than for any discernable constructive purpose
- Member questions Provost: What about the existing policy wasn’t working well? And would it be feasible to delay implementation of the policy by a year to allow time for a more inclusively-informed policy to be developed?
 - Provost comments on multiple purposes of assistantships: financially supporting students, providing educational and professional learning experiences for students, and conducting work that supports the research and teaching missions of the university
 - Provost responds that there is lack of data on how current assistantships are being utilized; cites concerns about inequalities between research assistantships and teaching assistantships, inequalities in teaching assistantships serving different class sizes, and inequalities in allocations between MA and PhD programs
 - Provost responds that historically assistantships have been allocated for one-year increments, new policy aims to introduce improved continuity by allocating assistantships that span multiple years
 - Provost advises that intention is not to drastically shift current allocation patterns nor to implement all new policy changes in one fell swoop, entire policy will be phased in incrementally over 3 years but immediate focus is on gathering data to inform next steps

- Provost advises that a Committee will be formed under the auspices of the Office of Graduate Studies (OGS) which will be empowered with making allocation decisions based on its analysis of data gathered in initial stages
- Provost expresses desire to adhere to principle of shared governance and work with Faculty members and governance bodies to ensure smooth implementation of policy that meets everyone's needs
- Provost objects to delaying implementation of new policy because too much work had already been put into it to stop now, and delaying data gathering will only further delay successful policy implementation
- Member expresses concerns about lack of shared governance: Faculty were not consulted about policy in any substantive way until abruptly being asked to perform the labor of gathering data for it, and now a committee is being formed after the policy has already been established
 - Member questions Provost: Which specific faculty governance bodies were consulted during the formation of this policy?
 - Provost responds that conversations about revising the policy took place 3 or 4 years ago with certain GPDs, during which a desire was expressed to move away from year to year allocations
 - Provost advises that policy is intended to be phased in over multiple years, with faculty feedback being incorporated along the way
 - Provost asserts that Administration holds primary responsibility for allocation of resources, but concedes that faculty should be consulted and substantively included in decision making processes and reaffirms desire to adhere to principle of shared governance
- Member questions Provost: How are consultations from 3 years ago relevant to implementation of policy now? How many individuals involved in those conversations 3 years ago are still in the same leadership positions today?
 - Member expresses concerns over process through which policy was communicated: Policy was only officially announced to Deans, GPDs only became aware of it when they were asked to gather information for it
 - Member comments that new policy may genuinely be beneficial improvement over current policy, but its impossible to know because Faculty remain unclear what the policy actually is and therefore it remains impossible to evaluate
 - Provost advises that policy was announced to Deans and that clarifications have been since been provided in other venues, such as Faculty Council
 - Provost commits to responding to Motion in a timely manner if it is passed
- Member questions Provost: GPDs will not be admitted to the OGS Committee charged with making decisions because this would represent a conflict of interest. So how will GPDs be consulted throughout the implementation of the policy?
 - Provost agrees with assessment that GPDs would have a conflict of interest, and advises that all committee members will be working toward the common good of the entire university. Provost comments that transparency and open

dialogue are necessary to ensure committee members are fulfilling this vision.

- Member comments that if goal of new policy is to provide continuity, the existing policy has historically been achieving this: Programs have had predictability of year to year allocations, whereas new model introduces a range of possible allocations and risk of losing allocations in multiyear increments
 - Provost differentiates between policy and practice: it has been common practice that allocations roll over each year, but actual policy does not guarantee this
 - Provost asserts need for evidence, clear priorities, and an inclusive process to develop a policy that meets everyone's needs
 - Provost advises that new policy will have a 3 year review cycle for allocations, similar to Periodic Multi-Year Reviews for Faculty personnel cases
- Member comments that current issue of allocation policy has striking similarities to process that occurred with the academic reorganization of McCormack Graduate School (MGS) into College of Liberal Arts (CLA), in both cases a major change was announced on a tight timeline and with minimal details as to its purpose or how it will be achieved.
 - Member questions Provost: Why didn't you engage with Faculty as allies to solve this problem in the first place? Instead of raising this issue to Faculty Council to generate solutions together, once again you implemented a policy first and are now on the defensive. Were any lessons learned from the MGS-CLA academic reorganization process?
 - Provost advises that he had informal conversations with multiple academic departments regarding the academic reorganization process before making any decisions
 - Provost comments that there is a 'the chicken and the egg' relationship between policy formation and faculty feedback, more important that both occur continuously than which came first
- Member questions Provost: If you don't anticipate any drastic changes to allocations this year, could we spend a year gathering data and do a practice run through the new allocation model without the high stakes' consequences?
 - Provost responds that there is an advantage to begin making multiyear commitments now, and that evidence is necessary to do so
 - Member questions if it would it be possible to do that, but with a promise that programs will not lose any existing assistantship allocations this year?
 - Provost responds that minor shifts in allocations do occur under existing policy based on OGS's analysis of enrollments, so he cannot commit to no changes in allocations because such changes have always occurred, but reaffirms that intent is not for new policy to produce any major changes
- Faculty Council Chair Amy Todd comments that in addition to GPDs, there are a number of Faculty Council standing committees that should have been consulted in

formation of this policy: Graduate Studies Committee, and Financial Aid Admissions and Records Committee since assistantships aim to financially support students

- Chair of Graduate Studies Committee (GSC) Andre Maharaj cites [Faculty Council Bylaws Section 16 Part A](#) in asserting that GSC must be given opportunity to assess impact of this policy prior to implementation
 - GSC submitted report to Faculty Council in May 2023 commenting on needs for additional supports for graduate students, requests opportunity to assess how new policy would meet the needs identified in that report
- Member comments that the biggest obstacle to graduate student success is low stipends not meeting costs of living thus requiring students to take on multiple jobs, biggest priority of new policy should be equitably funding assistantships to ensure students receive adequate financial support to succeed in graduate school
- Member comments on general feeling that Administration's decision-making processes are imposing unnecessary emotional labor and negatively impacting job satisfaction, Administration could win good will by speaking with faculty and staff prior to implementing policies that create more work for them

Motion Approved – 18 in favor, 2 abstentions, 0 opposed

VI. (Continued) Discussion of previously circulated reports from union representatives:

d. Faculty Staff Union (FSU) President, Caroline Coscia

- FSU has taken three actions related to the University's updated Space Use Policy
 - i. Sent Cease and Desist Letter to Chancellor on 9/10, Labor Relations responded indicating that the University doesn't see the policy as a relevant subject of mandatory bargaining
 - ii. Filed Prohibited Practices Charges (per MGL 150e) alleging policy produces a chilling effect of intimidation that hinders FSU members from engaging in concerted activity, hearing scheduled for January 2025
 - iii. FSU Executive Committee issued statement on 11/30 condemning the use of the Space Use Policy to charge staff members with disciplinary violations for their participation in the vigil on 10/8
- Full report available: [3\) Faculty Staff Union Report Nov 4.docx](#)

VIII. Discussion of previously circulated reports from administrators:

- Full reports available: [5. Administrators' Reports](#)

a. Chancellor, Marcelo Suárez-Orozco – no verbal report, left meeting during PSU report

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

- University Assessment Council will be relaunched after laying dormant for several years, will include broad representation from across campus and will assess program and student learning objectives
- Canvas LMS migration going well, 70% of campus has received training, most courses will be on Canvas for Spring semester and all will be by Summer

- Curriculog Working Group is being established to streamline governance and improve architecture of system, sent memo to Faculty Council asking for nominations to join committee

c. Vice Chancellor for Administration & Finance, Kathleen Kirleis – no verbal report

IX. Discussion of previously circulated reports from student government:

- Full reports available: [6. Reports from Representatives to Faculty Council](#)

a. Representatives from the Graduate Student Government – no verbal report

b. Vice President of Undergraduate Student Government, Julia Olszewski – no verbal report

X. Inter-College Requirement Change Notification motion. (See [Appendix D](#))

- Motions are intended to eliminate situations in which programs within one college may add/subtract courses taught by another college from their own college requirements, as occurred in August
- Clarification provided that motion mandates inter-college communication in these situations; only requires notification, does not mandate consultation with other college's governance bodies
- Member expresses concern that policy may be overly broad and restrict ability to innovate new courses within respective colleges
 - Provost advises that forthcoming Curriculog committee could assist with streamlining governance issues such as this
 - Member clarifies that language of the motion refers to 'program changes' thus referring only to changes in programmatic requirements, not applicable to creation/discontinuation of all courses

Motion Approved – unanimous

XI. Seeking volunteers to serve as interim Parliamentarian

- No discussion

XII. Open seats on Faculty Council

- Andre Maharaj has volunteered as Faculty Council member and representative to Board of Trustees

XIII. Contract with Stata: software can be downloaded onto to school-owned computers for \$25, but since graduate students are not supplied with their laptops by UMB they have to pay \$180/yr for the same software.

- Member summarizes that University's contract with Stata only applies to University's owned devices, meaning students with personal devices must pay out of pocket
- Provost advises that the matter has been referred to IT for further investigation, since IT oversees procurement of software contracts

XIV. New Business

- Member raises changes made to Protest and Demonstration sections of Space Use Policy, expresses desire to longer conversation than remaining time allows for
 - Member expresses preference to continue conversation in a 2nd November Faculty Council meeting on 11/18 rather than waiting until December meeting on 12/2
- Member questions Provost regarding Inter-College Requirement Change Notification ([Agenda Item X / Appendix D](#)): Do individual colleges have the authority to restrict which courses meet the requirements for general education within their colleges, without going through Faculty Council?
 - Provost advises that all changes to programmatic requirements must go through appropriate college governance, if changes are significantly major they must go through Faculty Council

XV. Motion to Adjourn

- Motion to adjourn temporarily and reconvene for continued discussion of New Business on Monday, November 18th at 1:00 pm

Motion Approved – unanimous

Minutes for Monday, November 18, 2024, 1:00 – 3:00 pm

Members Present: Lynne Benson (CLA), Alex Mueller (CLA), Timothy Oleksiak (CLA), Amy Todd (CLA), Nelson Lande (CLA), Peter Lert (CSM), Niya Sa (CSM), Lusa Lo (CEHD), Gretchen Umholtz (CLA), Daniel Gascon (CLA), Lorena Estrada-Martinez (SFE), Janna Kellinger (CEHD), Richard Hunter (CLA), Shaman Hatley (CLA), Anthony Van DerMeer (CLA), Lisa Heelan-Fancher (CNHS)

Members Absent: Marlene Kim (CLA), Harry Konstantinidis (CLA), Larry Kaye (CLA), Nelson Lande (CLA), Abdelkrim Mouhib (CLA), Todd Drogy (HC), Ana Lindsay (CNHS), Robert Kim (CM), Jason Rodriguez (CLA), Leon Zurawicki (CM), Jeffrey Stokes (CNHS), Tyler Hull (CM), Edward Ginsberg (CSM), Wenfan Yan (CEHD), Paul Dyson (CLA), Mohsin Habib (CM), Nurul Aman (on leave, CLA), Gonzalo Bacigalupe (on leave, CEHD)

Representatives Present: Jonathan Vega Martinez (GEO), Alexa McPherson (CSU),

I. New Business: Continued Discussion from 11/4 Meeting

I. New Business: Continued Discussion from 11/4 Meeting

- FC Chair Amy Todd summarizes previous discussion begun at first November Meeting on 11/4, regarding revised Protest and Demonstration section of Space Use Policy

- Further information and related resources available here: [Protest and Demonstration Policy Documents](#)
 - Point of Order: Discussion of topic cannot begin until a Faculty Council member puts forward a motion to do so
- FC Executive Committee Member Timothy Oleksiak puts forward motion for Faculty Council to endorse the CLA Senate’s “Resolution on Space Use & Reservation Policies” ([Appendix E](#)) and reads aloud the language of the resolution
- Member poses question: What are Space Use policies at other UMass campuses, and how does UMass Boston’s policy compare?
 - FC Chair Amy Todd advises Faculty Council can look into this
- Member poses 3 questions: What are the differences between the old and new policies? Why was it updated when it was? Who was involved in the process of updating it?
 - Member elaborates with follow up question: There is no history of violent protest on this campus, what was the threat assessment that prompted the creation of a new policy?
 - Member quotes from [Steve Strifler’s article in the Point](#): “Since UMass Boston did not experience much in the way of protests or demonstrations last Spring, our administrators were faced with the tough task of imposing a solution where there was no problem.”
 - Member draws comparison to previous discussion of Assistantship Allocation Policy: new policy being implemented for no discernable reason, no clear rationale for what the problem is that these new policies solve
- Vice Chancellor for Administration & Finance Kathleen Kirleis comments on rationale for formation of policy
 - VC Kirleis advises that a decades worth of major construction projects have now been completed (specifically cites [SDQD Project](#)), this has significantly altered the physical layout of the campus and thus necessitated an updated Space Use Policy to reflect the updated ways in which the campus is physically laid out
 - VC Kirleis advises that policy was formed over the Summer in anticipation of construction being completed and return of students to campus in Fall
 - VC Kirleis cites ensuring safety of individuals on campus as main priority of the policy, acknowledges that “academic freedom is essential” and that 1st Amendment imposes certain requirements on UMB as a public institution
 - VC Kirleis indicates willingness to meet with campus constituents to discuss concerns related to policy
 - VC Kirleis comments that catwalks connecting buildings used to allow for an alternative pathway to avoid engaging with protests taking place on the plaza, with the removal of these catwalks the plaza must now be kept unobstructed at all times

- o VC Kirleis advises that exceptions to Advanced Notification requirements for “Impromptu Protests” only apply to UMB community members, external groups would still need to register their event via the form
- VC Kirleis comments on process undertaken to create policy
 - o VC Kirleis advises that a committee was convened over the summer to formulate a policy, reiterates that completion of construction projects necessitated an updated policy to reflect the changed campus layout
 - o VC Kirleis advises that policy was announced via email in August, and was further explained via Campus Update event in October
 - o VC Kirleis advises that committee reviewed policies at other institutions, including UMass Amherst and Lowell, other public universities, other urban universities, and worked with Office of General Counsel
 - o VC Kirleis cites freedom of speech in the ‘marketplace of ideas’ as the orienting philosophy of the committee; acknowledges that individuals have a right to express their viewpoints but asserts that Administration has authority to regulate how those viewpoints are expressed on campus
 - o VC Kirleis advises that consultant firm [Edward Davis Company](#) was consulted by committee, a firm that has advised the UMass system and other universities nationwide on campus protest policies
 - o Member notes that Ed Davis was the former Boston Police Commissioner
 - o VC Kirleis comments that consultant’s expertise was beneficial given the larger context of current events that the University is operating within
- FC Chair Amy Todd questions VC: Did the UMass President’s Office direct each campus to review and update their respective protest policies?
 - o VC Kirleis reiterates that campus construction was the impetus for the policy, President’s Office did not provide directive and individual campuses underwent their own processes for reasons specific to each campus
 - o VC Kirleis advises that President’s Office did facilitate the hiring of Edward Davis Company as a consultant, making it easier for each campus to utilize their services
 - o Member questions VC: Do you have a report of the specific recommendations that the consultant firm made?
 - o VC Kirleis responds that consultant firm did not initiate any proposals, the committee sent them the proposed language of the policy and they provided feedback
- Member questions VC: The exclusion of the new quad from the allowable spaces for protest seems counterintuitive. Can you clarify why it was excluded?
 - o VC Kirleis responds that the quad is a space which can be reserved for a variety of purposes, just like any other space on campus
 - o VC Kirleis advises that Space Use Policy governs all spaces on campus and all possible usages, it isn’t specifically a policy to govern protests only
 - o VC Kirleis advises that the quad was not designed to accommodate protests, it is a critical juncture for crossing campus which protests would impede

- Member comments on troubling dynamic between campus beautification projects and the militarization of this beautified campus, suggests that the “cosmetic optics” of the physical space pale in comparison to the reality of a peaceful demonstration of students, staff, and faculty being surrounded by armed police
 - VC Kirleis advises that purpose of Advance Notice Form is to allow Administration to work with demonstration planners in advance to avoid such issues
 - VC Kirleis elaborates on protocols for determining response to demonstrations: Office of Student Affairs handles student-organized events, Human Resources and/or Provost’s Office handles staff- and faculty-organized events, Chief of Police handles events organized by outside parties
 - VC Kirleis advises that if Administration is unable to determine who has organized an event, police are dispatched to ascertain the identities of the organizers and then triage the interaction to Student Affairs, Human Resources, or Provost’s Office depending on the facts they ascertain
 - VC Kirleis advises that regardless of which office takes the lead, the purpose is to facilitate the success of the event
 - VC Kirleis asserts that the policy is ‘content neutral’ and is solely about ensuring safety and success of events, not using Advanced Notice form to screen which events to allow to take place
- FC Chair Amy Todd questions VC: In the decades I’ve been on this campus I don’t recall ever having seen Human Resources confronting employees for taking public action on campus. Is this the first time this has happened?
 - VC Kirleis responds that this is the first time such a situation has arisen since the implementation of the new policy
 - VC Kirleis reiterates that purpose of the Advanced Notice form is to avoid situations like this from occurring
- Member questions VC: Given that you had determined there was a need to update the policies, were any efforts made to involve the rest of the campus community in the process beyond just upper administration?
 - VC Kirleis responds that there was an urgent need to complete the process of formulating a policy over the summer to have it in place for Fall semester
 - VC Kirleis acknowledges that there was no consultation of any campus constituencies during the process
 - VC Kirleis advises that policy has since been updated based on feedback received, specifically cites the removal of language related to ‘chalking’
 - FC Chair Amy Todd questions VC: Why was there such a sense of urgency?
 - VC Kirleis reiterates that completion of construction projects and opening of new quad necessitated a new policy to be in place for the beginning of the Fall semester
- Member questions VC: The imposition of liabilities on protest organizers is extremely concerning. Why is that provision specific to the Protest and

Demonstration section of the policy and not applicable to any events taking place on campus, such as dignitaries who require extensive security details?

- o VC Kirleis responds that there are extensive policies dictating fee structures for events organized by external parties
- o Member questions if these fee structures are consistent with the liabilities imposed via the protest policy?
- o VC Kirleis responds that fee structures are consistent with event policies at other institutions
- o VC Kirleis advises that policy is intended to govern external groups, not student groups; and that intention is to avoid incurring property damage such as other universities have experienced
- Member comments that 'marketplace of ideas' seems to be being taken literally, in that if a group cannot afford to pay the potential liabilities then they cannot afford to hold a protest on campus at all – essentially charging a fee to protest
- Member questions VC regarding timeline of policy formation: Why couldn't faculty and staff have been consulted for input over the summer? The completion of the construction projects was not unexpected, why couldn't this consultation process have begun in the Spring semester?
- Member comments that it is troubling to have rights to speech and assembly be governed by an Events Policy in the first place, Event planning is an entirely separate domain which is not germane to legal rights of campus community members
- GEO Representative seeks clarification: If a gathering occurs on campus without using the Advance Notice Form, campus police will be dispatched to determine who is in charge and defer to the appropriate office to handle?
 - o VC Kirleis confirms this is correct, repeats that once organizers are identified situation would be referred to Student Affairs for student-led events and Human Resources for staff- or faculty-led events
 - o VC Kirleis advises that Advanced Notice Form is necessary to allow Events Services to operationally plan and support events, not used to make determinations about what events will be allowed to take place
 - o GEO Representative comments on recent enforcement of policy: campus police were dispatched to a peaceful assembly, event attendees were understandably intimidated by this armed police presence, then two staff members were charged with employee conduct violations based on the subjective interpretations of these police officers alleging that the staff members were uncooperative
- Member comments on removal of the Quad as a sanctioned space for protests: There is a tradition of protests on the Quad going back decades. The renovations have expanded the area and made it more open and accessible, so the explanation that protests cannot be allowed to occur there because it would impede people's ability to move across the campus doesn't make any sense.

- o VC Kirleis responds that protests in Skylight Park Plaza impedes flow of pedestrian traffic between Wheatley Hall, McCormack Hall, and Campus Center; does not address original question about the Quad itself
 - o FC Chair Amy Todd comments that prior version of Space Use Policy already contained provisions to prevent activities that obstruct access to building or disrupt flow of pedestrian traffic
 - o FC Chair Amy Todd comments that University-sponsored events often take up space and impede traffic in these areas, such as Chancellor's Barbeque which had tables and crowds lining the entire brick pathway from Campus Center to Healey Library. It appears to be disingenuous to apply the logic of preventing obstruction only to protests and not to these events.
- Member responds to VC Kirleis's earlier statement that policy is intended primarily to regulate outside groups coming to campus: If this is really the case then policy language needs to be updated to reflect this, as it is currently written it clearly applies to students, faculty, and staff.
- Member comments that provisions of the policy which imposes liabilities on event organizers produces a chilling effect that impacts entire campus. The Advance Notice Form is therefore not a benign administrative exercise, it imposes potential liabilities and penalties on anyone wishing to exercise their right to free assembly.
- Member comments that Space Use Policy fits into broader pattern of Administration using false sense of urgency to justify imposition of poorly thought out policies, and contempt for principles of shared governance
- Member questions VC Kirleis: When the policy refers to capacity limits for spaces, would that be counted based on actual participants in a protest or would it also include anyone passing by and observing?
 - o VC Kirleis advises that capacity limits would only apply to actual participants of a protest, not including passersby or observers
- Member questions VC Kirleis regarding liability provisions: If campus police are dispatched to a protest to observe and gather information, would organizers be responsible for the costs associated with that?
 - o VC Kirleis advises that organizers would not be liable for costs in this situation, liability provisions only apply in cases where there is a need for an extra police presence above and beyond the standard expectations
 - o Member comments that language of policy needs to be clarified to reflect this point, as currently written it could be interpreted either way
- CSU President Alexa MacPherson comments that CSU was the only bargaining unit whose members were served with disciplinary notices related to the October 8th vigil, despite presence and participation of members from FSU, PSU, GEO, and graduate and undergraduate student bodies
 - o CSU President reports that Human Resources replied, "What's the rush?" in response to inquiries about the timeline for disciplinary decisions to be made in the two CSU members cases, both of which have received no updates since their initial Pre-Disciplinary Hearings 2 weeks ago

- o CSU President reports that she was informed Massachusetts State Police were alerted to be on stand-by to assist with disbanding vigil and arresting participants
- o CSU President reports that members of Administration were seen photographing and videotaping vigil participants, and seeking input from attendees of vigil to identify those pictured in photos and videos
- o CSU President comments that members of Administration were observed laughing and joking amongst themselves during this somber event, recommends that Administrators attend the sensitivity trainings that are frequently offered by Human Resources
- o CSU President comments on the undue stress and distraction this entire ordeal has imposed on the two CSU members charged with disciplinary violations, as well as the Union leaders and campus community who has committed time and energy to support them; all of which distracts from the real work of keeping campus running
- FC Chair Amy Todd questions VC Kirleis: Were any students involved at any point in the conversations regarding the formation of this Space Use Policy?
 - o FC Chair Amy Todd cites Board of Trustees Statement of University Governance ([Doc. T73-098](#)), Section I, Article B, Paragraph 4: “Students will have primary responsibility for services and activities which are designed primarily to serve students or those which are financed primarily by students, managing student political affairs and organizational matters, and setting standards for student behavior, conduct, and discipline.”
 - o VC Kirleis responds that no students were not consulted with as part of these conversations
- Member comments that lack of consultations with students or faculty indicates Administration’s contempt for shared governance, implies that policy is more so about control, surveillance, and intimidation than any constructive purpose
 - o Member comments on hypocritical contrast between email sent on 10/7 by Vice Chancellor Ferrer-Muñiz and Vice Chancellor Marie Bowen to campus community praising members of campus community who support each other through difficult political and emotional times we are in, and then penalizing staff members for doing exactly that during the vigil on 10/8
 - o Member comments that if Provost and Chancellor cannot commit to having open and honest conversations with campus community members about these issues, then campus community deserve better leadership
- Member questions VC Kirleis regarding liability provisions: Is it possible to submit the Advance Notice Form without accepting the liability provisions?
 - o VC Kirleis: People can submit the form to initiate the process, and then have conversations about these concerns prior to the event actually taking place
 - o Member seeks clarification: The language of the policy indicates organizers will be liable for any damages or expenses, signing the Advanced Notice Form legally requires them to accept that liability. Without that signature,

there would be no legal basis for assigning liability to these organizers, so signing the form is not an invitation to an open conversation it is a legally binding contract.

- o VC Kirleis responds that Administration has the prerogative to enforce the policy, and reiterates that it is intended for outside groups
- o Member reiterates that policy language does not specify its applicability to outside groups only
- o VC Kirelsi responds that University just spent hundreds of thousands of dollars on renovations and cannot afford to permit a protest to take place which might threaten to destroy those investments
- o Member comments that state law already exists to penalize property destruction, unclear of the necessity for campus policy to dictate this
- o VC Kirleis reiterates talking point about policy focusing on preventing destruction by outside groups
- o Member seeks clarification: If I plan a protest and someone passing by trips on a shoelace and injures themselves, am I liable for that?
- o Member comments that liabilities are a discouragement for people not to engage in protected rights to speech and assembly on a public campus, and notes that protesting is in itself actually part of the educational experience
- o GEO Representative comments: The University spent hundreds of thousands of dollars on building a new Quad, while refusing to pay workers living wages, and now expects workers to forfeit their rights in order to protect the Quad

Motion Approved – 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained

II. Motion to Adjourn

Motion Approved – unanimous

Appendix A

The General Education Committee and its Distribution Subcommittee offer one motion for the November 4 Faculty Council agenda. The proposal may be found in Curriculog.

Moved: That Gerontology 190, Death and Dying, be approved as satisfying the Social and Behavioral Science distribution requirement.

Course Description: This course focuses on death and dying as social phenomena, which have implications not only for the dying person, but for surviving relatives and loved ones, as well as for social systems and structures that manage the dying process. Taking an analytic approach to death and dying, this course aims to help students link personal experiences of death and loss with broader social and structural issues concerning death, dying, and bereavement. This will include discussion of healthcare and life sustaining treatment, palliative care and hospice, as well as bereavement and rituals surrounding death and burial.

General Education Capabilities (two are required): Verbal Reasoning (Critical Thinking), Critical Reading and Analysis, and Effective Communication (writing, speaking, or other forms of expressive communication).

Appendix B

GSC Motions for November 4, 2024 FC Meeting
All materials available for review on Curriculog

Motion #1

From: CEHD

Request for a new course, HIGHED 895 Dissertation Support Seminar, for doctoral students who need additional support at any point in the Dissertation process and is malleable to meet the individual needs of the students who register. It is tailored for students who have completed their coursework and have struggled to finalize their dissertation proposal or have been away from their doctoral program for a number of years. The course is a scaffold to equip students with practical skills in basic research designs, empowering them to make informed judgments that align research designs with specific research problems in higher and urban education. Students learn how to construct a research question that can be empirically addressed during dissertation preparation, enhancing their research capabilities and fostering a sense of confidence in their abilities. Previously offered as HIGHED 797 - 02 Special Topics Dissertation Support Seminar, Spring 2024.

Description: This course is designed for advanced doctoral students who have completed coursework (including all program dissertation seminar courses) and at least two semesters from coursework completion. Those enrolled in this support seminar will work on completing preliminary dissertation proposal work that is needed to move toward completion of their individual study/research topic for their dissertation in their doctoral program of study. Students will be provided with assistance with academic writing, research study (re)conceptualization, literature searches, research design, drafting, and writing final drafts of their dissertation proposal.

Motion #2

From: CEHD

Request for a course change to INSDSG 655 Project in Multimedia. This proposal would combine INSDSG 655 Project in Multimedia and INSDSG 651 Designing Your Online Professional Presence and allow for two streams within the same course. Because there are two streams, students would be permitted to take the course twice for credit (unless they have already taken INSDSG 651). This new model would mean that INSDSG 651 is not offered for the foreseeable future. This requires a change to the course description for INSDSG 655 and allowing the course to be repeated once, with the student taking the other stream the second time.

Old description: This course provides an opportunity for students to create a website or eBook project using multimedia including text, hypertext, images, video, audio, and interactivity. The process begins with the creation of an instructional design document specific to multimedia projects. Students use their choice of technology tools to complete the project.

New description: This course provides an opportunity for students to create a website or eBook project using multimedia including text, hypertext, images, video, audio, and interactivity. The process begins with the creation of an instructional design document specific to multimedia projects. Students use their choice of technology tools to complete the project. This course has two learning streams: (1) the project stream which involves creating an educational eBook or Website, and (2) professional portfolio which involves creating an online portfolio. This course can be taken twice.

Rationale: To complete their certificate in Instructional Technology, graduate students in the Instructional Design program need to take either INSDSG 655 Project in Multimedia or INSDSG 651 Designing Your Online Professional Presence. With the reduced frequency in running the courses due to lower enrollment, students end up taking whichever is available, which often is not appropriate for them.

Although the projects themselves involve creating different types of content, both courses require the creation of a multimedia project. This change allows INSDSG 655 to run more frequently and helps to ensure that students take the track that aligns best with their needs.

Appendix C

Whereas, without further evaluation of governance documents, this policy may revise specified GA support in graduate program proposals that were already approved through the process of academic governance;

Whereas, GPDs have not been given an explanation or evidence for why the previous allocation model needs to be changed and why it needs to be changed now;

Whereas, the priority for doctoral programs will likely shrink or shutter Master's programs, especially those that cannot support students through external grant funding;

Whereas, the priority for "instructional capacity" will likely reduce the number of Research Assistants (RAs), eliminating research support for faculty that will deny students opportunities to receive faculty mentorship, develop research skills that are critical for their education as graduate students, and participate in publication opportunities;

Whereas, without further evaluation of the consequences for diversity, equity, and inclusion, reallocation may cut GAs from programs and colleges that support students from historically underrepresented populations, particularly first generation, working class, and BIPOC students;

Whereas, this new policy will create competition between programs and colleges that will negatively affect our commitment to be an anti-racist and health-promoting public university:

Be it resolved, that the Provost and the Office of Graduate Studies put an immediate halt to the rollout of this new policy, convene a committee of GPDs from across all colleges to offer direct input in the development of any new GA allocation policy, and maintain level funding for all programs until any new policy is fully evaluated by all GPDs in all graduate programs.

Appendix D

Motion: Inter-College Requirement Change Notification

The following motion[s] are meant to remedy a structural problem in the undergraduate program review process that came to the attention of the Faculty Council Executive Committee in early September: A program change in one college may involve a course offered by a department in another college. The involvement may be the addition or subtraction of the course from major requirements. Because the unit offering the course is not part of the college proposing the change, that unit is not assured of learning of the change through a normal review process leading to the college senate, where all departments are represented. Lack of timely notification may affect a department's scheduling and resource planning.

Thus, the following three motions are offered:

1. That academic units contemplating program changes that affect the offerings of units in other colleges should notify those units on impending changes so that those units might track proposals' progress through Curriculog.
2. That College senates are asked by the Faculty Council to check that those units from other colleges whose courses are part of program proposals have been notified of the changes during the senates' review of the proposals. This request is made in the interest of collegiality among colleges and the effective use of instructional resources.
3. That a question be added to the Curriculog form for substantial program changes (up1) that asks originators of proposals to state whether the proposed change requires or eliminates contributions of course spaces from colleges other than their own. The question would include a request that a copy of a notification to each affected unit be included in the proposal's "file" folder and inclusion of the affected unit in the decision route.

Appendix E

College of Liberal Arts Resolution on Space Use & Reservation Policies

Whereas: The University unilaterally changed the Protest and Demonstration sections of the Space Use & Reservation Policies in the summer, notifying the campus community on August 30, 2024, and then doing so again on October 4, 2024 with no notification, curtailing the “maximum freedom of expression” necessary for faculty, staff, and students to protest and demonstrate on a public campus. Whereas these new amendments cause undue burdens on the right to speak publicly.

Whereas: On September 10, 2024, the Massachusetts Teachers Association (MTA) sent a cease-and-desist letter on behalf of the Faculty Staff Union regarding the implementation of the new Space Use Policy arguing that such changes are “an intrusion on our labor management relationship” requiring bargaining.

Whereas: This new policy recognizes only four locations (University Entrance, Campus Center Lawn, Skylight Par Plaza, Campus Center 1st Floor Terrace) as public assembly locations and bans the use of the following locations: “Interior spaces within academic buildings, administrative areas, libraries, computer labs, healthcare facilities, athletic facilities, and residence halls are restricted to their primary purpose and may not be used for protest or demonstration” (12).

Whereas: This new policy leaves it at the discretion of the university to determine whether protests and demonstrations are impromptu, i.e., due to events occurring within the span of the day (“spontaneous expression”) which can only lead to subjective assessment: “The University acknowledges that sometimes protest or demonstration by members of its community may be caused by immediate events for which the 5-day requirement is impractical. The University will work with individuals to comply with all other aspects of this policy, but exceptions to the advance notice requirement may be made when protests or demonstrations are caused by news or affairs coming into the public knowledge less than 24-hours previously” (13).

Whereas: This new policy fails to define how it will evaluate safety concerns regarding language: “If the use of flyers, banners, and signs creates safety concerns or impedes the participation of others, University officials will require the individuals carrying the posters, banners, or signs to move to a different location or remove their materials” (14).

Whereas: This new policy imposes undue and possibly “unlimited” financial obligations on persons and organizations protesting and demonstrating, which is determined solely at the discretion of the university: “Individuals must be prepared to compensate all university servicing departments for expenses resulting from protest or demonstration, including

custodial services, traffic control, grounds maintenance, and event services arrangements. The chief of police or their designee, may exercise their public safety discretion to detail one or more police officers to attend and remain present for a protest, at which time services and any reasonable costs accrued shall be the responsibility of the individual or individual(s) organizing and/or participating in the protest or demonstration or organization an event that triggers a counter protest. If unforeseen or extraordinary staff support needs arise from the protest, the university reserves the right to bill users of campus facilities whether or not such staffing support has been agreed to in advance” (14-15).

Whereas: This new policy fails to determine how employees or enforcement officials can distinguish between attire meant to conceal identities and attire used as safety precaution (“protective masks”) outside of subjective assessments: “Please note, attire that attempts to disguises or conceal the identity of the wearer that the institution may be deem as obstructing the enforcement of these rules or the law, or to intimidate, hinder, or interrupt a UMass Boston employee or enforcement official in the lawful performance of their duty is not permitted during protest or demonstration” (15).

Whereas: On October 8, 2024, the University deployed several armed police officers and unarmed security guards (including Chief of Police Stacey Lloyd) and several administrators (including the Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs, Karen Ferrer-Muñiz, and Mickey Gallagher, Executive Director of Labor & Employee Relations) to a peaceful assembly sponsored by the Beacon Coalition for Action (which consists of faculty, staff, and students) for not filling in the “Protest and Demonstration Advanced Notification Form.” Whereas this vigil for the lives of Khaliifah Ibn Rayford Daniels 'Abdul-Qudduus (“Marcellus Williams”), Ayşenur Ezgi Eygi, Aaron Bushnell, Matthew Nelson, and those murdered in conflicts throughout the world (including, but not limited to, Palestine, Lebanon, and Sudan) was asked to immediately disperse. Whereas there was no consideration as to the fact that there are new deaths and massacres each day that follow “spontaneous expression.” Whereas this demonstration at Skylight Park Plaza was met with intimidation and surveillance when the vigil refused to disband.

Whereas: On October 10, 2024, Kathleen Kirleis, Vice Chancellor Finance & Administration of the Space Use & Reservation Policies, stated that changes to the Space Use policy were grounded on the “marketplace of ideas.” Whereas this new policy transforms our public campus into an actual marketplace where speech will be taxed at the discretion of the university: “We basically started by really grounding the policy in affirming the marketplace of ideas where we were able to, which included and continues to include content-neutral time, place, and manner requirements that provide for us to ensure the safety of the campus community, to be able to have continuity of instructional activities as well as university business, and promote the exchange and discussion of ideas.”

And Whereas: The University has not responded to the cease-and-desist letters issued by the Faculty Staff Union (FSU), Classified Staff Union (CSU), and Professional Staff Union

(PSU) or the letter from the Foundation for Individual Rights and Expression (FIRE) condemning the new policy as a violation of free speech rights.

Be it resolved that the College of Liberal Arts requests that the recent and unilateral changes to the Space Use & Reservation Policies be immediately rescinded and that the “Protest and Demonstration Advanced Notification Form” be suspended until bargaining and meaningful dialogue is had with faculty, staff, and students.