

Minutes for Monday, May 4, 2026, 1:00 – 3:00 pm

Members Present: Amy Todd (CLA), Andre Maharaj (CEHD), Dan Finn (CLA), Daniel Gascon (CLA), Gonzalo Bacigalupe (CEHD), Gretchen Umholtz (CLA), James Soldner (CEHD), Jose D'Incao (CSM), Judith Pare (MCNHS), Kathryn Archard (CM), Larry J. Kaye (CLA), Lorena Estrada-Martinez (SFE), Lusa Lo (CEHD), Lynne Benson (CLA), Marlene Kim (CLA), Mehran Azimi (CM), Nelson Lande (CLA), Niya Sa (CSM), Richard Hunter (CLA), Shaman Hatley (CLA), Timothy Oleksiak (CLA), Travis Johnston (CLA), Tyler Hull (CM)

Members Absent: Abdelkrim Mouhib (CLA), Ana Lindsay (MCNHS), Anthony Van DerMeer (CLA), Jeffrey Edward Stokes (MCNHS), Leon Zurawicki (CM), Peter Lert (CSM), Todd Drogy (HC)

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

I.Motion to Approve or Amend the Agenda

- Amendment: postpone Items II (seating of newly elected councilors) and Item III (election of Chair, Associate Chair, and Executive Committee Members) to end of Agenda; based on past practice

Motion Approved, as Amended - unanimous

II.Motion to approve the April 2026 Meeting Minutes

Motion Approved - unanimous

III.Motion to recommend candidates for the degree of Bachelor of Arts or Bachelor of Science

Be it moved that faculties recommend to ~~the President and the Board of Trustees~~ *the Chancellor of UMass Boston* that the listed students and any additional candidates who upon completion of all requirements for graduation and the maintenance of good standing be awarded the degree of Bachelor of Arts or Bachelor of Science.

- Amendment: replace “the President and the Board of Trustees” with “the Chancellor of UMass Boston”, reflecting correction to approval process

Motion Approved, as Amended - unanimous

IV.Motion to recommend candidates for the Graduate degrees

Be it moved that faculties recommend to ~~the President and the Board of Trustees~~ *the Chancellor of UMass Boston* that the listed students and any additional candidates who upon completion of all requirements for graduation and the maintenance of good standing be awarded the degree of Master of Arts, Master of Fine Arts, Master of Science, Master of Education, Master of Business Administration, Master of Public Administration, Master of Public Policy, Doctor of Philosophy, Doctor of Education, Doctor of Nursing Practice, Certificate of Advanced Graduate Study, Post-Master's Certificate, Educational Specialist.

- Amendment: replace “the President and the Board of Trustees” with “the Chancellor of UMass Boston”, reflecting correction to approval process

Motion Approved, as Amended - unanimous

V.Motion to admit to the record the response from Provost Berger and Marie Bowen to “Motion concerning requests from Human Relations that faculty re-file I-9 form,” passed on March 2, 2026 (and again on April 6, 2026). (see [Appendix A](#) below)

Motion Approved - unanimous

VI.Motions to approve new members of standing committees:

Motion to add Kathryn Archard (Faculty Council) from Management and Serra Acar from Curriculum & Instruction to the Academic Affairs Committee.

Rationale: Both are members of the Open Education Resources (OER) committee. Presently, the OER has no means to contact FC, nor bring any motions to FC.

Motion Approved - unanimous

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

Motion Approved - unanimous

VIII. Motion to approve the Revised Acceptable Use Policy (AUP)

- Supporting documents: [Acceptable Use Policy \(Clean copy plus prior drafts\)](#)
- Motion was tabled on [February Faculty Council Meeting](#)
- Members endorse concerns raised in [Parliamentarian Report](#), argue need for issues raised therein to be discussed and incorporated into policy before voting
- Members comment that policy is risk averse and primarily protects the institution over individual faculty members (e.g. no explicit mention of academic freedom)
- Member questions what surveillance practices are already in place, and how approval of the AUP would substantively affect these practices
- Chief Information Officer (CIO) David Albrecht clarifies that a major purpose of the proposed AUP is to provide greater clarity and transparency on existing security and surveillance practices.
 - IT does currently monitor devices for malicious software and for exfiltration of protected data (e.g. FERPA, PII, financial data) beyond university networks
 - IT does not search device contents or activity logs beyond this, unless instructed to do so by an authorized investigatory procedure (e.g. FOIA Request, subpoena, Human Resources investigation, etc.) and always in consultation with Office of General Counsel (OGC)
 - Members argue need for these clarifications to be explicitly incorporated into policy language to avoid future confusion
- CIO Albrecht clarifies that any devices utilizing university infrastructure (including personal devices connected to university wifi) would be subject to AUP, but that searches and surveillance would only be conducted according to above practices
 - CIO Albrecht clarifies that all university email correspondence is already legally subject to public records requests. Further cautions that university business should only be conducted over university emails, as use of personal email to conduct university business would then subject that personal email to public records law.
- CIO Albrecht clarifies that AI provisions of policy are primarily concerned with ensuring no protected data (e.g. FERPA, PII, financial data) is being fed into AI models that operate externally from university servers.
 - Google Gemini and Microsoft Copilot have been official approved and procured by the university, and may be accessed using UMB log-in credentials. When accessing these tools via UMB log-in, the data being fed into them will be protected within university servers.
- Member raises concern about AUP's lack of clarify on how FOIA requests are handled, specifically provisions for notifying faculty if they are being subjected.
 - Vice Chancellor for Marketing & Engagement Megan Sullivan clarifies university's process for handling FOIA requests: Matthew Fenlon (Assistant Chancellor Government Relations) is the university's designated FOIA representative. When a FOIA request is received, AC Fenlon works with Office of General Counsel to review and refine the scope as much as legally permissible. Human Resources then notifies impacted Faculty members.

- VC Sullivan confirms that impacted Faculty members are notified by Human Resources *before* the university authorizes IT to compile and release requested information.
- Amendment: Faculty Council approves of the AUP, subject to the provision of an accompanying FAQ protocol which documents the above clarifications.

Amendment Approved - unanimous

Motion Approved, as Amended – 14 in favor, 4 abstentions

IX.Motion to Allow internship courses from Community Colleges to transfer to UMass Boston as elective credit (Academic Affairs Committee)

Whereas current University policy is that internship courses should not be accepted in transfer from Community Colleges; and

Whereas our major "feeder" Community Colleges, specifically Bunker Hill Community College and Roxbury Community College, have expressed concerns over this policy as many, though not all, of their programs incorporate internships; and

Whereas other institutions are accepting these courses in transfer and we are losing a competitive advantage;

Be it resolved that Faculty Council approves the recommendation of the Academic Affairs Committee that UMass Boston should:

1. Allow internship courses from Community Colleges to transfer to UMass Boston as elective credits and
2. Allow departmental discretion for when such courses can transfer as equivalents.

Rationale (best practices and anticipated outcomes):

After surveying public transfer credit databases from other state institutions, including other UMass four-year institutions, it is found that many institutions are allowing these courses to transfer in for elective credit. In some cases, though not many, they are transferring in as equivalent credit. (review [hyperlink document](#)). AACRO (The American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers) recommends institutions allow internships for credit where possible and does not denote a reason that we should not accept these courses. See Guide to Best Practices: Awarding Transfer and Prior Learning Credit posted in the Motions & Supporting Documents subfolder in the May Meeting Documents Folder.

The proposed change will help in maintaining positive relationships with key community college partners such as BHCC and RCC – especially as we pursue another joint admissions agreement with RCC. The MassTransfer (Articulation) program includes pathways that are both linked and mapped where we must guarantee 60 credits. By allowing internships to transfer in for credit, we are enabling additional programs to be linked and mapped because historically we've excluded those with internships incorporated.

- Supporting documents: [Motions from the Academic Affairs Committee](#)
- Academic Affairs Committee clarifies that students who earn an Associate's Degree at a community college are supposed to be eligible to automatically transfer 60 credits toward an undergraduate degree at UMass Boston per existing statewide agreements, but current UMass Boston policy doesn't allow for transfer of internship course credits earned during associate degree career
- Academic Affairs Committee clarifies that proposal is for internship transfer credit to be automatically approved as elective credits, but that individual programs may choose to approve for required credits toward degree requirements. Programs that have their own internship or capstone requirements would be under no obligation to approve transfer credits in lieu of that degree requirement.

Motion Approved – 17 in favor, 1 abstention

X.Motion to make changes to the course repeat policy (Academic Affairs Committee)

Be it resolved that Faculty Council approves the recommendations of the Academic Affairs Committee that:

1. A student's first F grade *in any given course at UMass Boston* should not count as a repeat when a student enrolls in the same course again, according to the following conditions:

The present course repeat policy is 4 repeats lifetime for undergraduate students. AAC recommends not counting the first F grade as a repeat when the student enrolls in the same course again. This maintains the 4-repeat limit (with possible appeals to the Director, Undergraduate Studies for an additional repeat). The F grade will appear on the transcript but not be factored into the GPA if a repeat replaces the F grade with a passing grade. If a course is failed for the second time followed by a new enrollment in the same course, then the third attempt is counted as a repeat. The Academic Policy Initiative (API) group has a similar recommendation.

2. The current practice of not counting a W as a repeat should be maintained.

3. The current limit of 4 repeats lifetime for undergraduates should be maintained, with exception for the first F grade when a student re-enrolls in the same course. The AAC does not support unlimited repeats.

4. When a student repeats a course, the current policy is to use the repeat grade to replace the original grade. The AAC recommends using the better grade of the two. The Registrar says that this can be done. Both grades will be evident on the transcript but only the higher of the repeated course grades will be included in the GPA. The API has a similar recommendation.

5. Departmental policy, rather than a broad UMB standard, should determine whether GenEd courses can be repeated. Some institutions disallow repeating GenEd courses. The Registrar informed the AAC that it is not easy always to define what is a GenEd vs elective course. Thus, the AAC defers to departmental policy.

6. Departmental policy, rather than a broad UMB standard, should determine whether a student who has completed advanced courses within a major/minor should be allowed to subsequently repeat a lower-level course required for that major/minor. Some feel that this is unfair to the students competing against a more advanced student (e.g. one who has completed advanced courses). The AAC defers to departmental policy.

7. Departmental oversight of their major(s) and/or program(s) cannot be overruled, subsumed, or supplanted. Departmental oversight of the aforementioned matters is obligatory to their educational endeavors and their expertise is unequaled by any general policy impacting their major(s) and/or program(s). Rationale: Multiple documents are attached for the perusal of the FC members, including the most recent changes approved by FC.

For recommendation 1: Best practices at myriad institutions (see included document), including UMB peer institutions, does not count the first F grade as a repeat.

Specifically for our students, we have many freshmen failing one or more courses in their first semester(s) due to:

- being a first generation student with little understanding of college expectations;
- not being appropriately prepared by their High School academic experiences;
- commuting or housing issues combined with poor time management;
- family situation: lack of a study space and/or a disruptive environment;
- course load: CSM majors have a first semester of 18 credits for some majors, including a Biology lec/lab course, a Chemistry lec/lab course, a gateway seminar, Eng 101, Math 140 (calculus) (or Math 130, pre-calculus, which is then 17 credits course load).

The first-year experience of F grades may preclude the student from having some or all future repeats available. Combined with the disheartening experience of F grades students may discontinue their college experience. Thus, as a matter of retention of incoming students this is a reasonable change. From the included documents it is obvious that the majority of repeated courses are introductory courses. "Students who continue into the second year on track (in terms of credit accumulation and grade point average) are far more likely to graduate than students who do not." (see document).

For recommendation 3: Unlimited repeats were discussed and rejected because if a student is allowed to repeat a course indefinitely that has consequences: they may preclude a freshman or sophomore student from enrolling in a limited enrollment course, thereby preventing that student from staying on track to graduate in 4 years; in courses where course supplies are a significant budget issue, unlimited repeats will

exhaust funds; some departments have rules preventing a third attempt at a course for educational reasons (data indicates that after the second attempt it is unlikely that the grade will improve).

For recommendation 4: Using the better grade is also best practice at many institutions including our peer institutions (see documents).

- Supporting documents: [Motions from the Academic Affairs Committee](#)
- Academic Affairs Committee clarifies that under proposed policy if a student receives an F and then needs to retake the course, that retake would not be counted against the maximum cap of 4 total retakes in an undergraduate career. Failing and retaking a 2nd time would be counted as a repeat. Retaking a course that you did not fail in an attempt to raise your GPA (e.g. earning a B and retaking to attempt an A) would be counted as a repeat.
- Registrar clarifies the majority of requests for exceptions to the current cap of 4 retakes are from students who have received an F, so the proposal to separate this situation into own category is intended to remove burden of requesting exception.
- Director of Undergraduate Studies Tim Blackman clarifies that majority of repeat requests are for required coursework in a major, since without being granted a repeat there is no pathway to graduation this then becomes a retention issue.
- Academic Affairs Committee clarifies many freshmen (especially first generation college students) face difficulty adjusting to academic expectations at university level, policy is intended to give greater leeway during this adjustment period.
- Registrar clarifies that if a course is retaken, both grades are listed on transcript but only the higher grade is used to calculate GPA (except for medical school and law school, which average both grades).
- Registrar clarifies that failed courses still generate issues with academic standing and financial aid eligibility, so there are still guardrails in place to ensure this policy wouldn't incentivize failing.
- Member questions financial aid implications of repeated coursework. Registrar confirms that Financial Aid charges based on attempted, not completed, credits.
- Member questions if students with documented accommodations would be granted flexibility under this policy. Director Blackman clarifies that students provide a personal statement when petitions for repeat exemptions, and documented accommodations are considered.
- Amendment: Insert "in any given course at UMass Boston" in recommendation 1, to clarify that policy pertains to first F grade in a particular course rather than first F grade of overall undergraduate career.

Amendment Approved - unanimous

Motion Approved, as Amended – 15 in favor, 1 opposed, 1 abstention

XI.Motion to revise the UMB Pass/Fail option (Academic Affairs Committee)

Be it resolved that Faculty Council approves the following recommendations of the Academic Affairs Committee:

That students may use more than one P/F during the same semester as part of their total 8 P/F available during their undergraduate careers at UMass Boston. Current UMB policy limits students to one P/F course per semester, for a maximum of 8 P/F courses for the student's lifetime. The AAC suggests that the limit be maintained at 8 P/F courses for the student's lifetime, but that the 8 repeats need not be only one per semester. If a student wished to use more than one P/F in a semester that would be acceptable but, again, they are still limited to 8 per career at UMB.

2. That current UMB policy allowing GenEd courses to be taken P/F should continue. Some institutions (UMASS Amherst) prevent the P/F option from being used for GenEd courses. The AAC believes that GenEd courses should be eligible for P/F, but that the hosting department should be able to restrict a course from being P/F.

3. That if a student earns a grade of A in a course taken P/F, the P will automatically change to an A on the student's transcript when that letter grade numerically exceeds the student's total GPA.
4. That students should have the option of changing a P to a letter grade if doing so will improve their GPA, and should be notified on Wisers about options for doing so, via an opt-in drop down menu whereby a student can indicate their minimum acceptable letter grade in lieu of the P.
5. That faculty should not be required to approve a student to register for P/F before their academic term begins (or at any other time).

Rationale (and logistical considerations):

For Recommendation 1: There are instances where a student may need, during a semester, to change more than one course to P/F. This may occur for personal issues and be necessary to maintain their academic standing that would be in jeopardy due to low grades, maintain financial aide, maintain international status, etc. By maintaining the limit of 8 P/F courses during their undergraduate career we ensure academic credibility. This refers to P appearing on the transcript no more than 8 times.

For Recommendation 2: The AAC found no cogent reason to alter the current UMB policy of P/F with regard to GenEd courses.

For Recommendations 3 and 4: Some institutions (including UMass Amherst) automatically change a P to an A, some (including UMass Amherst) change a P to a letter grade if that letter grade numerically exceeds the total GPA. The AAC recommends that:

When students register there should be a notice in the Wisers portal about changing a P to a letter grade after grades are filed. The Registrar indicates this could be a possibility and makes more sense to provide notification up front as opposed to after grades are posted. Registrar needs to check with UITS to see if this is possible. A student could indicate, via a drop-down menu, if they opt in and could indicate the minimum grade acceptable in lieu of the P.

Automatically changing a P to an A grade seems appropriate. It will not negatively affect the student's GPA. Moreover, if students are aware that a P is changed automatically to A we believe that their participation and engagement in a course will be more enthusiastic and dedicated.

The opt-in possibility in the Wisers portal to change a P to a grade lower than A offers students a means to improve their GPA if the grade less than A is a betterment. Again, if students are aware that a P can be changed to a passing grade acceptable to them, we believe that their participation and engagement in a course will be more enthusiastic and dedicated. Some students, however, may not wish to have certain grades appear on their transcript so their choice in changing a P to a grade is necessary as part of the opt-in choice.

Without an opt-in choice with a minimum grade indicated, there are caveats. First is the timing. If no minimum grade is chosen beforehand then the Registrar would contact students who requested the opt-in possibility. However, regarding the Registrar contacting students about a P being possibly changed to a letter grade, after grades posted: The Registrar can let all students that opted for a P know that they are now allowed to rescind that decision after grades are posted. The two critical issues would be where to notify them, and the timing on the change. Also, the Registrar would not be able to complete end of term processing, such as Academic Standing, etc., until all grades are finalized. Grade changes would impact a student's semester academic standing significantly; therefore there would need to be strict deadlines imposed. Thus, an opt-in with a drop down menu to indicate the student's minimum letter grade is necessary.

Regarding a student being able to see their reported grade so that they can make the decision if they still want the P grade, before the Registrar notifies them, would be another change that the Registrar would have to present to UITS as a system enhancement.

- Supporting documents: [Motions from the Academic Affairs Committee](#)
- Member raises concern that policy will incentivize students to use up their limited Pass/Fail options early in undergraduate career and have none left by the time they reach more challenging upper level course work.

- Academic Affairs Committee clarifies that data shows majority of students struggle during early semesters while adjusting to academic expectations of university coursework. Further clarifies that most required core courses for majors do not permit Pass/Fail options anyway.
- Academic Affairs Committee clarifies that policy was proposed because it would incentivize students who are initially enrolled as Pass/Fail to continue working hard to earn a higher letter grade

Motion Approved – 14 in favor, 1 opposed, 1 abstention

XII.Motion to request survey items be included on Campus Climate Survey (Marlene Kim (Faculty Council) and Maxim Olchanyi (CSM Senate Chair))

Whereas, the Satisfaction Survey will be conducted by an outside vendor; and

Whereas, input from faculty is important for the questions asked; and

Whereas, dissemination of the results is important as well;

Be it Resolved that the following questions be included on this survey; and

Be it Further Resolved that the survey results pertaining to these questions be disseminated campus-wide, with each question addressed individually.

Please rate your overall satisfaction with the following aspects of your experience at UMass Boston:

college leadership

(a) Satisfied; (b) Neutral; (c) Dissatisfied

university leadership

(a) Satisfied; (b) Neutral; (c) Dissatisfied

Please rate the degree of your agreement with the following statements:

I feel valued by the college administrators

(a) Agree; (b) Neither agree nor disagree; (c) Disagree

I feel valued by the university administrators

(a) Agree; (b) Neither agree nor disagree; (c) Disagree

Please rate the degree of your agreement with the following statements:

The office of the Dean supports shared governance

(a) Agree; (b) Neither agree nor disagree; (c) Disagree

The office of the Provost supports shared governance

(a) Agree; (b) Neither agree nor disagree; (c) Disagree

Motion Approved – 13 in favor, 2 abstentions

XIII.Discussion of previously circulated reports from administrators:

- Reports posted: [5. Administrators' Reports](#)

A. Chancellor - Marcelo Suárez-Orozco

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

C. Vice Chancellor for Administration & Finance – Kathleen Kirleis

XIV.Motion to Adjourn & reconvene for discussion of remaining agenda items on May 11th

- Discussion of previously circulated reports from union representatives
- Discussion of previously circulated reports from student government
- Motion to enter into executive session to discuss the report of the Faculty Council Working Group on the Provost's Five Year Performance Evaluation
- Seating of newly elected councilors; appreciation for departing councilors
- Election of Chair of Faculty Council, election of Associate Chair and election of other Executive Committee Members
- New Business

Motion Approved – unanimous

